UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 94—PART 8

JULY 26, 1948, TO DECEMBER 31, 1948
(PAGES 9353 TO 10316)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1948

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
MAY 31 '49

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 26, 1948

The Senate reassembled this day in its Chamber at the Capitol, in the city of Washington, in pursuance of the proclamation of the President of the United States of the 15th day of July 1948.

ARTHUR VANDENBERG, President pro tempore, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of infallible wisdom, we have entered upon days which are fraught with perplexing problems and heavy responsibilities, but also with glorious opportunities and possibilities.

We pray that we may have the interpreting light and the clear and confident leading of Thy spirit in all our deliberations and decisions.

May the ideals and principles of our blessed Lord not only stir our emotions but our wills, and may every lofty God-inspired sentiment be translated into action and achievement.

Grant that it may be the goal of all our aspirations to glorify Thy great and holy name and to build Thy kingdom of peace and good will among men and nations.

Hear us for the sake of the Christ. Amen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proclamation of the President reconvening the Congress will be read by the clerk.

The Chief Clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) read the proclamation, as follows:

CONVENING THE CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the public interest requires that the Congress of the United States should be convened at 12 o'clock noon on Monday, the 26th day of July 1948, to receive such communication as may be made by the Executive;

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the Congress of the United States to convene at the Capitol in the city of Washington on Monday, the 26th day of July 1948, at 12 o'clock noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as Members thereof are hereby required to take notice.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the United States.

Done at the city of Washington this 15th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1948, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-third.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

By the President:
G. C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hoey	Pepper
Brewster	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kem	Russell
Capehart	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capper	Knowland	Smith
Connally	Langer	Sparkman
Cooper	Lodge	Stennis
Cordon	Lucas	Stewart
Donnell	McCarthy	Taft
Downey	McClellan	Taylor
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McMahon	Thye
Fenzel	Magnuson	Tobey
Ferguson	Martin	Umstead
George	Maybank	Vandenberg
Green	Millikin	Watkins
Gurney	Moore	Wherry
Hatch	Murray	Wiley
Hawkes	Myers	Williams
Hayden	O'Conor	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official state business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without reading, the Journal of the proceedings of the Senate for the calendar days Friday, June 18, Saturday, June 19, and Sunday, June 20, 1948, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on June 20, 1948, the President pro tempore, under the authority of House Concurrent Resolution 219, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Doris E. Snyder;

S. 418. An act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes;

S. 595. An act to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war;

S. 1243. An act to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1260. An act to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers;

S. 1322. An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased;

S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III;

S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.;

S. 2242. An act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes;

S. 2281. An act to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes;

S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co., and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyance;

S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold;

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montieth;

S. 2554. An act to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes;

S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks;

S. 2655. An act to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota;

S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund;

S. 2698. An act to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institution, a State institution, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. An act to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.;

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura;

S. 2730. An act to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces and on war transfer by employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 2743. An act providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians;

S. 2747. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company;

S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment;

S. 2790. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2794. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations;

S. 2830. An act to extend for 2 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry;

S. 2849. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.;

S. 2861. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans;

S. 2877. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended;

H. R. 333. An act for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, the veterans of World War II;

H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 2798. An act to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure";

H. R. 3416. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument;

H. R. 4044. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases;

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5882. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes;

H. R. 5904. An act to continue the Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States;

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission;

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City;

H. R. 6465. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey;

H. R. 6481. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948;

H. R. 6771. An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6801. An act making appropriations for foreign aid, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations;

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees;

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor;

S. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska;

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author;

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer U. S. Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War;

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America; and

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on June 20, 1948, the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, heretofore duly signed by the Presiding Officers of the two Houses, were presented to the President of the United States by the Secretary of the Senate:

On June 21, 1948:

S. 83. An act authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn;

S. 1107. An act relating to the arming of American vessels;

S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner irrigation district, and for other purposes;

S. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer;

S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation;

S. 2186. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes";

S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act;

S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 2510. An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes;

S. 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building;

S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hun-

dredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.;

S. 2821. An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; and

S. 2825. An act to increase the rates of service-connected-death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes.

On June 23, 1948:

S. 418. An act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes;

S. 595. An act to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war;

S. 1243. An act to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1260. An act to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers;

S. 1322. An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased;

S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III;

S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc., Walsh Construction Co., and Atkinson-Kier Co.;

S. 2242. An act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes;

S. 2281. An act to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes;

S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyance;

S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold;

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montrieth;

S. 2554. An act to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes;

S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks;

S. 2655. An act to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota;

S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund;

S. 2698. An act to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. An act to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.;

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura;

S. 2730. An act to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces and on war transfer by employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 2743. An act providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians;

S. 2747. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company;

S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment;

S. 2794. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations;

S. 2830. An act to extend for 2 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry;

S. 2849. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.;

S. 2861. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans;

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

S. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

On June 24, 1948:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Doris E. Snyder;

S. 2790. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2877. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on June 20, 1948, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved acts and joint resolutions as follows:

On June 19, 1948:

S. 263. An act to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes;

S. 295. An act to further amend the thirteenth paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended;

S. 424. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John J. Higgins, and others;

S. 554. An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census;

S. 612. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, and to repeal section 36 of said chapter III of said act, as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments;

S. 692. An act to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents per mile for United States marshals and their deputies for travel on official business;

S. 873. An act for the relief of Warren H. McKenney;

S. 1062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West;

S. 1082. An act to credit service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion;

S. 1214. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes," approved August 13, 1946, as amended;

S. 1265. An act to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of James R. Walsh;

S. 1442. An act to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

S. 1470. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and Citizens' Military Training Camps who are injured or contract diseases while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1747. An act to authorize credit in certain accounts of United States property and disbursing officers under the War Department, and for other purposes;

S. 1783. An act to provide for retention in the service of certain disabled Army and Air Force personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 1790. An act to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service prior to reaching 18 years of age for the purpose of computing longevity pay, or for other pay purposes," approved March 6, 1946;

S. 1791. An act to transfer certain lands at Camp Phillips, Kans., to the Department of the Army;

S. 1795. An act to repeal section 1 of the act of April 20, 1874, prescribing regulations governing inquiries to be made in connection with disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army (18 Stat. 33; 10 U. S. C. 174);

S. 1835. An act for the relief of Harry Daniels;

S. 1861. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide promotions for temporary employees of the custodial service;

S. 1871. An act to restore certain lands to the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.;

S. 1925. An act to convey certain land to the city of Pierre, S. Dak.;

S. 2040. An act for the relief of the owners of certain properties abutting Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia;

S. 2152. An act to increase the maximum travel allowance for railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks;

S. 2251. An act to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States Naval Hospital, United States Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 2283. An act to amend the Lanham Act so as to permit the sale of certain permanent war housing thereunder to veterans at a purchase price not in excess of the cost of construction;

S. 2400. An act to authorize the President, in his discretion, to permit the stoppage of work on certain combatant vessels;

S. 2406. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make further provision for the recording of title to, interests in, and encumbrances upon certain aircraft, and for other purposes;

S. 2592. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government, and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings;

S. 2642. An act to amend the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942; and

S. 2643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a lien for moneys due hospitals for services rendered in cases caused by negligence or fault of others and providing for the recording and enforcing of such liens," approved June 30, 1939.

On June 21, 1948:

S. 1933. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to School District 55, Roosevelt County, Mont.

On June 22, 1948:

S. 1090. An act to safeguard and consolidate certain areas of exceptional public value within the Superior National Forest, State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

S. 1337. An act for the relief of Hou Chung Chay;

S. 1493. An act to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), and for other purposes;

S. 1573. An act for the relief of Marcella Kosterman;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki; and

S. 2122. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to operate and maintain ocean stations.

On June 24, 1948:

S. 1266. An act to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying;

S. 1274. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Wilkinson County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of William Collins;

S. 1275. An act conveying all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in Warren County, Miss., to the heirs, assigns, and successors in title of Moses Evans;

S. 2192. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to permit the issuance of free passes to time inspectors of carriers subject to part I of such act;

S. 2223. An act to authorize the promotion of Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, United States Army, and for other purposes;

S. 2237. An act to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act;

S. 2505. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to clarify the position of the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to such act, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish six additional positions in the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2508. An act relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico;

S. 2655. An act to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2706. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to lease for commercial purposes certain space in the building located at 811 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., commonly known as the Lafayette Building; and

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain lands and mineral deposits by the United States from the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations of Indians.

On June 25, 1948:

S. 1409. An act for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu, Atsushi Jun Imamatsu, and Tomoe Iwamatsu;

S. 2242. An act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes;

S. 2401. An act to provide for the administration of military justice within the United States Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 2675. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; and

S. 2770. An act to fix the rank of the Assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river and harbor and flood-control improvements.

On June 26, 1948:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Doris E. Snyder;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton;

S. 1853. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation;

S. 2186. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the laws relating to navigation, and for other purposes"; and

S. 2591. An act to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Gen. Jose Vervasio Artigas, and for other purposes.

On June 28, 1948:

S. 83. An act authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn;

S. 2849. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.; and

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

On June 29, 1948:

S. 3. An act to provide for the training of air-traffic control-tower operators;

S. 158. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 239. An act to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy and for a Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 765. An act for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta;

S. 1087. An act to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944;

S. 1107. An act relating to the arming of American vessels;

S. 1303. An act for the relief of Lydia A. Thompson;

S. 1322. An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 1447. An act to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes;

S. 1730. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer;

S. 2225. An act to transfer administration of the Federal Credit Union Act to the Federal Security Agency;

S. 2281. An act to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes;

S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold;

S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks;

S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota;

S. 2698. An act to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institute, a State institution, and for other purposes;

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura;

S. 2739. An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.;

S. 2747. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company;

S. 2830. An act to extend for 2 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry;

S. 2877. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended;

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the eighty-fifth anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; and

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution to change the name of the Potholes Dam in the Columbia Basin project to O'Sullivan Dam.

On June 30, 1948:

S. 418. An act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes;

S. 1820. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation;

S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyances;

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montieth;

S. 2510. An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. An act to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.;

S. 2730. An act to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces and on war transfer by employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund;

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day;

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States; and

S. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate boundary compact by and between the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

On July 1, 1948:

S. 2341. An act to authorize an increase in the annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 2790. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2825. An act to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to certain widows, children, and dependent parents of persons who served in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes;

S. 2861. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans; and

S. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

On July 2, 1948:

S. 595. An act to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war;

S. 1260. An act to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers;

S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State;

S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III;

S. 2554. An act to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industry productive capacity, and for other purposes;

S. 2743. An act providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians; and

S. 2821. An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents.

On July 3, 1948:

S. 1243. An act to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.; and

S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment.

DISAPPROVAL OF BILLS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on June 20, 1948, transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate lists of bills and a joint resolution disapproved by him, with his reasons for such action, as follows:

On July 2, 1948:

ESTATE OF WILLIAM R. STIGALL, DECEASED

S. 1717. I have withheld my approval from S. 1717, an act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased.

The purpose of this bill is to compensate the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased, for his death from injuries sustained by him while in the military service.

It appears that on September 5, 1941, Pvt. William R. Stigall, a member of Headquarters Company, First Signal Armored Battalion, Fort Knox, Ky., which was en route from Fort Knox to Camp Polk, La., by Army convoy, was accidentally electrocuted when the antenna of the radio scout car in which he was riding touched a high-tension electric power line. The convoy had halted by the roadside for the noonday meal. The antenna of the radio scout car was released to permit the canvas top of the car to be rolled back, and as the antenna rose into the air it came into contact with a high-tension power line approximately 19 feet above the ground. Private Stigall dismounted from the car, with one hand on the door thereof, and as he stepped on the ground, completing the circuit, the current flowed through his body, causing his death almost instantly. It appears that the power line had not been recognized as such by any member of the military personnel, in view of the fact that it was composed of two light wires suspended comparatively close to the ground.

In view of the fact that at the time of his death Private Stigall was in line of duty as an enlisted man of the Army, any dependents left by him would be entitled to all of the benefits conferred by general law on dependents of members of the armed forces of the United States who die in line of duty. It appears, however, that Private Stigall left no one who was dependent upon him. His service record, under the heading "Government Insurance," bears the notation "No insurance desired." Had he chosen to take advantage of the opportunity afforded him to obtain national service life insurance, he could have been insured in the maximum amount of $10,000, and his beneficiary, or beneficiaries, would have been compensated in that amount for his death. However, his father, Dumont Stigall, received the statutory death gratuity benefit, in an amount equal to the decedent's Army pay for 6 months.

The approval of this bill awarding compensation for the death of Private Stigall would be discriminatory in that it would grant to his estate a special benefit denied to the estates of other members of the armed forces where the facts are similar and to the estates of military and naval personnel who are killed in action. There are no circumstances present in this case that would warrant singling out this estate for preferential treatment. On June 11, 1948, I withheld my approval from a similar bill, S. 252, an act for the relief of the estate of Lee Jones Cardy (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 94, p. 8080, June 14, 1948). While deeply regretting the untimely death of Private Stigall, I am obliged to withhold my approval from this bill.

RATES OF PAY FOR CERTAIN VETERANS' AFFAIRS FIELD INSTALLATION POSITIONS

S. 2794. I am withholding my approval from S. 2794, an act "To authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations."

This bill would authorize the Administrator to establish pay scales for some 60,000 field employees of the Veterans' Administration, including hospital attendants, dental mechanics, and others who work in veterans' hospitals. These employees are now paid under the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923.

It is argued that this authority is needed since the Administration has had difficulty in recruiting and retaining personnel to staff veterans' hospitals. It is estimated that the increase to be given the employees affected by this bill would have been about $80 per year. Since I have just approved a bill increasing salaries for persons covered by the Classification Act by $330 per year, the authority granted by this bill would be unnecessary.

Furthermore, I do not believe that this bill represents a sound approach to the problem of recruiting and retaining Government employees. It would have affected only certain employees of one agency, whereas the same problem confronts many other agencies, and should be dealt with by general legislation. It would have set no standards or limits to guide the Administrator except the single provision that he could not set rates of pay lower than those prescribed by the Classification Act. This would have been a step toward uncoordinated and diverse pay scales for Government employees, when the need is for greater uniformity.

On July 3, 1948:

REPAIR AND REHABILITATION OF IRRIGATION WORKS IN FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT

S. 1639. An act authorizing the repair and rehabilitation of irrigation works damaged by flood and the prevention of flood damage in the Fort Sumner Irrigation District, and for other purposes. (No statement.)

On June 27, 1948:

FRANCIS SCOTT KEY MANSION

S. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key Mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Memorial, and for other purposes. (No statement.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
H. C. M. Case, consultant [1]	$10,000.00	$1,055.50
James M. Kendall, clerk	7,075.06	3,537.53
Joycette K. Jones, clerk	6,026.72	3,013.36

[1] Service terminated Feb. 8, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	2,851.51
Amount expended as of Dec. 31, 1947	2,416.90
Balance unexpended	4,731.59

ARTHUR CAPPER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LONG-RANGE FARM PROGRAM, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 147, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$15,000.00
Amount expended	2,477.88
Amount expended as of Dec. 31, 1947	5,345.46
Balance unexpended	7,176.66

ARTHUR CAPPER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Everard H. Smith, Chief Clerk	$10,000.00	$4,999.98
Cecil H. Tolbert, Assistant Chief Clerk	9,524.13	4,762.02
Adelbert F. Teague, assistant clerk	7,075.06	3,537.48
Edmund T. King, assistant clerk	7,549.08	3,774.54
Mary K. Yanick, clerical assistant	$3,212.74	$1,606.32
Marie Jeneau, clerical assistant	3,461.04	1,730.52
Bernadine Wassam, clerical assistant	3,047.22	1,523.58
Kimball Sanborn, professional staff member	7,075.06	3,537.48
Robert H. Montgomery, professional staff member	8,023.09	4,011.54
Earl W. Cooper, professional staff member	8,023.09	4,011.54
Francis S. Hewitt, professional staff member	8,023.09	4,011.54
Harold E. Merrick, professional staff member	8,023.09	4,011.54
Thomas J. Scott, professional staff member	8,023.09	4,011.54
Yvonne A. Beaudry, clerical assistant	3,047.22	1,523.58
John Pillsbury, professional staff member	7,075.06	3,537.48
Lawrence H. Wendrich, assistant clerk	6,522.05	3,261.00
Herman E. Downey, assistant clerk:		
Jan. 1–19	5,447.37	287.49
Jan. 20 to June 30	6,440.54	2,880.34
Regina H. Simms, clerical assistant, Apr. 27 to June 30	3,047.22	541.71
Margaret S. Smith, clerical assistant, Feb. 2 to June 12	3,047.22	1,108.83
Thomas J. Graves, professional staff member:		
Jan. 1–7	8,576.10	166.75
Jan. 8 to June 30	10,000.00	4,805.53
H. Maurice Joyce, assistant clerk, Jan. 1 to June 20	6,522.05	3,079.83

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

EMPLOYED TEMPORARILY

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Carl R. Dortch, staff member	[1] $20.96	
Jan. 22, to Feb. 29		$817.80
May 20 to June 19		650.05
Wilbur E. McCann, staff member	[1] 20.96	
Jan. 19 to Mar. 11		1,111.37
Hale G. Knight, consultant	[1] 35.00	
Feb. 4–7		140.00
Apr. 22–27		210.00
June 1–19		665.00
Laurence A. Lawler, consultant	[1] 35.00	
Jan. 20–24		175.00
Feb. 2–3		70.00
Horton H. Nielson, clerical assistant	5,281.84	
Feb. 1–18		264.09
Claude S. Holloway, staff member	[1] 20.96	
Feb. 3 to Mar. 31		1,216.22
Betty M. McClure, assistant clerk	3,047.22	
Feb. 1 to Apr. 10		592.50
L. H. Simerl, assistant clerk	[1] 20.96	
Feb. 1 to May 15		2,201.78
Robert Ralston, Jr., staff member	[1] 20.96	
Mar. 1 to Apr. 30		1,279.13
Harold C. M. Case, staff member	10,000.00	
Apr. 16 to May 25		1,111.10
Earl R. Lind, assistant clerk:		
Apr. 1–30	1,188.00	99.00
May 1 to June 15	2,004.20	250.51
Robert K. Rochester, assistant clerk	[1] 20.96	
Apr. 1 to June 30		1,908.22
E. William Andrews, Jr., assistant clerk	[1] 20.96	
May 10–23		293.57

[1] Per diem.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$50,000.00
Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1947	$690.36
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	13,055.34
	13,745.70
Balance unexpended	36,254.30

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report in addition to the statement showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Miscellaneous expenses

Unexpended balance of funds authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 130, as of January 1, 1948, plus additional authorizations in S. Res. 201 and 265	$25,875.37
Amount expended January 1 to June 30, 1948	13,587.97
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	12,267.40
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of January 1, 1948	43,158.89
Amount expended January 1 to June 30, 1948	5,031.91
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	38,126.98

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 30, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John G. Adams, Chief Clerk	$10,000.00	$5,000.00
J. M. Chambers, staff adviser	10,000.00	4,646.26
Mark Galusha, staff adviser	10,000.00	4,646.26
Verne D. Mudge, staff adviser	10,000.00	4,646.26
H. S. Atkinson, assistant clerk	6,440.54	2,146.84
Georgia Earle, clerical assistant	3,626.56	1,813.28
Irene Posey, clerical assistant	3,626.56	1,813.28
Roberta Van Beek, clerical assistant	3,626.56	1,813.28
Anne Reardon, clerical assistant [1]	3,626.56	372.72
Walter I. Smalley, assistant clerk [2]	5,281.84	880.30

[1] Temporary.
[2] Employment terminated Mar. 1, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,096.40
Amount expended	6,331.06
Balance unexpended	3,765.34

CHAN GURNEY,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 6, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 3, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Robert D. L'Heureux, professional staff member	$10,000.00	$4,788.73
Wm. F. McKenna, professional staff member	10,000.00	4,976.53
Joseph P. McMurray, professional staff member	10,000.00	4,694.42
Charles T. Andrews, professional staff member	10,000.00	3,638.87
Raimond Bowles, clerk	6,996.06	2,995.30
Eunice V. Avery, clerical assistant	5,281.84	2,608.71
Caro McNeill Pugh, clerical assistant	3,543.80	1,771.86
Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant	3,543.80	1,771.86
Edna A. Stewart, clerical assistant	3,543.80	1,771.86

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, balance Dec. 31, 1947	$2,625.07
Additional appropriation	10,000.00
Total	12,625.07
Amount expended through June 30, 1948	7,631.51
Balance unexpended	4,993.56

C. W. TOBEY,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 30, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. George Stewart, Chief Clerk	$8,023.09	$4,011.54
James R. Kirkland, counsel	8,971.11	4,485.55
Thomas S. Henderson, assistant counsel	7,549.08	3,813.20
Edna L. Ward, stenographic secretary	3,626.56	1,813.28
Ruth Wallace, stenographic clerk	3,295.51	1,647.75

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,306.36
Balance unexpended	5,693.64

C. D. BUCK,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 15, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. H. Macomber, Jr., Chief Clerk	$9,524.13	$4,762.02
Glenn K. Shriver, Assistant Chief Clerk	7,391.07	3,695.52
E. B. Van Horn, staff director	10,000.00	4,999.98
Walter L. Reynolds, staff member	8,734.11	4,367.04
Thomas A. Sappington, staff member [1]	7,075.06	1,768.74
Philip C. Ward, staff member	9,050.11	3,821.12
Gordon R. Ewing (from June 16, 1948), staff member	10,000.00	416.66
Ann M. Griekis, clerk-secretary	5,116.32	2,558.16
Emily I. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerk-stenographer	3,461.04	1,716.72
Marie C. Tylor, clerk-stenographer	3,461.04	1,716.72
Velda Blanche Holder, clerk-stenographer	3,212.74	1,592.53

[1] Terminated Feb. 29, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 80th Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended	4,501.12
Balance unexpended	5,498.88

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 15, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS ON FUNDS AUTHORIZED AND EXPENDED UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 152

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Eli E. Nobleman (from Jan. 17, 1948), counsel, Subcommittee on Relations with International Organizations	$6,026.72	$2,748.47
Dr. Clarence Heer, staff director, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations	25.00	305.54
Paul H. Menk, Jr. (May 19 to June 15, 1948), administrative analyst, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments	6,838.06	512.84

[1] Per day (per diem basis).

Funds authorized or appropriated for expenditure under S. Res. 152, 80th Cong		$30,000.00
Amount expended:		
Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations	$5,416.57	
Subcommittee on Relations with International Organizations	3,321.13	
Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments	512.84	
Balance on statutory receipt	499.47	
		9,750.01
Balance unexpended		20,249.99

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON SURPLUS PROPERTY OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
George F. Boos, chief investigator	$7,707.08	$1,284.50
Kathleen M. Colson, stenographer	2,633.40	621.77
Edward A. Connors, investigator	4,695.66	2,847.78
Caira May Cook, secretary	3,626.56	826.04
Philip F. King, consultant	7,470.07	3,735.00
Myles C. McCahill, investigator	5,695.66	1,423.89
Hubert R. Moody, investigator	5,695.66	1,170.75
Robert L. Piper, chief clerk and investigator	5,695.66	1,423.89

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$45,027.35
Amount expended	16,123.50
Balance unexpended	28,903.85

HOMER FERGUSON,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF SENATE INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from March 1, 1948, to July 1, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman, assistant counsel	$6,495.72	$1,984.80
Carmine S. Bellino, investigator and consultant	8,476.10	2,477.52
George F. Boos, chief investigator	7,707.08	2,569.00
Robert Brosnan, assistant counsel	8,576.10	
Kathleen Colson, assistant clerk	2,716.16	716.74
Frederick M. Coughlin, assistant counsel	6,026.74	1,640.58
Mary M. Cousins, assistant clerk	3,378.27	929.01
Francis D. Flanagan, chief assistant counsel	9,998.14	3,332.68
John D. Leadbetter, messenger	2,222.00	
Lydia Lee, record clerk	5,033.55	852.90
Myles C. McCahill, investigator	5,695.66	1,423.89
Mollie Jo McCarthy, assistant clerk	3,129.98	504.27
Robert L. McElroy, assistant clerk	3,212.74	803.16
Gladys E. Montier, assistant clerk	3,626.56	956.99
Constance L. Morris, assistant clerk	3,129.98	825.96
Betty F. Oliver, assistant clerk	2,716.16	716.74
Robert L. Piper, assistant counsel	5,695.66	1,423.89
William P. Rogers, chief counsel	10,000.00	3,333.32
Mary Lou Shepherd, assistant clerk	3,129.98	625.99
James F. Sheridan, investigator	5,695.66	1,740.31
Ruth M. Young, clerk	3,792.09	948.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$125,000.00
Amount expended	32,745.69
Balance unexpended	92,254.31

HOMER FERGUSON,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 6, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to July 1, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Sherwood B. Stanley, clerk:		
Jan. 1 to June 8, 1948	$7,549.08	$3,856.60
June 9 to June 30, 1948	8,892.11	
Elizabeth B. Springer, assistant clerk:		
Jan. 1, to June 8, 1948	5,116.32	2,683.44
June 9 to June 30, 1948	5,530.14	
Fred R. Peel, research clerk	5,281.84	2,640.90
Bernice N. Crouse, clerk-stenographer:		
Jan. 1 to June 8, 1948	3,626.56	1,838.54
June 9 to June 30, 1948	4,040.38	
Janice Everly, clerk-stenographer:		
Jan. 1 to June 8, 1948	3,626.56	1,838.54
June 9 to June 30, 1948	4,040.38	
Jesse R. Nichols, document clerk:		
Jan. 1 to June 8, 1948	3,129.98	1,575.09
June 9 to June 30, 1948	3,295.51	

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1947, through Dec. 31, 1947 (previously reported)	4,909.83
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948	2,610.83
Total expended	7,520.66
Balance unexpended	2,479.34

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 7, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 3, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff	$10,000.00	
Richard H. Heindel, professional staff	10,000.00	
Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, professional staff	9,129.12	
C. C. O'Day, clerk	8,576.10	
Emmett M. O'Grady, assistant clerk	4,536.97	
Isabel M. Smith, assistant clerk	4,040.38	
Morella R. Hansen, assistant clerk	3,709.33	
Eilene Marie Galloway, assistant clerk	5,281.84	

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	[1] $20,000.00
Amount expended	11,021.81
Balance unexpended	8,978.19

[1] $10,000 of this amount was authorized under S. Res. 215, 80th Cong., 2d sess.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 7, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE EFFECT OF CERTAIN STATE DEPARTMENT ACTIVITIES (S. RES. 161, 80TH CONG., 1ST SESS.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 26, 1947, to January 28, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditures	4,827.96
Amount expended	4,827.96
Balance unexpended	[1] 20,172.04

[1] Authority of above subcommittee expired on February 1, 1948, and said balance of $20,172.04 has reverted to the contingent fund of the Senate.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 30, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Hugh R. Brown, chief clerk	$10,000.00	$5,000.00
Nellie D. McSherry, assistant chief clerk	7,075.00	3,537.48
Albert A. Grorud, professional staff	7,707.08	3,796.45
Elmer K. Nelson, professional staff	7,707.08	3,688.47
Orville Watkins, clerical staff	5,116.32	2,558.16
Estelle Bedsworth, clerical staff	3,543.80	1,751.17
Charlotte Mickle, clerical staff	3,212.74	1,585.63
Lynne A. Kaufman, clerical staff	2,964.45	[1] 1,111.68

[1] Terminated May 15, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$17,847.14
Amoun. expended	10,450.78
Balance unexpended	7,396.36

HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman.
By HUGH R. BROWN,
Chief Clerk.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 30, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Edward Jarrett, clerk	$10,000.00	$4,723.16
Edward Cooper, professional staff member	10,000.00	4,723.16
Halford G. Davis, professional staff member	10,000.00	4,723.16
Vera Burgess, clerical staff	4,619.73	2,309.87
Harriet Gray, clerical staff	3,626.56	1,813.26
Dorothy Prout, clerical staff	3,626.56	1,813.26
Martha Shaffer, clerical staff	3,212.74	1,606.32
C. H. Dolan, air accident investigator (temporary)	8,339.10	1,389.84

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$26,431.20
Amount expended	7,058.75
Balance unexpended	19,372.45

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 24, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Richard Arens, professional staff (legal)	$7,944.09	$3,972.05
Maurice Covert, professional staff (legal)	7,944.09	3,899.94
Joseph A. Davis, assistant clerk	7,944.09	3,972.05
Miriam O. Fox, stenographer	4,040.38	2,020.19
Helen Ganss, stenographer	3,461.04	1,730.52
Margaret Holland, stenographer	3,461.04	1,482.00
Mary Rogers, stenographer	4,040.38	2,020.19
J. Carlisle Ruddy, professional staff (legal)	7,944.09	3,972.05
Harold R. Wilde, clerk of committee (5 months)	10,000.00	4,166.65
Robert B. Young, professional staff (legal)	7,944.09	3,310.00
Robert B. Young, clerk of committee (1 month)	8,655.10	721.26
TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES UNDER S. RES. 120		
Leila Lively, clerk-typist (5½ months)	$2,964.45	$1,136.00
Rita Baird, clerk-typist (2 months and 6 days)	2,550.63	446.39

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$40,000.00
Amount expended	23,826.35
Balance unexpended	16,173.65

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 30, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 137, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from

January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Thomas J. Davis, investigator	$5,695.66	$2,847.78
John A. Loftus investigator	5,695.66	2,847.78
Guy M. Massey, investigator	5,695.66	2,847.78
Fred M. Mesmer, investigator	5,695.66	2,847.78
Margaret P. Hogan, stenographer	3,626.56	1,813.26
Lois C. Odham, stenographer	3,626.56	1,813.26
James C. Messersmith clerk	5,695.66	2,847.78

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$33,037.21
Amount expended	18,231.32
Balance unexpended	14,805.89

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 28, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Philip R. Rodgers, clerk	$9,682.13	$4,788.38
Earl B. Wixcey, assistant clerk	8,181.09	4,089.56
Paul Sample, clerical assistant	4,702.50	2,351.28
Crawford C. Heerlein, clerical assistant	4,123.08	2,061.54
Vivien Harman, clerical assistant	3,212.74	1,606.42
Dorothy Murphy, clerical assistant	2,964.45	1,482.18
Melvin W. Sneed, professional staff member [1]	8,023.09	4,011.54
Archibald Cox, professional staff member [2]	7,549.08	3,141.70

[1] Appointed Jan. 1, 1948.
[2] Appointed Feb. 2, 1948, resigned June 30, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure:		
Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	$10,000.00	
July 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948	8,000.00	
		$18,000.00
Amount expended:		
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1947	3,660.00	
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1947	3,533.35	
Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	7,342.58	
		14,535.93
Balance unexpended		3,464.07

ROBERT A. TAFT,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 10, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Baca, Anna, clerk	$3,957.62	$1,951.22
Betsch, Lorena, clerk	3,957.62	1,951.22
Burnett, Frank, staff member	$8,260.09	$4,031.29
Chrissos, Costas D., committee reporter	5,033.55	2,399.53
Homan, Colette E., Chief Clerk	6,680.05	3,257.99
Irwin, Mary, clerk	4,702.50	2,316.77
Lynott, Dorothy, clerk	3,957.62	1,951.22
Phenix, John D., statistician	10,000.00	5,000.00
Riley, George D., staff director	10,000.00	5,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	6,993.82
Balance unexpended	3,006.18

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 10, 1948.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE (SENATE) OPERATING UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 81

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Burton, Ralph, chief investigator, Jan. 1-3, 1948	$7,628.08	$63.56
Fox, Thomas F., investigator	5,530.14	2,765.07
Risher, John T., chief investigator	7,628.08	3,432.61
Van Olinda, Walter K., assistant investigator, Jan. 1-3	5,116.32	42.63
Ulsrud, Jennie, clerk	5,447.37	2,206.38

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$35,000.00
Amount expended	31,893.80
Balance unexpended	3,106.20

WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
June 30, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
E. W. Bassett, professional staff	$10,000.00	$5,000.00
Ronald Moist, professional staff	10,000.00	5,000.00
William A. Stevens, professional staff	10,000.00	5,000.00
Theo W. Sneed, professional staff	8,260.09	364.16
Orren L. Jones, clerical staff	10,000.00	5,000.00
Eloise Porter, clerical staff	5,281.84	2,640.92
Priscilla E. Cordova, clerical staff	5,281.84	220.07
Frances Stovall, clerical staff	4,619.73	2,309.86
Mary Batalo, clerical staff	3,295.51	1,882.22
Joan Beam, clerical staff	3,047.22	550.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, original appropriation and S. Res. 247	$15,000.00
Amount expended	6,698.76
Balance unexpended	8,301.24

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 6, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Albert L. Seidel, Chief Clerk	$9,999.96	$4,999.98
Nelson Deranian, professional staff (counsel)	9,999.96	4,999.98
George J. Nilles, assistant clerk	6,522.05	3,261.03
Laura Vogt, clerk (secretarial) (employed from Feb. 17, 1948)	3,047.22	1,134.22
Myrtle Paynter, clerk (stenographic) (employed from Mar. 10, 1948)	2,964.45	914.01
B. Floye Gavin, clerk (research)	4,868.02	2,434.01
Ela N. Hathaway, clerk (research) (employed to Feb. 19, 1948)	3,461.04	471.08
Phyllis M. Wherry, clerk (stenographic) (employed to Feb. 16, 1948)	3,129.98	399.93

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure remaining Jan. 1, 1948	$9,406.87
Amount expended Jan. 1, through June 30, 1948	279.70
Balance unexpended	9,127.17

C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 6, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION, SUBCOMMITTEE, PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Henry P. Kiley, investigator	$5,695.66	$2,847.78
Burbeck B. Gilchrist, investigator	5,695.66	1,423.89
Jack M. Poorbaugh, investigator	5,116.32	2,558.16
Elda G. Quast, clerk	3,626.56	433.16
Evelyn M. Kearsey, clerk	3,626.56	273.75
Grace E. Johnson, finance clerk	6,357.78	3,178.86
Francis T. Kelly, chief investigator	6,357.78	2,649.05
Helen C. Earp, clerk	3,626.56	249.21
Arthur R. Breor, Jr., chief investigator	6,357.78	2,902.96
Mary L. Green, administrative assistant	3,792.09	1,896.00
Camille Jeneau, administrative assistant	3,792.09	1,264.00
Leah G. Miller, clerk	3,212.74	524.62
Robert K. Lyle, investigator	4,288.68	1,786.95
Marie A. Heid, clerk	3,212.74	201.41
Joseph V. McCann, investigator	5,695.66	2,675.38
Betty J. B. Du Jack, secretary	3,792.09	1,758.10
Fred H. Kohler, investigator	5,116.32	2,487.10
Joseph F. Langan, investigator	5,695.66	2,675.38
William P. Reed, investigator	5,199.08	2,565.05
Dorothy A. Sailors, clerk	3,212.74	261.70
Joseph F. Kelly, investigator	5,116.32	213.18

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Kelso Elliott, assistant counsel	$8,339.10	$3,288.36
Judd Leighton, investigator	5,116.32	1,065.90
Roy St. Lewis, counsel	6,026.72	2,008.88
Helen Austin, stenographer	3,212.74	7.31
Doris L. Le Master, stenographer	3,212.74	7.31
Martha Lesinewski, stenographer	3,212.74	14.63
Elizabeth McGunity, stenographer	3,212.74	14.63
Lena Orme, secretary	3,212.74	267.72

Funds on hand, July 1, 1948, plus funds authorized by S. Res. 233 agreed to May 19, 1948:	
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$172,069.24
Amount expended	58,419.10
Balance unexpended	113,650.14

W. E. JENNER,
Chairman, Subcommittee,
Privileges and Elections.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 1, 1948.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1948, to May 15, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman, assistant counsel	$6,495.72	$1,264.05
Bernard S. Bercovici, investigator	8,075.76	3,030.39
Lucille Bruskin, assistant clerk	3,378.27	1,266.83
William S. Cole, assistant counsel	9,366.12	2,731.78
Frederick M. Coughlin, assistant counsel	6,026.72	1,372.73
Philip R. Davis, assistant counsel	10,000.00	833.33
Agnes P. Dodge, assistant clerk	2,881.69	1,080.62
Francis D. Flanagan, chief assistant counsel	9,998.14	1,666.34
Phelps, Hunt, editorial clerk	1,931.60	160.96
Linton W. Jeffery, investigator	8,075.76	3,028.39
Lydia Lee, editor	5,033.55	1,663.85
Joseph M. Mannix, investigator	6,026.72	284.59
George Meader, consulting counsel	10,000.00	833.33
Gladys E. Montier, assistant clerk	3,543.80	836.71
Constance L. Morris, assistant clerk	2,881.69	680.39
Eric Nordholm, messenger	1,188.00	165.00
Betty F. Oliver, assistant clerk	2,633.40	621.77
Franklin N. Parks, assistant counsel	6,680.05	315.44
Jeanie M. Prichard, assistant clerk	3,212.74	713.92
William P. Rogers, chief counsel	10,000.00	1,666.66
Haven Sawyer, investigator	5,392.22	1,572.72
James F. Sheridan, investigator	5,392.22	1,048.48
Dorothy M. Smithson, assistant clerk	3,212.74	535.44
Eleanor L. Taylor, assistant clerk	3,212.74	330.18
Agnes S. Wolf, investigator	5,199.08	938.70
Franklyn F. Yearsley, investigator	4,205.91	876.22
Ruth M. Young, clerk	3,792.09	948.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$62,946.08
Amount expended (including accrued annual leave)	55,179.43
Balance unexpended	7,766.65

OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be read, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration thereafter.

The resolution (S. Res. 266) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is reassembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] as the committee required by the resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in keeping with the custom, the tradition, and the precedents of the Senate, I now move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 26, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the proclamation of the President of the United States convening this extraordinary session of the Eightieth Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONVENING THE CONGRESS OF THE THE UNITED STATES

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the public interest requires that the Congress of the United States should be convened at 12 o'clock noon, on Monday, the 26th day of July 1948, to receive such communication as may be made by the Executive;

Now, therefore, I, Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the Congress of the United States to convene at the Capitol in the city of Washington on Monday, the 26th day of July 1948, at 12 o'clock noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as Members thereof are hereby required to take notice.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the United States.

Done at the city of Washington this 15th day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and forty-eight, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and seventy-third.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

By the President:
G. C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State.

PRAYER

Rev. Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all mercies, with reverence and gratitude we acknowledge Thy unfailing goodness. Lift up the light of Thy countenance, O Lord, upon the peoples of the earth and give them peace. Out of the testimony of many witnesses may Thy truth be established throughout the world.

At the beginning of this special session of Congress, may these Thy servants give Thee a high and honored place in their lives. Suffer not the works of their hands to be stained with dishonor nor their minds to be abased with unworthy thoughts.

May every memory of patient endurance by which justice has been established, and may every example of sacrificial service by which America's advancement has been made possible, offer inspiration and guidance to those who bear responsibility in government. This we pray in the name of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of June 19, 1948, was read and approved.

APPOINTMENTS MADE AFTER ADJOURNMENT

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Resolution 691, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of June 19, 1948, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did on June 29, 1948, appoint as members of the select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission the following Members of the House: Hon. FOREST A. HARNESS, Indiana, chairman; Hon. LEONARD W. HALL, New York; Hon. CHARLES H. ELSTON, Ohio; Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, Tennessee; Hon. OREN HARRIS, Arkansas.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by Public Law 636, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of June 19, 1948, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did on July 9, 1948, appoint as members of the United States-Washington and Lee University Bicentennial Commission the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ohio; Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, New York; Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., Virginia; Hon. FADJO CRAVENS, Arkansas.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE AFTER ADJOURNMENT

A message from the Senate, received by the Clerk of the House on June 24, 1948, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution relative to negotiations with the Canadian Gov-

ernment concerning the construction of railroads in Alaska and the establishment of reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 333. An act for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, the veterans of World War II;

H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 2798. An act to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure";

H. R. 3416. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument;

H. R. 4044. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases;

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5882. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes;

H. R. 5904. An act to continue the Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States;

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission;

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City;

H. R. 6465. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey;

H. R. 6481. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948;

H. R. 6771. An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6801. An act making appropriations for foreign aid, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees;

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations;

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author;

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer U. S. Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War;

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America; and

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 219, Eightieth Congress, announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate as follows:

On June 22, 1948:

S. 418. An act to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes;

S. 595. An act to provide that the rates of compensation for disabilities incurred in active military or naval service other than in a period of war service shall be equal to 80 percent of the rates payable for similar disabilities incurred during active service in time of war;

S. 1243. An act to provide for the payment of revenues from certain lands into the tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and for other purposes;

S. 1260. An act to create a commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers;

S. 1322. An act to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 1683. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of New York with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Archie Hamilton and Delbert Hamilton;

S. 1717. An act for the relief of the estate of William R. Stigall, deceased;

S. 1969. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III;

S. 2217. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the joint claims of Silas Mason Co., Inc.; Walsh Construction Co.; and Atkinson-Kier Co.;

S. 2242. An act to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes;

S. 2281. An act to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes;

S. 2371. An act validating certain conveyances of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. and the Union Pacific Railroad Co. and waiving, relinquishing, and disclaiming all title and all right of reverter and forfeiture of the United States of America to the lands described in said conveyance;

S. 2376. An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold;

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Charles Duncan Montrieth;

S. 2554. An act to promote the common defense by providing for the retention and maintenance of a national reserve of industrial productive capacity, and for other purposes;

S. 2621. An act authorizing the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks;

S. 2655. An act to provide for the common defense by increasing the strength of the armed forces of the United States, including the Reserve components thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2676. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota;

S. 2692. An act to terminate the retirement system of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and to transfer that retirement fund to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund;

S. 2698. An act to authorize the transfer of horses and equipment owned by the United States Army to the New Mexico Military Institution, a State institution, and for other purposes;

S. 2705. An act to reimburse the James & Phelps Construction Co.;

S. 2709. An act for the relief of Stefan Magura and Michal Magura;

S. 2730. An act to include as allowable service under the act of July 6, 1945, service performed in the military forces and on war transfer by employees in the field service of the Post Office Department;

S. 2743. An act providing for the more expeditious determination of certain claims filed by Ute Indians;

S. 2747. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code for the purpose of incorporating the Panama Railroad Company;

S. 2767. An act to provide assistance in the recruitment and distribution of farm labor for the increased production, harvesting, and preparation for market of agricultural commodities to meet domestic needs and foreign commitment;

S. 2794. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe the rates of pay for certain positions at field installations;

S. 2830. An act to extend for 2 years the authority to provide for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry;

S. 2849. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arkansas to Washington County, Ark.;

S. 2861. An act to assist by grants-in-aid the Republic of the Philippines in providing medical care and treatment for certain veterans;

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution providing for participation by the Government of the United States in the Pan American Railway Congress, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

S. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the United States Maritime Commission to make provision for certain ocean transportation service to, from, and within Alaska.

And on June 23, 1948, enrolled bills of the Senate as follows:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Dor's E. Snyder;

S. 2790. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2877. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 21, 1948:

H. R. 371. An act for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas;

H. R. 564. An act for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg;

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Anthony Arancio;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 851. An act for the relief of Adney W. Gray;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Kam Forg Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Diaz, Joseph de Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa;

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Chester O. Glenn;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp., of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand III;

H. R. 1733. An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick;

H. R. 1734. An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.;

H. R. 1779. For the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn.;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2192. An act for relief of the Massman Construction Co.;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees, and to provide for the sale of certain lands to the Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County, Okla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of George Cleve Williams;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek drainage district of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2551. An act for the relief of William R. Ramsey;

H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley;

H. R. 2696. An act for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie and Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.;

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Henry;

H. R. 2878. An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein;

H. R. 2889. An act for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.;

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;

H. R. 3261. An act for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson;

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 3499. An act for the relief of Petrol Corp.;

H. R. 3566. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders;

H. R. 4047. An act for the relief of Edmund Huppler;

H. R. 4071. An act to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4199. An act for the relief of George Haniotis;

H. R. 4272. An act to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4441. An act for the relief of the Williams J. Burns International Detective Agency;

H. R. 4452. An act for the relief of Douglas L. Craig;

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 4516. An act for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 4518. An act for the relief of Gerald S. Furman;

H. R. 4587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey);

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen;

H. R. 4635. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 4690. An act to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $100,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals;

H. R. 4856. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petricu;

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5355. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5508. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans;

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

H. R. 5716. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz;

H. R. 5734. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. H. 5886. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 5888. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6089. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 6096. An act to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa; Kansas City, Mo.; and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of

the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6116. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act:

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp., of Noank, Conn.;

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins;

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6318. An act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6428. An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.;

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6598. To amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Office Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381), 80th Cong.), and for other purposes;

H. R. 6818. An act to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. R. 6860. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act;

H. R. 6412. An act to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President";

H. R. 6419. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6705. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statute of Commodore John Barry;

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roocevelt National Memorial Park, as amended;

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

On June 23, 1948:

H. R. 333. An act for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, veterans of World War II;

H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 2798. An act to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure";

H. R. 3416. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument;

H. R. 4044. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief of internees in certain cases;

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5882. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes;

H. R. 5904. An act to continue the Virgin Islands Company as an agency of the United States;

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission;

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City;

H. R. 6465. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey;

H. R. 6481. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred enrollments;

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948;

H. R. 6771. An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6801. An act making appropriations for foreign aid, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations;

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees;

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author;

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Volunteer United States Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War;

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America; and

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes.

APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

A message from the President of the United States, received by the Clerk of the House, reported that on the following dates the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 19, 1948:

H. R. 238. An act for the extension of admiralty jurisdiction;

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of W. A. Knox, W. L. M. Knox, and Frank C. Morris, operating as Knox Lumber Sales Co., of Thomson, Ga.;

H. R. 1222. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. M. C. Lewis;

H. R. 1726. An act for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow;

H. R. 1781. An act for the relief of Annie L. Taylor, and William Benjamin Taylor;

H. R. 1855. An act for the relief of Elbert Spivey;

H. R. 2062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee;

H. R. 2273. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 2479. An act for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant;

H. R. 2684. An act for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the

United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese beetle quarantine;

H. R. 2721. An act to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "an act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Walter Vandahl and Esther S. Vandahl, Allabrada Adams, Mrs. Lucile L. Rrice Talbot, Mrs. Gladys Webb, and John E. Webb;

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Charles B. Featherstone;

H. R. 3007. An act for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of the estate of John Delman;

H. R. 3159. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald;

H. R. 3260. An act for the relief of Clarence S. Osika;

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Emeline Latigue;

H. R. 3402. An act to extend the authorized maturity date of certain bridge revenue bonds to be issued in connection with the refunding of the acquisition cost of the bridge across the Missouri River at Rulo, Nebr.;

H. R. 3433. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3500. An act for the relief of Lester L. Elder and Mrs. Esther E. Elder;

H. R. 3641. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen E. Scofield;

H. R. 3683. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title to the Army vessel *Hygiene;*

H. R. 3915. An act to increase the size of the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4244. An act to authorize assistance to certain veterans in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities;

H. R. 4455. An act to authorize the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac Railroad Co., of certain lands lying in the bed of Roaches Run, Arlington County, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4663. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the owners of the fee-simple titles and leasehold interests in lands leased to the United States by the city of Macon, Ga., for use as a part of the site of Camp Wheeler, Ga.;

H. R. 4628. An act to enlarge the Gettysburg National Cemetery;

H. R. 4820. An act for the relief of Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe, Inc.;

H. R. 4874. An act to transfer Pelican Rock in Crescent City Harbor, Del Norte County, Calif., to that county;

H. R. 5065. An act to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt hospitalized servicemen and veterans from the admissions tax when admitted free;

H. R. 5112. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5147. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Florence A. W. Arens;

H. R. 5174. An act to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to make adjustment payments to certain producers of raw cane sugar in Puerto Rico and Hawaii;

H. R. 5344. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5330. An act for the relief of W. W. DeLoach;

H. R. 5655. An act confirming the claim of Juan Berrar to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, county of Attakapas, now parish of St. Martin, said claim being listed as No. B-690 in the report of the commissioners dated June 1811, so as to include section 2, township 11 south, range 6 east, Louisiana meridian, containing one hundred and thirty-nine and sixty-two one-hundredths acres;

H. R. 5758. An act to amend further the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, to permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers and sisters, and nieces and nephews, of deceased members and former members of the armed forces;

H. R. 5808. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5820. An act to aid in the development of improved prosthetic appliances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5883. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (exclusive of the Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5889. An act to extend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act to the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 5891. An act to repeal an act approved August 24, 1894, entitled "An act to authorize the purchasers of the property and franchises of the Choctaw Coal & Railway Co. to organize a corporation, and to confer upon the same all the powers, privileges, and franchises vested in that company," and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto;

H. R. 5957. An act to provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, to include the site of the old Hudson's Bay Co. stockade, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5983. An act to amend section 202 of title II of the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, to remove the present restriction on appointments to the Navy Medical Service Corps;

H. R. 6073. An act to provide for the acquisition of lands for grazing and related purposes;

H. R. 6110. An act to permit the landing of halibut by Canadian fishing vessels to Alaskan ports, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6113. An act to transfer certain land in Langlade County, Wis., to the United States Forest Service;

H. R. 6114. An act to amend title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to increase the interest rate on title I loans, to provide for the redemption of nondelinquent insured mortgages, to authorize advances for the preservation and protection of the insured loan security, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6229. An act to authorize the extension of leases of certain land in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6234. An act to authorize the establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6252. An act to authorize the issuance of a land patent to certain public lands, situated in the county of Kauai, Territory of Hawaii, for school purposes;

H. R. 6339. An act to amend the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act relating to standards of maintenance and operation for hospitals receiving aid under that title;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6469. An act to provide for the temporary free importation of lead;

H. R. 6716. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer a portion of the Veterans' Administration center at Los Angeles, Calif., to the State of California for the use of the University of California; and

H. R. 6758. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

On June 21, 1948:

H. R. 633. An act for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Hovde;

H. R. 6368. An act to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the dedication of the Palomar Mountain Observatory.

On June 22, 1948:

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Ernest L. Godfrey;

H. R. 4964. An act to preserve seniority rights of 10-point preference eligibles in the postal service transferring from the position of letter carrier to clerk or from the position of clerk to letter carrier;

H. R. 5071. An act to extend the public land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma; and

H. R. 5272. An act relating to the compensation of certain railway postal clerks;

H. R. 5822. An act to establish the Saratoga National Historical Park, in the State of New York, from the lands that have been acquired by the Federal Government for that purpose pursuant to the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 608), and for other purposes;

H. R. 6239. An act to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska;

H R. 6246. An act to authorize the transfer of certain Federal lands within the Chopawamsic Park to the Secretary of the Navy, the addition of lands surplus to the Department of the Army to this park, the acquisition of additional lands needed to round out the boundaries of this park, to change the name of said park to Prince William Forest Park, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6289. An act to provide for the voluntary admission and treatment of mental patients at St. Elizabeths Hospital.

On June 23, 1948:

H. R. 2588. An act requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of a city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service to be delivered by Government-owned motor vehicles; and

H. R. 6766. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

On June 24, 1948:

H. R. 239. An act to further perfect the consolidation of the Lighthouse Service with the Coast Guard;

H. R. 2867. An act to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest, designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3889. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases;

H. R. 4071. An act to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended;

H. R. 4047. An act for the relief of Edmund Huppler;

H. R. 4516. An act for the relief of the Moore Dry Dock Co., of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 4962. An act to provide pensions for certain widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection;

H. R. 5036. An act to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to September 25, inclusive, 1948;

H. R. 5275. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of limestone to be used in the manufacture of fertilizer;

H. R. 5936. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, in the States of Georgia and Tennessee, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6318. An act to amend section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone;

H. R. 6771. An act making appropriations for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6822. An act to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State;

H. R. 6188. An act to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa;

H. R. 6698. An act to authorize the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy to be given to not exceeding four persons at a time from the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 6726. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to dental diseases and conditions, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6772. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Navy and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

On June 25, 1948:

H. R. 564. An act for the relief of Sarah Lee Cregg;

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Anthony Arancio;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of Hiro Higa and Kana Higa;

H. R. 945. An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors;

H. R. 1409. An act for the relief of Frantisek Jiri Pavlik or Georg Pavlik;

H. R. 1642. An act for the relief of Miss Rosella M. Kostenbader;

H. R. 2009. An act for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno;

H. R. 2193. An act for the relief of Robert E. Graham;

H. R. 2431. An act for the relief of the estate of David Jefferson Janow, deceased;

H. R. 2734. An act for the relief of Joseph M. Henry;

H. R. 2766. An act to amend section 2 of an act, entitled, "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725);

H. R. 3190. An act to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure";

H. R. 3214. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary";

H. R. 3427. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary H. Overall and Thomas I. Baker;

H. R. 4114. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4298. An act for the relief of Henry Hill;

H. R. 4452. An act for the relief of Douglas L. Craig;

H. R. 4566. An act for the relief of William Nally;

H. R. 4587. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harry A. Light (formerly Mrs. Elsie Purvey);

H. R. 4518. An act for the relief of Gerald S. Furman;

H. R. 4659. An act to ratify and confirm amendments to certain contracts for the furnishing of petroleum products to the United States;

H. R. 4881. An act for the relief of Dimitri Petrou;

H. R. 5524. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5886. An act to amend section 332 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940;

H. R. 6293. An act to amend the act of June 19, 1934, providing for the establishment of the National Archives, so as to provide that certain fees collected by the Archivist shall be available for disbursement in the interest of the National Archives;

H. R. 6327. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Samuel O. Burdette;

H. R. 6412. A act to codify and enact into law title 3 of the United States Code, entitled "The President";

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain surviving spouses of annuitants retired prior to April 1, 1948;

H. R. 6935. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Eire of a statue of Commodore John Barry; and

H. J. Res. 433. Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes.

On June 26, 1948:

H. R. 2551. An act for the relief of William R. Ramsey;

H. R. 2732. An act for the relief of Dennis Stanton;

H. R. 3218. An act to authorize an emergency fund for the Bureau of Reclamation to assure the continuous operation of its irrigation and power systems;

H. R. 3937. An act for the relief of William C. Reese;

H. R. 6039. An act to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Army of one officer in the grade of general and to authorize the permanent appointment in the Regular Air Force of one officer in the grade of general, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6224. An act for the relief of John Watkins;

H. R. 6556. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

On June 28, 1948:

H. R. 371. An act for the relief of Jenness C. Thomas;

H. R. 1076. An act for the relief of Chester O. Glenn;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of James D. Sigler and Frederick P. Vogelsand III;

H. R. 2269. An act for the relief of Frank A. Constable;

H. R. 4330. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to perform certain consular-type functions within the United States and its Territories and possessions;

H. R. 4367. An act authorizing the Hidalgo Bridge Co., its heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Hidalgo, Tex.;

H. R. 4635. An act to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes";

H. R. 4690. An act to amend the act of July 30, 1947, permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport certain merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and points in the continental United States;

H. R. 4917. An act to provide further benefits for certain employees of the United States who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for probational civil-service appointments by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, and who, due to service-connected disabilities, are unable to perform the duties of the positions for which examinations were taken;

H. R. 5053. An act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5710. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended;

H. R. 5716. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz;

H. R. 6448. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land in Tennessee to the city of Johnson City;

H. R. 6707. An act to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6801. An act making appropriations for foreign aid, and for other purposes.

On June 29, 1948:

H R. 333. An act for the relief of sundry residents of Alaska, veterans of World War II;

H. R. 703. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Kam Fong Chun, Mr. and Mrs. Jose Dias, Joseph De Souza, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Ayres, and Jose Oducado;

H. R. 915. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the executors and trustees of the estate of L. L. McCandless, deceased, as their interests may appear, against the United States of America;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2239. An act to amend section 13 (a) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

H. R. 2372. An act for the relief of George Cleve Williams;

H. R. 2395. An act for the relief of the Cypress Creek Drainage District of the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 2744. An act to provide for the elimination of Regular Army and Regular Air Force officers and for the retirement of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Forces, and to provide retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States, the Air Force of the United States, United States Navy and Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association;

H. R. 4103. An act for the relief of Charles M. Davis;

H. R. 4816. An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $100,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals;

H. R. 5734. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for public-park and

golf-course purposes, certain land situated within the boundaries of the Veterans' Administration center at Cheyenne, Wyo.;

H. R. 5750. An act to provide for the extension and improvement of postoffice facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5861. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 5888. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6028. An act to authorize appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation for payments to school districts on certain projects during their construction status. (Hour indicated on bill, 5:05 p. m. eastern daylight time.)

H. R. 6089. An act to amend the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134);

H. R. 6186. An act for reimbursement of the Hawaiian Dredging Co., Ltd.;

H. R. 6452. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6507. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewal of level premium term insurance for a second 5-year period, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6527. An act to provide assistance to certain local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred, or postwar national-defense-incurred, enrollments;

H. R. 6860. An act to amend the Federal Airport Act;

H. R. 6634. An act to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of Moina Michael, originator of Flanders Field memorial poppy idea;

H. R. 6705. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 305. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Rough Riders (First Vounteer United States Cavalry) of the Spanish-American War;

H. J. Res. 421. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to investigate and study certain matters relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution correcting act establishing the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution providing an extension of time for claiming credit or refund with respect to war losses.

On June 30, 1948:

H. R. 631. An act for the relief of the Allied Aviation Corp.;

H. R. 1780. An act for the relief of the Cannon Valley Milling Co.;

H. R. 2096. An act to amend section 11 of the act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 317), relating to Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2489. An act for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins;

H. R. 2552. An act for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley;

H. R. 2696. An act for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie and Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.;

H. R. 2878. An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein;

H. R. 4856. An act to delay the liquidation of mineral interests reserved to the United States as required by the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5416. An act to promote the interests of the Fort Hall Indian irrigation project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5904. An act to continue the Virgin Islands Co. as an agency of the United States;

H. R. 6090. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 6162. An act to make imported beer and other similar imported fermented liquors subject to the internal-revenue tax on fermented liquor;

H. R. 6419. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6465. An act to amend and supplement section 2 of the act approved August 30, 1935, relating to the construction and financing of toll bridges over the Delaware River by the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey;

H. R. 6598. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia," approved August 9, 1939;

H. R. 6481. An act making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6829. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1948:

H. R. 2352. An act to provide for sale to the Crow Tribe of interests in the estates of deceased Crow Indian allottees, and to provide for the sale of certain lands to the Board of County Commissioners of Comanche County, Okla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2729. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor;

H. R. 2889. An act for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston;

H. R. 3566. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4272. An act to provide for the procurement and supply of Government headstones or markers for unmarked graves of members of the armed forces dying in the service or after honorable discharge therefrom, and other persons, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by redefining certain powers of the Administrator, by authorizing delegation of certain powers by the Civil Aeronautics Board to the Administrator, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4441. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency;

H. R. 5355. An act authorizing a per capita payment of $50 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 6116. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; and

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution relating to the marital deduction, for estate-tax purposes, in the case of life insurance or annuity payments.

On July 2, 1948:

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of the United States Radiator Corp., of Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 1734. An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.;

H. R. 2192. An act for the relief of the Massman Construction Co.;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of the estate of Rudolph Maximilian Goepp, Jr.;

H. R. 3261. An act for the relief of Capt. Carroll C. Garretson;

H. R. 3416. An act to provide for the establishment of the Pensacola National Monument;

H. R. 3735. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3999. An act to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders;

H. R. 4462. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Park County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming;

H. R. 4644. An act for the relief of E. Brevard Walker, trading as E. B. Walker Lumber Co.;

H. R. 5252. An act to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5508. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to extend the benefits of such act to certain mothers of veterans;

H. R. 5882. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to donate excess and surplus property for educational purposes;

H. R. 6096. An act to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6428. An act to reimburse the Luther Bros. Construction Co.;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize an exchange of lands and interests therein between the city of San Diego, Calif., and the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6454. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States.

On July 3, 1948:

H. R. 2798. An act to amend section 5, Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4044. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases;

H. R. 6402. An act to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission;

H. R. 6808. An act to permit refund or credit to brewers of taxes paid on beer lost in bottling operations;

H. R. 6248. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities; to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, reenacted by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6916. An act to provide for permanent postal rates and to provide pay increases for Government employees; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of Juliette Low, founder and organizer of Girl Scouting in the United States of America.

DISAPPROVAL OF BILLS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The message also announced that the President had vetoed the following bills of the House on the dates indicated:

ADNEY W. GRAY

I withhold my approval from the enrolled bill H. R. 851, "For the relief of Adney W. Gray."

The bill provides for payment of the sum of $3,810 to Adney W. Gray, Pepperell, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of silver foxes allegedly caused by the operation of a sawmill, belonging to an agency of the Department of Agriculture, near claimant's fox ranch.

It appears that after the New England hurricane in September 1938, millions of feet of timber were blown down and it became the responsibility of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture to develop a program whereby such timber could be salvaged. Accordingly, contracts were entered into for a large number of portable sawmills for manufacture of the salvaged logs into lumber. One of the contract sawmills, operated by A. L. Trueax, was moved to a site near claimant's ranch during the latter part of March 1939, and began sawing operations which continued for several weeks. Under the express terms of this contract Mr. Trueax assumed "all obligations and responsibilities * * * for damage to other property arising from his operation." Mr. Trueax's position was that of an independent contractor, as distinguished from an employee or agent of the Government. Claimant had 18 vixens ready to whelp at the time, and basing his estimates on average production of pups in previous years, he expected a minimum of 64 pups. The unusual disturbances resulting from operation of the mill, however, so annoyed and unnerved the vixens that claimant was able to realize only 12 pups which could be raised to salable size, the balance of the expected production of 64 being either aborted or killed by the vixens soon after birth.

It would appear that the sawmill whose operations caused the damage to claimant's silver foxes did not belong to an agency of the Department of Agriculture, as alleged in the bill, but was owned and operated by an independent contractor who, under the express terms of his contract, assumed all obligations and responsibilities for damage to other property arising from its operation. The Government can in no proper sense assume responsibility for the negligence of independent contractors.

Accordingly, I am unable to approve the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

G. C. HEDRICK

I am withholding my approval of H. R. 1733, Eightieth Congress, "An act for the relief of G. C. Hedrick."

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $318.22 to G. C. Hedrick, Beckley, W. Va., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained as the result of a fire alleged to have been caused by Donald Benjamin Nichols, on March 21, 1945.

Donald Benjamin Nichols, a World War II veteran, was admitted to the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Roanoke, Va., on July 20, 1944, the day he was discharged from the Army. The medical staff of the hospital granted him leave for a ninety-day trial visit to his home on November 24, 1944, in accordance with the desire of his mother and himself. Before such leave was granted, the veteran's mother signed the following statement: "I agree to assume all responsibility as to the designated patient's care, treatment, and conduct while in my custody and to return him to the hospital at my own expense." The granting of such leave was in accordance with Veterans' Administration regulations and sound medical practice. In December 1944, the veteran's mother reported that his condition was improving and that he was adjusted to civilian life. An additional 90-day leave was granted, beginning on February 22, 1945.

I find no legal, equitable or moral grounds for imposing liability upon the Government for damages resulting from the fire.

While the amount of damages sought is relatively small, the precedent which would be established by the bill is so far reaching that I would be remiss in my duty if I approved the bill. During the next 50 or more years, thousands of disabled veterans will be hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration. A large percentage of them will, unfortunately, be suffering from nervous or mental disabilities as in this case. Accepted medical principles require the granting of leave to certain of such veterans for trial visits when circumstances indicate that the veteran is socially adaptable and that a trial visit would best serve his interests and health. Such trial visits are part of the curative treatment. To deny leave under appropriate circumstances would jeopardize the entire program for the care and treatment of the mentally ill. Moreover, if the Government is to assume liability for all damages caused by veterans who have been hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration for mental conditions, especially during periods while such veterans' are not under the direct care and control of the Veterans' Administration, the ultimate cost of such program cannot be anticipated, but it is apparent that such cost would be very considerable.

Under the circumstances, I have felt obliged to withhold my approval of the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

WINONA MACHINE & FOUNDRY CO.

I have withheld my approval of enrolled enactment H. R. 1779, entitled "An act for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation of Winona, Minn." This enactment would release the Winona Machine & Foundry Co. from its liability to the United States arising out of the termination by the Navy Department of a contract of June 11, 1940, and the subsequent purchase by that Department against the contractor's account of the items called for by the contract, namely, certain stretcher weights needed for the Navy. It would authorize and direct the Comptroller General of the United States to cancel the entire debt which has been raised against the contractor in the sum of $7,148.77.

The facts are that the Navy Department requested bids, to be opened May 14, 1940, for the furnishing of 145 "stretcher weights," 8-ton, for delivery either at destination, transportation charges paid, to the Naval Fuel Depot, Tiburon, Calif., or f. o. b. bidder's shipping point for shipment to said destination on Government bills of lading. The Winona Machine & Foundry Co. submitted a bid offering to furnish the stretcher weights f. o. b. its shipping point, Winona, Minn., for shipment on Government bills of lading at a unit price of $358.8175, or for the total sum of $52,028.54. Also, there was received by the Government a bid from the Pottsville Castings & Machine Shops offering to furnish the weights f. o. b. its shipping point, Pottsville, Pa., at a total price of $50,025. However, after adding freight costs, handling and other charges to the above f. o. b. shipping point bids, it was determined by the Navy Department that the bid of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co. would result in a lower destination cost to the Government than would the bid of the Pottsville Castings & Machine Shops. Accordingly, the bid of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co. was accepted by the Navy Department on June 8, 1940, well within the time specified for acceptance by the contractor and, pursuant thereto, the parties entered into formal contract on June 11, 1940, which provided that delivery of the stretcher weights was to commence within 90 days and be completed within 150 days from the date of the contract.

Shortly after the contract was entered into, the contractor advised the Navy Department that there had been an increase in the cost of scrap iron since May 10, 1940, the date on which its bid was submitted, and requested that the contract unit price be increased by the sum of $49.50. However, the Navy Department promptly advised the contractor that the acceptance of its bid and the award of the contract obligated it to perform in accordance with the terms of the contract and that the Navy Department was without authority to relieve the contractor from the execution of its contract or to increase the contract price agreed upon. Subsequently, the contractor reiterated its request for an increase in the contract price but was advised that since it was apparent that the contractor would be unable to furnish the stretcher weights by the time required, action toward purchase of same elsewhere would be taken and any excess cost would be charged against its account in accordance with article 5 of the contract.

Thereafter, the Navy Department purchased the stretcher weights from the American Car & Foundry Co. at an excess cost to the Government of approximately $7,148.77, with which sum

the contractor is chargeable under the terms of its contract.

In support of the bill it is stated that the contractor, acting on the understanding that it was not the low bidder and assuming that the contract would not be awarded to it, did not take steps to protect itself by purchasing scrap iron and other materials at the prices prevailing when the bid was made, May 10. It is noteworthy, however, that the Navy expressly reserved the right to accept bids at any time within 60 days after the date of opening, which was May 14. It is also to be noted that the contract was executed by the company on June 11, within 3 days after receiving notice of the award, and that a request for an adjustment because of the increase in the cost of scrap iron was not made until June 13. The contractor was thus on notice at the time of submitting its bid, if not actually aware of the possibility, that its bid might be accepted at any time within the 60 days' period, and that during this period it would be subject to the normal business risk of an increase in material prices.

The record shows that performance of the contract was not rendered impossible by any circumstances or events arising after it had been entered into by the parties but merely that the cost of performance proved to be higher than the contractor had anticipated at the time its bid was submitted. Nor is the explanation convincing as to why the contractor did not act more promptly to protect its sources of supply at the prices currently in effect.

So far as the usual rules of law are concerned, it is well settled that where a contractor agrees to perform for a fixed sum, a thing possible to be performed, it will not be excused, or become entitled to additional compensation because unforeseen difficulties are encountered—whether such conditions are caused by the existence of war, or other circumstances, that the contractor did not anticipate. See *United States* v. *Spearin* (248 U. S. 132, 136); *Columbus Railway & Power Co.* v. *Columbus* (249 U. S. 399, 412); *Day* v. *United States* (245 U. S. 159, 161). It has been held by the courts that an abnormal rise in the price of goods or in transportation charges due to the existence of war or unusual trade conditions such that the contractor could not perform its contract without greater expense than anticipated is not such an impossibility as will excuse performance. *Farmers' Fertilizer Co.* v. *Lillie* (18 F. 2d. 197, 199). Also, see 30 Op. Atty. Gen. 301, 302, wherein it was held by a former Attorney General of the United States that increased costs of performing a contract caused by the outbreak of the First World War, which outbreak occurred after the contract involved had been entered into, did not afford any basis for an executive officer of the United States to release the contractor from its obligation under its contract. Furthermore, it has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States that the fact that a contractor's cost of performance may have been increased by the outbreak of war not only affords no basis for recovery on legal grounds but, also, that such fact does not afford any basis for equitable relief. See *Columbus Railway & Power Co.* v. *Columbus, supra.*

Under the principles of law established in the cases cited above it is clear that there is no legal or equitable basis for relieving the contractor from its obligation under the contract to make payment of any excess cost occasioned by the Government by virtue of its default. The proposed legislation would accord preferential treatment to only one of many contractors for whom no similar relief is provided by the law of the land, and would establish an undesirable precedent. It is known that there have been many such cases where bidders have incurred losses during periods of rising prices; conversely, in other cases the advantage may have been the other way in times of falling prices. To approve legislation in cases such as the present only encourages the disregard of contractual obligations which once entered into, are fully binding on the United States and should be of no less consequence on the other side.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

PETROL CORP.

I withhold my approval from the enrolled bill (H. R. 3499) for the relief of Petrol Corp.

The bill directs the Comptroller General to enter into a written arbitration agreements with Petrol Corp., to determine the amount, if any, by which the United States has failed to reimburse Petrol Corp., in accordance with commitments made by Federal officials, for losses incurred by the corporation in paying excessive war-risk marine insurance and purchasing residual fuel oils in aid of the war effort as requested and directed by such officials; and the amount, if any, by which the petroleum supply programs and related rulings (approved by the United States for the purpose of compensating the petroleum industry for the maintenance of adequate petroleum supplies on the Atlantic coast during 4 years of the war period) discriminated against Petrol Corp. The bill provides that the arbitration board shall consist of three members, one to be selected by the Comptroller General, another by Petrol Corp., and the third by agreement between these two arbitrators, or, failing agreement, by the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The board is to decide the issues presented and report its findings to the Congress.

The need for a special arbitration procedure, as provided for in the bill, is not apparent. There already exists an established statutory procedure designed to accomplish the purpose of this legislation. Under long standing provisions of law, claims of this type may be referred to the Court of Claims for consideration and determination of the facts. No reasons appear why this established procedure should not be utilized in this particular instance. To approve the creation of a special arbitration board for the determination of the issues in this case would be to establish an undesirable precedent for the determination of numerous other special cases arising out of the interpretation and administration of wartime governmental regulations. Moreover, the bill lacks any provision for the payment of the expenses attendant upon the creation of the board of arbitration. The authority granted to the Comptroller General to enter into the arbitration agreement might be interpreted to imply the authority to commit the Government to pay the claim in accordance with the findings of the board, as well as the expenses incurred by the proceedings.

Accordingly, I am unable to approve the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

ROBERT LEE THREATT

I have withheld my approval from H. R. 1910, "An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor."

The purpose of this bill is to pay to the legal guardian of Robert Lee Threatt, a minor, the sum of $4,000 on account of the personal injuries sustained by said minor as a result of the explosion of an Army shell.

It appears that on October 17, 1943, Robert Lee Threatt, who was then 15 years of age, accompanied by John Junior Parker, who was then 17 years of age, entered upon the Camp Chaffee Military Reservation in Arkansas. While walking about the reservation they found a small shell embedded in the ground. Robert Lee Threatt dug the shell out of the ground and then tapped it against a rock in an attempt to remove the copper band. When the shell was tapped against the rock it exploded. As a result of the explosion Robert Lee Threatt's right hand was badly mangled and it had to be amputated about 2 inches above the wrist.

The evidence in this case clearly establishes that Robert Lee Threatt was a trespasser on a military reservation when he found the shell which exploded and caused his injuries. From the fact that the shell was buried in the ground it would appear that it was in a part of the reservation which had been used as a target area and that it was one of the shells which had failed to explode upon impact.

It is a general rule of law that the possessor of land owes no duty to trespassers other than to abstain from wilfully or wantonly injuring them and so, ordinarily, is not liable for injury to trespassers caused by conditions on the land or by articles taken by trespassers from the land. It appears that the law of Arkansas, the jurisdiction in which this incident occurred, recognizes and follows this general rule. While some jurisdictions allow an exception to the rule of nonliability to trespassers in the case of trespassing children of tender years, this exception in all cases is based on a recognition of the inability of young children, because of their youth and inexperience, to appreciate the dangers to which they expose themselves. Robert Lee Threatt, however, was 15 years of age at the time of this incident and was accompanied by a youth 2 years his senior. There is no evidence tending to indicate that he did

not possess at least average intelligence for a boy of his age. He was, or should have been, fully aware of the danger latent in the shell. He was not a child of "tender years" and as such entitled to protection from dangerous instruments and conditions on the land even though he was trespassing. In attempting to remove the copper ring from the shell by tapping it against a rock he was doing a thing which he knew or should have known to be dangerous. In so doing he was negligent and his negligence was the sole proximate cause of his injury.

In the light of all of the facts and circumstances in this case there is no justifiable basis for the granting of an award for the benefit of Robert Lee Threatt. While deeply regretting this tragic occurrence, I feel obliged to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

GEORGE HANIOTIS

I am withholding my approval from H. R. 4199, an act for the relief of George Haniotis.

This bill would have provided for recording the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of George Haniotis, a national of Greece. It would have provided also for deducting one number from the immigration quota for Greece.

Since this bill was passed by the Congress, Mr. Haniotis has died. If I should sign it now, its only effect would be to reduce the immigration quota from Greece.

If Mr. Haniotis were still alive, I would gladly give this bill my approval in order that he might become a permanent resident of the United States. But I am sure that neither he nor his family would want it approved when its only effect would be to prevent some other person from emigrating from Greece to the United States.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

MRS. LORAINE THOMSEN

I am withholding my approval from H. R. 4590, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Loraine Thomsen.

The bill would authorize and direct the Federal Security Administrator to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to Mrs. Thomsen "as if such Administrator had found that the death of her husband, Immanual H. Thomsen, on December 5, 1946, had been the result of a personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty as an employee of the Navy Department."

It appears from the records of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Federal Security Agency that Mr. Thomsen, a Navy Department employee at the naval ammunition depot situated at Hastings, Nebr., suddenly fell dead while sweeping crushed rock with a push broom at his place of employment. A claim for compensation for death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act was filed by his widow, Mrs. Thomsen, who attributed the cause of her husband's death to the effects of excessive strain and exhaustion said to have been suffered by the decedent during the month of October in the performance of his duties.

The Bureau of Employees' Compensation submitted the evidence to a well-known heart specialist for an opinion as to the cause of death, who concluded:

> It is quite obvious from going over the medical report that Mr. Thomsen died as a result of arteriosclerotic heart disease involving the coronary arteries. These findings are substantiated at the time of the autopsy on Mr. Thomsen. This is a natural disease, the course of which is well known. I have carefully gone over the documents in reference to the alleged precipitating injury and it seems to me that there is insufficient evidence to point to the fact that this patient was subjected to any serious or unusual form of physical endeavor that was sufficiently close to the onset of the fatal attack to have any bearing on the course of a natural disease. I feel quite certain that death occurred purely as a result of the natural courses of his particular disease, namely, that of sclerosis of the coronary arteries that supply the heart muscle with blood. I do not believe that there is any validity in this claim as to the alleged injury being responsible for Mr. Thompson's death, but that he died rather as a result of natural processes of a well-known disease.

After careful investigation and upon the basis of all the evidence before it the Bureau of Employees' Compensation denied the claim for death benefits on the ground that the decedent's death "did not result from personal injury sustained while in the performance of duty, or from disease proximately caused by his employment," as the act requires.

Mrs. Thomsen, if she believed that the action of the Bureau was erroneous, had the right to appeal therefrom to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board established within the Federal Security Agency under the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946, as a quasi-judicial tribunal independent of the Bureau, but she failed to avail herself of that right. The bill thus runs counter to the salutary principle, recognized in the rules of the Subcommittee on Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary itself, that a claimant ought to be required to exhaust all available administrative remedies before seeking a review elsewhere.

In effect the bill amounts to a legislative review and reversal of a determination which has been made by the agency duly authorized by law to make such determinations and which has been made in accordance with a general law laying down the governing principles of adjudication. Such a method of review by legislative action cannot have satisfactory results. If Congress believes that an opportunity for an independent review of determinations upon claims is desirable outside the executive branch, the act could be amended by providing for the right of judicial review upon the record after exhaustion of administrative remedies.

I feel constrained for the above reasons to withhold my approval of this bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

EAST COAST SHIP & YACHT CORP.

I have withheld my approval of enrolled enactment H. R. 6184, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "An act for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp. of Noank, Conn."

This enactment would authorize the payment of $2,100, which represents a part of the liquidated damages withheld by the Government in making payment under contract No. W–52–qm–412, dated April 4, 1934, entered into with the War Department (now Department of the Army) for making repairs to the U. S. S. *Colonel Barnett*, and the amount of $4,518.74, which represents an amount claimed as payment for repairs made by the contractor to a section of the ship, which had been damaged while in possession of the contractor. Under the terms of the contract, the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp. agreed, for and in consideration of the payment of the prices set forth in schedule "B" attached to and made a part of the contract, to furnish all labor and materials and to perform all work required for the accomplishment of the items of repair on the steamer *Colonel Barnett* in accordance with the schedule and as specifically set forth in detail in the Specifications for Repairs to be Made to Twin Screw Steamer *Colonel Barnett* Stationed at Fort Slocum, N. Y. It was provided that the work would be commenced on the date the steamer was received at the contractor's yard, and be completed within 45 calendar days. In event of delay in completion of the required work, beyond the period specified, liquidated damages at the rate of $100 per day were to be charged against the contractor, unless the delay in performance was found by the contracting officer, or by the head of the Department on appeal from the finding of the contracting officer, to be due to an unforeseeable cause beyond the control and without the fault or negligence of the contractor, including, but not restricted to, the causes of delay specified in article 9 of the contract.

The record shows that the ship was delivered at the contractor's yard on April 9, 1934; that all of the required work of repair was completed on July 27, 1934; and that the ship was returned to Fort Slocum, N. Y., on July 28, 1934. The contractor was paid the sum of $18,724.90 for performance of the contract work, computed in accordance with the aforementioned schedule B, plus the amounts of certain change orders, less per diem allowance for a Government inspector as provided in the special conditions of the contract, the cost of fuel, oil, and supplies used by the contractor in removing the ship from Fort Slocum to its yard and in returning it to Fort Slocum after completion of the required repairs, and less liquidated damages in the amount of $4,200 for 42 calendar days of delay.

The basis for the contractor's claim for remission of liquidated damages is that it was required to perform extra work, and that the delay in performance was due to the performance of such work. However, the contracting officer reported, in effect, that none of the required work involved in the contractor's

claim represented extra work, and that the delay in completing performance resulted from the contractor's failure to prosecute the contract work with diligence, efficiency, and with a proper regard for its contractual obligations. While some officials of the War Department proposed recommending favorable consideration of the contractor's claims to the extent of refunding one-half of the liquidated damages which had been deducted, or $2,100, said recommendation was not approved by the Secretary of War, who disapproved payment of any amount upon the basis of a determination that the delay was not excusable under the terms of the contract. Such action is final and conclusive in the absence of a showing of fraud or of a mistake so gross as to amount to bad faith, neither of which has been established by the contractor.

With respect to the item of $4,518.74 paid to the contractor by the Home Insurance Co. by reason of damages to the ship while it was in the yards of the contractor, the administrative officers of the Government in charge of the work determined that the contractor had damaged the shaft log and contiguous parts to such an extent that they had to be replaced. Thereupon the contractor made claim on the insurance company, presumably under the terms of an insurance policy, for reimbursement of expenses incurred in installing the new shaft log. The insurance company made an investigation of the matter at the time, and upon a report of their investigator, payment of the sum of $4,518.74 was made to the contractor. However, a subsequent investigation was made by the insurance company almost a year later, at which time the insurance company concluded that the damage to the shaft log was not the result of any action by the contractor, but was due to its old and worn condition. As a result the company requested the contractor to refund the sum of $4,518.74 theretofore paid to it, and the contractor in turn requested payment of this amount from the Government. However, the contracting officer found as a fact that, on the basis of reports of the War Department employees who were present on the project, the contractor was responsible for the damage to the shaft log.

The claim for liquidated damages deducted from payment under the contract was forwarded by the War Department to the General Accounting Office for settlement, and said claim was disallowed. In decision of the then Comptroller General dated January 14, 1936, the disallowance of the claim was sustained. In addition, the claim for $4,518.74 was denied for the reason the record contained a finding of fact by the contracting officer, as provided in the contract, which was based upon reports made by three representatives of the War Department who were assigned to duty at the contractor's plant during progress of the work, all of whom were in agreement that the difficulty and delay in completing the work of repairing the vessel was due to the lack of efficiency in the operation of the contractor's yard, and to the contractor's constant attempt to avoid its obligations under the contract.

While there is some disagreement between the contractor and the Government's representatives on the site of the work as to the facts in the matter of the claims, the contractor has not established that the facts as found by the contracting officer were erroneous. Furthermore, several bills similar to H. R. 6184, supra, previously were introduced for the relief of the contractor but all failed of enactment, thus indicating that, after carefully considering the matter, it was determined on each occasion, that the claims were not sufficiently established to warrant payment by the enactment of a private bill. These bills were H. R. 12535 and S. 4366, Seventy-fourth Congress; H. R. 8227 and S. 718, Seventy-fifth Congress; S. 1106, Seventy-sixth Congress; H. R. 5702 and S. 1733, Seventy-seventh Congress; H. R. 2214, Seventy-eighth Congress; and H. R. 3053, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Accordingly, I am withholding Executive approval of the enrolled enactment.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

AMEND TITLE X OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

I am withholding approval of H. R. 6818, a bill "to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting."

I believe that this bill is unsound in principle, would not accomplish the ostensible purpose for which it was enacted, and would do serious damage to our social-security program. This bill is contrary to the most important principle on which our entire public-assistance program is based—relief of need. If it became law it would inevitably operate unfairly against those needy blind who are unable to work and who have no other sources of income. It would actually lead to reductions in the assistance payments of thousands of blind persons who are most in need of assistance and whose payments are even now far below that necessary to sustain them at a decent standard of living. Payments to these most needy recipients would have to be reduced in order to make available the funds required for the increased payments to those able to earn and who would be benefited by this bill. The most compelling reason for disapproval of this bill is my firm belief that the unsound principle on which it is based would seriously hinder further progress in the development of a sound and comprehensive social-security program.

Title X of the Social Security Act provides for Federal participation in assistance payments by the States to needy blind persons. One of the conditions of such participation is that the State agency take into consideration, in determining need, any other income and resources of the assistance claimant. H. R. 6818, now before me, would permit the States, in determining such income and resources, to disregard earnings up to $40 per month received by the blind person, without thereby losing the benefit of the Federal grants.

Naturally, everyone has a genuine concern for the plight of blind persons and a desire to help them overcome their affliction and attain security to the maximum extent possible. This concern found concrete expression in title X of the Social Security Act, which singled out blindness over all other kinds of physical disability for a special Federal-State program of public assistance. From a superficial point of view this bill might seem to be of benefit to all blind persons and a logical improvement in the aid-to-the-blind program. However, a thoughtful examination of the bill leads to the conclusion that it not only would endanger the benefit rights of thousands of blind persons presently receiving assistance under title X of the Social Security Act but would also, in the long run, retard a more constructive approach to the attainment of an adequate measure of security for the blind and other handicapped persons.

The bill would operate to the detriment of many needy blind persons now receiving financial assistance because in many States any new or increased assistance to blind persons who are employed can only be provided through reducing the assistance currently being granted blind persons who are without income. The capacity of many low-income States to contribute out of their own funds to the support of the blind has already been reached. This bill would increase the recipient case loads by perhaps as much as one-third by making eligible for assistance blind persons not now eligible because of their earnings from employment. Faced with the necessity of adding to their rolls these thousands of blind persons not now eligible for assistance, and with the necessity of increasing the assistance payments of many others whose earnings have heretofore operated to reduce their assistance payments, these States which are unable to make available additional money will simply have to divide among the larger groups of eligibles the limited funds now available. The result will be that the most needy blind persons in these States—blind persons unable to work and without any source of income whatever—will have their already meager assistance payments reduced in an amount sufficient to permit new or larger payments to the less fortunate of their fellows.

I fully appreciate that the relaxation of each State's present no-income requirement is, under the wording of H. R. 6818, optional with each State. But the arguments and influences which were brought to bear upon the Congress and led to the hasty last-minute passage of H. R. 6818 would, if that bill became law, be exerted with equal if not greater force upon the individual States. I believe it reasonable to expect that most of the States would soon conform their laws to the relaxed Federal requirement with the unfortunate results which I have described above.

I have recommended to the Congress that it amend all the public assistance programs in the Social Security Act—the old-age assistance and aid-to-dependent-children programs, as well as the aid-to-the-blind programs—so as to make it possible for the States, particularly the low-income States, to pro-

vide assistance payments more nearly adequate in terms of present-day living costs. What is needed in the public assistance area is, among other things, a substantial increase—much larger than the inconsequential $5 recently enacted by the Congress—in the maximum assistance payments in all three categories in which the Federal Government will participate. Furthermore, it is perhaps even more important to enact special provisions relating Federal grants more equitably to the financial resources and needs of the various States. Only by so doing can we provide our needy blind and all other needy persons with a realistic measure of assistance. A bill such as H. R. 6818, which would affect only one of the public assistance programs, and which would operate in many States merely to spread even thinner the already insufficient amounts available for assistance payments, is in no sense a response to my recommendation and offers no real solution to the problems of the needy blind.

There is another fundamental objection to this bill. The aid-to-the-blind program in title X of the Social Security Act, like the other public-assistance programs provided in that act, was designed and intended to provide financial assistance at a decent minimum of subsistence to those unable to provide for themselves. Necessarily payments under these programs must be made on the basis of a finding as to the need of each individual for assistance, and for such a finding to be realistic and equitable to all alike, it must be based on a consideration of each individual's earnings from employment and of any other resources available to him. To disregard an individual's income in determining the extent of his need for assistance negates the principle of providing assistance on the basis of need. Once this principle has been breached, grave questions arise as to a logical stopping place to changes of this character short of converting public-assistance payments into flat, noncontributory pensions.

I am sure that the American people would not want to make so significant a change in one of the public-assistance programs of our social-security system without the most careful consideration of its implications for the other public-assistance programs and for the contributory programs of unemployment insurance and old-age and survivors insurance. No such consideration was given to this bill by the Congress. The bill was introduced and passed in the closing hours of the recent session. No public hearings were held and no opportunity was provided the affected Government agencies—Federal, State, or local—to express their views.

The avowed object of the present bill as stated in the committee reports, is to provided a much-needed encouragement to the blind to become useful and productive members of the community. I do not in the least question the sincerity of purpose behind this measure. I question, instead, the underlying assumption of the bill that a cash incentive is needed to this end. I am not yet ready to believe that persons thus handicapped are so lacking in the spirit of self-reliance and in a desire to be useful and independent as to require this sort of incentive. The blind, like other people, want to work and be self-supporting. The blind, more than all others, would not welcome the establishment of such an incentive at the price of reducing the assistance payments available for the most unfortunate of their company and at the price of opening the door to distortions in, and potential wreckage of, our social-security program.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1948.*

The President further informed the House that he had withheld his approval of the bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for a program in the field of lighter-than-air aeronautics under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution (S. Res. 266):

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is reassembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the above resolution, Mr. WHERRY and Mr. BARKLEY were appointed on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll to establish a quorum.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members answered to their names:

[Roll No. 127]

Abbitt	Byrnes, Wis.	Evins
Albert	Camp	Fallon
Allen, Calif.	Canfield	Feighan
Allen, Ill.	Cannon	Fernandez
Allen, La.	Case, N. J.	Flannagan
Anderson, Calif.	Chapman	Fletcher
Andrews, N. Y.	Chelf	Folger
Angell	Chiperfield	Foote
Arends	Church	Forand
Arnold	Clevenger	Fuller
Auchincloss	Clippinger	Fulton
Bakewell	Coffin	Gamble
Banta	Cole, Kans.	Garmatz
Barden	Cole, Mo.	Gary
Barrett	Cole, N. Y.	Gavin
Bates, Mass.	Colmer	Gearhart
Battle	Cooley	Gillette
Beall	Cooper	Gillie
Beckworth	Corbett	Goff
Bell	Cotton	Goodwin
Bender	Cravens	Gordon
Bishop	Crawford	Gore
Blackney	Crow	Gorski
Bland	Cunningham	Gossett
Bloom	Dague	Graham
Bogg, Del.	Davis, Ga.	Grant, Ala.
Bolton	Davis, Wis.	Gregory
Bonner	Deane	Griffiths
Boykin	Devitt	Gross
Bradley	D'Ewart	Gwinn, N. Y.
Bramblett	Dingell	Gwynne, Iowa
Brehm	Dirksen	Hagen
Brophy	Domengeaux	Hale
Brown, Ga.	Dondero	Hall,
Brown, Ohio	Donohue	Edwin Arthur
Bryson	Dorn	Hall,
Buchanan	Doughton	Leonard W.
Buck	Douglas	Halleck
Buckley	Eaton	Hardy
Buffett	Eberharter	Harness, Ind.
Burke	Ellis	Hartley
Busbey	Ellsworth	Harvey
Butler	Engel, Mich.	Havenner
Byrne, N. Y.	Engle, Calif.	Hays
Hedrick	McMahon	Rooney
Herter	McMillan, S. C.	Ross
Heselton	Mack	Russell
Hobbs	MacKinnon	Sabath
Hoffman	Macy	Sadlak
Holifield	Madden	Sadowski
Holmes	Mahon	St. George
Hope	Maloney	Sanborn
Horan	Manasco	Sasscer
Huber	Mason	Schwabe, Okla.
Hull	Mathews	Scoblick
Jackson, Wash.	Meade, Ky.	Scott, Hardie
Jarman	Meade, Md.	Scott,
Javits	Merrow	Hugh D., Jr.
Jenison	Meyer	Scrivner
Jenkins, Ohio	Michener	Seely-Brown
Jensen	Miller, Calif.	Shafer
Johnson, Calif.	Miller, Conn.	Sheppard
Johnson, Ill.	Miller, Nebr.	Sikes
Johnson, Okla.	Mills	Simpson, Ill.
Jones, Ala.	Morris	Simpson, Pa.
Jones, N. C.	Morrison	Smathers
Jones, Wash.	Mundt	Smith, Kans.
Jonkman	Murdock	Smith, Maine
Judd	Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Ohio
Karsten, Mo.	Murray, Wis.	Smith, Va.
Kearney	Nicholson	Smith, Wis.
Kearns	Nixon	Snyder
Keating	Norblad	Spence
Kee	Norrell	Stevenson
Kefauver	Norton	Stratton
Kelley	O'Brien	Sundstrom
Keogh	Passman	Taber
Kersten, Wis.	Patterson	Talle
Kilburn	Peden	Taylor
King	Pfeifer	Teague
Kirwan	Philbin	Tibbott
Klein	Phillips, Calif.	Tollefson
Kunkel	Plumley	Towe
Lane	Poage	Trimble
Lanham	Potter	Twyman
Larcade	Potts	Van Zandt
Latham	Poulson	Vinson
Lea	Preston	Wadsworth
LeCompte	Price, Fla.	Walter
LeFevre	Price, Ill.	Weichel
Lemke	Priest	Welch
Lesinski	Rains	West
Lewis, Ky.	Rankin	Wheeler
Lewis, Ohio	Redden	Whitaker
Lichtenwalter	Reed, N. Y.	Whitten
Love	Rees	Wigglesworth
Lusk	Reeves	Williams
Lyle	Rich	Wilson, Ind.
McConnell	Richards	Winstead
McCormack	Riehlman	Wolcott
McCowen	Riley	Wolverton
McCulloch	Rivers	Wood
McDonough	Robertson	Woodruff
McDowell	Rogers, Fla.	Worley
McGarvey	Rogers, Mass.	
McGregor	Rohrbough	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 310 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 702) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communications that he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

INVESTIGATION UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 618

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the letter of the Secretary of the Interior, dated July 2, 1948, relative to the investigation sought in House Resolution 618 of the Eightieth Congress.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the communication from the Secretary of the Interior.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1948.

Mr. JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ANDREWS: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter to me on June 17, 1948, transmitting an attested copy of House Resolution 618, Eightieth Congress, which was adopted by the House of Representatives on June 16.

Pursuant to the request of the Congress, we have scheduled the investigation recommended in House Resolution 618 in our work to be undertaken in the fiscal year 1949.

Sincerely yours,
J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

SECOND QUARTERLY REPORT OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the President of the United States addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, received in the office of the Clerk on June 30, 1948.

Very truly yours,
JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the message from the President.

The Clerk read as follows:

PRESIDENT'S LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the second quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign aid program authorized by Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress, approved December 17, 1947.

This report covers the period from January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1948, during which the flow of United States supplies to Austria, France, and Italy accomplished the purposes of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947—"to alleviate conditions of hunger and cold and prevent serious economic retrogression."

Pursuant to section 5 (d) of the act, this report also includes the statements of the Governments of Austria, France, and Italy on the method of distribution and use of commodities made available under the act; the itemized list of commodities supplied each Government, the average price at which each commodity was sold, and the gross proceeds derived from their sale; and the disposition of local currencies derived from these sales.

The supplies provided by the United States have freed the peoples of these three countries temporarily from the fear of starvation and want and enabled them to hold their economy intact until a long-range program could help them and other countries to a general European reconstruction. To the peoples of these countries, however, the gift of these supplies by the people of the United States meant something more—this aid represented also a symbol of hope for their future.

To us, the American people, our aid was an act of faith in a future in which freemen shall prevail. The freely expressed will of the Italian people in their national election has already confirmed that faith.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1948.*

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MILLER of Maryland (at the request of Mr. BEALL), indefinitely, on account of being called back to active duty in the Army Reserves.

To Mr. SARBACHER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for this week, because of training with the Marine Corps reserves.

To Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of being confined to hospital through illness.

To Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of being confined to hospital by illness.

To Mr. STIGLER (at the request of Mr. MORRIS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. REGAN (at the request of Mr. GOSSETT), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. VAIL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and notify him that a quorum of the two Houses was assembled, and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he might be pleased to make, has performed that duty.

The President has informed the committee that he would communicate to the House a message in person tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1948, at 12:30 o'clock p. m.

PROVISION FOR JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 220) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, July 27, 1948, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States may be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESSES IN ORDER TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, July 27, 1948, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

THE LATE EDWARD BROWN, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I formally announce to the House the death on June 29, 1948, of Edward Brown, superintendent of the House Office Buildings, in the seventy-fifth year of his age. He had been ill from a heart attack which confined him to the hospital for about 7 weeks before he succumbed.

Ed Brown, as he was affectionately called by his many friends, had a long and useful life, the larger part of it spent in the service of the Federal Government. He entered the employ of the Government in 1900 under Mr. Clark, who was then Architect of the Capitol. He held the position of assistant to the constructor in 1905 when the Old House Office Building was built, and acted in the same capacity in 1909 and 1910, when the Capitol power plant and the Senate Office Building were constructed. He served in various other positions until 1930, when he was appointed superintendent of the House Office Buildings.

He met a great number of men and women who served in the Congress and he was respected by all for his rugged honesty, his cheerfulness of spirit, his devotion to duty, and his helpful service. He knew every pipe and pane of glass in the House Office Buildings; he loved his job and he worked unselfishly for the comfort of the Members. I, together with

many other Members, have lost a dear friend, and the Government service a faithful servant.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to pay my tribute to Mr. Brown. He was tireless in his devotion to duty. He had a tremendous knowledge of his work and he performed it with real enthusiasm. He took a great interest in each and every Member of Congress. He was endlessly patient, especially if we all wanted something done at the same time. We shall miss him and I join with those who mourn his loss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article by Walter Lippmann.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news item.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "A Job for the Special Session."

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address made by himself a year ago.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an admirable address delivered on Saturday last by Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., of Pennsylvania, chairman of the National Republican Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a radio address.

THE TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER HOUSING BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the House will need no advice as to what to do on the housing issue. The Members have been home, and I am sure most of them, if not all, recognize it is still the No. 1 domestic issue in the country.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill remains the one comprehensive housing measure before the country. Upon it the hopes of our people for housing are built. It can be passed by the House in the ensuing days while we are in session if the discharge petition now on the Speaker's desk is completed. It is by now clear that if any comprehensive housing measure is to pass it must be this bill. It is on the table, available for the signature of any Member. The record on housing in the coming session will be made on that discharge petition in this House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Or if a rule comes out of the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE PRESENT HIGH COST OF LIVING AND ITS CAUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the high cost of living that is getting higher every day is worrying the President so much it is going to be the burden of his song here tomorrow and can be directly laid on the doorstep of this administration. It has nine agencies in this country purchasing vast quantities of commodities every day, which they are giving to countries that do not need them and who definitely say they do not want them in many cases.

This administration is responsible for the high cost of living, and the people of this country ought to know it. The Republican Party ought to make an issue out of it right now and give the people the truth and facts. The administration is to blame because they want the high cost of living to get higher in the hope of getting the farmer's vote. The farmer wants his price made in the market place and the consumer is entitled to have his price made in that same market place. Until you get it determined at the right place, the high cost of living will get higher and higher. The blood and misery of this situation should be placed where it belongs.

In April of this year these nine agencies bought $129,800,000 worth of food and shipped it out of the country independent of ERP.

Thirty million dollars' worth of wheat and wheat products to countries that did not need it and some expressed themselves so. Europe has the largest harvests they have had for many years. The whole mess should be cleaned up, then prices would adjust themselves. When the OPA was ended, prices would have come down had not the Government entered the purchasing field.

There is no backlog of material or labor in the housing field, so if the Government goes into the building business present builders will have to quit, for supplies will have to be channeled through Government agencies, and it will take the Government at least a year to get started and housing will cost much more than the building now going on. On every hand square miles of houses are going up. Let us keep up the good work as is.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each newspaper articles.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by John W. Scoville.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include acceptance speeches of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, and Gov. Earl Warren, of California, at the recent National Republican Convention.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include correspondence with General Gray regarding the payment of dividends to veterans who carry insurance.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Long Beach Independent.

THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I look around this Chamber today and see very few people who appear to be happy. Some of my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be unhappy because this special session is nothing but a continuation of the Democratic National Convention. Most of them are still suffering from a combination of pigeonitis and platformitis. All that we need here to remind us of the reasons for this meeting will be a big cage and a shower of white pigeons. It is possible that the humane society may have managed to release them by this time and maybe they will be back with us in time for tomorrow's session. I suggest that we come well equipped tomorrow with umbrellas. Even if we are not greeted by the birds, we may be able to use them to ward off the shower of abuse being prepared for us.

Since the last time we had the pleasure of hearing our President, he has been indulging in a good deal of name calling. He has described this Congress as the worst in American history. Nevertheless, for the first time since 1856, we have been called into extra session in an election year—and the reasons are as obvious to us as they are to the President.

But I am not here to defend this Congress. The record will speak for us. That record will show that we have

strengthened our Nation's military defenses, that we have given our taxpayers at least some relief from an oppressive burden of taxation, that we have moved closer to stabilizing labor-management relations than ever before in our history, and that we are doing our share in the business of government.

I have risen, however, to propose that we rise higher than the motives which prompted our President to call us back to Washington. Let this session boomerang on the White House. We ought to consider some of the unfinished business on our agenda. I urge this special session to enact the measure which I had the honor of sponsoring which would abolish the poll tax from our statute books. I urge this special session to pass antilynching legislation, the civil-rights program endorsed by both political parties in their platforms, and the provision of the funds necessary to aid the United Nations in its building program. Let us take this opportunity to seize the ball. This Congress can give the birds, pigeons, and otherwise back to the President, by doing a job.

Some very good friends of mine made things fairly warm for the President in the City of Brotherly Love a few days ago. We are going to make things hotter still for him by proving that the Chambers of the Eightieth Congress can stand the heat of public appraisal better than the White House.

AMERICAN SHIPPING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that the administration is using foreign ships to send relief commodities to foreign countries and that our own ships are put into disuse. It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that the United States look after its own shipping. I need not remind the House that looking after our own shipping at the present time is particularly vital.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is no good reason for this special session of Congress. It is a political move, pure and simple. Every Member of the House knows this to be true. I do not believe anything has developed in either the domestic or international scene since the adjournment of Congress on June 19 that justifies the calling of this special session. Surely nothing has happened during this period that the administration was not aware of prior to that adjournment. I am therefore introducing a resolution to adjourn sine die immediately upon receipt of the President's message tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three matters and include newspaper items and other literature.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. JOHN McCORMACK.

Mr. BYRNE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written by William Rose Benet, appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each a newspaper article.

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he recently made to the Rotary Club of Norfolk.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as this special session of Congress convenes today the people of America are thinking and wondering about two questions, namely, how long Congress will remain in session subject to this call, and what legislation, if any, will be enacted.

Many people in my home district have asked me these questions since the President issued his call. The answer will depend on a number of conditions and events. There may or may not be cooperation between the Democrats and Republicans. There may or may not be cooperation between the Congress and the President. No one at this particular time can go further than to guess the answers to these questions.

Whatever may have been the motive behind the call for this special session, we have now convened and are here. It behooves every Member of Congress today to take an objective view of the situation and try to reach a conclusion as to how long this session should last. If there is a probability that Members can work together in sufficient harmony to enact needed legislation, then the country will benefit by having Congress remain in session.

If there cannot be a spirit of cooperation between the Democrats and Republicans in Congress, and also between Congress and the President, then the best thing for the country would be for Congress to adjourn as quickly as possible. There can be no possible benefit to the country from a prolonged session of Congress if nothing is to result from it but political wrangling and quarreling. That would add another useless expense to the already heavily burdened taxpayer.

For my own part, since we have convened and are here ready to go to work, I would like to see action taken to complete legislation on at least three important pending measures before consideration is begun of matters on which there is going to be heated controversy.

These three pieces of unfinished legislation, which should be completed as speedily as possible, are the Veterans' Homestead Act, which will provide low-cost homes and rental houses for veterans, both city and rural, the bill to provide State administered Federal aid for education, and the bill to remove Federal tax on oleomargarine.

There is no sectional bitterness involved in these measures. They will be beneficial to every section of the country. They are not political bills and they cannot be labeled as being either Democratic bills or Republican bills. They are supported by Members of both parties and by Members from all sections of America. I believe the President will sign each one of these bills. They are needed and should be enacted.

On this the opening day of this session, while it is still possible to make this a constructive, worth-while session of Congress, I earnestly urge consideration of and final action upon these three important unfinished pieces of legislation.

REPEAL OF TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to call to the attention of the House the fact that I have filed a petition to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, from consideration of the Lesinski bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley law. I think experience has shown that this law does not work. It cannot work. It is not necessary.

The claims of the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act that this law has been the decisive factor in the present era of industrial peace are not supported by the facts.

There is always a strong tendency on the part of management, particularly of management with a poor labor-relations policy, to exaggerate the losses due to work stoppages.

Figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that in the year of postwar adjustments, 1946, man-days lost jumped from 38,000,000 in 1945, while we were still fighting, to 116,000,000; and in 1947 they dropped back to 34,600,000 man-days lost.

However, it is a distortion of the facts to claim that this disruptive law had anything to do with the decrease in strikes.

At every point at which established labor-management relations have come into collision with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act there has been trouble. In most cases both sides have been willing to await court tests, which proves only that established reciprocity between the negotiators has not yet been entirely broken up by this law. However, the Chicago printers' strikes prove what happens when a conservative, long-established union comes up against this kind of intolerable intervention in recognized collective bargaining.

The Wagner Labor Relations Act had just been shaken down into its fullest usefulness after 10 years of trial and error when the disruptive Taft-Hartley law, reversing the purpose of the basic act and perverting the intent of the Congress which passed the old law, was superimposed on the NLRB machinery. The ill effects of this will become more apparent as time goes on; and I warn you solemnly that now is the time to repeal this law.

It is my belief that man-days lost from strikes can be reduced to the wartime lows of less than one-tenth of 1 percent if we get rid of this law; but with it they will rise again.

SIR OSWALD MOSLEY

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have read an article in the New York Post of July 17, 1948, that Sir Oswald Mosley, British Fascist leader, is planning to visit the United States soon to consult with certain individuals of like political persuasion.

We all know that this black-shirted menace is recognized as England's leading anti-Semite. It seems incredible to me that he should be granted permission to enter our United States. He has fomented enough trouble in his ruthless efforts to bring about the conquest of Britain, and certainly would be a most undesirable visitor to our shores.

Individuals of this ilk should not be granted the privilege of accepting our hospitality and proceed to stir up racial hatred and religious prejudice. I am sure that every American citizen would resent the intrusion of this Fascist leader. Under the circumstances, I cannot conceive our Department of State granting his application for a visa. I have already communicated with the Secretary of State for the purpose of vigorously protesting the issuance of a visa in the event it is applied for by Mr. Mosley.

NEW JOHNSONVILLE STEAM PLANT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to appropriate $4,000,000 to enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to begin construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn. This appropriation was declined in the last session of Congress by a very narrow margin because of partisanship and lack of full understanding of the necessity of the project on the part of some Members. I do not believe this partisanship would enter into consideration of this appropriation at the present time, in view of the further evidence of the absolute necessity of building this steam plant for defense purposes.

Last week I had a conference with Mr. A. D. Huddleston, general manager of the Aluminum Co., at Alcoa, Tenn. Mr. Huddleston and other officials of the Aluminum Co. are terribly concerned over the inability of getting sufficient electricity to continue full operation of the Aluminum Co. Mr. Huddleston told me that the Aluminum Co. had been advised by the TVA that it would have to reduce the amount of electricity it was furnishing the Aluminum Co. This means that production at the Nation's largest aluminum company will have to be curtailed and, of course, any possibility of increased production is out of the picture. The same situation prevails in other defense industries in the Tennessee Valley. In view of the tense international situation and the program of plane production which has been inaugurated by Congress, it is unthinkable that TVA should not be allowed to build this plant to furnish electricity vitally needed in our defense effort.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is the sole supplier of power for this large area containing 5,000,000 people. The progress that has been made in the last few years has substantially increased the proportionate tax revenue of the Tennessee Valley, and it has meant increased business for all sections of the country. The electrical equipment and farm machinery which the people are buying as the result of TVA development comes largely from other sections of the United States. Those in Congress who want to retard the progress of the Tennessee Valley are very shortsighted. A healthy development in any section is in the national interest. Members of Congress should also keep in mind that this appropriation is not a burden on the taxpayers of the Nation. Under the amortization plan adopted at the last Congress, this appropriation will be repaid to the Government within 40 years and the steam plant will, of course, then be the property of the Government. It is an advance of money that will pay big dividends to people not only of the Tennessee Valley but also of the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, last week I sent a telegram to the President of the United States, urging that he recommend in his message to this special session of Congress that funds be voted to allow construction of this steam plant. I have a letter from the President indicating that this will be done. I hope very much that Congress may consider this recommendation with an open mind and without partisanism or sectionalism and, with this kind of consideration, I know the appropriation will be approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative program for the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

RANKIN CHALLENGES BOTH TRUMAN AND DEWEY FOR DEBATE ON THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, our country is now at the crossroads. We are threatened by communism at home and abroad.

The American people were shocked and disappointed when both major political parties wrote a Communist plank into their platforms endorsing the so-called civil-rights program including the damnable FEPC with which Governor Dewey has punished the people of the State of New York.

I am tired of this whining about racial minorities. It is about time that somebody said something about the majority of the American people—the white Americans, if you please, who fight the Nation's battles in times of war and sustain its institutions in times of peace—and who are being punished or threatened with this kind of un-American legislation.

I here and now extend a challenge to President Truman and to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, to engage in a Nation-wide radio debate with me on this FEPC, the most dangerous communistic piece of legislation with which the American people have ever been threatened.

If they do not want to take me on personally I will take whomever they designate.

I will take this issue to the American people and show how it is inspired by Moscow and being used to undermine and destroy the American way of life as well as the American Government.

You Republicans talk about what President Truman said about you. Do

not forget that both political parties repudiated both the Democrats and the Republicans in Congress, because I know that you decent Americans on both sides of the aisle are not in favor of that communistic program.

If it continues you are going to see a rising tide of opposition to both tickets.

If Governor Thurmond and Governor Wright get their ticket on the ballot in every State of the Union, and the people understand what this communistic program means, they will sweep this country in the November election.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING AND THE HOUSING SITUATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the 1-minute speeches that have been made I have asked for this time. If those speeches had not been made today, I would not have asked for permission to address the House. But we might just as well clarify the situation since they were made.

The two most important problems confronting the American people today are the high cost of living and the housing problem. Those are inescapable facts. Every housewife in America knows what the high cost of living is doing and has done to her family budget. Every housewife knows what happens when she goes out to the store with $5 or $10, or even $20 and what she can bring back to her family. Everyone knows about the cost of meat, steaks, clothing, and all of the other items that enter into the cost of living. There are millions of families in America today who are suffering keenly as a result of the present high cost of living.

It is not my purpose to make any condemnatory speech, but to call attention to the fact that the people are acutely interested in this situation.

Both parties agree that there is a cruelly high cost of living. Our Republican friends used the word "cruel" in their platform. Everyone knows there has been an over-all increase in the cost of living of 40 percent during the past 2 years. Everyone knows that during the preceding 3½ years prior to June 30, 1946, the over-all increase in the cost of living was 6.6 percent. One of our distinguished friends in his speech referred to Government purchases. Of course, everyone knows that when controls were taken off, any purchase, small or large, accumulated, would have an effect on the cost of living and on prices, where there were shortages. But we must bear in mind that during the war the Government bought more farm commodities and food for export abroad than the Government has ever bought during the last 2 years. The Government has bought almost as much, if not more, for civilian purposes abroad, never mind our military purposes, during the war than it did for civilian purposes abroad during the past 2 years. Yet during the war period, prices were held down. Of course, strong measures had to be used, but that was the only way that justice could be brought to the average family in America. Otherwise, prices would have become abnormally high. The price level now is higher after World War II than it was after World War I. That is the situation, without regard to politics, that confronts millions and millions of American families.

Now, let us go to the question of housing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a backlog of labor and material in the country at the moment with which to build houses?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, we will come to that.

Mr. GROSS. I hope you will.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Now, so far as the housing legislation is concerned, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill or the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is reported out of the House Committee on Banking and Currency now. That bill contains provisions for slum clearance, low-cost housing, and public housing. Also, it contains title 6, which we failed to reenact in the last days of the last session, or failed to extend. The Democratic Party stands in favor of slum-clearance legislation, low-cost housing, and public housing, also extension of title 6. The Republican platform stands in favor of the same things where need exists. I think there is a need. The leadership in the House is opposed to the bill that passed the Senate. The Republican leadership in the House is opposed to the plank that is contained in the Republican platform. Both party platforms are in agreement on housing. Both parties recognize that there are insufferable conditions existing throughout the country in relation to the high cost of living. It seems to me that the people are concerned with that, and that party politics is not going to cause them to change their minds in the firm belief that insufferable conditions exist and that something should be done by the Congress. The people recognize that the President does not legislate. The Congress legislates. The President and the executive branch of the Government enforce the law.

So, making no speech of condemnation, we want results to give the people a break. Let us give them a break; never mind our inconvenience; let us go ahead. The housing bill can be brought up within a short time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I repeat, the housing bill can be brought up within a very short time. I realize that in the matter of legislation dealing with living conditions and the high cost of living that committees must sit and consider the bills.

We have got to be practical and we have got to be fair and I do not criticize because there is not immediate action on it; to criticize on that ground would not be fair. But with reference to the housing bill, it is in such shape that it could be reported out immediately by the Rules Committee and we could consider those provisions of the bill reported out of the committee that were not enacted in the closing days of the last session.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that on the last day of the session we passed under a suspension of the rules a tax bill in a very short time. The gentleman will concede, I am sure, that we could pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill here in 2 hours.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I have been listening with great interest to what the gentleman has been saying. I take it that he is the acting minority leader. Speaking for myself, I had concluded that I would wait until tomorrow to hear what the President had to say before I made any comment with respect to this special session.

I am wondering if the gentleman knows what the President will present in his speech tomorrow and whether we may rely on the proposition that what the gentleman has been saying is in anticipation of what the President will say tomorrow and is, in truth and in fact, a statement similar to or in line with what the President will say?

Mr. McCORMACK. In answer to my friend, the majority leader, I have no knowledge, I may say, as to what the President's message will contain. I have knowledge, however, of what the conditions are. I have been home. I did not have to go home to have knowledge that the people are suffering. Certainly we ought to try to make an effort to give the people a break under these conditions. So my answer is that I have no knowledge of what the President will say, but I do have a deep and intensely sympathetic knowledge of the suffering of the poor and the middle classes, the backbone of America, constituting millions of American families; and I think I know what is in their minds.

My remarks today are made simply because there were a couple of speeches made which I did not think expressed the full facts, and to allow them to go unanswered would not be a proper thing for me to do.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The President in his early morning acceptance speech of the nomination referred to price control, rationing, and allocation; in other words, the OPA. Is the gentleman suggesting that we reconstitute the OPA, with control of prices, rationing, and so forth?

Mr. McCORMACK. On this occasion my remarks are aimed at the basic proposition that something ought to be

done in order to protect the American people against the insufferable conditions that exist at the present time and which the Republican platform frankly admits are cruelly high. Mark you, the word "cruel" means to inflict not only punishment but unusual punishment. The Republican platform, by the use of that word "cruelly", admits that the American people, so far as the high cost of living is concerned, are having inflicted upon them punishment of an insufferable nature.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK], who was the majority leader 2 years ago and who preceded me.

I recall very distinctly that the Eightieth Congress—this Congress—was elected upon many propositions, but principally upon the proposition that price controls would be abolished. The people did not want high prices, yet they did not want the black markets. The prices charged the American people for every desirable commodity were prohibitive because of the black markets. The people of the country could not buy a commodity which they wanted without going into the black market. The shelves of the butcher shops and the grocery stores were empty because everything for which there was a demand had been driven into the black market.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I wonder if the gentleman cannot remember far enough back, the American people I am sure remember that far back, to the time just before the election in 1946 when Mr. Truman himself took all price controls off.

Mr. BENDER. Three weeks before the election public sentiment was so terrific for doing away with OPA controls that the President, with his ear to the ground, finally abolished price controls himself. As a matter of fact, the then majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, begged the President to suspend price controls for, I believe, 60 days. The President did so and he was in agreement with every other leader in the Republican and the Democratic Parties because the people were sick unto death of price control. They could not get what they wanted in the regular, legitimate markets. So at that time one of the most important issues before the American people was getting rid of price controls. The Eightieth Congress has respected the wishes of the people by abandoning price controls.

Our own majority leader has called attention to the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts. From what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, and he is an able and well-informed man, we have, I think, a foretaste of what the President is going to say.

Who has been running this country for the past 16 years? Not the Republicans. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman were in the White House, and they had their own way 100 percent. Who is responsible for the condition in which the country finds itself today? We won the war, but we lost the peace at Teheran, at Yalta, at Potsdam. The two gentlemen who were there were the leaders of the Democratic Party. They, and they only, knew what was going on. As a result of our having lost the peace, we have had to pay a terrific price. We have had to provide the sustenance, the food, the clothing, and the material for the rest of the world in order to carry out the cold war that now exists.

As the result we find ourselves with shortages in this country. I have thought this thing out and I know that you and I agree that if we did not have to divide our substances, our goods, our foods, our materials with the rest of the world, the supply at home would meet the demand. While we are feeding the world we lack the supply to meet our own domestic demand. When the supply meets the demand in this country you are going to have lower prices and not before. And possibly an old-fashioned buyers' strike might help.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I listened with a great deal of interest to the distinguished minority leader making this appeal to the people about the high cost of living. The gentleman from Massachusetts was one of the advocates of the subsidy payments whereby we take the American taxpayers' money, go out into the market, buy up the potatoes, take them out of the market to hold up the price structure, then dump them for fertilizer or put kerosene on them, destroy them, or feed them to the hogs wherever possible.

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Mr. GAVIN. If they would have let that supply come into the market the prices would automatically come down and the American people would secure relief from high prices on, not alone potatoes, but many products. It is about time for the Government to discontinue these unsound practices.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I did not have time to finish what I wanted to say about those pigeons earlier today. You know, it served the Democrats right to have the pigeons carry on the way they did at their convention. Somebody conceived the idea of putting those 48 pigeons in a floral piece, not realizing the habits of the pigeons. The pigeons were turned loose during the Democratic convention. The doors, you know, were closed. They did not want to let anybody out; they wanted to keep them in to hear the President speak at 2 a. m. The pigeons served them right. I hope they turn pigeons loose here tomorrow when the President speaks. All we will have tomorrow will be campaign speeches. Mr. Truman will not tell you that at Potsdam and Teheran and Yalta he and his predecessor were responsible for creating these shortages by giving Russia everything they wanted. They turned over the whole works to Russia, including Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia. They turned the whole works over to them, and now Mr. Truman says, "Look at this fellow; see what he is doing to us." As a result of spending these billions of dollars all over the world we find ourselves, our own economy, in a terrible state. That is what is responsible for your high prices and your high cost of living and your shortages. You cannot feed the rest of the world and your own people too, and not pay high prices; and when you create an OPA, you create a black market. Under OPA no restaurant man, no consumer, no individual could go into a store and purchase anything at regular prices. There were two prices—one on top of the table and one under the table.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. My good friend, I wonder if the idea was not to eliminate rationing?

Mr. BENDER. Rationing?

Mr. HUBER. And do we not have more rationing today regarding those in the low-income brackets than we had under OPA?

Mr. BENDER. My friend, your crowd has been playing politics with this thing now for years. I am sick and tired of it, and I hope you will have the courage to do what should be done and tell the American people the truth about this thing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

CALLING SPECIAL SESSION NOW ENDANGERS NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the calling of a special session of Congress, in view of our international situation, seems to me to be a dangerous and reckless step.

The setting for this call was the culmination of the most partisan political event in the entire country. We all know that the political conventions, held every fourth year to select candidates for President and Vice President, accentuate partisanship to the *n*th degree. At the end of the Democratic convention, to the assembled delegates, the President chose to make his announcement. Preceding the actual announcement he detailed a

number of matters which he had submitted to Congress, some of which had not been passed to his liking, and some of which had been passed over his veto by a vote of the majority of each of the major parties in both Houses of Congress.

Any amateur student of American political life knows that rabid partisanship and statesmanship seldom, if ever, coincide. In this case they clearly did not. After detailing the matters which Congress had already passed upon in most cases pursuant to recommendations by the President, he made this statement:

I am therefore calling this Congress back into session on the 26th of July.

To show how partisan and almost bitter the President was, he made this statement:

Senator BARKLEY and I will win the election and make these Republicans like it; don't you forget that.

It never was my conception that the provision in the Constitution which provides in article II, section 3, that the President may, "on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses or either of them," gives him the right to call Congress together for the purpose of reconsidering matters which may have been suggested to it by the President, some of which had been acted upon and some of which had not been acted upon. The general conception is that extraordinary occasions mean some emergency which requires the calling of Congress, when it is out of session, for some necessary present action on an actual emergency. This is not a right granted to the President to be exercised at his whim, or convenience, or for the purpose of trying to coerce Congress into action in accordance with his views on some controversial political matter.

If there was any emergency, as contemplated by the Constitution, why was the President away on a political junket during the closing days of Congress? At that time the same controversial matters, cited by him in his convention speech, concerning which he is calling us back, were before the country. Yet he made a purely political trip, castigating Congress and making wisecracks that it seemed to me were unbecoming of our President. When he announced his determination to reconvene Congress the particular emergency he found himself in was as a political candidate, nominated by a divided convention, where an opponent who was not a candidate, was not at the convention, and was not seeking the nomination, getting the votes of almost 300 delegates, and also part of the solid South walking out on the convention because it was determined to nominate Truman, and some of the big Democrats publicly stating that Truman could not be elected.

It must be apparent, considering the whole picture involving the calling of this special session, that the only extraordinary occasion involved was that an election was coming up in which Mr. Truman was one of the candidates and in which his announced plan is to convince the electorate that Congress, by its actions in this session, is not worthy of their confidence.

The matter that concerns me is not the statements made by the President. He has a perfect right to make such statements. Perhaps we cannot blame him for making the statements which he did, or for the obvious anger which he has exhibited by the manner in which the statement was made.

Undoubtedly we are in one of the most precarious and dangerous international situations in which the country has ever found itself. Over 3 years since the ending of the war, we still do not have stability or peace. This may be partly due to the President. We have joined in Congress in supporting the President, many of the Members against their own personal judgment, to present to the world a united front in our determination to bring peace and stability to the world, and especially to Europe. The situation between ourselves and the Soviet Union today is something that will make any thoughtful person, and especially those who have even a minor responsibility connected therewith, shudder with fear. It is laden with dynamite. It could involve us in a war which would be more devastating and deadly than the last one. Everyone who reads and thinks about the matter realizes that every foreign office in Europe is watching every move that America makes. One of the great obsessions that many of us have is that we must be thoroughly united on our international policy. We must make a showing of united strength, which we think will bend the will of those who are thwarting, opposing, and irritating us into a mood to bring a cessation to the present impasse. Some of us have personal knowledge of other hot spots, such as Austria, Korea, Trieste, Greece, and China. Any one of them could provide the setting for an explosion that might rock the world and possibly destroy civilization.

What concerns me is that this action of the President and the setting where it was germinated may give the world the idea that we are disunited, disorganized, flabby, and starting to drift and disintegrate as we did, with reference to international affairs, in the early twenties. Our foreign friends and antagonists do not understand American politics or psychology. If they think we are lapsing back into our old isolationist position those who we are trying to strengthen will lose faith and hope; those who are trying to start trouble may put more pressure on us. This disunity—or the show of it—was distinctly caused by the President. To the foreigner, he cannot say with any degree of faith in the belief of it by foreigners "that what I am saying and doing at this convention and following this convention, does not apply to or count in the international field." They cannot discriminate to that extent. They simply see the President riding around the country condemning the Congress, especially the Republican Members of it; they see him enter, after a long wait in a back room, the Democratic convention and condemn the Congress and in a bitter partisan tirade obviously designed to destroy confidence in Congress, say to the convention, "I am going to call them back into session." They see also that he does not even have the support of his own party, a big block of delegates walking out and a large block voting for another candidate and many of the leaders, such as Hague, before the convention convened, publicly voicing their disapproval and lack of faith in Truman.

To show that I am not relying entirely on my own judgment as to what might be accomplished by a Congress called back by an angry President to consider matters in an election year, I will quote from one of the most experienced and respected legislators in Congress. I refer to Senator BARKLEY, the running mate of the President. In the consideration of an agricultural bill on the Thursday before the Saturday on which Congress adjourned he made this statement—page 8559, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know, but I am told by members of the House committee they will not consider the legislation without holding further hearings. We know the difficulty which will be encountered concerning this bill if we adjourn Saturday. I have done what I could to cooperate with the majority in bringing about an adjournment, because I think if we sit here until after the convention, or if we sit here between the conventions, or after the two conventions the entire time of the Congress will be taken up with political bickering and political legislation and political oratory, and I do not want that to be brought about. I want to finish what we can finish and adjourn the Congress, and I have tried my best to cooperate with the leaders on the other side to bring about an adjournment.

It must be remembered that the President is calling a special session, not to take up anything new, nor is he announcing that there is anything of an emergency nature requiring the convening of Congress.

It is called to again submit to Congress matters which he has several times before submitted to us. These matters have been considered by Congress, and while Congress did not agree with the President in some of them, nevertheless it has never been felt that, where the President and Congress disagree, this furnishes the basis which gives the President the right to call a special session. He merely wishes a rehash of what has gone before, and it seems to me that he must know full well, unless Congress changes its mind, what the answer to these questions will be.

It must be admitted that the situation—internationally—is very critical. The reports one reads every morning indicates the tenseness of the situation. Congress has wholeheartedly gone along with the President in trying to present a solid front against insults, intimidations, and even aggression by any foreign power. We believe that, by taking a firm and undeviating stand for our rights and the rights of other people, we will ultimately bring about some type of a peace. The important thing to the world, which is watching us closely, is that America be united in its program. We should not indicate to the world that

we are in a cat-and-dog position of internal controversy, bickering politics, and petty jealousies. Those who suggested the call of this present session may have been smart, but they certainly were not wise. It seems incredible to me that the President, who spent 10 years in the United States Senate, would issue such a call. He knows enough about the American legislative procedure, the cross currents that will be given play by discussion of some of these controversial measures, that it is doubtful if anything can be accomplished. That is one of the prices we pay for freedom of discussion and freedom of political ideas. It may be wrong, but we certainly must face the realities of the situation.

The result might be that the world would think that we are weak and disintegrating. That might give comfort to those of other nations who would like to put pressure and heat upon us, and God knows that it might be more than heat and might result in an incident. Think what might happen in the train of such an event.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I give a list of all previous "extraordinary occasions" which our Presidents have called, indicating the reason for the call and showing that in every case a real emergency existed:

LIST OF SESSIONS

The first was called by President Adams in 1797 to suspend diplomatic relations with France. The others:

1803: By Jefferson, on Spain's cession of Louisiana to France.

1807: By Jefferson, to consider relations with Great Britain.

1811: By Madison, preparatory to declaring war on Great Britain.

1814: By Madison, on matters concerning the war with Britain.

1837: By Van Buren, to suspend specie payments.

1841: By William Henry Harrison, to consider finances and revenue.

1856: By Pierce, to pass an Army appropriation bill.

1861: By Lincoln, because of "insurrection in certain Southern States."

1877: By Hayes, to pass an Army appropriation bill.

1879: By Hayes, for legislative, executive, judicial, and Army appropriations.

CLEVELAND'S ACTION

1893: By Cleveland, to repeal the Silver Purchase Act.

1897: By McKinley, to pass the Dingley Tariff Act.

1903: By Theodore Roosevelt, to consider a commercial treaty with Cuba.

1909: By Taft, to revise the Dingley Tariff Act.

1911: By Taft, to consider a reciprocal trade agreement with Canada.

1913: By Wilson, to change tariffs.

1917: By Wilson, to declare war on Germany.

1919: By Wilson, to appropriate funds for Government operation.

1921: By Harding, to consider war-caused economic problems.

1922: By Harding, to consider a merchant marine.

1929: By Hoover, to consider farm relief and tariff changes.

1933: By Franklin D. Roosevelt, to take steps to relieve the depression.

1937: By Roosevelt, to fight the industrial recession.

1939: By Roosevelt, to repeal the Neutrality Act on the outbreak of World War II.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING AND THE SHORTAGE OF HOMES ARE THE RESULT OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] tells us what we all know, that is, that our people are suffering from the high cost of living and from a shortage of homes. There is no doubt about that. But the gentleman from Massachusetts did not tell us, as he also well knows, that both were the direct result of the policies of his party, of the present administration.

The gentleman from Ohio and others this morning have told us why we have this high cost of living. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] attempted to excuse the present prices by saying that, if we had the same controls now that we had during the war, the prices would be down; that might be true, but we would have the same scarcities we had then. But what the gentleman forgets or neglects to state is that since the war we have given other nations, other customers, millions and billions of dollars to come into our local open markets and compete and bid against us and that has forced our prices even higher. What he also forgets is that the Government by subsidies, by support prices, by going into the market and purchasing with tax money, at a price which the individual cannot pay, is increasing the price of everything that we use.

With one breath, President Truman cries out against high prices, but uses Government funds to increase them. What the President is doing is seeking to retain the seller's vote by increasing prices with Government funds and, at the same time, angling for the purchaser's vote by yelling that prices are too high.

He is indulging in the small-minded politician's double-talk, playing both ends against the middle.

He is attempting to make the voters feel that they are misused and abused; that, if they will vote for him, their distress, which his administration has created, will be relieved.

As to the shortage of homes, the same reasons caused that shortage. The administration has gone into the market and has not only been buying materials which we need and must have if we are to build homes but they compete with the man, with the veteran, with the farmer who wants to build his own home.

Yes, and the administration, to catch the tenant vote, has insisted upon a rent schedule which has curtailed the repair of old, the building of new, housing facilities.

It is true, is it not, that all during these years, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has said, the Democratic Party, or rather the New Deal Party, has been in control of the whole situation. They have had control of the executive department. They have shaped and put through Congress legislation, except during the last 2 years, legislation designed to create present conditions. And about every time during this session the Republican Congress has enacted a law which was beneficial the administration has sabotaged every effort to make it work.

I will cite just two instances, and both were disclosed in sworn testimony given before House committees. We passed the Taft-Hartley Act. A large number of you gentlemen on the Democratic side voted for that legislation. The Congress passed it by substantial majorities over the President's veto. After the Congress passed that law over the President's veto, he said, that being the law of the land, he would enforce it. Instead of so doing, he has attempted to bypass it; to, by indirection, make it of no real benefit, after promising his support.

Then here in Washington, when the first test arose under that law, what happened? The issue was raised in the GSI strike. I will tell you what happened, and this is from the sworn testimony from friends of the President, from officials in the present administration.

The President, Mr. Truman, called to the White House the Secretary of Labor and others, and there advised him that he should use his efforts to settle that strike, which was all right except that he gave him to understand that he should force the private corporation to deal with an outfit whose officers refused to deny before a House committee that they were Communists. By that action the President sabotaged, and he did it deliberately, the Taft-Hartley Act, the act which he had told us that he would, although he did not believe in it, enforce after the Eightieth Congress passed it.

I charge here and now that he deliberately not only ignored but attempted to render ineffective a law passed by the Congress of the United States. That is the testimony, that is the record, and the President cannot dodge it.

To give the President the benefit of the doubt, to give him the opportunity to deny that his agents had endeavored to coerce the GSI into dealing with known Communists, a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee subpenaed Mr. Steelman. Mr. Steelman refused to appear.

The subcommittee subpenaed him the second time and again he refused to appear, and gave as his reason for his refusal and for his violation of a Federal statute the statement that the President of the United States, Mr. Truman, had told him not to appear before the subcommittee.

The statute to which I refer is section 192 of title 2, United States Code, and it reads as follows:

Every person who having been summoned as a witness by the authority of * * * any committee of either House of Congress, willfully makes default * * * shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 nor less than $100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not less than 1 month nor more than 12 months.

When the President of the United States orders, as did President Truman, one of his assistants to disregard a subpena duly and lawfully issued under a Federal statute, what reason is there to believe that he will comply with the law of the land if it does not happen to meet with his approval?

I will give you another one. The President is responsible for the appointment of the Attorney General. The Attorney General appoints members of the Parole Board. A few years ago six gangsters, members of a Chicago mob, the Capone gang, were convicted of a conspiracy to extort a million dollars from the motion-picture industry. Mark you, they were convicted and were sent to prison. They were also indicted for using the mails to defraud. That was on a charge that they had collected from members of unions in the motion-picture industry, from workingmen and workingwomen, another million dollars. That was the mail-fraud indictment.

They were sent to prison on the conspiracy charge. Then an application for parole was made and later endorsed by a friend of the President, a man who visits him here in Washington, Paul Dillon by name. This is the sworn testimony of Dillon himself.

An application for a parole was made. To get a parole it was necessary that the mail-fraud indictment be dismissed. And who appeared as attorney in support of the application for the dismissal of the mail-fraud indictment? None other than Maury Hughes, of Dallas, Tex., the boyhood and long-time friend of Attorney General Clark. That is the testimony of Maury Hughes and not of someone else.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there an objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, that is the record up to that point. Then what happened? The paroles were granted.

When Mr. Truman took office I incurred the ill will of some of my Republican friends in my district by sending out a newsletter in which I stated that I thought Mr. Truman was an honest, sincere, and average American citizen, and that if he were left to his own devices, he would make us an honest and conscientious—a good President. That was my thought for I did not believe that any average American accepting that high office could do otherwise.

Yet, when this question of granting these paroles came along, I found that the President, who was still a member of the Pendergast Club, a political organization down in his home State, I found that man not raising a hand or saying a word to prevent the parole of these gangsters.

And when our committee asked the President to issue an Executive order making available to it the results of an investigation conducted by the FBI into the granting of these paroles, the President refused to give us that information. Well, the committee held hearings and it was disclosed that the trail of those interested in securing paroles led from the gangsters in Chicago to the attorneys for gangsters in St. Louis, down to Dallas, Tex., and to the White House and the offices of the Parole Board here in Washington, and traveling that trail we found a personal friend of the President, the President's campaign manager in two senatorial contests, and a boyhood friend of the Attorney General. The improvident granting, if you want to put it charitably, of these paroles was exposed and last week two of the six went back to jail.

There is not very much use of following the advice of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] as to the enactment of legislation when there is not fair, impartial and wholehearted enforcement of that legislation by the executive department. It makes little difference—it makes little difference what laws this Congress or any Congress enacts when you have in the White House and in the administrative departments and executive branches of the Government men who will violate their oath of office and go along with gangsters and crooks and politicians and nullify and sabotage the laws that we do pass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in one, to include an address delivered by him on July 5, 1948, on the occasion of the centennial anniversary of the settlement of Frankenlust township, Bay County, Mich.; in another, to include an article by Tom L. Munger; and in the third, to include an article by Samuel Pettengill, a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a while ago, when my distinguished friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who talked so much about pigeons and all that goes with them, was speaking, I repeatedly asked him to yield as I wanted to ask him a question or two. He did not see fit to do so. As long as he is seated here now, I am going to ask him, What has the Republican majority done in the year and a half they have been in control of Congress about the high cost of living? And, No. 2, What are they going to do at this session about the presently impossible high cost of living?

I will now yield to my distinguished friend to answer these questions, if he can.

Mr. BENDER. First, I want the gentleman to answer me. What did you do about the high cost of living?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, now, you see, my distinguished friend is answering me with another question, and I do not believe that is cricket. The gentleman from Ohio repeatedly refused to yield to me for just these two simple questions during the tirade that he made a while ago. I am awaiting his answers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has expired.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman let me answer the question?

Mr. ROONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BENDER. That is what I was talking to the gentleman about. I hope the gentleman was listening when I was speaking. How are you going to reduce the high cost of living when everything is short because of the mistakes principally that your fellow partisans made in bungling the whole foreign situation?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman and his colleagues on the majority side of the aisle are in control of this Congress. They have a wide margin of votes in favor of anything they agree upon. They really control our foreign policy.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman knows we do not control the administration.

Mr. ROONEY. But the gentleman was more interested in talking about pigeons and all that goes with pigeons than he was in the issues that have been confronting the lives and existence of the American taxpayer and the American citizen.

Mr. BENDER. But I said to the gentleman that as a result of the things that your administration had done we were having shortages which created the high cost of living.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman was talking about that at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress and he is still talking about it, after a year and a half has gone by with his party in control.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has again expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the question has been asked by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] as to whether the President tomorrow in his address to the Congress will speak to the membership on the high cost of living and on the great shortage of housing in this country.

The minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], for whom I have a very deep regard, answered the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], whom I also respect very greatly,

saying, "I do not know." I do not know, either, but I suspect that the President will report on those two vital issues. I hope that he will. I hope that he will for the Republican housewives of America, as well as for the Democratic housewives of America, as well as for the third-party housewives of America. I hope he will, not only for the sake of our economy at home but for the peace which we must have if our civilization is to survive. I hope that he will, for the sake of unity—the unity which the Republican nominee, Governor Dewey, said he seeks to obtain, and for which I commend him. I believe he is sincere.

May I point out, however, that the only way we are going to obtain unity in America is to look at the whole community as a whole and the total needs of all the people in the community.

We have made a real contribution this morning to this special call of the Congress because the majority Members—the Republicans—have at long last admitted that there is a danger in the present high cost of living and the continuing spiraling of prices of food, clothing, rent—everything that people need. They have also admitted that there is a drastic shortage of housing.

In order to solve any problem you first have to recognize the problem exists. The Republicans in this House have today recognized and admitted the two great problems that face the American people—the drastic housing shortage and the dangerously high and soaring cost of living. The first hurdle is passed.

Now we come to the second—the basic issue. What are the causes of the present inflation that is drying up the savings of the American people, sending them into debt and mortgaging the economic future of the families of America?

I want to tell this Congress very seriously the housewives of America cannot eat speeches, whether they be campaign speeches or just speeches on the floor of this House or in the Senate. They cannot pay their bills with speeches. They cannot pay the $125 a month asked for a two-room apartment with a speech. They cannot pay doctors' bills with speeches. They cannot buy milk which they need for their children with speeches.

What is the cause of present high prices? Because we have to agree on the cause in order to arrive at the remedy.

Let us stop making speeches and see if we cannot agree on a remedy to correct present high prices and get some houses built.

The gentleman from Ohio says our foreign policy is the cause of our present inflation. I do not agree with him, but if our foreign policy of foreign aid has brought about inflation, then may I point out that the foreign policy of this country is bipartisan. It has been said on the floor of the House today that our foreign policy, inasmuch as it aids other countries to buy goods in this country, has brought on present high prices. This is not the basic cause of our present troubles. But even if it were the basic cause, and if the gentleman is really making a sincere statement and not just indulging in campaign oratory, then I ask seriously does he suggest that the remedy to high prices is the withdrawal of all foreign aid—a shutting off of all exports?

I point out again what I have said, and others have said, in this House, Mr. Speaker, that the total export program is but a small percentage of the productive capacity of this country. No; exports are not the basic cause of inflation.

The export program carried out under our foreign policy helps to aggravate the inflation we have permitted to overtake us, but it is not the root cause of this inflation. If we had no foreign-aid program at all we would still have inflation today in the absence of controls.

I remind the gentleman from Ohio that his party helped to make this foreign policy, and I remind him, for instance, that we passed the British loan before we killed price control.

I repeat that we passed the British loan before we killed price control. Go back over my speeches. My record is clear and I remember making the statement before we killed price control that we were not yet out of the woods; that we ought to keep full controls a while longer, a year, possibly 2 years. I also reminded the Members that if we did not keep price control we would not only endanger our own economy and the living standards of our own people but that we would jeopardize the rehabilitation program that must be successful if peace was to be permanently established in the world. I pointed out that the money we were lending the British would not go as far as they planned or we planned. Why? Because prices would get out of hand here at home in the United States. I pointed out that this was short-sighted in our own long-term interests.

I have not finished my statement yet, but the gentleman can see where I am going.

Mr. BENDER. Yes, I know where the gentlewoman is going.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from California may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. I know where the gentlewoman is going, and as far as foreign policy is concerned, the present policy, I cannot disagree because I voted as the gentlewoman from California did. I am talking, however, about what happened before we voted that and before Mr. VANDENBERG acted and before the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, and the Foreign Affairs Committee acted.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. To what period does the gentleman refer?

Mr. BENDER. I am talking about what happened at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Prices were under control at the time of the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam Conferences——

Mr. BENDER. My friend, the gentlewoman, knows also what happened 2 weeks before election the last time. Did you agree with that or did you disagree with that? I say that as a result of that foreign policy, as a result of those mistakes that were made——

Mrs. DOUGLAS. At Potsdam, Yalta, and Teheran?

Mr. BENDER. Yes. Because of those mistakes that were made we are having to pay the price now.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further.

This business of Yalta and Teheran needs a full-dress speech. It has been kicked around very unthinkingly, I believe, by the Republican side of the aisle—very short-sightedly.

I make the flat statement now that the policies adopted at those conferences are not the basic causes of the high cost of living today.

The high cost of living today is the result of the war. No nation can begin when the last shot is fired where it left off before the first shot was discharged because in the meantime billions upon billions upon billions of dollars' worth of raw materials throughout the world have been detroyed.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Now, wait a minute. We know that we are short of raw materials not only in our own country but throughout the world. We have been burning up raw materials all through the war at a frightening rate. We had to burn them up if we were to win the war, if we were to remain freemen. The price we paid was not too much but we dare not lose sight of that price now if we are to act intelligently in the face of perplexing problems.

We know that we came out of the war short of consumer goods. For years we were making munitions of war instead of refrigerators, stoves, farm machinery, and homes for the American people. We know that people are short of these very things in other countries. We know also that in the other countries they not only have been going without new refrigerators, without new machinery and without homes, but the very factories that make those things have themselves been destroyed.

Now, of course, we could have pulled back into our shell and said that we would not help the rest of the world, that we had done our part in the war and that we would not participate in the restoration of other nations. That would have been a withdrawal into isolationism and I think the gentleman from Ohio would agree that such a policy would have been and would be today, foolhardy, very shortsighted and finally ruinous.

In recognizing our responsibilities for participation in the rebuilding of the world since we were the strongest, the healthiest, the wealthiest nation, we had a further obligation.

It was our obligation to ask ourselves: How long must we exercise such controls over the amount that we ourselves will consume in order that the whole world may move forward?

It was our duty to have exercised the necessary self-control the peace demanded—for the future of our children and the children of the world.

I say that the Republican side of the House, with some Democrats, but the majority of the Republican side of the House with a minority on the Democratic side of the House, fought to remove all price controls the day the war was over. It was too early. That is a simple fact.

Instead of all this vituperation today, instead of asking who did what, who was responsible for this or that, for heaven's sake, can we not recognize that food has risen 50 percent since this Congress took over? Can we not recognize that the consumer today is in hock to banks, stores, and loan companies more than double what they were in 1929 when the plug was pulled on consumer buying power and this country was crippled and toppled into a depression? Can we not recognize that this is a common problem from which we all suffer, that we must do something about it, that we cannot permit prices to go on up because, if we do, everybody will go down, rich, poor, middle class, and everybody else, and our international program will be ruined?

There are some people who say: Let the Republicans do nothing in this Congress. So what. Housing? It is not an issue, when it is passed you cannot tell who passed it; let the gentleman on the Banking and Currency Committee have his way.

Mr. Speaker, I say such an attitude in view of the present conditions existing in the world is too costly for everyone.

Mr. BENDER. Does the gentlewoman advocate OPA?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Failure to act on housing in this session and failure to act to control the rising costs of living will be disastrous. I would remind the gentleman from Ohio that I introduced a price-control and allocations bill over 3 months ago. At the same time I made my report to Congress on high prices. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, that I have repeatedly urged Congress to act on these vital matters.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING AND ITS CAUSE—THE CURE IS IN THE HANDS OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, except to announce that I think at the conclusion of this address I will move the House adjourn, if the Speaker will recognize me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, these are serious days. We have a national debt of $256,000,000,000. We had an assessed valuation of every farm and every farm building in the United States in 1940 of some $40,000,000,000. Prices are high, taxes are high, everything is high.

Since I have been a Member of this body I have tried to operate on the basis that my country comes first, my party second, and I come third. It is a pretty good formula. I do not know whether I have always followed it or not, but at least that has been the objective.

Coming from a State that was the sixth agricultural State of the Nation until the present administration shoved it down to eleventh place last year, I feel somebody has got to say something about the high cost of living that we hear so much about but do nothing about. There is plenty of land in the United States. I happen to live in a country where you can go out and pick berries any time you want to. The berries retail at 50 cents a quart. There is not a farmer or producer involved in that. You just go out and pick the berries. How are you going to lower the cost of those berries?

It is easy enough to talk about lowering prices, but whose prices are you going to lower? It is always somebody else's price you want to lower, not yours. I do not want to get personal, but if we are interested in lowering prices it might be a pretty place to start right here among ourselves. Why do not these people who talk about lowering prices talk about lowering their own salaries?

The fact is that if the farmer gave his milk away the consumer would be paying 12 to 15 cents per quart for milk. The fact is that some meats would be 50 to 60 cents per pound even if the farmer gave the meat animals away.

The fact is that on many food products the spread between the producer and the consumer is more than the producer received for his food product in 1939.

Now, there is an opportunity and a pretty good place to start. One should not stand up here and complain about some firm or businessman who is making $5,000, $6,000, or $7,000 or more in a year so long as he obtains more for his own services. We hear much about the minimum-wage law. Our friends in the cities say that everything is so high that they cannot eat. Well, there is lots of land to be had; if they want to, they can go out and raise the food that they need. Of course, they might have to work more than 40 hours a week if they get into that business.

It surely would be nice if you can keep the rural people of this country on a peasant basis; that would be fine, like we had them in 1939. You do not have to go back to 1932, but 1939, the seventh year of the more abundant life, when we still had 54-cent-per-bushel wheat, 5-cent hogs, and our 8-cent cotton. Surely it would be fine if you can get the women and children to work for practically nothing on the farm. You do not say anything about their wages and hours; you do not say anything about working the children on the farm—boys and girls of 10 and 12 years of age, even—out working, running tractors. They think that is fine as long as they produce cheap food. Is food high in comparison to a piece of farm machinery or an automobile? But, is that the way you want food produced, or do you want to have the American farmers have the things that the rest of society think they should have? If we are going to keep this thing going, the first thing to do is to have somebody in the Department of Agriculture live up to the promises they made to the American farmers, and not be playing cheap politics all the time. There is no Member of the House that can deny that statement that the President at this moment has the power and the authority and the money to control prices at the wholesale level on every agricultural product, just as much as the OPA ever had on a retail level. You cannot ship anything out of this country without obtaining an export license. We put in fifteen or twenty billion into a defense program. It was deemed necessary. Most of us voted for it. Of course, that has had repercussions. We appropriated another five or six billion dollars, a large part of it for food that went into the Marshall aid plan. Of course, that has an influence on our economy. The same people that sigh and cry and moan about the high cost of living are the same ones who want to give it all away and then come up here and complain about it. I do not know how much longer we are going to be able to deceive the American people, but the time has come to act. I think every Member of Congress should assume his or her responsibility along this line, and we should have a Department of Agriculture that will quit playing politics and furnish abundant food to the American people. It can be done. Does it make sense to you to burn potatoes, give them away for $5 a car, and at the same time have the consumer pay 6 or 8 cents a pound or $4.80 to $6.40 a bushel for them? That is due to faulty administration. This whole food program is the policy of the present administration. Support prices are not high prices. Support prices are not any more than fair prices, and any time we have an administration that wants to do something about it, something can be done. And why all these crocodile tears; all these people that holler about what it costs to eat? Sure, I realize what the average family is up against, but the responsibility is down here at the White House, and no one needs to pass the buck to me as far as that is concerned, because I know who can handle it any time he wants to do that, and no one can deny that statement. It is surprising that the Luckmans have not done more harm than they already have done to the food program of our country.

Who but the Secretary of Agriculture put a 165-percent parity support price under flax and then why complain about the price of paint made from linseed oil?

Why does the President, in one breath, tell about the large farm income and

praise high prices to them, and in the next breath tell the consumers that the Republicans are to be blamed for the price they pay for their groceries?

Farm prices have taken a nose dive of late, but just how much will it be reflected in consumer prices?

Mr. Truman, with the available power, authority, and money can control prices, and he did not need to depose Mr. Eccles as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank for trying to control excess credits which is the basis of any inflation, if he was really as interested in doing something about inflation as he is talking about it.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I know it is not a very pleasant thing to come back to Washington in this humid weather when tempers are taut. But, notwithstanding that, we face a realistic condition, and I am sure that there have been many things said here this afternoon on both sides of the aisle that are really food for thought. I am certain that with the President's message tomorrow that he will give us, sincerely and without passion, a task and a duty to perform. I feel that a great legislative body that we are, a legislative Government that is looked upon for leadership throughout the world today, has a mission to perform. We should not grope for lack of vision and we should measure up to the task that is ours. We must face realistically conditions as they are today. No amount of apology, no amount of dodging, no amount of trying to shake the finger at one side or the other will be the answer to the question. The challenge is here. It is, What are we going to do with the conditions from now on in? That responsibility faces us now—today, and in the succeeding days of this special session. Let us measure up to our responsibility. The public awaits our answer. Failure to act in itself is a declaration of policy. The challenge is with us, the Members of Congress. How shall we meet it?

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 411. An act for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 10 years old); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 543. An act to confer jurisdiction on the States of North Dakota and South Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 617. An act for the relief of Richard T. Charett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1301. An act for the relief of Alfonso Felici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1691. An act for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1872. An act for the relief of Jose Babace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1973. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1982. An act for the relief of Herman A. Bennink; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1995. An act for the relief of George Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2049. An act for the relief of the Alamo Irrigation Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2050. An act for the relief of Gracy Mariluch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2054. An act for the relief of Engebert Axer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2075. An act for the relief of Wisia Paryzenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2299. An act for the relief of Ella L. Browning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2339. An act to prohibit the mailing of propaganda disseminated by agents of foreign principals unless the source of such propaganda is identified therein; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2360. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2382. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2504. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton, former associate professor at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2524. An act for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2551. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Pearl Scott Loukes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2605. An act for the relief of the widow of Robert V. Holland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2662. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2677. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to clerks in air-mail field railway post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2686. An act to establish the Navajo-Hopi Administration, to provide for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 2691. An act authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 2726. An act for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2764. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2810. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired members of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2831. An act to authorize the coordination of emergency and relief activities of Federal agencies in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2850. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1668. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1669. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of a submarine chaser to the University of North Carolina Institute of Fisheries, State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1670. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the number of professors and instructors and the amount of compensation for each employed at the United States Naval Postgraduate School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1671. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture advising that he is withdrawing his request for the voluntary plan for the conservation of grain by the brewing industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1672. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for the United States Atomic Energy Commission projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1673. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for warm-air heating equipment for residential housing and copies of the requests for compliance therewith which the Secretary of Commerce has issued to various steel producers and steel consumers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1674. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report on the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and the program for purchase and sale of tin metal in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1675. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, transmitting the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Federal Housing Administration, for the calendar year 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1676. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1677. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a recommendation in the form of an amendment to section 4 (g) of the Communications Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1678. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report entitled "The Merger Movement: A Summary Report"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1679. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting one copy of the report, Production of Electric Energy and Capacity of Generating Plants in the United States for the year 1946, and one copy of the report, Power Market Survey, Colorado River, Upper Basin, Part 1—Power Requirements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1680. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report on manufacture and distribution of farm implements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1681. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report on international steel cartels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1682. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "The International Electrical Equipment Cartel"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1683. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request that the case of Angele Charlotte Douthe, nee Rivis, or Simone Rivis, or Simone Douhte, be withdrawn from those now before Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1684. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request that the case of Viggo John Schmidt be withdrawn from those now before Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1685. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a request that the case of Armando Pinto y Bisquerra be withdrawn from those now before Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1686. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a request that the case of Camilo Crestes Rafael Faneral y Bertini be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1687. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 10 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1688. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of all claims paid under the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), for the period July 1, 1947, to the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1689. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1690. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Post Office Department under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act during the fiscal year 1947–48; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1691. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting Report No. 15 of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1692. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1693. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Forty-seventh Annual Report of the Governor of Puerto Rico, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1694. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one certified copy of each of the ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1695. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1696. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a volume containing the acts of the fourth regular session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, February 9 to April 15, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1697. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a joint resolution adopted by the Eighth Guam Congress on June 5, 1948, which permits and authorizes the printing and issuance of Liberation Day memorial stamps on July 21, 1948, to commemorate the fourth anniversary of the liberation of Guam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1698. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty-inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1947; the number of pieces procured, the estimated mailings, and the estimated cost by departments and agencies for the period July 1, 1947, to March 31, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1699. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 11, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., with a view to improvements at Muscatine, Iowa, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 21, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 733); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1700. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of findings on a plan for the development of the Gooseberry project, Utah, together with related data and letters of comment on the report; to the Committee on Public Works.

1701. A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Fourth Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, as required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

On June 29, 1948.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Select Committee to Investigate Commodity Transactions. Preliminary report of speculative transactions on commodity markets by employees and officials of the United States Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 2449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 7031. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 7032. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 7033. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act (relating to aid to the blind) so as to provide greater encouragement to blind recipients thereunder to become self-supporting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 7034. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 7035. A bill making an additional appropriation to carry out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, to provide for the construction of one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7036. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on fermented malt liquors, provide for the establishment of brewery bottling house on brewery premises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 7037. A bill to provide emergency relief for livestock farmers in drought-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 7038. A bill to amend the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 so that the pay increase granted by such act shall apply to officers and employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 7039. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the ninetieth anniversary of the beginning

of the petroleum industry in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Bankruptcy Act so as to reserve to the States authority over the service, operation, and rates of railroads reorganized under said act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States favoring a comprehensive program of merchant shipbuilding in this country and expanding our merchant marine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 7040. A bill for the relief of Jose Jamie Kohn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7041. A bill for the relief of Francesco Benintende; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7042. A bill for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2117. By the SPEAKER: Petition of American Federation of Women's Auxiliaries of Labor, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to proceeding of fourth convention of the American Federation of Women's Auxiliaries of Labor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2118. Also, petition of Adam Daniel and others, of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to making such necessary representations to England as will bring about the end of the partition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2119. Also, petition of President Fernando Leon de Vivero, of Peru, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to expression of profound condolence of the passing of Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2120. Also, petition of Hector J. Campora, President of the House of Deputies, Buenos Aires, Argentina, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to notifying the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives that the House of Deputies of Argentina paid hearty homage to the anniversary of the independence of their great brother country, the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2121. Also, petition of Kaminskis V. & Ritums H., Esslingen a. N., Germany, United States zone, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a booklet entitled "We Accuse the Eastern Power of Despotism—the Western Ones of Indifference," asking for support in the abolishment of the inhuman terror as is executed by the Communists; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2122. Also, petition of Greek-American Parliamentary Group, of Athens, Greece, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the one hundred and seventy-second anniversary of the Fourth of July; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2123. Also, petition of Leroy Switzer, Illinois State Penitentiary, Menard, Ill., petitioning consideration of his petition for a writ of habeas corpus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2124. Also, petition of Nicholas J. Curtis, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to a redress of grievance according to the provisions of the decision of the board of review in the case of Nicholas J. Curtis against Phillip Forman, United States district judge, district of New Jersey, and Guy L. Fake, United States district judge, district of New Jersey, Newark, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2125. Also, petition of the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Virgin Island Company, St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2126. Also, petition of the secretary, Lions International, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to favoring statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2127. Also, petition of Manhattan Wallace Committee, New York 16, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to demanding the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

2128. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to an amendment to the Wigglesworth bill, H. R. 6829; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2129. By Mr. EATON: Joint resolution of the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to proceed with all possible dispatch to the preparation and adoption of necessary legislation designed to encourage and make adequately effectual a comprehensive program of merchant shipbuilding in this country's shipyards and expanding our merchant marine; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JULY 9, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George L. Reid, Jr.	Clerk	$4,999.98
Joseph O. Parker	Attorney	4,999.98
Dr. Walter W. Wilcox	Economic consultant.	1,027.77
John J. Heimburger	Research specialist	4,762.08
Hugh H. Soper	do	3,511.20
Fred R. Benham	Attorney	1,315.47
Katherine Wheeler	Assistant clerk	2,696.10
Mae Toole	Stenographer	786.25
Mary Elizabeth Laxton.	do	1,845.44
Lorraine Adamson	do	1,523.58
Ruth B. Phillips	do	824.58

(H. Res. 298 and H. Res. 317 of the 80th Cong., 1st sess., authorized and appropriated $25,000 for the House Committee on Agriculture to conduct hearings, studies and investigations by the committee acting as a whole or by a subcommittee. H. Res. 676, 80th Cong., 2d sess., appropriated an additional $5,000, making a total of $30,000. The funds so appropriated have been used for traveling expenses, hotel and other expenses of the committee in conducting hearings in the various parts of the United States. No personnel has been employed from these funds.)

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,964.32
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	8,303.31
Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	19,267.63
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	10,732.37

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JULY 15, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	The clerk	$4,999.98
Kenneth Sprankle	The assistant clerk	4,999.98
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk.	4,827.90
Arthur Orr	Assistant clerk	4,498.68
R. E. Lambert	do	4,498.68
Corbal D. Orescan	do	4,498.68
Robert P. Williams	do	4,169.52
Paul M. Wilson	do	4,169.52
Claude E. Hobbs, Jr.	do	3,511.20
Jay B. Howe	do	3,511.20
Bert J. Skinnard	Junior assistant clerk.	2,556.16
Lawrence C. Miller	do	2,144.34
Earl C. Silsby	Clerk-stenographer	1,523.58
John D. Cook	do	343.81
Melvin E. Lefever	do	1,316.70
Watson L. Cormier	do	416.96
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger	1,440.84
Frank B. Avery	Page	1,119.20
William H. Jahn	Clerk to minority	4,527.75
Dorothy Davis	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member.	1,730.52
Dorothy E. Henry	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman.	1,730.52
Charlotte B. Plumley	do	1,730.52
Eleanor L. Fox	do	1,153.68
Mary Jane Fisher	do	576.84
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	do	1,730.52
Marjorie H. Van Riper.	do	576.84
Veronica Strozak	do	1,730.52
David Phillips	do	1,730.52
Molly J. Turner	do	1,730.52
Helen Kenchtel	do	1,730.52
Dorothy Lydic	do	288.42
G. Homer Skarin	do	1,442.10
Vivian I. Raber	do	1,730.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$165,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	63,893.26
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	78,689.24
Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	142,582.50
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	22,417.50

JOHN TABER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

JULY 15, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert E. Lee	Chief investigator	$4,498.68
Harris H. Huston	Investigator	3,511.20
James J. Kerr	do	3,511.20
Harry S. Barger	do	3,511.20
Eugene F. Rinta	do	3,511.20
Enid Morrison	Legal clerk	2,144.34
Jean E. Morrow	Clerk-stenographer	129.30
Mildred E. McGinnis	do	1,440.84
Laura J. Ames	do	365.75
Pamela C. Fazakerley	do	63.84
Hazel M. Hall	do	431.59
Marjorie Dickey	do	16.16
Mary H. Smock	do	40.40
Margaret P. MacVicker	do	137.37
Pamela C. Fazakerley	do	121.22
Christobel J. Dodge	do	347.49
Alden C. Fensel	Investigator (special employee)	1,216.22
William C. Meyer	do	1,614.67
Theodore H. Smith	do	838.77
Arthur R. Stone	do	1,132.36
Cliff K. Titus	do	1,656.60
Charles H. Tawnes	do	733.93
Clarence L. Turner	do	1,090.43
Wallace G. Kileen	do	1,782.42
Arch D. Schultz	do	419.39
William H. Stauffer	do	272.61
J. S. Seidman	do	419.38
C. Oliver Wellington	do	146.78
J. M. Ashton	do	629.09
Edward A. Kracke	do	1,803.36
Albert P. Learned	do	629.09
E. B. Nutt	do	880.70
Thomas J. Quinn	do	1,656.58
Arthur R. Roberts	do	587.13
George E. Shipway	do	503.26
Paul L. Tracy	do	1,006.53
A. J. Watson	do	943.61
Tom Wortham	do	1,027.50
Arch D. Schultz	do	691.98
Wilfred H. Sigerson	do	1,666.66
George A. Hewitt	do	671.02
Arthur J. McCrary	do	1,530.78
Gordon W. Blair	do	1,216.24
Benjamin S. Simmons	do	1,782.42
Reimbursement to— U. S. Treasury Department.	For services of special employee, J. Robert Brown.	2,038.41
Federal Bureau of Investigation.	For services of special employees: James E. Nugent, $3,397; R. C. Gresham, $2,957.10.	6,354.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	41,171.29
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948	64,670.38
Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	105,841.67
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	44,158.33

JOHN TABER, *Chairman.*

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

JULY 6, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert H. Harper	Chief Clerk	$4,966.12
James Deakins	Assistant clerk	1,597.17
Townsend W. Hoopes	Assistant to the chairman.	3,708.68
John R. Blandford	Professional staff member.	4,345.11
Clinton B. D. Brown	do	4,191.47
Bryce N. Harlow	do	4,345.11
Robert W. Smart	do	4,345.11
Agnes H. Johnston	Secretary	2,086.84
Rosemary Curry	Stenographer	1,879.95
Gladys E. Flannagan	Stenographer (investigation staff).	1,516.68
Bernice Kalinowski	Stenographer	1,879.95

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,707.44
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1948	2,482.50
Total amount expended from July 25, 1947, to June 30, 1948	5,189.94
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	19,810.06

W. G. ANDREWS, *Chairman.*

BANKING AND CURRENCY

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink	Technical staff director.	$4,367.04
William J. Hallahan	Clerk	4,103.64
Elsie L. Gould	Deputy clerk	3,397.50
Margaret P. Battle	Stenographer	2,144.34
Mary W. Layton	do	219.92

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, none.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Mabel G. Haller	Executive secretary (clerk).	$4,109.85
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Minority clerk	3,511.20
Ruth Pingley	Stenographer	2,144.34

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, none.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, *Chairman.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOME RULE AND REORGANIZATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George B. Galloway	Staff director	$4,999.98
Clarence M. Pierce	Assistant staff director.	4,103.70
Geraldine W. Eaker	Stenographer (January, February, March).	727.32

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	11,528.87
Amount expended from Dec. 31, 1947, to May 31, 1948	9,244.94
Total amount expended	20,773.81
Balance unexpended as of May 31, 1948	9,226.19

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, *Chairman.*

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

JULY 2, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
W. Manly Sheppard	Chief clerk	$5,000.00
F. Albert Reiman	Assistant clerk (professional staff).	5,000.00
Irving G. McCann	Chief counsel (professional staff).	5,000.00
Frank S. McArthur	Investigator (professional staff).	5,000.00
Bingham W. Mathias	Minority clerk (professional staff).	5,000.00
Jennie Ward Carter	Clerk-stenographer	2,433.96
Mary Pauline Smith	do	2,433.96
Mary Ellen Gilbert	do	2,433.96
Myrtle S. Locher	do	2,433.96
Frances A. Los	Clerk-stenographer (minority).	2,433.96
Special employees pursuant to H. Res. 111		
Henry A. Bates	Investigator	1,417.27
John O. Graham	do	4,000.00
Kenneth P. Dilion	Special counsel	543.88
Agnes Ainilian	Clerk-stenographer	2,433.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Total amount expended from Jan. 2 to June 30, 1948	19,288.61
Balance unexpended	30,711.39

FRED A. HARTLEY, JR., *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JULY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Annual base salary rate during 6-month period
Helen M. Balog	Clerk-stenographer	$3,700.00
Helen M. Boyer	Clerk	6,000.00
Dolores Fel'Dotto	Clerk-stenographer	2,900.00
Carl E. Hoffman	Professional	6,000.00
Hazel Huffman	Investigator	6,200.00
Francis T. O'Donnell	Professional	6,000.00
George H. Perkins	Investigator, Jan. 13 through Apr. 30, 1948.	4,400.00
Martha C. Roland	Clerical	3,700.00
Lawrence Sullivan	Professional, Jan. 1 through May 31, 1948.	7,265.00
William A. Young	Professional	5,000.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$6,500.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	775.07
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	434.94
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	1,210.01
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	5,289.99

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXTRA-LEGAL ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JULY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
None (all work done by staff of full committee)		

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$40,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	5,867.41
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	4,517.19
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	10,384.60
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	29,615.40

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman.

PROCUREMENT AND BUILDINGS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Benjamin J. Brooks	Special counsel, Apr. 22 to May 31.	$666.34
Peter Coleman	Stenographer, Jan. 1 to June 30.	1,307.46
Virginia Craft	Investigator, June 1 to June 30.	357.39
Jane Deem	Stenographer, Apr. 23 to June 30.	295.65
Marion Galland	Secretary to counsel, Mar. 19 to June 30.	1,040.46
Henry H. Glassie	Chief counsel, Jan. 12 to June 30.	3,757.19
Betty Judd	Typist, June 1 to June 30.	185.16
Fritzie Manual	Investigator, Jan. 1 to June 30.	3,006.42
Saul G. Stillman	Associate counsel, Mar. 1 to June 30.	2,340.80
C. D. Terry	Chief Clerk, Jan. 1 to June 30.	3,931.93
Gertrude Weber	Investigator, Jan. 1 to June 30.	2,499.50
Jon Magnusson	Investigator, Mar. 5 to Apr. 17.	718.20
Robert Brown	Special counsel, Jan. 1 to Feb. 29.	1,024.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure:	
First session	$40,000.00
Second session	40,000.00
Supplemental	15,000.00
Total	95,000.00
Amount expended	50,712.40
Balance unexpended	44,287.60

GEORGE H. BENDER, *Chairman.*

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
None		

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$10,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	92.70
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	882.43
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	975.13
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	9,024.87

J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
Chairman.

SURPLUS PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Edmond J. Donohue, Jr.	General counsel, Jan. 1 to June 15.	$3,794.63
George L. Quinn, Jr.	Special Counsel, Mar. 16 to June 15.	2,074.29
Harold S. Harrison	Associate counsel, Apr. 12 to May 15.	600.44
Joseph C. Lewis	Associate counsel, Apr. 12 to May 15.	600.44
Paul F. Morrison	Chief Investigator, Jan. 1 to June 15.	3,015.86
Edward E. Fine, Jr.	Investigator, Jan. 1 to June 15.	1,965.64
Elmer B. Solomon	Investigator, Mar. 1 to June 15.	1,492.26
Abe Lincoln Mahony	Investigator, Mar. 8 to 14.	101.62
J. V. Falvey	Investigator, Apr. 1 June 9.	1,896.87
Kathryn E. Smith	Chief Clerk, Jan. 1 to May 31.	1,758.20
Anna-Marie Hogin	Stenographer, Jan. 1 to June 30.	1,937.40
Mary Donna Long	Stenographer, Jan. 1 to 31.	288.42

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$90,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	58,806.42
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	29,771.90
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	88,578.32
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	1,421.68

ROSS RIZLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Clerk and administrative officer	$5,000.00
George Pettee	Staff assistant	5,000.00
Charles B. Marshall	do	5,000.00
John W. Easton	do	5,000.00
Howard S. Piquet	do	4,944.44
June Nigh	do	2,144.34
Winifred Osborne	do	2,558.16
Doris Leone	do	2,144.34
Mabel Henderson	do	1,799.46

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	23,810.55
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	15,612.16
Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	39,423.01
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	85,576.99

CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Marjorie Savage	Clerk, Committee on House Administration.	$3,379.50
Frank J. Specht	Assistant clerk, Committee on House Administration.	3,247.86
Jack Watson	do	3,247.86
Irene Gilchrist	do	1,937.40
Gladys Riggs	do	1,937.40
Maureen B. Sandiford.	do	1,937.40
George P. Forbes, Jr.[1]	Counsel, Subcommittee on Elections of Committee on House Administration.	877.80

[1] Served May 16 to June 30, 1948.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, none.

K. M. LECOMPTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
CLERICAL STAFF		
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$4,999.98
Marjorie A. Biddle	Assistant clerk	2,144.34
Royice Reno	do	2,144.34
Georgia G. Glassmann	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	2,020.14
Julia Watterson	Assistant clerk-stenographer, from Jan. 15, 1948.	1,363.00
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	1,454.64
PROFESSIONAL STAFF		
Arlin E. Stockburger	Aviation and engineering consultant.	4,999.98
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	4,999.98
Kurt Borchardt	Professional assistant.	4,198.23
John H. Frederick	Consultant	3,642.84
ADDITIONAL STAFF PERSONNEL		
Martha E. Wright	Stenographer, from Feb. 2, 1948.	1,432.43
Alice M. Dodd	Stenographer, June 3 to 21, 1948.	191.39

The following additional amounts have been expended from the appropriation under H. Res. 163—Transportation survey:

Western Union Telegraph Co., January 1948	$16.54
The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., February 1948	3.10
House stationery room, March 1948	90.41
The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., March 1948	1.15
The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., March 1948	2.85
The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., April 1948	1.10
Majority room, S. Molineu (stencils) May 1948	27.50
House stationery room, June 1948	297.20

The above additional staff personnel is pursuant to H. Res. 63—Transportation survey.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,095.52
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to July 1, 1948	2,063.72
Total amount expended from June 30, 1947, to July 1, 1948	12,159.24
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1948	22,840.76

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
C. Murray Bernhardt	Chief clerk	$4,498.73
Velma Smedley	Assistant chief clerk	4,169.55
Walter R. Lee	Claims specialist	3,511.20
Walter M. Besterman	Clerk-stenographer	2,891.51
Anne J. Berger	do	2,005.40
Frances Christy	do	1,983.41
Harriet B. Lamb	do	2,006.40

SCHEDULE A

1. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:		
A. Unexpended balance Jan. 1, 1947, preparation of new edition of United States Code, 1944–46		[1]$79.90
B. Unexpended balance Jan. 1, 1947, preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year)		[2]101,730.71
C. Revision of the laws, 1947		[1]8,000.00
D. Revision of the laws, 1948		10,000.00
Total		119,809.61
2. Amount previously expended during period covered by prior reports:		
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code, 1944–46	0	
B. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year)	54,419.08	
C. Revision of the laws, 1947	0	
D. Revision of the laws, 1948	0	
Total	54,419.08	
3. Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1948:		
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code, 1944–46	0	
B. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year)	0	
C. Revision of the laws, 1947	0	
D. Revision of the laws, 1948	4,959.54	
Total	4,959.54	

[1] Unexpended balance returned to Treasury.
[2] Including $12,000 appropriated Mar. 22, 1947 (Public Law 25).

SCHEDULE A—continued

4. Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948:		
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code, 1944–46	0	
B. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year)	$54,419.08	
C. Revision of the laws, 1947	0	
D. Revision of the laws, 1948	4,959.54	
Total	59,378.62	
5. Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948:		
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code, 1944–46	[1]79.90	
B. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year)	47,311.63	
C. Revision of the laws, 1947	[1]8,000.00	
D. Revision of the laws, 1948	5,040.46	
Total	[2]60,431.99	

[1] Unexpended balance returned to Treasury.
[2] Of this amount, $13,120.36 was returned to the Treasury, leaving an available balance of $47,311.63 as of July 1, 1948.

EARL C. MICHENER,
Chairman.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JULY 13, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Gus S. Caras	Professional staff	$3,774.54
Elizabeth B. Bedell	Chief clerk	2,834.04
Leonard P. Pliska	Clerk	1,776.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	3,104.37
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	761.67
Total amount expended	3,866.04
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	46,133.96

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
Chairman.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

JULY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Moore	Chief counsel	$4,999.02
Frederick C. Belen	Counsel	4,498.68
Lucy K. Daley	Assistant clerk	2,006.40
Elayne Morelle	Secretary	1,799.46
Lillian Hopkins	do	1,661.52
Margaret Barnes	do	1,592.58
Barbara Blakeslee	Stenographer	182.88

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Employed under H. Res. 176		
Edward J. McCormack.	Chief, studies and investigations.	$4,959.54
Albert Briggs	Statistical clerk	772.14
Ann Hayden	Secretary	355.57
Nan Clark	Stenographer	88.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	9,123.42
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	17,364.96
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	26,488.38
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	23,511.62

EDWARD H. REES,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

JULY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George H. Soule	Mining expert	$4,611.09
Ernest A. Grant	Clerk	5,000.00
Claude A. Ragan	do	2,696.10
Nancy J. Arnold	do	2,696.10
Gemma M. O'Brien	do	2,696.10
Forrest Reeve	do	2,696.10

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 94)	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	11,480.17
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	2,231.58
Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	13,711.75
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1948	11,288.25

RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert F. McConnell	Clerk of committee	$2,971.98
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.	Professional staff member.	4,096.53
Joseph H. McGann, Jr.	Minority clerk	2,144.34
Mrs. Vera Watts	Stenographer-clerk	2,489.19
Mrs. Elaine Jackson	do	2,489.19
Mrs. Violet V. Young	do	2,489.19
SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING QUESTIONABLE TRADE PRACTICES		
John T. M. Reddan	Counsel	$4,749.96
E. R. Ferguson, Jr.	Assistant counsel	3,355.14
Martin O. Hanson	Chief investigator	1,658.07
Charles F. Meany	Investigator-accountant.	2,406.17
Arthur Perlman	Investigator	2,519.26
George G. Vlk	do	2,471.94
Walton Woods	do	2,739.41
Joseph M. Mannix	do	2,705.77
Herbert J. Cooney	do	1,887.57
Jay S. Hartzell	do	1,384.22
William E. Davis	do	481.03
Doris M. Mahood	Stenographer-clerk	1,776.30
Dorothy B. Hayward	do	1,479.54
Catherine C. Hubbard	do	1,038.27

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	12,305.95
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	44,460.79
Total amount expended to June 30	56,766.74
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 30, 1948	68,233.26

GEO. A. DONDERO,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JULY 1, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Lyle O. Snader	Clerk	$4,999.98
Donald O. Montgomery.	Assistant clerk	2,971.98
Humphrey Scott Shaw.	Minority clerk	2,709.84
Jane E. Wright	Assistant clerk-stenotypist.	2,694.77
Mildred M. McGuire.	Stenographer (entered on duty May 1, 1948).	457.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, none.

LEO E. ALLEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
HOUSE PAY ROLL		
Robert E. Stripling	Chief investigator	$4,999.98
Benjamin Mandel	Director of research	4,279.24
Louis E. Russell	Investigator	4,153.05
Donald T. Appell	do	3,642.84
John W. Carrington	Minority clerk	3,642.84
Anne D. Turner	File chief	3,511.20
Rosella A. Purdy	Clerk-stenographer	2,385.72
Carolyn Graham	File clerk	2,282.28
Juliette Joray	Clerk-stenographer	2,144.34
Margaret S. Kerwan	do	2,144.34
VOUCHER PAY ROLL		
Virginia Allen	Clerk-typist	2,144.34
Jo Benisch	do	2,144.34
Jean D. Carey	Clerk-stenographer	2,144.34
Lucille Fitzgerald	File clerk	2,144.34
Lillian E. Howard	Research clerk	2,144.34
Mary E. McFerran	Clerk-stenographer	2,144.34
Lorraine M. Nichols	do	2,144.34
Thelma I. Scearce	do	2,144.34
Ruth Tansill	do	747.38
Jacqueline Hill	do	714.78
Peggy Shaw	Clerk-typist	2,144.34
Catherine Lee Crews	do	690.93
Sadie C. Cagle	do	355.50
Alice Elaine Walker	do	774.34
Lucille Lowther	do	857.73
Lois Marie Padberg	do	1,525.58
Helen Irene Mattson	Research clerk	2,144.34
Ann W. Kelliher	Clerk-typist	774.34
Mary Ann Moffett	Research clerk	833.90
Alvin W. Stokes	Investigator	3,511.20
William A. Wheeler	do	3,642.84
Robert B. Gaston	do	3,642.84
Walter Wieczerzak	do	1,983.32
James H. Walter	do	782.41

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
Jan. 30, 1947	$50,000
Apr. 2, 1947	50,000
Mar. 9, 1948	200,000
Total	300,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	84,572.73
Amount unexpended Jan. 1, 1948	15,427.27
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	41,335.14
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	141,335.14
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	158,664.86

J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JULY 6, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Karl Standish	Chief Clerk	$5,000.00
Bessie N. Kenyon	Assistant clerk	3,840.27
Louise M. Peter	Clerical staff	2,148.34
Frances Montanye	do	2,148.34
Mary C. Schmidt	do	2,148.34
George J. Turner	do	2,098.34
Casey M. Jones	Professional aide	5,000.00
Edwin B. Patterson	do	5,000.00
Ida Rowan	do	4,169.55

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	8,954.91
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	1,807.69
Total amount expended from Apr. 2, 1947 to June 30	10,762.60
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	13,491.90

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
CLERICAL STAFF		
Gordon Grand, Jr	Lawyer	$1,899.44
T. J. Polsky (Schnitz)	Assistant clerk	3,511.23
Gladys L. Kullberg	Stenographer	2,144.34
Don E. Larson	Stenographer and accountant.	1,964.00
Susan Taylor	Stenographer	1,896.05
Margie Halsey	do	1,896.05
Sam Hardy	Messenger	1,111.00
Hughlon Greene	do	1,111.00
Harry Parker	Retired messenger	1,186.00
PROFESSIONAL STAFF		
Lynn L. Stratton	Tax adviser	5,000.00
Serge Benson	Lawyer-economist	4,498.73
Charles W. Davis	Lawyer	4,169.55
James A. Tawney	do	4,498.73

Special Tax Study Committee:	
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,457.91
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	22,542.09

HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Edward Ames	Consultant	$624.81
Barbara Berry	Economic analyst	951.45
John R. Burton, Jr	Consultant	222.22
Blanche Dell	Secretary	687.61
Nathalie J. W. Fallon	Clerk-typist	610.20
Carl J. Friedrich	Consultant	416.65
Theodore Geiger	do	2,861.04
Charles R. Gellner	International relations librarian.	557.04
Edwin B. George	Consultant	1,500.00
Dorothy I. Gray	Secretary	1,011.12
Maurice H. Hellner	Consultant	190.59
Robert J. Landry	do	1,144.13
Phyllis H. Leuchtenburg.	Secretary-executive assistant.	1,396.69
Franklin A. Lindsay	Consultant	2,666.59
Samuel Lubell	do	416.66
Max F. Millikan	do	527.74
Dorothy S. Neilson	Secretary	178.60
Wallace Parks	Consultant	1,297.08
Winfield W. Riefler	do	55.55
John Kerr Rose	Geographer analyst	306.35
Frances K. Topping	Secretary-economist	1,705.44
Fulton Want, Jr	Clerk-typist	141.71
Emily Whitman	Secretary	1,429.56
Rose Mary Woods	do	762.36

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	81,682.81
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	31,868.51
Total amount expended from July 27, 1947, to June 30, 1948	113,551.32
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	11,448.68
Plus credits	129.36
Total	11,578.04

CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NEWSPRINT AND PAPER SUPPLY

JULY 12, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Alyce E. Warren	Clerk	$1,523.58

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$25,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	5,929.22
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	1,679.19
Total amount expended from Mar. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948	7,608.41
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	17,391.59

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE COMMODITY TRANSACTIONS

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 701, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Golden N. Dagger	Chief counsel	$4,389.00
Charles D. Budd	Investigator	2,006.40
Bertram M. Long	do	2,006.40
Marie E. Wolff	Secretary	1,696.03

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
H. Res. 407, Dec. 19, 1947	$25,000.00
H. Res. 674, June 18, 1948	10,000.00
Total	35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	None
Amount expended	None
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	12,263.00
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	22,737.00

AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Chairman, Select Committee To Investigate Commodity Transactions.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

JUNE 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the six-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
H. Ralph Burton	General counsel, Apr. 15 to June 30.	$1,899.44
William E. Murray	Chief investigator, Apr. 15 to June 30.	1,593.68
Robert B. Barker	Investigator, Apr. 15 to June 30.	1,482.51
Walter K. Van Olinda	do	1,482.51
Catherine Fadely	Stenographer, May 5 to June 5.	333.65
LaRue Dickson	Typist, May 19 to June 30.	339.41
Kathryn E. Smith	Chief clerk, June 1 to 30.	357.39
J. V. Falvey	Investigator, June 10 to 30.	346.73

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$40,000.00
Total amount expended from Apr. 15, to June 30, 1948	8,937.51
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1948	31,062.49

ROSS RIZLEY,
Chairman.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the second calendar quarter of 1948.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name ----------
Business address----------

INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM PERSONS REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:
(1) ----------
(2) In whose interest he appears or works:
(2) ----------
(3) The duration of such employment:
(3) ----------
(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:
(4) ----------
(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:
(5) ----------
(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:
(6) ----------
(7) What expenses are to be included:
(7) ----------
See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name ----------
Business address----------

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:
(1) ----------
(2) To whom paid:
(2) ----------
(3) For what purposes:
(3) ----------
(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:
(4) ----------
(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:
(5) ----------

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the second calendar quarter 1948, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B. (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

American Association of University Women, The,[1] 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) Represents its general membership. (3) [Blank.] (4) Receives no money for legislative activities—legislative information prepared for membership from general fund used for preparing all of association's study materials for its members. (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) Only expenses for preparing mimeographing, and mailing informational materials to members.

Austern, H. Thomas, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, B. C., Canada. (2) British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, B. C., Canada. (3) Indefinite. (4) This is an attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis, computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services, to advise concerning pending legislation which may affect Canadian fisheries. (5) British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, B. C., Canada. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) Traveling expenses, within the District of Columbia, telephone, and telegram.

Ayer & Son, N. W., Inc., a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., is employed as publicity counsel by National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Registrant is engaged by National Association of Electric Companies to furnish the association with consulting service on public relations and services in connection with publicity affecting the electrical industry. The arrangement does not contemplate that registrant shall engage in lobbying as that term is commonly understood and registrant is not engaged, and does not propose to engage, in lobbying. Under the arrangement registrant may, however, engage in publicity work which may aid or influence the passage or defeat of legislation pending from time to time before the Congress of the United States and affecting the electric industry. Registrant is also exposed to the risk that its publicity service, though not engaged in for the purpose of so aiding or influencing action by legislators, will, nevertheless, be held to have such purpose. Registrant does not believe that its proposed activities come within the purview of the Lobbying Act and files this registration solely for self-protection and to avoid the penalties of the act and with full reservation of all rights. (3) Registrant is engaged on a month to month basis. (4) The association pays N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., $2,100 per month plus a 16⅔ percent commission on printing, photographs, and like expenditures; and also miscellaneous expenses. (5) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., is paid by National Association of Electric Companies and the individual registrants are paid by N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (6) The expenses are estimated at an average of $200 per month exclusive of any expenses on any special work. (7) Principally mimeographing, printing, traveling, and miscellaneous expenses.

Banigan, Leon F., 1015 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The registrant believes that this registration is not required by him by the terms and intent of the act but files this registration as a precaution to comply fully with the requirements to the extent if any that it might be held applicable and valid. Registrant is employed as managing director of the National Council of Private Motor Truck Owners, Inc., a New York corporation, with headquarters at Suite 1015, National Press Building, Washington, D. C. My employment is not principally for the purpose of or necessarily in any part for the purpose of influencing legislation. My principal duties involve management of association affairs and rendering of informational services to the membership of this organization regarding various legislative, regulatory, trade, and other activities affecting their operations as private motor-truck owners. This includes the issuance of bulletins and various other informational services, publications, statistical reviews, etc. (2) Registrant would appear or work on legislative problems in the interest of private motortruck owners. (3) My employment is on contract subject to termination on 60 days' notice by the board of directors or by myself. (4) Registrant has received no compensation and none has been determined with respect to such duties as I may or may not have assigned to me which would involve principally the influencing of legislation. (5) See item 4. (6) See item 7. (7) Registrant receives remuneration for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in traveling and so forth. There is no predetermined expense allocation.

Barnard, Robert C., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Cooley, Crowley & Gaither, 333 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, doing business under the name of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., Mills Building, San Francisco, Calif. (3) Employed to render professional legal services, and the services, being professional, could be terminated at any time. (4) Normal professional fee. (5) Cooley, Crowley & Gaither. (6) Actual out of pocket disbursements. (7) Normal office expenses, such as telephone, telegraph, taxi fares, and mail expenses.

Beeks, William T., 111 Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Evans, McLaren, Lane, Powell & Beeks, 111 Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash. (2) Alaska Freight Express Corp., pier 50, Seattle, Wash. (3) Indefinite. (4) Compensation will depend on duration of employment at rates not yet fixed. (5) Alaska Freight Express Corp. (6) Reimbursement for ordinary expenses such as travel, lunches, telephones, taxies, etc. (7) Travel, lunches, telephones, taxies, etc.

Bennett, Irving, Ketchum, Inc., Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Ketchum, Inc., Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (2) National Education Association. (3) April 20 to June 15, 1948. (4) Part of fee paid to Ketchum, Inc. (5) Ketchum, Inc. (6) Refund of actual expenses. (7) Travel, meals, cabs, hotel bills, tips, and usual personal expenses.

Bennett, Jess B., 625 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Braniff Airways, Inc., Love Field, Dallas, Tex. (2) The above company. (3) Permanently employed for contacts in Washington, D. C., and in the capitols of South America. (4) Salary, $9,000 annually. (5) Braniff Airways, Inc. (6) Reimbursed for taxi fares and an occasional

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

meal while on duty in Washington. (7) Only those listed in (6) above.

Berger, Robert I., 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinite, no fixed term. (4) One payment of $250. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Berna, Tell, 10525 Carnegie Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 10525 Carnegie Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The United States Machine Tool Industry. (3) Continuous since 1937. (4) $25,000 per year. (5) Above association. (6) Actual out-of-pocket traveling expenses only—average about $150 per week. (7) Only actual traveling expenses.

Blair, Newell, 421 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is vice president and director of Cardin Mining & Milling Corp., Picher, Okla. (2) Same as (1) and other operators of tailing mills in the tri-State district. (3) Indefinite. (4) To be determined upon outcome of legislation. (5) Cardin Mining & Milling Corp. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, telephone, telegraph, taxis, entertainment.

Boorde,[1] Thomas A., 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) General Welfare Federation of America, Inc., 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Behalf of old-folks retirement under Social Security Act (extension and liberalization). (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary. Travel and other incidental expenses. (5) General Welfare Federation of America, Inc. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Travel, hotel, telegrams, and telephone, taxi, etc.

Bromsen,[2] Archibald, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) The Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. box 798, New Haven, Conn. (2) The Railroad Pension Conference. (3) First compensable employment as of May 1948. (4) To be paid $50 per diem for specific legal services, together with expenses. (5) The Railroad Pension Conference. (6) Approximate, actual expenses incurred. (7) Travel, lodgings, meals, etc.

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md. (1) Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla. (2) Florida Island Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla. (3) Indefinite. (4) Compensation to be on the basis of time spent pro rated from total compensation for all services on normal consultant-client basis. (5) Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla. (6) No arrangement for expenses for this purpose. (7) [Blank.]

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md. (1) Retained by the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (2) The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (3) Indefinite. (4) Compensation to be on the basis of time spent pro rated from total compensation for all services on normal consultant-client basis. (5) The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (6) Reimbursement for telephone calls to the Vulcan Co. only. (7) [Blank.]

Building Products Institute, The, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The institute is not employed by anyone unless working in the interest of its contributors constitutes being employed. Names and addresses of contributors filed with form A. (2) In the interest of its contributors. The Building Products Institute is an organization devoted to economic research and analysis of trends in construction, disseminating its findings to those interested in the construction industry and to the public. However, in view of the uncertain intepretation of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes "principal purpose" and the phrase "to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation, etc.," we are filing this form giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (3) Indefinite. (4) Contributions in varying amounts. (5) By the contributors. (6) The amount received from contributions. (7) Offices, staff, legal and administrative fees, public relations counsel, economist, printing, news service, accounting, etc.

Burke, Edward R., 514 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Hawaii Statehood Commission, 740 Eleventh Street, Washington, D. C. (2) Same. (3) Continuing. (4) Annual retainer, $5,000. (5) Hawaii Statehood Commission. (6) None. (7) None.

Leo Burnett Co., Inc., 360 North Michigan, Chicago, Ill. (1) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (3) From November 6, 1944, until termination of relationship. (4) 15 percent of total amount expended by employer through Leo Burnett Co., Inc. (5) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Carey,[1] John L., 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) American Institute of Accountants, the Journal of Accountancy, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Same. (3) Continuous. (4) Total annual salaries, $22,000; less than 10 percent of time spent on legislative work. (5) American Institute of Accountants, the Journal of Accountancy. (6) Only amount of actual disbursement for travel. (7) Travel expenses.

Carpenter, Austin W., Sherburne, N. Y. (1) New York Associated Businessmen, Inc. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary; will be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenditures. (5) Will be reimbursed for actual expenses by New York Associated Businessmen, Inc. (6) Will be reimbursed for expenses incurred; no set amount. (7) Travel, meals, hotel, postage, stationery, printing, telephone, etc.

Carr, Ralph, 614 Symes Building, Denver, Colo. (1) United Indian Traders Association, Inc., Gallup, N. Mex. (2) The above association. (3) Until the completion of work involving pending legislation. (4) $10,000. (5) The above association. (6) $2,000 (not more). (7) Travel expense, living costs away from home and other expenses such as stenographer, printing, and like items.

Carter, Clarence B., P. O. box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. box 798, New Haven, Conn. (2) Membership of Railroad Pension Conference. (3) Indefinite. ((4) Actual expenses. (5) Membership. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Case, Ralph H., Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Allied Aviation Corp., Cockeysville, Md. (2) Same as (1). (3) Eightieth Congress, from and after June 11, 1948. (4) Paid nothing. To receive not over 5 percent of the recovery. (5) Same as (1). (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Chan, Sau Ung, 934 Smith Street, Honolulu, T. H. (1) Chinese Merchants Benevolent Association of Honolulu, T. H., 71 North Hotel Street, Honolulu, T. H. (2) Chinese Merchants Benevolent Association of Honolulu. (3) Approximately 2 months. (4) $7,700. (5) Chinese Merchants Benevolent Association of Honolulu. (6) Expenses are included in $7,700 stated in (4). (7) All expenses, including travel.

Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade,[2] 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) List of committee members attached.[3] (2) Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. (3) Three months. (4) No reimbursement. (5) Contributions solicited for expenses only. (6) $39,100. (7) Professional counsel, printing, mimeographing, distribution of leaflets, news releases, weekly newsletter, travel, telephone, and telegraph.

Clarke, David R., 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Self. (2) National Metal Trades Association, Chicago, Ill., for which he is general counsel. (3) Indefinite. (4) An annual retainer for all legal services rendered of which not over $1,000 (after payment of all office expenses) per year can reasonably be allocated to Federal lobbying. (5) National Metal Trades Association, Chicago, Ill. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Cost of transportation, hotel room, meals, etc., for registrant.

Coles, Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Ingoldsby, Coles & Wright, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Alaska Freight Express Corp., pier 50, Seattle, Wash. (3) Indefinite. (4) Compensation will depend on duration of employment at rates not yet fixed. (5) Alaska Freight Express Corp. (6) Reimbursement for ordinary expenses such as travel, lunches, telephones, taxies, etc. (7) Travel, lunches, telephones, taxies, etc.

Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Members. (2) Communications workers. (3) [Blank.] (4) Per capita dues at 25 cents per member per month. (5) Members. (6) [Blank.] (7) Expenses authorized by executive board.

Courtney, Paul Lawrence, 1025 Vermont NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinitely employed. (4) Not over $1,000 per annum for legislative work (should any be done). (5) National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont NW., Washington, D. C. (6) I am reimbursed for amounts actually incurred and paid by me for travel and other incidental expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel bills and other similar incidental expenses.

Crawford, William A., 536 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) Railroad Association of Georgia, 536 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga. (2) Railroad Association of Georgia and its member roads (member roads are listed in exhibit A,[3] attached as a part of this registration). (3) Continuing. (4) Applicant receives $625 a month which covers compensation for all the work he does for the railroads shown in exhibit A. Only a small part of that work is related to Federal legislation, almost all of his duties being devoted to general public relations activities. Those activities consist almost entirely of local public relations and other service having to do with State matters within the State of Georgia. His compensation is not allocated between Federal legislation work and other activities. (5) Railroad Association of Georgia. (6) Reimbursement of personal expenses incurred in the performance of his duties. (7) Out-of-pocket expenses incurred in his employment, such as taxicab fares, use of personal automobile and other traveling expenses while away from headquarters, including hotel bills, and cost of meals, telephone and telegraph bills, and stenographic or clerical expenses.

Daczkowski, Wallace W., 225 Frankford Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Amputees of World War No. 2, 2225 Frankford Avenue,

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.
[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

[1] Registration with Secretary only.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.
[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Philadelphia, Pa. (2) Amputees of World War No. 2. (3) November 1, 1948. (4) None. (5) No one. (6) None. (7) None.

Damon, Eugene J., 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo. (2) See appendix A.[2] (3) Continuous. (4) See appendix A.[2] (5) See appendix A.[2] (6) Reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses in the performance of his duties. (7) Travel, meals, hotels, postage, telephone, taxi, tips, entertainment, miscellaneous and incidental expenses.

Darby, Frederick R., 3270 Westerville Road, Columbus, Ohio. (1) Work for myself. (2) Self. (3) Period not known, in re S. 2213 until action is completed. (4) Unpaid as yet. (5) Undetermined. (6) Undetermined. (7) Undetermined.

de Quevedo, R. G., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Building Products Institute, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Building Products Institute. (3) Month-to-month beginning October 16, 1946; employed student attending Georgetown University Law School. (4) $350 monthly for secretarial and general office work. (5) Building Products Institute. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses only. (7) Same as item 6 including taxis, streetcars, etc.

Dilweg, LeVern R., 801 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Philippine Veterans' Mission to U. S. A., Manila, Philippine Islands. (2) Philippine Army Veterans. (3) 30 days. (4) $3,750. (5) Same. (6) None. (7) [Blank.]

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Henry B. Cleereman, Green Bay, Wis. (2) Some as (1) above. (3) Retainer for indefinite period. (4) Retainer of $2,500 with additional fees to be agreed on the basis of work involved and time and effort expended. (5) By person named in (1) above. (6) No expenses involved or to be paid except possible telephone and taxi, reimbursable by clients. No expense account involved or furnished. (7) No expenses to be included except possible telephone or taxi, reimbursable by client. No expense account involved or furnished.

Dow, Fayette B., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for Pipe Line Companies, care of L. H. Kahle, treasurer, box 1349, Tulsa, Okla. (2) Interstate pipe line companies which are subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission and which are represented by Committee for Pipe Line Companies referred to in (1) above. (3) No limitation has been fixed. (4) See statement on Form A, to be filed by Committee for Pipe Line Companies, for purposes and functions of the committee by which deponent is employed. Of total compensation received, paid, and to be received by deponent, the sum of $500 is believed to be a fair apportionment, under present conditions, for services that might be covered by the Lobbying Act. (5) The Committee for Pipe Line Companies, referred to above. (6) No fixed amount; deponent is an attorney and expects to be reimbursed for such expenses as are ordinarily incurred by an attorney for his client. (7) These expenses will include travel, telephone, telegraph, etc. See (6) above.

Drake, John, 1721 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinite; no fixed time. (4) $5,000 per year for all services for the federation including such services, if any, as may be rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (6) Actual expenses. (7) All expenses incident to the employment.

DuBrul, Stephen M., 11-243 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. (2) General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. Registrant is director of the social and economic relations section of the Public Relations Staff of his employer. In addition to his normal duties in the above capacity registrant has also now been authorized by his employer, as circumstances require, to engage in activities on behalf of his employer which, if and when performed, may require registration under the act. Accordingly, registrant is registering so as to be in compliance with the act, if and when he may be so engaged. (3) Monthly. (4) See statement attached.[2] (5) General Motors Corp. (6) See statement attached.[2] (7) See statement attached.[2]

DuBuque, Jean H., 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., suite 1016, Washington, D. C. (1) National Aviation Trades Association, Inc., 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., suite 1016, Washington, D. C. (2) Represents the above association as public relations counsel. Present activities are not believed to be within the purview of the act but registration is submitted in the event future activities should fall within the scope of section 308. (3) Indeterminate; subject to the will of the executive committee of the association. (4) $500 per month retainer fee for public relations counsel to the association, embracing publicity, public speaking, liaison with Federal agencies, associations, private organizations; writing bulletins, magazine articles, speeches etc. (5) National Aviation Trades Association, Inc. (6) Actual expenses incurred in conducting public relations activities as covered by approved vouchers. (7) Transportation, telephone, telegraph, hotel, taxies, secretarial, reproduction of material, postage, meals, and any other incidental expenses in connection therewith.

Edwards, Alanson W., 1731 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Marsh Stencil Machine Co., Belleville, Ill.; Ideal Stencil Machine Co., Belleville, Ill.; Diagraph-Bradley Industries, Inc., 5455 Forest Park Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo. (2) To obtain revision of the exise tax laws as they pertain to the above-named companies. (3) One year. (4) $125 per month. (5) Companies named in paragraph 1. (6) None. (7) None, except telephone and telegraph charges directed to the above companies.

Eliason, Courtleigh W., 11-243 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. (2) General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. Registrant is a member of the staff of the social and economic relations section of the public relations department of his employer. In addition to his normal duties in the above capacity, registrant has also now been authorized by his employer, as circumstances require, to engage in activities on behalf of his employer which, if and when performed, may require registration under the act. Accordingly registrant is registering so as to be in compliance with the act if and when he may be so engaged. (3) Monthly. (4) See statement attached.[2] (5) General Motors Corp. (6) See statement attached.[2] (7) See statement attached.[2]

Ellsworth, Charles K., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Hill & Knowlton is not engaged in any lobbying activities and does not believe that it is required to register under Public Law 601. However, it has been engaged by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, the American Butter Institute, and the National Creameries Association to carry on certain educational activities intended to explain the consequences of proposed legislation to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine. In view of announced interpretations by representatives of the Department of Justice implying that such educational activities are subject to Public Law 601, the firm is reporting receipts and expenditures for said educational campaign, pending judicial clarification of the law's intent. (3) Indefinite. (4) $750 per month. (5) Hill & Knowlton, Inc. (6) Necessary travel and entertainment expenses. (7) See above.

Examerica Traders of New York, Inc., 135 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Lloyd Triestino, Societa Anonima di Navigazione, Trieste, by Capt. Francisco Filbier now in the United States on behalf of Lloyd Triestino. (2) Lloyd Triestino, Societa Anonima di Navigazione. (3) Indefinite. (4) Have been paid the sum of $3,500 and is to receive a 3-percent commission on all ships purchased from the United States Government by Lloyd Triestino. Amounts received have been against expenses. (5) Capt. Francisco Filbier for Lloyd Triestino. (6) Have been paid total of $3,500 in full for expenses only part of which have been consumed or are to be consumed in lobbying. (7) Printing, mailing, telephones, telegrams, railroad fares, hotels, and entertainment (not of Members of Congress).

Fain, David, of Black & Kendall, 1200 Cascade Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Anacortes Shipways, Inc., room 904, Lewis Building, Portland, Oreg. (2) Anacortes Shipways, Inc. (3) Our firm has been and is general counsel for Anacortes Shipways, and to the extent we have been professionally retained, it is possible that this employment may be terminated by Anacortes at any time. In regard to our work in connection with Senate bill 2476 and House bill 6057, the same is limited to the second session of the Eightieth Congress. (4) The usual and normal legal fees. (5) Anacortes Shipways, Inc. (6) Direct reimbursement for taxi fares, telephone calls and mailing costs, and legal fees for services rendered. (7) Taxi fares, telephone calls, mailing expense to the extent the same are necessary or required by our representation of Anacortes Shipways, Inc.

Ferguson, Herbert T., Langdon Street, Madison, Wis. (1) Wisconsin Valley Improvement Co., care of Wisconsin Power & Light Co., 100 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (2) Wisconsin Power & Light Co., Madison, Wis.; Wisconsin Public Service Corp., Milwaukee, Wis.; Consolidated Water Power & Paper Co., Wisconsin Rapids, Wis. (3) 1 year. (4) Have not been paid anything as yet and will receive compensation at $35 per day plus traveling expenses. (5) Wisconsin Valley Improvement Co. (6) Traveling expenses actually incurred. (7) Railroad, bus, airplane, and taxi fares, meals, hotel bills, and incidental expenses.

Fifer, Russell, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Same as above. (3) Annual basis. (4) $12,000 per annum; such payments are received for services as executive secretary of the American Butter Institute and are not dependent upon services encompassed by this act. (5) American Butter Institute, for services as executive secretary. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Usual and normal expense items such as travel, telephone and telegraph, meals, hotels, taxi, etc.

Fistere, Charles M., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Butter Institute. (3) Indefinite. (4) Subject to future agreement depending upon amount of time spent in the interest of client. (5) American Butter Institute. (6) Reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Taxi fares, telephone.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Fleming, Roger W., 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Farm Bureau Federation. (3) Continuing. (4) $10,000. (5) American Farm Bureau Federation. (6) None, except reimbursement of actual necessary expenditures approved by officers of the American Farm Bureau Federation. (7) None, except as noted under (6).

Foster,[1] Charles E., 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW. Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of service-connected disabled American war veterans and their dependents. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,500 per annum and 10-percent bonus. (5) Disabled American Veterans. (6) Any expenses incurred (see No. 7). (7) Taxies, lunches, and other expenses incidental to work at the Capitol. Actual traveling expense.

Gaither, Jr., H. Rowan, 333 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Member of the law firm of Cooley, Crowley & Gaither, 333 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., Mills Building, San Francisco, Calif. (3) Cooley, Crowley & Gaither have been general attorneys for Stapleton since 1936. There is no employment or retainer contract and the services, being professional, could be terminated by the client at any time. (4) There is no contract, contingent or otherwise, concerning compensation and the practice has been to bill Stapleton at an hourly rate for services rendered. The rate varies, depending upon which member or employee of the firm performs the service. (5) Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co. (6) Stapleton pays for actual out-of-pocket disbursements which include expense of communication (telephone, telegraph), travel, and actual subsistence expenses while away from San Francisco. (7) Communication and travel.

Garstang, Marion R., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $6,500 per year to cover all services as attorney for the Federation, including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the Federation.

Gavitt, Frank, Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Schenley Distillers Corp. (2) Schenley Distillers Corp. (3) Have been employed for the past 8 years as public relations counsel, with lobbying incidental to this employment. (4) $3,000 per month and disbursements due under the general contract as public relations counsel to Schenley Distillers Corp. (5) Schenley Distillers Corp. (6) Reimbursement of all expenses. (7) All expenses incurred by Carl Byoir & Associates on behalf of Schenley Distillers Corp.

Goodwin, William J., the Loch, Roslyn, N. Y. (1) National Resources Commission of China, 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Same as above. See statement attached.[2] (3) March 31, 1949. (4) $30,000. (5) National Resources Commission of China. (6) None. (7) None.

Griffith, George M., 109 Vine Street, Columbiana, Ohio. (1) Farm Labor Association of Northern Ohio, 109 Vine Street, Columbiana, Ohio. (2) The above association consisting of fruit and vegetable growers who are praying for farm labor at once in order that fruit and vegetable crops may be produced for the requirements of the public. (3) Not any longer than it will take Congress to enact the proper legislation which we fervently hope will not take longer than a month. (4) Is to receive a nominal sum of $150 per month as secretary-treasurer of the association. (5) By the Farm Labor Association of Northern Ohio from assessments of its membership. (6) No set amount designated; however expenses cover ordinary travel and hotel. (7) None other than covered in No. 6.

Griffiths, Dr. H. M., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) National Economic Council, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, organized under the membership corporation law of the State of New York, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) National Economic Council, Inc., whose purpose is to aid in developing an informed public opinion on the major political, social, and economic problems of the Nation. Said National Economic Council, Inc., does not in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicit, collect or receive money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, nor is its principal purpose to aid, in passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress, or to influence, directly or indirectly, passage or defeat of such legislation. Consequently, nothing in this statement is to be construed as an admission that the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act applies to it. (3) Indefinite, currently serving as director of public relations, National Economic Council, Inc. (4) $7,600 annually. (5) National Economic Council,, Inc. (6) Reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses, principally stationery, stenography, postage, and traveling expenses. (7) See (6) above.

Haines, Samuel P., 4407 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, Otto K. Eitel, chairman, 171 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Hotel owners who are members of the Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, as listed in addenda exhibits 1 and 2.[3] (3) Until reduction or repeal of the 20 percent cabaret tax is brought about. (4) Copy of agreement, April 28, 1948, with the Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee attached hereto as exhibit 3.[3] (5) Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, Otto K. Eitel, chairman, 171 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. (6) See exhibit 3 attached.[3] (7) See exhibit 3 attached.[3]

Hale, John, 408-416 Tama Building, Burlington, Iowa. (1) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (2) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. (3) I am regularly employed by the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. and on very rare occasions I am asked to go to Washington in connection with pending legislation. (4) $100 per day for actual time spent. (5) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual and necessary expenditures for food, lodging, and transportation. There is no definite agreement as to entertainment but very modest items have been approved in the past. However, I have never spent more than $50 for entertainment in any one year.

Hall, Edwin S., Farmington, Conn. (1) Self. (2) The American people. (3) Life. (4) Nothing. (5) Nobody. (6) Nothing. (7) Thinking, living, travel, and printing expenses—out of my pocket.

Hanlon, Daniel J., 1727 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Sidney Smith, Inc., Joplin, Mo. (2) Sidney Smith, Inc., Joplin, Mo. (3) Duration of the Eightieth Congress. (4) $3,000. (5) Sidney Smith, Inc., Joplin, Mo. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Hawes, Robert N., 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Forks Chamber of Commerce, Forks, Wash.; Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, Port Townsend, Wash.; Sequim Chamber of Commerce, Sequim, Wash; and Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Port Angeles, Wash. (1) Forks Chamber of Commerce, Forks, Wash.; Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, Port Townsend, Wash.; Sequim Chamber of Commerce, Sequim, Wash.; and Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Port Angeles, Wash. (3) Year of 1948. (4) Compensation covered by payment from the Grays Harbor Industries of retainer of $10,000 and out-of-pocket expenses. (5) See (4). (6) See (4). (7) Travel, telephone, telegraph, stenographic services, entertainment.

Hill & Knowlton, Inc.,[1] Room 300, Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C. (1) American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.; National Creameries Association, 625 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.; National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) Basic retainer of $3,000 a month plus necessary out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Same. (6) Necessary expenses for travel, entertainment, postage, and communications. (7) See above.

Hinders, Justin, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) National Association of Real Estate Boards. (3) Since June 21, 1948. (4) $4,000 per annum. However only about 50 percent of my time is devoted to legislative activities. (5) National Association of Real Estate Boards. (6) Reimbursed as such expenses are incurred. (7) Hotel bills, meals, travel, and miscellaneous.

Hinkson,[1] Ralph H., 3405 Milton Avenue, Dallas, Tex. (1) PER, Inc, 3405 Milton Avenue, Dallos, Tex. (2) PER, Inc. and a group of clients located in the South and Southwest. (3) Permanently, as president of PER, Inc. (4) $6,000 per annum. (5) PER, Inc. (6) Expenses as required and necessary. (7) Travel, food, lodging, entertainment.

Hynes, W. J., 409 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho. (1) Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr. (2) The Union Pacific Railroad Co. (3) Continuing employment by employer, but activity in connection with Federal legislation is incidental to regular employment and subject to assignment for temporary periods. (4) Salary at the rate of $20 per day plus reimbursement of expenses. (5) Union Pacific Railroad Co. (6) No fixed amount. Reimbursement of expenses incurred. (7) Traveling expense, hotel, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, secretarial service and all miscellaneous expense incurred in discharge of duty.

Jackson, Robert C., 301 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cotton Council of America, 165 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (2) National Cotton Council of America—an organization of cotton producers, ginners, merchants, warehousemen, cottonseed crushers and cotton textile mills. Sole purpose of organization is to increase consumption of cotton, cottonseed and the products thereof. (4) $10,800. (5) National Cotton Council of America only. (6) Reimbursement for legitimate out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Legitimate out-of-pocket expenses such as out of town travel, telephone and telegram, cab fares, meals for guests, etc.

Jaillette, Harold W., 209A West Evans Street, Florence, S. C. (1) South Carolina Association of Public Accountants. (2) Public Accounting profession. (3) Duration of Eightieth Congress. (4) $25 per day for each day

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

in Washington, D. C. (5) South Carolina Association of Public Accountants. (6) All expenses incurred to and from Washington, D. C. Also expenses of hotel and meals in Washington, D. C. (7) Traveling expenses, hotel, and meals.

Keesling, Francis V., Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) City and county of San Francisco (Calif.). (2) City and county of San Francisco. (3) April 15, 1948, to June 30, 1948 (amended to July 7, 1948, through June 30, 1949). (4) At the rate of $1,000 per month, plus reimbursement for expenses. Covers services before executive departments and is not confined solely to legislative services. (5) City and county of San Francisco. (6) No fixed amount. Depends on amount expended. In no event can exceed $10,000. (7) Travel, living, stenographic, telephone, telegraph, conference, and related expenses.

Krueger, A. H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (2) Millers' National Federation, a corporation not for profit, organized under the General Not-for-Profit Corporation Act of the laws of the State of Illinois. (3) Employment with Millers' National Federation is on an annual basis for indefinite period. (4) I am employed by the Millers' National Federation at an annual salary of $8,500 paid to me for a variety of services which have no relationship to the activities described in section 307 of title 3 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Any services which I may perform in connection with the activities set forth under subdivisions (a) or (b) of said section 307, would be incidental to the services which I perform for the Millers' National Federation. No specific amount of my salary is allocated for activities covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. I estimate that such activities would take less than 5 percent of my time. (5) Millers' National Federation. (6) No specific amount. Regular expense incurred in performance of services for which employed will be paid by me and reimbursed by my employer. (7) Actual expenses incurred in performing duties of employment.

La France, Francis X., 911 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (1) Partner, Swan, Keeney & Smith, attorneys and counselors at law, 911 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (2) Narragansett Brewing Co., New Depot Avenue, Cranston, R. I. (3) Undetermined at this time. May be terminated at any time—not on contract basis. (4) Reasonable amount to be determined by the amount of services rendered; not to exceed $150 per diem. (5) Narragansett Brewing Co. (6) Only necessary expenses for traveling, etc. (7) Traveling expenses only.

League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Self. (3) Indefinite. (4) Registrant receives no contributions specifically for activities for which this registration is being filed. An extremely small portion of the activities of the registrant are such as might possibly be construed as being covered by any provision of this act. (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

McCaskill, James L., 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Department of Higher Education, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Membership of the above. (3) Permanent (beginning April 26, 1948). (4) Total annual salary, $6,400. Not more than 10 percent of time will be allocated to activities under this act. (5) Department of higher education. (6) Actual expenses only. (7) Transportation and incidental.

McGrath,[1] Tom J., Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, National Coal Association, 324 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) This is to notify that assignment has been completed and registration should be withdrawn. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Marks, Herbert S., 305 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The Detroit Edison Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) Undetermined except as reasonable value of legal services in matters requiring advice and assistance of Washington counsel, including legislative matters as to which registration may be necessary. (5) Detroit Edison Co. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses. (7) Customary expenses incidental to legal work, such as telephone, telegraph, taxis, and travel.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) William J. Goodwin, The Loch, Roslyn, N. Y. (2) National Resources Commission of China, 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. See statement attached to registration form of William J. Goodwin. (3) March 31, 1949. (4) $7,500. (5) William J. Goodwin. (6) None. (7) None.

Martin, Robert F., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Vitrified China Association, Inc. (3) Continuous; executive secretary of association. (4) Maximum proportion of salary allocable to legislative affairs, $1,500 per annum. (5) Vitrified China Association, Inc. (6) Under $500 per annum allocable to legislative affairs. (7) Travel, printing, mimeographing, entertainment, and incidentals.

Mattei, A. C., president, Honolulu Oil Corp., 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Honolulu Oil Corp. (2) Honolulu Oil Corp. (3) Permanent. (4) I receive no compensation earmarked for or in consideration of activities for the principal purpose of aiding or influencing the passage or defeat of legislation. However, in the absence of authoritative opinion as to what constitutes a principal purpose within the meaning of Public Law 601, I am reporting that part of my compensation which may be allocated to activities in any sense related to legislative matters. It is estimated that compensation allocable to such activities will not exceed $1,000 per annum. (5) Honolulu Oil Corp. (6) Indefinite. (7) Such travel and miscellaneous expenses as may be required.

Meixell, Harry, 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C. (1) National Aviation Trades Association, Inc., 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Represents the above association as executive director. The association is a federation of 42 State chapters, composed of more than 3,200 fixed base operators engaged in all phases of the aviation trades. (3) Retained on annual contractual basis subject to the will of the executive committee of the association. (4) Retainer for services as executive director is $11,000 per annum, no part of which is paid for activities covered in Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (5) National Aviation Trades Association, Inc. (6) Actual expenses incurred in connection with official duties as executive director. (7) Transportation, meals, hotel, telephone, and telegraph, secretarial, postage, mimeographing, and all other incidental expenses.

Messer, James, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla. (1) Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla. (2) Florida Railroad Association, composed of Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., Florida East Coast Railway Co., Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., and Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. The principal purpose of my employment with Florida Railroad Association is not in connection with pending or proposed legislation in the Congress of the United States, such work being only incidental to my employment. (3) Indefinite—at the pleasure of the employer. (4) $4,800 per annum. (5) Florida Railroad Association. (6) Actual expenses not to exceed $265 per month. (7) Actual traveling, office, telegraph, and telephone expense.

Mote, Lynn E., 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York City, N. Y. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) At the rate of $8,000 per annum, of which only a part, if any, is applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601. (5) Association of American Ship Owners. (6) Actual and necessary expenses. (7) Traveling expenses, phones, taxis, etc.

Mougey, William J., 200 Hill Building, Seventeenth and I Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. (2) General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. The duties of the registrant are as follows: (a) Registrant is in charge of his employer's Washington office, located at 200 Hill Building, Seventeenth and I Streets NW., which is maintained to assist his employer and its representatives in their business relations with the various agencies of the Federal Government. Registrant believes that these activities are not within the scope of Public Law 601. (b) Registrant also collects information regarding, and reports on proposed and anticipated action by Congress and agencies of the Federal Government for the information and guidance of his employer and its representatives, and sometimes assists in assembling information which may be submitted to Members of Congress, congressional committees or other agencies of the Federal Government. The activities listed as (b) above, in the opinion of the registrant, are not subject to the act. However, they are enumerated herein and the registrant is registering in order to be in compliance with the act in the event of any contrary interpretation. (3) Monthly. (4) See statement attached.[3] (5) General Motors Corp. (6) See statement attached.[3] (7) See statement attached.[3]

National Association of Stevedores,[1] 90 West Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) All members. (2) All members of association. (3) See statement A attached.[4] (4) See statement A attached.[4] (5) See statement A attached.[4] (6) All expenses will be reimbursed. (7) All travel expenses including transportation, hotel, and food expenses.

National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The registrant is not employed by anyone. Its membership, however, consists of agricultural cooperatives owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by farmers acting together on a cooperative basis. (2) Registrant works in behalf of its membership. (3) There is no employment. (4) Registrant receives no funds for the specific purpose of influencing legislation. It receives dues from its members for its operation. (5) Registrant receives no payments other than from its members who pay dues. (6) Registrant receives no amount for expenses, but all expenses are taken care of out of dues collected from its members. (7) There are no specific expenses allocated to influencing legislation. Any expenses incurred, however, in appearing before committees of Congress or otherwise with respect to legislation are absorbed as a part of the cost of operation of registrant.

Noyes,[2] Charles E., 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) American Institute of Accountants, American Institute Publishing Co., 13 East Forty-first Street, New York,

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.

[4] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

[1] Registration with the Secretary only.
[2] Registration with the Clerk only.
[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

N. Y. (2) Same. (3) Continuous. (4) Total salaries $10,000 annually; not over 10 percent of time spent on legislative work. (5) American Institute of Accountants, American Institute Publishing Co. (6) Actual expenses when traveling. (7) Only travel expense.

O'Connell, Jerry J., 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill. (3) Indefinite. (4) On loan from the Progressive Party of the State of Washington from which salary received is $125 per week. (5) See (4) above. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Traveling: transportation, hotels, etc.

Oliver, Fred N., 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Senior partner of Oliver & Donnally, attorneys, with offices at 110 East Forty-second Street, New York City, and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (2) (a) The National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and (b) the Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc. Oliver & Donnally is general counsel for both associations. (3) Indefinite. (4) Estimated $525 from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and an indeterminate part of $3,250 from Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc. About $7,000 is the estimated proportion of distribution received by registrant as partner of Oliver & Donnally of total annual compensation from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks for all legal services performed by the firm. Registrant estimates that not in excess of 15 percent of that amount is for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act, or $1,050 annually, of which about $525 is for the first 6 months. Six thousand five hundred dollars is the total compensation of Oliver & Donnally received from the Railroad Security Owners' Association for all legal services since January 1, 1948. It is estimated that not in excess of 50 percent is for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act, or $3,250. An indeterminate part of this amount is distributed to registrant. All of such work was confined to public appearances before congressional committees. (5) The associations pay Oliver & Donnally and registrant draws his share as a partner from the firm. (6) The registrant is reimbursed for all legitimate expenses only. None paid during this period. (7) These expenses include only traveling expenses, long-distance telephone, printing, and extra stenographic expenses.

Pastor,[1] Richard, 213 East Twenty-fifth Street, New York City. (1) None (volunteer worker for the Veterans Committee Against Mundt-Nixon bill). (2) None. (3) Two weeks. (4) Nothing. (5) None. (6) $137.05. (7) Transportation, hotel, meals, miscellaneous.

Patterson, Belknap & Webb, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. As counsel, for the purpose of obtaining an amendment to the Trading with the Enemy Act, whereby alien property in this country formerly owned by persons under persecution by an enemy government, in cases where the owner is dead and left no heirs, may be turned over to organizations for the relief of survivors. (3) Indefinite period; such period may last until the necessary amendment to the Trading with the Enemy Act is passed. (4) Not yet determined; sum to be paid will depend upon amount of time spent by registrant in this matter. (5) The American Jewish Committee. (6) The amount of the payment will depend upon the expenses actually incurred by the registrant. (7) Transportation expenses and telephone and stenographic charges.

[1] Registration with the clerk only.

Phillips, Clare L., 2700 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Self. (2) Concessionaires and applicants for concessions in Government buildings and national parks. (3) Indefinite. (4) Fee basis from interested parties. (5) Applicants for concessions and any present concessionaires interested. (6) According to services rendered. (7) Traveling and retaining fees.

Powell, E. Henry, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) As a partner of Oliver & Donnally, attorneys, with offices at 110 East Forty-second Street, New York City, and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (2) The National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (3) Indefinite. (4) $10,000 approximately, is annual share of partnership income for all legal services. Only a small part of this (not more than 5 percent) is for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act. (5) Oliver & Donnally. (6) The registrant is reimbursed for all legitimate expenses such as travel, hotel, and meals. (7) All necessary expenses of the character indicated above.

Putt, C. J., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans. (2) The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. (3) Continuing. (4) Nothing for legislative service. My salary as an officer of the company is $12,000 per year. (5) The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. I do not directly or indirectly for any purpose solicit, collect, or receive money or other thing of value from any person other than my employer; legislative activity on my part is not my principal purpose but is only occasional and incidental. Registration is made as a matter of precaution because of the vagueness and indefiniteness of the act. (6) Reimbursement of actual expense incurred in discharge of duty. No fixed amount. (7) All expense necessarily incurred, including travel, hotel, meals, etc.

Ragland, Edward F., 109-110 Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) Associated Tobacco Manufacturers, 109-110 Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. (2) Associated Tobacco Manufacturers. (3) Indefinite. (4) Registrant is regularly employed as executive secretary of the Associated Tobacco Manufacturers and receives an annual salary for his duties in that connection. Registrant will receive no compensation in addition to his regular salary for legislative activities covered by the act, which activities comprise only an incidental and minor part of the registrant's duties. (5) Associated Tobacco Manufacturers. (6) Registrant is reimbursed monthly for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in the performance of his duties as executive secretary. (7) See item (6).

Railroad Pension Conference, post office box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) Railroad Pension Conference. (2) Membership of Railroad Pension Conference. (3) Indefinite. (4) Membership fees. (5) Membership. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Ratcliffe, William O., Baltimore Lumber Co., 1600 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Jack Pustilnik, district manager, 1600 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) No accounts. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Reese, Richard J., Sr., 146 North Irby Street, Florence, S. C. (1) The South Carolina Association of Public Accountants, Columbia, S. C. (2) The public accounting profession. (3) During the session of the Eightieth Congress. (4) $25 per diem while actually in Washington, D. C. (5) The South Carolina Association of Public Accountants, Columbia, S. C. (6) Actual expenses incurred while in Washington, D. C., and traveling to and from Washington to Florence, S. C. (7) Transportation, meals, tips, hotel, and incidentals.

Reese, Robert S., 146 North Irby Street, Florence, S. C. (1) The South Carolina Association of Public Accountants, Columbia, S. C. (2) The Public Accounting Profession. (3) During the session of the Eightieth Congress. (4) $25 per diem while actually in Washington, D. C. (5) The South Carolina Association of Public Accountants, Columbia, S. C. (6) Actual expenses incurred while in Washington, D. C., and traveling to and from Washington to Florence, S. C. (7) Transportation, meals, tips, hotel, and incidentals.

Reckord, Milton A., 1600 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) The National Rifle Association of America, Washington, D. C. (2) The National Rifle Association. (3) I have been an official of the association for 20 years as the executive vice president. (4) As an official I receive $12,000 per year. (5) By the National Rifle Association. (6) Actual expenses, which I estimate are approximately $100 per month. (7) Only actual expenses.

Richter, Mrs. Persis, 1710 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Foreign Affairs Research Council, United World Federalists, Inc., World Government House, 31 East Seventy-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Foreign Affairs Research Council, United World Federalists, Inc., World Government House, 31 East Seventy-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Approximately July 1, 1948. (4) $20 per week. (5) Foreign Affairs Research Council, United World Federalists, Inc., World Government House, 31 East Seventy-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Rudy, John Forney, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Employed as director of public relations for and by National Federation of American Shipping, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. It is not believed that the duties performed as director of public relations come within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. However, this registration is being filed in order that there may be compliance with the act in the event it is interpreted to cover such activities. (2) See (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) See (1). (5) See (1). (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Travel, hotel, and meals.

Russo, Paul M., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural, Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee, Detroit, Mich. (2) Members of the UAW-CIO, all working men and women, and consumers. (3) Indefinite. (4) $90 per week. Covering duties as a Washington representative for functions which include representation of UAW-CIO and its members before Government agencies, service on special labor committees, distribution of information to our members on Government activities, laws and regulations, as well as presentation of UAW-CIO views to members of Congress and congressional committees. (5) UAW-CIO. (6) $8.50 per day, plus transportation, hotel, etc., expense when traveling, not to exceed $6 per day. (7) Transportation and hotel, etc., not to exceed $6 per day.

Rutherford, F. S.,[2] 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Republic Steel Corp. (3) Permanent. (4) No part of my compensation is earmarked for the purposes set forth in Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. My services (insofar as legislative matters are concerned) consist primarily of factually reporting the status and content of pending proposals affecting the steel industry. The maximum part of my compensation which may be allocated to services within the scope of Public Law 601 will not exceed $5,000 per annum. (5) Republic Steel Corp. (6) Undetermined; estimated not to exceed $500 per

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

year for expenses incident to legislative work. (7) Travel, meals, and miscellaneous.

Smith, Howard J.,[3] 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Central Arizona Project Association, Wayne M. Akin, president, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (2) Central Arizona Project Association, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Indefinite. (4) $750 per month. (5) Central Arizona Project Association, Phoenix, Ariz. (6) Actual and necessary expenses, car mileage, travel expense, room and board when engaged in travel in interest of association. (7) All expenses listed above and any additional expense which may occur in connection with work of the association.

Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. (3) Counsel to association under annual retainer agreement. In the opinion of the registrant, none of its activities nor any contemplated for the future fall within the terms of Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) Annual retainer at the rate of $5,000 per annum, no part of which, however, is paid for activities covered by Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. (5) Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. (6) Disbursement of actual expenditures. (7) Telephone tolls, postage, telegrams, fares, and similar items to be disbursed pursuant to the prevailing rules of the legal profession.

Stone, John, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill. (3) From June 1, 1948. (4) No salary. (5) [Blank.] (6) Actual expenses incurred, not to exceed $100 per week. (7) Expenses incurred in preparing press releases, photography, motion-picture coverage, radio coverage, and general public relations.

Stoudenmire, Sterling F., Jr., 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. I am not engaged specifically "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress." My employment with the Waterman Steamship Corp. is as attorney in the office of the general counsel of that corporation and its subsidiaries in Washington, D. C., and my duties of employment are the usual duties of an attorney with such a corporation. The Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries are interested in any legislation affecting the merchant marine, the operation of aircraft, and transportation generally. This, of necessity, requires presentation of information and facts to the members of committees handling such legislation. This work is not the principal part of my employment by any means, but is just one of the many general duties in connection with my employment. (2) Waterman Steamship Corp. (3) Permanent. (4) $8,400 per annum. (5) Waterman Steamship Corp. (6) I am paid no expenses "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress," but am reimbursed for all out-of-pocket expenses incurred in connection with my duties as attorney for this corporation. (7) Waterman Steamship Corp. reimburses me for out-of-pocket expenses only, incurred in connection with my employment with this corporation in Washington, D. C., which include cab fares, traveling expenses, if any, and other miscellaneous expenses.

Sullivan, Francis M., care of National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, Central Building, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers. (2) National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers. All legislative work performed by associate. (3) Indefinite. (4) $2,000 annually (divided by two associates). (5) See No. 1. (6) Only reimbursement for out-of-city travel. (7) See No. 6.

Tool Owners Union, Local No. 104, Tenth Congressional District, 1318 Beacon Street, Brookline, Mass. (1) Tool Owners Union, Brookline, Mass., Local No. 104, a chapter of the Tool Owners Union (a nonstock, nonprofit organization, which may be at times interested in proposed legislation before Congress). (2) In the interest of its members all of whom are individuals. (3) During such period as Brookline local, No. 104, remains a constituent organization of the Tool Owners Union. (4) Unknown. Income is derived from voluntary contributions, varying from $1 to $100 per annum to $1,000 for life membership. All officers serve without compensation. (5) Individuals who voluntarily contribute from year to year, and who may cease to contribute at will. (6) Expenses vary according to contributions received, and include all costs of operation of the organization. (7) None coming under the scope of title 601. Expenses may include reimbursement for traveling expenses of officers on trips or for printed material to be used incident thereto.

Townsend, Dr. F. E., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The Townsend plan. (3) Indefinite. (4) Approximately $7,800 per year. (5) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (6) Only living expenses when away from home and/or company business. (7) Hotel, travel, and meals when away from home.

Townsend, R. C., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) The Townsend plan. (3) Indefinite. (4) Approximately $5,200 per year. (5) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (6) Only living expenses when away from home and/or company business. (7) Hotel, travel, and meals when away from home.

Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) This is a trade association of vitrified china manufacturers: (1) Buffalo Pottery, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.; (2) Gladding, McBean Co., Los Angeles, Calif.; (3) Iroquois China Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; (4) Jackson Vitrified China Co., Falls Creek, Pa.; (5) Mayer China Co., Beaver Falls, Pa.; (6) D. E. McNicol Pottery Co., Clarksburg, W. Va.; (7) Onondaga Pottery Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; (8) Scammell China Co., Trenton, N. J.; (9) Shenango Pottery Co., New Castle, Pa.; (10) Sterling China Co., East Liverpool, Ohio; (11) the Walker China Co., Bedford, Ohio; (12) Wallace China Co., Ltd., Huntington Park, Calif.; (13) Warwick China Co., Wheeling, W. Va. (2) The vitrified china industry. (3) Continuous. (4) Not over $2,000 per annum allocable to legislative affairs. (5) Vitrified china industry members—see attached list. (6) Not over $500 per annum allocable to legislative affairs. (7) Travel, printing, mimeographing, entertainment, and incidentals.

Walker, Jimmie, P. O. box 1329, 305-306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc. (2) [Blank.] (3) An elected secretary-treasurer for 1 year from March 1948, and work on a voluntary basis. (4) Retained by Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., and reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in behalf of the association. (5) Voluntary and reimbursement on expense basis. (6) Actual, as incurred and approved. (7) Travel, telephone, postage, meals, and lodging; and when considerable time is devoted to work of association, it is expected in the future that some salary will be paid.

Wheeler, Burton K., Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Shore Line Oil Co., Las Vegas, Nev.; Craw Co., Las Vegas, Nev. (2) Above-named companies. (3) June 30, 1948, unless matter terminated earlier. Should purpose of employment be not completed at that date, retainer agreement will probably be renewed. (4) $1,000 per month (the legal fee covers presentation of actions in Federal district court and cognizant departments of the Federal Government). (5) Above-stated companies. (6) All out-of-pocket expenses, including court costs, telephone, traveling, mimeographing, printing, and taxicabs. (7) See (6).

Wheeler, Edward K., Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Shore Line Oil Co., Las Vegas, Nev.; Craw Co., Las Vegas, Nev. (2) Above named companies. (3) June 30, 1948, unless matter terminated earlier. Should purpose of employment be not completed at that date, retainer agreement will probably be renewed. (4) $1,000 per month (the legal fee covers presentation of actions in Federal District Court and cognizant departments of the Federal Government). (5) Above stated companies. (6) All out-of-pocket expenses including court costs, telephone, traveling, mimeographing, printing, and taxicabs. (7) See (6).

Whitlock, Douglas, partner, law firm of Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock & Howrey, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The address of the employer, Building Products Institute, has been changed from 1756 K Street NW., to 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Same. (3) Same. (4) Registrant's services include a wide field, viz, legal, administrative (management, economic research, public relations) and legislative. For all such services he has received $1,500 per month from date of employment. This has been allocated as follows: $1,000 to legal and administrative and $500 per month to legislative. (5) Same. (6) Same. (7) Same.

Willingham, Carl H., lawyer, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) (a) National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 4 Park Avenue, New York City; (b) Oneida, Ltd., Oneida, N. Y.; (c) Willmark Service System, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City; (d) Clyde Y. Morris, 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md. (2) Those listed above. (3) (a) annual; (b) 1948; (c) 1948; (d) 1948. (4) (a) $12,000 per annum; (b) $2,500; (c) not determined; (d) not determined. (5) Those listed above. (6) (a) Reimbursement for travel expenses, hotels, telephone, taxicabs; (b) none; (c) none; (d) none. (7) Travel, hotels, telephone, taxicabs.

Yeaman, Addison, 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville, Ky. (1) Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville. (2) Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. (3) Registrant is an attorney employed since May 1, 1937, by Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. as assistant to the general counsel to that corporation. The term of registrant's employment, as above stated, is indefinite. (4) Registrant was not, and is not engaged "for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of legislation," except as such activities may be within the scope of his employment as stated in (3) above, which includes services as counsel in all matters affecting Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. It is impossible for registrant to estimate what part of his time, as an employee of Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., will be spent in activities covered by this registration. Registrant, therefore, states that the amount he is to be paid for activities covered by this registration is $5,500, being a part of his total compensation

[3] Registration with the Clerk only.

as counsel. (5) Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. (6) Actual expenses as incurred. (7) Travel, hotel, and miscellaneous living expenses.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the second calendar quarter, 1948, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 9393) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Abbott, Charlotte E., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated May 7, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910. "Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act."

Adkerson, J. Carson, 976 National Press Building, Washington D. C. (1) Expended $252.30. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Alifas, Nels Peter, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machnists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,999.98; reimbursed to the extent of $60 for legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 50 percent of time spent on this work. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly periodical, of which he is editor. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time. In June spoke to two Senators relative to merchant marine legislation.

Allman, Roy G., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received; however expended approximately $100 per month. (2) Transportation, taxis, telephone, cables, postage, entertainment. (3) To promote bills to pay Americans for damages received as result of war in the Far East. (4) None. (5) To pay Americans for war damages.

American Booksellers' Association, Inc., Gilbert E. Goodkind, secretary, 31 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) One hundred and three dollars and twenty cents expended. (Bills for telegrams sent and long-distance phone calls made during June not received in time for inclusion in this report—amount expended to be included in next quarterly report.) (2) ABC Mailing Service, 1 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (3) Mimeographing and mailing leaflets to members of this association. (4) None. (5) Legislation to increase the book parcel-post rate.

American Association of University Women,[4] 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary of staff member for quarter (approximately one-half of staff member's activities are in legislative field), $1,000. Expenditures on communications to branches and taxi fares, telegrams, etc. $50.83. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Journal of American Association of University Women (quarterly). General director's letter (issued three or four times a year for educational guidance of branch officers. (5) Support: Federal aid to education; housing bill; repeal of oleo tax; Marshall plan; Foreign Informational and Educational Exchange Act; renewal of Reciprocal Trade Act; status of women bill; Stratton bill for D. P.'s; WHO; appropriations bills. Oppose: equal rights amendment; Social Security appropriations bill.

American Nurses' Association,[5] 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Five dollars for postage. (2) Edith M. Beattie, chairman of American Nurses' Association special committee on Federal legislation. (3) See item number 1. (4) The American Journal of Nursing is the official publication of the American Nurses' Association. Through the medium of the American Journal of Nursing, membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting nurses, nursing or health by means of editorials or signed articles. (5) Legislation pertaining to health, nurses or nursing. Specifically, promotion of legislation to amend the Social Security Act to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to the self-employed, and to employees of nonprofit agencies. Legislation affecting nurses in the Army and Navy Nurse Corps—active and retired, and promotion of United States participation in World Health Organization.

American Nurses' Association,[6] 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Approximately $50, clerical assistance, postage, copies of bills, taxi, telephone. (2) Edith M. Beattie, chairman of American Nurses' Association Special Committee on Federal Legislation. (3) See item No. 1. (4) The American Journal of Nursing is the official publication of the American Nurses' Association. Through the medium of the American Journal of Nursing, membership is kept informed of pending legislation affecting nurses, nursing, or health by means of editorials or signed articles. (5) Legislation pertaining to health, nurses, or nursing. Specifically, promotion of legislation to amend the Social Security Act to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors' insurance to the self-employed and to employees of nonprofit agencies. Legislation pertaining to bill S. 2588 and House Joint Resolution 161.

American Short Line Railroad Association, The, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Contributed by 310 member lines during second quarter 1948, $20,322, only a small portion of which is for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) J. M. Hood, $157; National Press Club, $445.95; Tiny Meeker, $76.67; proportion of president's time and supporting secretary and clerks, telegraph, telephone, postage, rent, office supplies, taxes, and so forth, estimated at $412. (3) For salaries, office expenses, printing, and reimbursement of personal expenses in furtherance of the legislative program of the 310 member lines of the association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting short-line railroads. (See previous report for complete text of legislative program.)

Aring, Hector M., 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See original registration form for complete explanation. No other contributions received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposed to appropriation for cotton subsidy under section 32 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act, 1947—tax legislation.

Arnold, W. C., Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) None. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Austern, H. Thomas, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, B. C., Canada. (1) No money received or expended during second quarter of 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Canadian fisheries.

Ayer & Son, Inc., N. W., a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer) received from National Association of Electric Companies $7,194.37, of which $6,311.14 represented compensation to Ayer and $883.23 was for out-of-pocket expenses (see item 2 below). The only money received or spent by registrants, J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, was for out-of-pocket expenses noted in item 2 below. (2) J. Vance Babb, R. C. Baker, and B. J. Kelly, employees of Ayer, for traveling and miscellaneous expenses, $508.77; materials, postage, messengers, clippings, telephone and telegrams, mimeographing, prints, etc., $374.46. (3) The amounts described in items 1 and 2 above were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electric industry as described in registration dated March 3, 1947. Neither the services, nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) None, except commencing about February 10, 1948, Ayer services include publicity regarding the proposed appropriation to the Tennessee Valley Authority for construction of steam power plants.

Babbitt,[7] Elizabeth Clarke (Mrs. George Harris Babbitt), The Service Star Legion, 1819 Wyoming Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $35; expended $15. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) Service Star Legion magazine. (5) Education equalization, support; Bureau of Child Welfare, support; housing for veterans, support; OPA, oppose; international relations, support; Marshall plan, support; displaced persons, oppose; school lunches, support; public health, support; charter for Service Star Legion, support.

Babcock, Charles E., route 4, box 73 Vienna, Va.; National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Have an expense account of $50 per month for out of pocket expenses. No salary. (2) Various—see below. (3) Services at gasoline stations; postage; telegrams; meals; and hotel rooms. Transportation to and from Washington. (4) The Junior American; the official organ of the Junior Order (as above). (5) Immigration, deportation, and naturalization matters; free public school measures; and occasionally other legislation that the Order believes for the general good.

Bailen, Elsie T., Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, January 29–February 21, 1948, $425; travel and transportation expenses, January 29–February 21, 1948, $370.53; (services terminated February 21, 1948). (2) Salary received used for personal expenses, no part of it spent on behalf of the Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery. Travel and transportation expenses covered by actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Some as (2) above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channel. (5) Legislation to provide for a European recovery program.

Bailey, C. Lloyd, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, $1,000; travel expense, $234.83. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation,

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed with Clerk only.

and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Bailey, Frazer A., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 received as salary from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the second quarter of 1948 which is allocable to legislative activities. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) As President of the Federation, am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. However, during past quarter supported overtime-on-overtime legislation and certain amendments to Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Baker, Gibbs L., 1011 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Charles Niedner's Sons Co., Inc., Malden, Mass.; the United States Rubber Co., New York City; the Firehose Mfg. Co., Inc., New York City; the Approved Equipment Mfg. Co., Inc., New Milford, N. J.; and the Federal Firehose Mfg. Co., Inglewood, Calif. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5608.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenses, April 1 through July 1, 1948, $109.70; salary, same dates, $379.25. (2) Expenditures made for transportation, office work, and supplies, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting civil liberties.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, April 1 through May 22, on which date my resignation became effective, $500. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation for a permanent FEPC, S. 984 and H. R. 2824.

Baldrige, H. M., United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 per month, or $6,000 for the quarter. No money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) During the year I opposed H. R. 5051, H. R. 6502, and H. Res. 425.

Baldwin and Mermey,[1] Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received retainer from Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade, $16,460.23; reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, $14,829.77. (2) Various. (3) Telephone and telegraph service, postage, messenger service, mimeographing, printing, travel, distribution of newsletter, and releases. (4) [Blank.] (5) Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Baldwin and Mermey,[1] 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (1) Received retainer from Hershey Corp., $2,250; reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, $4.29. (2) New York Telephone Co., Baldwin and Mermey. (3) Telephone and postage. (4) [Blank.] (5) Sugar legislation.

Banigan, Leon F., National Council of Private Motor Truck Owners, Inc., 1015 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See (1). (5) None.

Barber, Hartman, room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Seventh Floor, Brotherhood Bldg., Cincinnati 2, Ohio. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. Total salary for quarter, $1,320; total expenses for quarter, $489.78. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; The Haloid Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barlow, Joel, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (1) Received, $1,408.56; expended, $112.67. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $78.07; Western Union, $5.78; cab fares, miscellaneous expense, $28.82. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, teletype messages, transportation within the District of Columbia and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer for the purpose of rendering general legal advice and assistance. Considerable time is being currently spent and may continue to be spent in the preparation of materials for presentation to Congress in support of proposed legislation to improve marketing conditions in the fruit industry during the postwar interruption in normal export marketing.

Barnard, Robert C., Associate of Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Cooley, Crowley & Gaither (attorneys for Stapleton Lumber and Piling Co.), 333 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No money was received by registrant or by Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox for professional services rendered in connection with H. R. 6253 and S. 2539. Expenditures by Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, $33.63. (2) Leet Brothers Co., Inc., 1221 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C., $33.48; postage, $0.15. (3) For photostatic copies of contracts between James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., and the War Department of the United States, for submission to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6253 and S. 2539, both bills entitled, "For the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co."

Barnett, Arthur R., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $3,375 as an officer and employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $526.68 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, airlines, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, book stores, and stationers. (3) Railroad and transportation $93.20, hotel and restaurants $356.75, book stores and stationers $1.10, telephone and telegraph $0.35, gratuities and miscellaneous $75.28. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies of which I am an officer and employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Bass, Frank E., legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $229.17. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Bauer, Charles J., Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) BOMA Letter (bimonthly news letter). (5) I was not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. I was employed as permanent secretary of Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington with duties including appearance at public hearings on legislative and regulatory matters of direct concern to the association.

Beirne, Joseph A., Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $588.87 expenses, $3,300 salary, total moneys $3,888.87. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, airlines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Bemmels, Violet G., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated June 15, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Bennett, Jess B., 625 Bowen Building, 816 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Braniff International Airways, Love Field, Dallas, Tex. (1) Salary, $2,250; reimbursements, taxi, phone calls, railroad fares, dinners, and entertainments, total for last quarter, $701.78. (2) No money paid to any individual. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) All constructive legislation which will advance civil aviation.

Benson, Ernest H., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. National Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary at rate of $8,600 per annum. No expense account. (2) Ernest H. Benson. (3) Activities in connection with legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.

Berckes, Herbert C., secretary, Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Received for services as secretary, $750; expended for travel expense, $1,337.08 (includes transportation and per diem). (2) [Blank.] (3) Legislation. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the Southern Pine Lumber Industry.

Berge, Wendell, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Council of Technical Schools, fees

[1] Filed with the clerk only.

none, disbursements, $25.28; National Council of Business Schools, fees none, disbursements, $16.85. (2) No disbursements for purposes of section 307. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Veterans' training program.

Bergin, Preston B., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $400 salary, $47.05 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Berna, Tell, National Machine Tool Builders Association, 10525 Carnegie Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $1,396.50. (2) Paid for meals, lodging, transportation, and other traveling expenses only. (3) Traveling expenses on business trips. (4) Technical journals such as American Machinist, Iron Age, etc., and business journals such as Business Week, etc. (5) H. R. 6081, appropriation bill for ECA. section 204.

Bernard, William S., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) "Homeless, Tempest-Tossed," Survey Graphic, April 1948. "The Time is Now," Machinists Monthly Journal, April 1948. "Children of Misfortune," Pi Lambda Theta Journal, May 1948. (5) H. R. 6369, Emergency Displaced Persons Act.

Berns, Karl H., legislative-federal relations division, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,771.18, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $354.23. (2) Self (salary), expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Biorn, Norman E., Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 511-516 Commerce Building, St. Paul, Minn. (1) Salary from Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., none; received for actual expenses, $395.02; spent for legislative activities, none. (2) United States post office, $25.09; Northwest Bell Telephone Co., $30.55; Mary Lou Kustelski, $150; Northwest Airlines, $120.64; Railway Express Co., $5.13; McClain & Hedman, $7.38; miscellaneous, $56.23. (3) Postage, phone, telegrams, stenographic services, travel, express charges, stationery, miscellaneous travel expenses. (4) None. (5) Elimination of inequalities in tax legislation.

Bison, Henry, Jr., 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,581.27, expenditures for living purposes only. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of the free-enterprise system.

Bloch,[1] Charles J., Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co., 614 Persons Building, Macon, Ga. (1) Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, under which I have registered, requires that reports shall be filed by registrant so long as his activity continues. Inasmuch as my activity did not continue during the preceding quarter, I am filing no formal report. The only money which I have received from the Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. during the past quarter is as stated in paragraph 1 of my report for the previous quarter. There have been no expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Bodary, D. A. (national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America), 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 107 West Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. (1) Annual compensation of $6,000; $12 per diem for expenses, hotel, meals, etc. (2) D. A. Bodary. (3) As national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America. My duties include handling of legislative matters and handling and progressing of grievances and other activities of my organization. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.

Bodfish, Morton, United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended $850.16. (2) Various. (3) For travel, hotel, and maintenance in Washington, D. C. (4) Only the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade association periodicals, and in our trade association bulletins: FSLIC Premium Reduction—Now, by Morton Bodfish, March 1948, Savings and Loans News; FSLIC Premium Rate Reduction Still on Congress' Agenda, by Morton Bodfish, April 1948, Directors Digest (condensed from Savings and Loans News of March 1948). (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Boehne, John W., Jr., 1058 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association Employees of Collector of Internal Revenue, $900; same for postage and printing, $83.31. (2) John W. Boehne, Jr. (3) Counsel for above association. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employees of Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Bohannon, John N., Asheville, N. C., and 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) Personal remuneration, including expenses, during the preceding calendar quarter, $4,500. Money expended, see (3) below. (2) See (3) below. (3) Personal subsistence, transportation, routine, and other customary expenses only. Also see (6) Form B heretofore filed. (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect producing, gathering, transportation, distribution, or sale of natural gas.

Boorde, Thomas E.,[4] 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Railroad fares, $19.84; hotel, $4.50; meals, telephone, and incidentals, $14.95; total, $59.29. (2) Indicated above. (3) Indicated above. (4) National Pension Guide. (5) Extension and liberalization of old-age retirement (pensions) under Social Security Act.

Borkin, Joseph,[5] 1017 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.; Federation for Railway Progress, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $643.95. (2) Mimeographing service, Western Union, telephone company, office supplies company; hotels and railroads. (3) Office supplies and services, and travel. (4) [Blank.] (5) The above amount represents expenses in connection with the Washington office of the Federation for Railway Progress and travel and were not paid to me for the support of or opposition to any legislation.

Borkin, Joseph,[6] 1017 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $537.65. (2) Mimeographing service, Western Union, telephone company, office supplies company. (3) Office supplies and services. (4) [Blank.] (5) The above amount represents expenses in connection with the Washington office of the Federation for Railway Progress and was not paid to me for the support of or opposition to any legislation.

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Sugar Cane League, main office, New Orleans, La.; Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, main office, Saginaw, Mich. (1) $170.95 has been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contacts with Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch when Congress is in session. (2) Various. (3) See (1). (4) Sugar Bulletin, of New Orleans, La.; Sugar Beet Journal, of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar producer.

Bowden, Benjamin Edward, 267 Robbins Drive, Newark (Licking County), Ohio; American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,022.34; expenses, $622.36; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxicabs, telephone, postage, laundry, cleaning, pullman fare, and various restaurants. (3) Necessary living, transportation, communication (lodging, meals, laundry, and cleaning services, transportation, telephone, and telegraph). (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor, particularly to oppose legislation detrimental to existing Railroad Retirement Insurance System.

Bowden, Ray B., National Grain Trade Trade Council, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, National Grain Trade Council (3 months), $1,919.30; refunds for travel expense, National Grain Trade Council, $558.99. (2) Salary, all for personal use; none for business or lobbying use. Travel expense, refunds for routine trips among market members of National Grain Trade Council. For actual lobbying expenses, not more than $5 paid for lobbying expenses, and this for taxi service in Washington, D. C. Remainder for other than lobbying activity. (3) Travel expense is for routine activity, carried on for many years, in visiting member markets, speaking at trade conventions, attending regular meetings of the Council; not designated as a lobbying activity except insofar as certain legislation, enacted or proposed, may be discussed as matter of information to trade. (4) Trade journals and occasionally the daily press comments upon talks I have made before meetings over the country. (5) Opposed international wheat agreement; favored minor revisions in Fair Labor Standards Act; favored modification of C. C. C. Charter language.

Boyd, H. B., U. S. Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyd, William R., Jr., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule[3] for answers to items 1 to 5. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Boyle, James J., 410 Hill Building NW., Washington, D. C.; the United Public League Health, room 2009, 450 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received from employer United Public Health League, $3,128.22. (2) To the undersigned salary $2,101; rent $225, travel $156, telephone and telegrams $33.42, office supplies $10, clerical service $78, taxis $40.80, postage $11, conferences, lunches, dinners, $426. (3) All money received was paid for salary, rent, travel, miscellaneous services, office supplies, postage, conferences, taxis. (4) An occasional bulletin by the United Public Health League, San Francisco, Calif. (5) To support any and all legislation in the interest of the Public Health and to oppose what may not be of interest.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Bradley, Otis T., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Guaranty Trust Co., of New York as trustee of the several trusts described as the Frances G. Phipps trust, Herbert Sanford Ward trust, Sarita E. Barclay trust, and Colville Herbert Sanford Barclay trust, under indenture dated December 24, 1913, and various indentures supplemental thereto made by Charles H. Sanford, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure an amendment to the Federal Gift Tax Acts involving gifts in trust and the effect for gift tax purposes of the surrender by the grantor of a retained power to alter the disposition of the property but not in any way beneficial to himself, and the employment is expected to continue until such amendment is either secured or rejected.

Brady, Joseph E., International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Regular salary at the rate of $8,500 per year, plus $12 a day for 4 days in Washington and $22 added expense for telephone, telegrams, and cab. (2) Ambassador Hotel; Western Union; Telephone Co.; cab company. (3) General expenses while in Washington. (4) None. (5) Dry legislation—opposed.

Breed, Arthur H., Jr., 310 Fifteenth Street, Oakland, Calif.; Waterfront Employers Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948: salary, $3,574.92; transportation, $533.78; travel expense, $1,346.46; portage, telephone and telegraph, miscellaneous office expense approximately $145. (2) James D. Hahn, Associate, $50 per week plus expenses. (3) Supporting overtime-on-overtime legislation. (4) None. (5) Overtime on overtime.

Brewbaker, James M., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employers, $481.20; expenditures, $481.20. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, and taxicabs. (3) Attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trade-marks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC Acts.

Bright, O. O., 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $73.49. (2) To various hotels, cab drivers, and so forth. (3) See No. 2 above. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber manufacturing industry.

Brightman, Melvin H., Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 salary as executive secretary of Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting dairy industry.

Bronson, Ruth M., 1426 Thirty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Congress of American Indians (unpaid secretary), Claremore, Okla. (1) $40. (2) [Blank.] (3) Postage informing members and interested organizations and individuals of pending bills, telegrams and telephone, same purpose. (4) National Congress of American Indians Washington Bulletin. (5) All legislation concerning North American Indians.

Brooks, A. E., 2202 Forth Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.; American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Cook Building, Mexico, D. F. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

Brooks, William F., National Grain Trade Council, 607 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expenses received during period amounted to $2,741.52, of which less than $10 was spent for any purpose covered by the act. (2) Taxicab fares, no one of which was in excess of 95 cents. (3) Transportation. (4) None, other than weekly newsletter published by employer. (5) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

Brown, Edgar G., director, National Negro Council, 1717 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Money received: $1,600 membership contributions; expended, $1,380.39. (2) Various. (3) Printing, publicity, and advertising, etc. (4) None. (5) Antilynching, civil rights, legislation, nondiscriminatory measures, and reduction of representation based on disfranchisement.

Brown, Frederick E., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street, N. Y., Washington, D. C. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Meat-inspection bills, S. 2256, H. R. 5675, H. R. 6259.

Brown, Russell B., Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act: $30. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include those of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Bryson,[5] Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received, $6,280.79; expended, $6,280.79. (2) To self. (3) For personal and family needs. No sums received or expended in connection with activities covered by act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

NOTE.—Delay in filing this return was due to absence from city.

Bryson,[6] Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received, $6,280.79; expended, $6,280.79. (2) To self. (3) For personal and family needs. No sums received or expended in connection with activities covered by act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.; the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (1) Received from the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J., for professional services, $500 pro rata; expended for long distance telephone calls to the Vulcan Detinning Co. an amount to be reported next quarter. Complete telephone bills not yet received. (2) The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) Long distance telephone service. (4) None. (5) S. 2830, Eightieth Congress. In support of amendatory language designed to place private enterprise on a par with Government in the smelting of tin.

Bugbee,[5] George, American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $4,749.96; reimbursement of travel expenses, $377.57. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the Journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Bugbee,[6] George, American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $4,749.96; reimbursement of travel expenses, $1,177.48. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Buck, Mrs. J. L. Blair, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For April, May, and June 1948, $1,450 travel and expense of entertaining in connection with work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. (2) See question 1. (3) See question 1. (4) General Federation clubwoman and State federation magazines. (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the General Federation supports or opposes legislation, and asks the organization membership to do likewise, when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

Building Products Institute,[5] 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No contributions received during last quarter. See attached sheet for expenditures during last quarter. The Building Products Institute is an organization devoted to economic research and analysis of trends in construction, disseminating its findings to those interested in the construction industry and to the public. However, in view of the uncertain interpretation of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes "principal purpose" and the phrase "To influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation etc." we are filing this form giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (2) See attached sheet.[7] (3) As indicated by items on attached sheet.[8] (4) Construction trends, press releases, and certain economic studies. (5) Proposals which may affect the producers of building materials.

Building Products Institute,[6] Room 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa. The Building Products Institute is an organization devoted to economic research and analysis of trends in construction, disseminating its findings to those interested in the construction industry and to the public. However, in view of the uncertain interpretation of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes "principal purpose" and the phrase "To influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation, etc." we are filing this form giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (2) See attached sheet.[7] (3) As indicated by items on attached sheet.[8] (4) Construction trends, press releases, and certain economic studies. (5) Proposals which may affect the producers of building materials.

Bulow, William J., Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, none; money expended $85.60. (2) Various transportation, telephone and telegraph companies, and United States Post Office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation,

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[8] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

telephone calls, telegrams and postage. (4) None. (5) Postage rate legislation.

Burger,[5] George J., National Federation of Small Business, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $5,780.90 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent and acting as director in charge Washington office, National Federation of Small Business. Disbursements, $5,427.83. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel expenses. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Antitrust law enforcement, rubber tires bill, all legislation affecting small business.

Burger,[4 6] George J., 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $5,068.05 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent and acting as director in charge, Washington office, National Federation of Small Business. Expenditures: $4,770.96 for general operating expenses. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel expenses, etc. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Antitrust law enforcement (monopoly), rubber tires bill, all legislation affecting small business.

Burke, Edward R., 514 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Hawaii Statehood Commission, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $5,000 annual retainer as legal adviser to Hawaii Statehood Commission. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The Enabling Act for Hawaii Statehood.

Burke, Harold, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for 3 months at $708.33⅓ per month equals $2,125. No expenses received or expended on any legislative activity. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Burke, Thomas F., the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received no money from the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits during April, May, and June, and had no expenses incurred on their behalf during like period. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946. Please accept this as notice of my last filing under Public Law 601, inasmuch as I will not be actively engaged in supporting or opposing any type of legislation after June 1948.

Burke, William R., 6612 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated June 15, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Burnett, Leo, Co., Inc.,[5] 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $90,855.86. (2) See addendum A.[3] (3) See addendum A.[3] (4) None. (5) Generally, legislation favorable to margarine manufacturers; specifically, discharge petition No. 12, and the Rivers bill (H. R. 2245).

Burnett, Leo, Co., Inc.,[6] 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) For National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $77,142.26. (2) See addendum A.[3] A portion of this sum not definitely ascertainable was for purposes referred to in section 307, Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. The reason for our not being able to specify the exact amount used for so-called lobbying purposes is that we handled advertising generally for the margarine association. Not only is some of our advertising not directed at the effective legislation at all, but individual advertisements may be partially what may be termed general advertising and partially an appeal to support the Margarine Association's position in the legislative matters referred to. (3) See addendum A.[3] (4) None. (5) Generally legislation favorable to margarine manufacturers; specifically the Rivers bill (H. R. 2245).

Burrows, Orrin A., International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,725, expenses $81.42, minus withholding and railroad retirement deductions. The expenses are deductible expenses, such as for transportation and other incidental items. None for lobbying purposes. (2) Telephone, taxi and bus companies, hotels and restaurants. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging, and telephone calls. (4) The Electrical Workers Journal. (5) All legislation affecting the electrical worker in particular and labor in general.

Butler, Eugene J., National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,758.96 salary for 3 months. (2) Eugene J. Butler. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

Butts, Joseph G., Jr., Gall & Lane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $4,000, expended $60.32. (2) Retainer paid to Gall & Lane. Expenses as indicated in item (3) below. (3) Taxi fares $17.25; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, $19.87; Eastern Photoprint Co., Washington, D. C., for photostat copies $19.20; miscellaneous, $4. (4) None. (5) To support limitation on Federal funds for insulation subsidies.

Byrum, George N., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $437.50; expenses, $437.50. (2) To George N. Byrum. (3) For salary and expenses while working in behalf of legislation in which the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen is interested. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interest of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

Cadden,[7] Joseph, Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $101.26. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, hotel and restaurants. (3) Transportation and living expenses in Washington. (4) [Blank]. (5) Civil rights legislation; including support of bills to outlaw lynching abolish poll-tax, establish permanent FEPC, and oppose Mundt bill.

Caffrey, Charles G., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Manufacturers Association, 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C. (1) One-quarter of per annum salary of $9,000 per year effective as of May 1, 1948. (2) No payments were made to anyone by Charles G. Caffrey for any purpose whatsoever during the quarter in question (normal expenses excepted). (3) None. (4) None, however I might record that I spent about $25 during quarter for taxicab fare, lunches, telephone and carfare to and from the Capitol to find out and keep informed on legislation. (5) None.

Caldwell, Louis G., member of Kirkland, Fleming, Green, Martin & Ellis, 914 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) May 12, 1948, $4,472.09; May 14, 1948, $6,800.63; breakdown: $2,400 retainer at $1,200 per month; $7,027 legal fees in excess of retainer; disbursements on behalf of client, $1,845.72; May disbursements for which payment received July 5, 1948, $538.01; June disbursements for which payment has not been received $1,523.34. (2) See attached.[3] (3) See attached.[3] (4) None. (5) S. 2231, to limit the power of broadcast stations and to break down clear channels, and other bills and resolutions covering the same subject matter.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Rehabilitation Association, care of H. Earle Correvont, president, 900 Bauch Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) $450 received from the National Rehabilitation Association by the firm of Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for the association. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) No particular legislation. The association is interested in any legislation affecting the vocational rehabilitation program.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $2,100 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for National Tax Equality Association. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Firm retained as Washington counsel to prepare and present to congressional committees legal aspects of tax advantages enjoyed by cooperatives and other tax-exempt corporations.

Carey,[7] John L., American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary received, $5,500 (less than 10 percent of time devoted to legislative work). Travel expenses to Washington on legislative work, $75. (2) I have paid no money to anyone for any purposes related to legislative work. (3) None. (4) The Journal of Accountancy, the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Legislation relating to rights of certified public accountants to practice before Federal agencies (H. R. 2657, H. R. 3214, H. R. 5732), or other legislation relating to accounting or auditing.

Carpenter, Austin W., New York Associated Businessmen, Inc., Sherburne, N. Y. (1) Receipts, $1,817; expended, $2,362.27. (2) Various. (3) For dispensing information and traveling expenses to appear before congressional legislative committees. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which discriminates in any way against the constitutional right of small business people to equality of competitive opportunity.

Carr, Ralph, 614 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.; United Indian Traders Association, Inc., Gallup, N. Mex. (1) Have received $6,000 from United Indian Traders Association, Inc., Gallup, N. Mex. (2) Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., $55.13; United Air Lines, Denver, Colo., $103.16; Pennsylvania Railroad, $15.31; Northwestern Air Lines, $95.39; Santa Fe Railroad, $100.16; El Navajo Hotel, Gallup, N. Mex., $10.26; meals, incidentals, tips outside of hotel, $165; total, $544.41. (3) Traveling to Washington, D. C., and Gallup, N. Mex., for work in connection with my employment. (4) None. (5) My employment is not in any sense for lobbying, but appearance before the Congress in connection with matters involving my employer which necessitated appearance before a joint committee of the House and Senate on proposed legislation of $90,000,000 for Navajo Indians. My first work is to advise and represent the traders on the Navajo Reservation in their dealings with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Navajo Tribal Council.

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Pacific Gas & Elec-

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the secretary only.
[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the clerk only.

tric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation; reimbursed $764 for expenses advanced. Expended $975.65 which will be reimbursed as follows: Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $87.90; Munsey Trust Co., $525; travel expense, $250; incidentals, $37.50; stenographers, $75. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Munsey Real Estate Co., stenographers, transportation, and incidentals. Stenographers G. Miller and M. Smith. (3) Telephone service, rents, transportation, and incidentals; stenographers. (4) None. (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

Carter, Asa L., B-Line Abutters, 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) I received and expended only $112.16; costs and disbursements herein, divided: Petty cash, clerical work, searching records, and addressing mail, $60.14; and for postage, printing, telephoning, carfare, etc., $52.02. (2) It was paid to postmasters, printers, public-service companies, and standard clerical help at Pittsburgh, Pa. (3) For the purpose of furthering sentiment for a "Rainhill prize" for the best, very high speed electric B-line pipeway wagon train for major heavy freight—maximum ton-miles and minimum time and space for passageway rolling stock, etc. (low-priced ocean electric power, no tunnel costs at sea and equipment one two-hundredths weight of present used railroad rolling stock—same cost per weight). (4) I publish nowhere except by first-class mail to abutters and contributors, and their due and immediate representatives. (5) Everything for or against very high speed B-line. I include that set forth in last quarter report and that which appears in hereto attached "exhibit A" each, every, and all statements of which I repeat herein. (Note: The first three figures of high-speed curves is a supplement to the note in last quarter's report.)

Carter,[5] Clarence B., Railroad Pension Conference, post office box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) Received $45 for traveling expenses. (2) Clarence B. Carter. (3) Traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support of H. R. 4695 and S. 2055 which provided retirement after 30 years of railroad service at half pay.

Carter,[6] Clarence B., Railroad Pension Conference, post office box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) Received $60 for traveling expenses. (2) Clarence B. Carter. (3) Traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support of H. R. 4695 and S. 2055, providing 30-year retirement at half pay for railroad workers.

Carter, Jack, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $375 per month as salary, minus social security and withholding taxes; $33.50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration.

Case, Ralph H., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Allied Aviation Corp., Cockeysville, Md. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 631, Eighticth Congress.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Case, Ralph H., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.: (A) the Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; (B) the Quinaielt Tribe, Washington State; (C) the Sioux Tribe, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Montana. (1) Receipts (A) the Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., $1,077.25; (B) the Quinaielt Tribe, Washington State, none; (C) the Sioux Tribe, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Montana, none. (2) Disbursements: (A) Stenographer and reporter, $65; (B) None; (C) stenographer, telegrams, sundries, $36.65. (3) As stated above. (4) None. (5) None.

Casey, D. E., American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received as salary, $2,649.99. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specified.

Casey, Joseph E., Committee for Equalization of Tobacco Taxes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $15,000. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912, which provides for a fair and equitable tax on cigarettes depending upon the price at which these cigarettes are sold.

Cates, Larry, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $2,338.10, expended $583.10. (2) Various companies and business firms for transportation, communications, gasoline, oil, airplane operation, miscellaneous entertainment, meals, hotels, tips, and incidental expenses. (3) Travel and all expenses in connection therewith, taxi, telegraph, telephone, and for the prosecution of a pilot strike on National Airlines where scab pilots are currently employed in a strike-breaking attempt. (4) Air Line Pilot. (5) All legislation concerning aviation safety and hours, wages, and working conditions of pilots on our commercial air lines.

Chace, W. E., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $75 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, 2494, 3421, 4562, 4752, 4417, and S. 1251.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses in Washington reimbursed by employer, $1,041.46; expenditures in Washington, $1,041.46. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills affecting national labor policy, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trade-marks, control powers, revision of SEC, foreign aid, Federal housing, Government competition with business, and such other matters as may affect industry.

Chan, Sau Ung, 934 Smith Street, Honolulu, T. H. (mailing address, Post Office Box 3315, Honolulu, T. H.); Chinese Merchants Benevolent Association of Honolulu, 71 North Hotel Street, Honolulu, T. H., and Mr. K. L. Wong, King and Smith Streets, Honolulu, T. H. (1) Money received: $350 from Mr. K. L. Wong, King and Smith Streets, Honolulu, T. H. ($7,700 from Chinese Merchants Benevolent Association of Honolulu, 71 North Hotel Street, Honolulu, T. H., previously reported). Money expended: See Form A attached herewith.[1] (2) V. K. Kwong, Pan-American Airways, United Airlines, Hotal New Yorker, Hotel Shoreham, Hotel Delmonico, Hotel Sir Francis Drake (for details see Form A attached herewith[1]). (3) Refund of expenditures incurred on my behalf, travel and miscellaneous expenses. (4) Pamphlet entitled "To Rectify a Hardship on Certain Persons Lawfully Resident in the United States of America for Periods of 16 to 24 Years." (5) H. R. 5922, 5929, S. 2349 (identical bills); H. R. 6476 and S. 2687 (identical bills).

[1] Not printed.

Chandler, E. Lawrence, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $10. (2) Taxicab drivers, United States post office. (3) Taxicab fares, postage. (4) None. (5) Legislative bills regarding which it is considered that the engineering viewpoint can be constructive.

Christman, Miss Elisabeth, National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,105 salary as secretary-treasurer of the Nation Women's Trade Union League. Legislative work is only one phase of the program of the league. My work is predominantly administrative, but a small percentage of my time is spent in activities in furtherance of our legislative program. (2) No money expended except for an occasional taxi fare. (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin, the league's monthly publication. (5) [Blank.]

Church, R. R., 6000 Champlain Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Commission, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I receive no salary. $10 per day allowance, when away from home for hotel and meals only, as incurred, plus railroad transportation when necessary. I advance out of my funds, paying these expenses, after which I am reimbursed by the National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission. At the present time said council is indebted to me for advancement for hotel, meals, and railroad fare. (2) Dunbar Hotel, Washington, D. C.; McAlpin Hotel, New York; B. & O. Railroad, and Pennsylvania Railroad. (3) For subsistence of myself, when actively engaged for aforesaid council. (4) None. (5) Ives-Fulton bill (S. 984) against discrimination in employment.

Citizens' Committee for Reciprocal World Trade,[7] 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) List of contributors attached.[2] (2) Rider attached.[2] (3) Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. (4) [Blank.] (5) Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Clarke, David R., 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Cohn, Marcus, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During a typical month, the registrant devotes a maximum of 5 percent of his time to matters which may possibly be regarded as embraced in section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures set forth here for the months of April, May, and June 1948 are based upon that percentage; salary, $93.75; travel, $6.66; telephone, $12.36; office and miscellaneous expenses, $65.41. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) See (1). (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) Legislation dealing with immigration and S. 2764 and H. R. 6817. See original registration statement and item (1).

[1] Not printed.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the clerk's office.

[7] Filed with the clerk only.

Colborn, Miss Fern M., Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Personal expenses refunded, meals, $30.25; lodging, $6; travel, $38.26; total, $74.51. Salary, quarterly, $350. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as No. 3.

Coles, Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Alaska Freight Express Corp., Pier 50, Seattle, Wash. (1) During past calendar quarter, registrant has received no money from Alaska Freight Express Corp. as compensation for work done has not yet been fixed or paid. Expenditures have been approximately $180. (2) Payments have been made to the telephone and telegraph company, several restaurants, taxies, and Army and Navy Club. (3) Telephone, telegraph, luncheons, dinners, taxies, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation dealing with Government assistance to Alaska shipping.

Coles, Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; New York Foreign Freight Forwarders & Brokers Association, 27 Water Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Since April 1, 1948, we have received a total amount of $1,632.54 from members of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Customs Brokers Association and $700 from various freight forwarders located in other cities. Our expenditures have been $122.95. (2) Expenditures have been purely for incidental matters such as telephones, lunches, transportation, and mimeographing, and have been paid to the telephone company, taxicab company, mimeographers, restaurants, etc. (3) Telephones, luncheons, transportation, mimeographing. (4) [Blank.] (5) Registrant has been employed as attorney to present to the Congress and to the governmental agencies concerned information concerning foreign freight forwarders and use of their services under the foreign relief programs.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., which firm receives an annual retainer from the Chase National Bank of the city of New York for professional services. As stated in his registration statement on form B, registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Registrant's Federal tax legislative work comprises only an incidental and minor part of his duties. If any of registrant's activities are subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act the portion of the annual retainer from the Chase National Bank that might be attributed to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $250 during the second quarter of 1949, and disbursements pertaining to such activities were $11.32. (2) See answer to (1). Expense payments were made to the firm under the terms of the annual retainer for hotel rooms, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of members and employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the city of New York.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Collett, F. G., 1844 Mintwood Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Indians of California, Inc., 1078 University Avenue, Berkeley, Calif. (1) Receipts, $2,154.21; expended, $2,173,57. (2) To various persons and concerns for miscellaneous services, such as stenographic services, stationery and supplies, rooms and meals, telephone and telegraph, postage and transportation, and expenses and maintenance of delegates representing Indians of California, and of other persons (see attached report of expenditures.[1]). (3) To secure remedial legislation. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to Indians of California.

Compton, R. T., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary $3,750; expenses reimbursed by employer, $778.11; expenditures, $778.11. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,175, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $235. (2) Self (salary); expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), and informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Condon, Arthur D., 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., Military and Naval Distributors Association, Inc., 295 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,250. Expended none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Condon, Arthur D., 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Morton Salt Co., 310 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) April, May, June 1948, received $5,221; expended $221. (2) $221 expended for long-distance calls and transportation. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717.

Cone, John C., Pan American Airways, Inc., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since registering under the lobby, I have been ill with virus pneumonia and other complications and have been confined to the hospital, at home, and later away from Washington, convalescing in Florida, until returning to duty June 14, 1948, and have not received or spent any funds in connection with legislation. (2) None received or spent in connection with legislation. (3) Same as above. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose legislation but may be concerned with any legislation relating to aviation which may be pending.

Conn, Donald A., Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the calendar quarter April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, my salary from the association was $6,250. The time spent in Washington in this period were the days April 13–16, May 21–24, and June 9–10. Expended $459.50. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Conover, Julian D., American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received no compensation other than regular salary as previously stated. Expended, $36.09. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $15.75; telephone, $20.34. (4) Am editorial director of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Conroy, Eugene J., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None—no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cooley, Thomas M., II, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (Compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement.) Employment terminated as of June 30, 1948. (2) Employment terminated as of June 30, 1948. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 6396.

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; Veterans' Association Federal Employers Naval Ship Yard, New York, N. Y., Lenruth Hall, Waverly and Myrtle Avenues, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) None this quarter. (2) Self. (3) Travel, hotel, meals, and expenses only when on official business for Veterans' Association Federal Employees Naval Ship Yard, New York. (4) None. (5) Support or oppose legislation effecting veterans' preference in Federal employment.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $2,681.70 as wages and $200.01 for office rental. (2) $200.01 to "Labor" for office rental. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interest of labor.

Cortright, Frank W., National Association of Home Builders, Suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, April, May, and June 1948, $4,375.02; per diem, April, May, and June 1948, $637; expenses, travel, $594.08, taxis in town, $54; entertainment, $83—$731.08; expenses in connection with committee meetings, taxis, meals, tips, entertainment, and so forth, $45; total, $5,788.10. As indicated upon my registration, I have been advised by counsel that I am not subject to the Lobbying Act. Such registration and this report are therefore filed under protest and merely as a matter of personal precaution in view of the indefiniteness of said act and the lack of judicial interpretation thereof. Neither said registration nor this report in any way are intended to constitute an admission by me that I am subject to the act. The payments reported above as my salary and per diem are for general services as executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders, and are not dependent upon rendition of services which might be considered "lobbying" within the meaning of the act. Similarly, expenses reported include substantial amounts for routine association business which could not be regarded as lobbying within the meaning of the act. Expenses reported do not include items of association expense such as travel, secretary's salary, telephone, and rent, which are part of the general administrative budget of the association and do not represent moneys received by me from the association. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, INS, UP, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. I also write an article each month

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

for the American Builder, a monthly publication devoted to the interests of the housing industry. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but I am the executive vice president of the trade association for the home building industry. In that capacity it is incumbent upon me to supervise, among other things, the work of the association's legislative department. The function of that department of the association is to follow all legislation affecting the home building industry; to advise the membership of the association of all such legislation; and to make known to the public and to the Congress the opinion of the membership on all such legislation.

Costello, John M., 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.; American League for an Undivided Ireland, care Charles T. Rice, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Received as fee for service., $750; received as reimbursement for expenditures, $1,193.25. (2) (a) Public Printer, Washington, D. C., $1,025.79; (b) Truman Ward, Washington, $52; (c) Acme Newspictures, Washington, D. C., $14; (d) Wide World Photos, $17; (e) Albee Stenographic Service, $20; (f) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $26.17; (g) miscellaneous, $37.69. (3) (a) Reprints congressional speech; (b) mimeographing letter; (c) photographs; (d) photographs; (e) mimeographing; (f) long-distance toll charges; (g) travel expenses, gas, oil. (4) Congressional Record. (5) Any legislation which may tend to effectuate the unification of all Ireland into a united nation.

Covington, J. Harry, III, American Smelting & Refining Co., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for clients, $88.37. (2) Telephone and telegraph expense, $63.37; travel expense including hotel accommodations, $25. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Crampton, Charles J., 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex. State Rights Association, box 2559, Houston, Tex. (1) Retainer fee as counsel, State Rights Association, second quarter, 1948, $5,000; second quarter, 1948 expense account filed for reimbursement, $630.79. (2) Statement attached. (3) Statement attached. (4) None. (5) To bring about constructive cooperation between community property and common law States for the development of a plan of tax equalization which will afford an equitable basis for income, estate, and gift taxation in the Federal tax structure. To support complete retroactive repeal of the 1942 estate and gift-tax amendments as they apply to community property States in an unfair, discriminatory, inequitable manner. We have supported and will continue our support of the American Bar Association's recommendation for tax equalization.

Crawford, William A.,[1] Railroad Association of Georgia, 536 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) No money received or expended for any lobbying activities. (2) No one. (See reply to question (1) above.) (3) None. (See reply to question (1) above.) (4) None. (5) None.

Crowley, Leo J., 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.; the Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, 509 Seventeenth Street, Denver, Colo. (1) In connection with Federal legislation received attorney's fee of $130 and expenses of $257 during April 1948, and attorney's fees of $200 and expenses of $402 during June 1948. Expense money was reimbursement for amounts expended for Pullman fare, hotel expenses, dining car, restaurants, taxicabs, tips, and other incidentals. (2) Various restaurants, Hotel Statler and Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Pullman Co., taxicab drivers, Washington Baseball Club and various Washington theaters. (3) $659 was expended by me during the period of this report for hotel expenses, meals in restaurants, dining cars, pullman fares, taxicabs, tips, entertainment, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads operating in and having trackage in the State of Colorado.

Cullum, Robert M., Committee for Equality in Naturalization, 261 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary totaling $1,500 for quarter; traveling expenses, $47.60. (2) Paid out miscellaneous traveling expenses, fares, hotels, taxis, etc. (3) To attend executive board meetings in New York City. (4) None. (5) Legislation to provide that the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race.

Cuneo, John C., 922 Jay Street, post office box 1054, Modesto, Calif.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Receipts for California operations of Townsend plan, $839.16; less deductions by national office, $125.78; net amount for operations in California, $713.38; received from California legislative committee for operations, $675; total available for California operations, $1,388.38; amount paid to John C. Cuneo for his personal use, $1,080; balance to be used for future California operations. (2) Total disbursements for State operations paid from total receipts deposited in State office account, $370.66. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Townsend national recovery plan.

Curran, Roland, Central Valley Project Association, box 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (1) Received from Central Valley Project Association for all activities connected with association, April 1 to June 30, 1948, $8,978. (2) Maintenance of Bakersfield office and California activities, $1,428; Hotel Carroll Arms, Washington, D. C., 31 days, $270; Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C., 49 days, $392; telephone and telegraph, postage, meals, taxi, stenographic service, miscellaneous, $665; total, $2,755. (3) Salary, maintain California office and Washington activities, personal expenses to and from Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Central Valley project and flood-control project in same area.

Curtiss, Ralph E., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; retained by Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis. (1) Received, $1,000.10; expended, $9. (2) Telephone company and telegraph company. (3) Telephone calls and telegrams. (4) ATOA News (monthly publication of the association). (5) Any legislation affecting the tavern industry.

Daley, William L., 528 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Receipts and expenditures on behalf of National Editorial Association, $1,072.92. (2) Railroads, telegraph and telephone companies, taxicabs, office-supply companies, $247.92. (3) Reimbursement for expenses, transportation, and communication. (4) NEA Legislative Bulletin, the National Publisher, bulletins of State and other publishers' organizations, and industry trade publications. (5) Furnishes advisory analysis of all legislation affecting the press.

Damon, Eugene J., St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., chairman, Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Salary indicated on Form B plus reimbursement of $172.82 out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Hotels, restaurants, Pullman Co., taxi operators. (3) Travel, rooms, meals, and incidental expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation of interest to railroads generally.

Darby, Frederick R., 3270 Westerville Road, Columbus, Ohio. (1) No money received or expected. Action will not begin until middle of following quarter. (2) Negate. (3) Negate. (4) The Columbus Citizen, April 29, 1948; United Press Radio, June 5, 1948. (5) In re bill S. 2213 of the second session in the Eightieth Congress.

Daugherty, Paul J., Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to the organization.

Davidson, John B., Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., formerly Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 902 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Davies, Aled P., American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $2,538.46. Travel expenses when out of Chicago, including lodging, meals, taxicabs, entertainment, transportation, telephone, and telegraph, $3,880.11. (2) Various railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and telephone and telegraph companies. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry.

D'Avila, Sarah H., National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax, 127 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $510.41. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to abolish the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections.

Davis & Gilbert, a partnership consisting of A. M. Davis and A. M. Gilbert, the Best Foods, Inc., 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenditures: $526.96 for transportation, meals, lodging, telephone, and telegraph expenses; and $102.90 to Dr. A. J. Carlson for transportation from Chicago to Washington, D. C. and return, and for his hotel and living expenses during the course of the trip. Receipts: The registrant was reimbursed in part by the Best Foods, Inc., during the quarter for the aforementioned expenditures, and will be reimbursed by said company for the entire sum thereof. Registrant has received from the Best Foods, Inc., the usual equal monthly installments of its annual legal fee of $35,000, which fee the registrant has received every year for many years. (2) $526.96 to railroads, air lines, cabs, hotels, restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies; $102.90 to Dr. A. J. Carlson, University of Chicago. (3) $526.96, travel to and from Washington, D. C., living expenses in Washington, D. C., and telephone calls and telegrams; $102.90 paid to Dr. A. J. Carlson to reimburse him for expenses incurred in connection with his appearance as a witness on April 2, 1948, before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services which was then considering margarine legislation. (4) None. (5) Registrant is not and was not employed specifically for the purpose of supporting or opposing any pending legislation, nor was registrant employed specifically for the purposes set forth in the first sentence of section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Registrant is paid a yearly retainer for acting as legal counsel to the Best Foods, Inc., and, in addition to registrant's major duties as such counsel, registrant presented the cause of the company in respect to legislation affecting margarine which is one of the many products manufactured by that company.

Dawes, Bourbon, Hotel Association of Washington, D. C., 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,624.98; expenses,

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

$84.30. (2) (a) Taxis and transportation, $31.30; (b) miscellaneous lunches, dinners, $33.25; (c) miscellaneous entertainment of visitors, $19.80. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia hotels.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley (the Chase National Bank of the City of New York), 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., which firm receives an annual retainer from the Chase National Bank of the City of New York for professional services. As stated in his registration statement on Form B, registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Registrant's Federal tax legislative work comprises only an incidental and minor part of his duties. If any of registrant's activities are subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act the portion of the annual retainer from the Chase National Bank that might be attributed to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $250 during the second quarter of 1948, and disbursements pertaining to such activities were $11.32. (2) See answer to (1). Expense payments were made to the firm under the terms of the annual retainer for hotel rooms, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of members and employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley (the New York Stock Exchange), 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Dawson, Joseph Martin, Joint Conference Committee on Public Relations, Baptists of the United States, 1628 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) In addition to monthly salary (a total of $1,749.99 for the quarter) allocated by sustaining conventions and paid for conducting the office which has little to do with Congress, I expended $9 for congressional approaches. (2) United States post office, office printer. (3) Letters and literature. (4) Report From the Capital, monthly newsletter issued by the organization; various papers published by the Baptist denomination throughout the United States; news releases to Religious News Service; Larston D. Farrar's Washington Religious Review; and local newspapers. (5) None. In the case of Federal Aid to Education, I did write letters and send literature to some Congressmen urging amendment to Taft and McCowen bills with view to amending said bills so as to prevent application of Government tax funds to nonpublic schools; also in response to official resolutions adopted by northern and southern Baptist conventions, I appeared before Senate Military Committee in opposition to universal military training. In addition, I attended citizens' committees in behalf of admitting displaced persons and renewing Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, following which I wrote a few letters to congressional committees in behalf of these measures.

Day, Mary R., lawyer, 741 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Massman Construction Co., 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Bill for the relief of the Massman Construction Co., H. R. 2192.

DeGroot, E. H., Jr., 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) See attached statement,[2] typewritten and signed, which is hereby made an integral part of this Form C, to which the oath of the registrant filing same applies without reservation or exception. (2) See statement attached.[2] (3) See statement attached.[2] (4) None. (5) See statement attached.[2]

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,875 was received as retainer for services rendered plus $346.27 reimbursement for personal expenses in connection with work for the association; $150 of the above amount covers the salary of an economist employed in my office. (2) William I. Denning. (3) For general legal representation in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Not called upon during quarter in connection with any legislation.

DeQuevedo, Rafael G., Building Products Institute, Room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C.: Salary, $1,050; expense, $148.55. (2) Taxi, $42.70; restaurant, $103.35; publication, $2.50. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Dickerman, John M., National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary from April 1 through June 30, 1948, $2,500; expenses, $150.06. The salary and expenses listed under (1) are charged against that portion of the association's budget allocated to the legislative department, of which I am in charge, which allocation is $20,000 for 1948. Only some of the functions of this department might be deemed as coming within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, hotel rooms, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, INS, UP, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter, and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) All legislation affecting the home-building industry.

Dickinson, A. W., American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary $1,375 for this activity; expended $22.05. (2) Sundry payees. (3) Taxicab fares, $9.50; luncheons, $12.55. (4) Am associate editor of Mining Congress Journal, a monthly magazine for the mining industry. (5) Measures affecting the mining industry.

Disbrow, Walter L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, April, May, and June 1948, $1,090.90. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the retirement federation on legislation affecting their welfare. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any and all legislation affecting the civil-service retirement laws.

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, $1,500; Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C., $6,250; American Hotel Association, New York, N. Y., $1,000; Wilcox Oil Co., Tulsa, Okla., $500; Marlboro Cotton Mills, Inc., McColl, S. C., $100; Penobscot Chemical Fiber Co., Boston, Mass., $575; Lowell Liquidation Corp., Boston, Mass., $2,500; Rudolph Wurlitzer Co., Chicago, Ill., $500; Henry B. Cleereman, Green Bay, Wis., $1,000; Ozark-Mahoning Co., Tulsa, Okla., $7,500; incidentals, such as taxi fares, telephone calls, etc., $163.29. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments; depreciation allowance; family partnerships; percentage depletion; attention to legislative matters affecting oil and gas industry.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) $600 salary and $225 expense allowance. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., the postmaster, the Superintendent of Documents, and others. (3) Telephone service, postage, Government documents, rent, and minor office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dorsett, J. Dewey, Association of Casualty Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the first quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Article entitled "Casualty Companies Prepare for Atomic Energy Problems" appearing in May 28, 1948, issue of the New York Journal of Commerce. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

Dougherty, John E., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $619.36 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $85.83 was expended by me as expense money, during the second quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $171.62 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $85.83 was expended by me as expense money during the second quarter of 1948 for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Dow, Fayette B., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Pipe Line Companies, care of L. F. Kahle, treasurer, box 1349, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Deponent has rendered no services in the past for the Committee for Pipe Line Companies that come within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. This registration under the act is made in order to comply with its provisions with respect to any such services that he may render in the future. Of total compensation received by deponent the sum of $500 is believed to be a fair apportionment for such services as might come within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. (2) No money has been expended by deponent. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) No legislation is proposed by Committee for Pipe Line Companies, deponent's employer, and there is no pending legislation which deponent has been called upon to support or oppose.

Dowd, M. J., care of Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) For second

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

quarter of year 1943: Salary $960 per month; incidental traveling expenses, $1,047.63. (2) The salary is regular compensation for my full-time employment as consulting engineer for Imperial Irrigation District on irrigation, power, drainage, and related matter. Expenses represent reimbursement to me for personal travel, hotel, and subsistence expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Colorado River and affecting Imperial Irrigation District.

Downs, Scheib, Becker & Walsh, a law firm, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See statements filed by Thomas J. Downs. Registrant does not believe that it is required either to report or register under the act. (2) Same. (3) Same. (4) Same. (5) Same.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers (now known as Associated Fur Manufacturers, Inc.), 393 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank]. (3) [Blank]. (4) [Blank]. (5) Legislation affecting the fur industry.

Drake, John, The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $37.60. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares. (4) [Blank]. (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act jointly to process and market their milk.

Dresle,[5] Grey, 202 Bitting Building, Wichita, Kans., Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) $5.98 received as reimbursement for actual expense. (2) Telephone Co., $5.98. (3) Telephone calls. (4) Friendly Dollar. (5) Tax equality.

Dresle,[6] Grey, 202 Bitting Building, Wichita, Kans., Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, Wichita, Kans. (1) $150 from Kansas Independent Business Men's Association for traveling expense to Chicago, Ill. (2) Various filling stations, hotels, etc., from Wichita, Kans., to Chicago, Ill. (3) Travel. (4) The Friendly Dollar. (5) Tax equality.

Drysdale, R. M., Jr.,[5] Federation for Railway Progress, 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,958.34, represents total remuneration as executive vice president and includes no amount for supporting or opposing any legislation; expenses, $316.83. (2) To various railroads, hotels, etc. (3) Travel expenses. (4) Railway Progress, vol. 2, No. 1, March 1948 "A Report on One Year of Progress." (5) None.

Drysdale,[6] Robert M., Jr., Federation for Railway Progress, 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $2,124.99; expenses, $139.75. (2) To various hotels, railroads, etc. (3) For traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

DuBois, Ben, secretary, Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Center, Minn. (1) I perhaps am employed in a dual capacity. I am secretary of the Independent Bankers Association and carry on the work of the association. I am also our Washington representative and, therefore, am registered as a lobbyist. I can't conceive of the necessity of listing all the general expenses of this organization. It would seem that the information required was that amount of money spent in what might be called lobbying. I was in Washington once during this quarter and my total expenses covering transportation, hotel accommodation, sustenance, etc., amounted to $207.68. I visited a few Members of the Congress as we were interested in the passage of S. 829. We haven't put out any general circular letter as I have been attending State banker association conventions and calling on banks generally in quite a number of States. Some of my conversations with bankers might be in the category of lobbying, as I have urged them to urge their representatives in Congress to use their influence in support of S. 829. If under the terms of this act this constitutes lobbying, kindly advise and I will file my expenses incident to the trips I have taken. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Dunn, William M., Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $295.40, expenses; $1,999.98, salary; total, $2,295.38. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary previously reported. Expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,193.67. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, retail stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling and incidental expenses, newspapers, periodicals, cigars, cigarettes, etc.; meals and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum and its products, or natural gas.

Echols, Oliver P., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Nothing received except salary no part of which was paid for activities covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. No expenditures. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Edleman, John W., 1031 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Textile Workers Union of America-CIO, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,499.94 salary; $582.89 to reimburse actual expenses incurred—$100 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington—remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Eichelberger, Frank, 1501 Taylor Way, Tacoma, Wash.; Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co., 1225 Crocker First National Bank Building, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co., $159.60. (2) Mayflower Hotel and Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., $84.36; Pennsylvania Railroad, New York City, $42.84; restaurants, taxicabs, and transportation companies, $32.40. (3) Rooms, meals, and transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6535.

Elliott, John Doyle, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received salary of $60 per week and reimbursement for fares, mileage, hotel expenses, meals while traveling or away from residence location, up to the amount of $30 per week; these latter expenses amounting to $85 during this last quarter. (2) Expenses designated in (1), above, consisting of fares and meals only in this quarter, paid to carriers and restaurants. (3) Contacting citizens, organizations, and Townsend Clubs. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, Eightieth Congress, first session, generally known as the Townsend National Recovery Plan, in support thereof.

Ellis,[7] Clyde T., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,000; car allowance, $300; expense accounts, $249.64; American Airlines, $380.07; total, $3,929.71. (2) Self for salary and expenses including reimbursement for meals, hotel, transportation, and tips. (3) Travel incident to members' meetings, board of directors meetings, etc. (4) Rural electrification. (5) Legislation affecting the growth and welfare of rural electric cooperative corporations, public power and public utility districts, and legislation affecting public power developments where they would in turn affect the rural electric cooperative corporations, public power and public utility districts.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Arabian-American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None received and none expended. This is submitted as a final report, since we are no longer retained to represent Arabian-American Oil Co. Therefore, there will be no further activities by us. At such time as we render a bill and are paid by this client we shall submit a report, but until that time we shall file no quarterly report because of our inactivity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; R. W. Britton, 1416 Cherry Street, Erie, Pa. (1) None received and none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to partnerships.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; St. Joe Paper Co. and affiliated companies, Barnett National Bank Building, Jacksonville, Fla. (1) None received and none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with investigation by subcommittee of Senate Judiciary Committee into question of any impairment of credit of Florida.

Ellsworth, Charles K., Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,250; expenses, $650 Hill & Knowlton is not engaged in any lobbying activities and does not believe that it is required to register under Public Law 601. However, it has been engaged by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, the American Butter Institute, and the National Creameries Association to carry on certain educational activities intended to explain the consequences of proposed legislation to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine. In view of announced interpretations by representatives of the Department of Justice implying that such educational activities are subject to Public Law 601, the firm is reporting receipts and expenditures for said educational campaign, pending judicial clarification of the law's intent. (2) Expense money paid out only to hotel, restaurants, and cab drivers. (3) Covered above. (4) Have no records of any such publication. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Have been assigned by Hill & Knowlton, Inc., to prepare educational information and material showing consequences of measures proposing to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; as general counsel, American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Services to date have not involved the supporting or opposing legislation. At the request of the association, legal analyses and opinions are rendered from time to time on legislation affecting public power.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. Report as attorney for Water Project Authority of the State of California. (1) $1,500, the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office

[5] Filed for first quarter 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions, and legislative matters incidental thereto. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telephone, telegraph, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 2873, 3194, 3218, 4152, 4157, 5524, 5901, 5927, 6367, 6419, 6705, 6763, 6935; House Resolution 618; House Joint Resolution 226; S. 912, 2255, 2377, 2473, 2858; Senate Joint Resolution 145.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel for Colorado River Board of California and Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $8,520, representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in legislation and litigation affecting California's interests in the Colorado River. Of this figure $1,500 was paid by the Colorado River Board and $7,020 by the Six Agency Committee. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on: H. R. 2873, 3194, 3218, 3538, 5313, 5776, 5777, 5901, 6367, 6658, 6705, 6717, 6763, 6935; House Resolution 618; House Joint Resolution 226; S. 1987, 2255, 2346, 2392, 2473, 2714, 2858; Senate Joint Resolution 145.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel, department of water and power, city of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $2,400, representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, litigation and legislative matters incidental thereto. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph companies, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telephone, telegraph, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 727, 728, 2873, 3194, 3218, 4989, 5313, 5776, 5901, 6031, 6367, 6658, 6697, 6705, 6717, 6763, 6777, 6935; House Resolution 618; House Joint Resolution 226; S. 1985, 1987, 2346, 2392, 2473, 2858; Senate Joint Resolution 145.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) $2,100 representing legal fees, etc., for services of this office, and in California, in negotiation with the Government departments, litigation, and legislative matters relating thereto. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telephone and telegraph, suppliers of office materials. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telephone, telegraph, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 2001, 2873, 3194, 3218, 5313, 5901, 6658, 6705, 6717, 6763, 6935; House Resolution 618; House Joint Resolution 226; S. 1987, 2346, 2392, 2473, 2714, 2858; Senate Joint Resolution 145.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; as special counsel for Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (1) None. Services as special counsel are loaned by the Water Project Authority of the State of California, which pays a fee of $500 per month. See registration and report under that employment. (2) See No. 1 above. (3) See No. 1 above. (4) None. (5) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 4152, 4157, 5524, 5927, 6705; S. 2377.

Euler, W. A. F., United Zinc Smelting Corp., 50 Union Square, New York, N. Y.; and the Ore & Chemical Corp., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $65 for expenses including train and plane fare, hotel accommodations, meals, entertainment, telephone calls, and other sundry "out-of-pocket" expenses for trip to Washington, April 11–13, inclusive, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6623—Russell bill.

Evans, Mrs. Ruth M., Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,650. (2) Self (salary), expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, and so forth. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Fain, David, Black & Kendall, 1200 Cascade Building, Portland, Oreg.; Anacortes Shipways, Inc., 904 Lewis Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Expended, $37.13. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 6057.

Fairbanks, Joseph, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, Milton Addison Thomas, secretary general, 212 West Highland Avenue, Chesnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) No payments. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2673, a bill to incorporate the Descendants of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Fakler, Herman, 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) I received $5,000 salary and a regular annual bonus of $1,100 as an officer of the Millers' National Federation. I am not employed specifically to engage in activities described in section 307 of title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. During the preceding quarter I devoted approximately 5 days to such activities, which were incidental to my regular employment. My expenditures for these activities total $433.94, for which I have been reimbursed by Millers' National Federation. (2) [Blank.] (3) My expenditures were for taxi fares, meals, and hotel expenses of members of the industry attending congressional hearings. (4) Wrote a letter to the editor of Chicago Journal of Commerce answering a personal attack by a columnist. Letter was published April 7, 1948. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the preceding quarter I attended a hearing on a proposed amendment to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, prepared a letter of information for an industry committee on pending labor legislation, and assisted an industry committee in preparing testimony in opposition to the proposed international wheat agreement.

Farrington, Charles J., National Coal Association, 803 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,627.70, salary and expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lunch, taxi, telephone, telegrams, salary. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting the coal industry.

Farshing, Donald D., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,300 gross salary received, $145.60 expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Farshing, Donald D., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary received $1,950, expenses, $123.20. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Fenning, Karl, National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $709.06, expended none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2860.

Ferguson, Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Taxicabs, telephone calls, telegrams, and lunches, $138.19; general retainer as Washington counsel, United States Building and Loan League (less than half of work is in connection with legislation), $1,750; expense trip to Chicago, $112.05; expense trip to Savannah, $87.51; total, $2,087.75. (2) Taxicab drivers, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., railroads, hotels, and incidental expense. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting building and loan association and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson,[1] H. T., 1 Longdan Street, Madison, Wis.; Wisconsin Power & Light Co., 100 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Received $250 from Wisconsin Power & Light Co. to cover expenses of trip from Madison to Washington, D. C., and return; expended $150; retained $100 for future expenses. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, taxi fares, etc. (3) To cover expenses of trip. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5992, so-called tidewater bill; H. R. 2972, H. R. 2973, re Federal Power Commission.

Ferguson, John H., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery, 8 West Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, April 1–9, 1948, $230.70; travel and transportation expenses, April 1–9, 1948, $50.85. (Services terminated April 9, 1948.) (2) Salary received used for personal expenses, no part of it spent on behalf of the Committee for the Marshall Plan To Aid European Recovery; travel and transportation expenses covered my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Same as (2) above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channels. (5) Legislation to provide for a European recovery program.

Ferguson, John A., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,125 (allocated); expenses, $210.61. (2) Reported as disbursements by Independent Natural Gas Association of America; miscellaneous including taxis, tips, luncheons, etc., $210.61. (3) See (2) above. (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) All legislation pertaining to natural gas.

Ferris, Muriel, League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $185.42 salary every 2 weeks; received and expended carfare to and from the Capitol and travel, $60. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) carfare and travel only. (4) Trends, Member Magazine; publications of the League of Women Voters of the United States. (5) I am employed principally to inform league mem-

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

bers on legislative matters; secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see League Program adopted by national convention, 1948, attached.[2]

Fifer, Russell L.,[7] in care of American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin St., Chicago, Ill. (1) Expended, $1,057.31. (2) To hotels, air lines, etc., for services rendered. (3) Normal business and traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) General farm legislation affecting the butter and dairy industry.

Filer, Harry L., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary $5,300 and expenses $546.05. (2) Hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) Expenses for traveling and as shown in item 2. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Fillius, Maurice W., the National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc., 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received fee of $5,000; reimbursed $6.40 for expenditures made. (2) Various taxicab operators. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5965; activity on this ceased with the passage of the bill.

Fillius, Maurice W., Puerto Rico Rum Institute, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received retaining fee as reported on form B filed January 7, 1947. Engaged in no activities and made no expenditures in quarter ending June 30, 1948, for purpose of influencing legislation. All activity affecting or having any influence on legislation has ceased. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3282 and H. R. 3283; however, all activity on these bills has ceased.

Finkel, William H., Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received nothing from the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits and had no expenses on their behalf. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Crosser Act passed into law July 31, 1946. Please accept this as my last filing inasmuch as I will not actively be engaged in supporting or opposing any type of legislation after June 30, 1948.

Finucane, James, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Compensation at the rate of $3,600 annually. Expenses totaling $93.55. (2) Expenses paid to miscellaneous stores, vendors, and carriers. (3) Books, periodicals, train, and carfare, etc. (4) Peace Action, monthly publication of the NCPW. Daily newspapers carrying NCPW releases. (5) to support an act to repeal the Selective Service Act of 1948, and any other legislation leading to a more peaceful world. To oppose any legislation tending to militarize the United States and bring war.

Fisher, Lewis H., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; and Canal Construction SVC Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z. (1) Receipts from Canal Construction SVC Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z., none; receipts from the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, $300; receipts from Dr. Alexander Renner, native of Hungary, latest residence, Shanghai, China, $50. (2) Various individuals and companies. (3) Taxicabs, $17.25; postage, $10; telephones and telegraphs, $23.50; office help, $95; stationery, $7.50; 25 meals, etc., $60. (4) Annuitant. (5) Support of legislation in the interests of annuitants, potential annuitants, and civil pensioners; support of displaced persons bill, S. 2242.

Fitzpatrick, F. Stuart, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $3,250; expenses, $36.60. Expended: Transportation, $1.60; lunches, $35. (2) Taxi companies and the Statler Hotel. (3) Transportation to and from, and communication with, the Capitol; other necessary normal expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the general fields of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

Fleming, Charles Henry, Coast Guard League, 1011 DuPont Circle Building, 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) Nothing. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting veterans of service in the United States Coast Guard, or any legislation affecting the United States Coast Guard in which the league has a definite interest.

Fleming, Roger W., 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $24.60 expended (from May 17 to June 30, 1948). (See item (6) of form B, filed May 1948.) (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon, conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, farm credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of postwar construction of highways, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department, transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment of Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by Secretary of Agriculture, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, labor extension service, alcohol plants, social security, weed killer, crop insurance, wheat carry-over, international wheat agreement, Parker River project, fiber identification, displaced persons, reciprocal trade agreements, rural electrification, radio, health, housing, standard time, Fair Labor Standards Act, railroad rates, Government corporations.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Approximate average $30 per week expenses. (2) Hotels, meals, and traveling expenses when away from my own home. (3) Above. (4) The Townsend National Weekly. (5) Support a bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Ford, John B., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (1) A fair proportion of my salary chargeable to lobbying purposes is $100 per month—$300 for the quarter. I have not expended or received any other money for lobbying purposes. (2) To me. (3) Compensation for personal services. (4) I caused no articles or editorials to be published. (5) Legislation affecting the American merchant marine, specifically legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (H. J. Res. 377, 398, 412, and 413, and companion bills). Overtime-on-overtime legislation and other legislation affecting shipping.

Ford,[7] Tirey L., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Fort,[7] J. Carter, Association of American Railroads, 922 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For all services rendered to the Association of American Railroads, described in registration Form B, filed December 1946, registrant received salary at the rate shown in such registration and in the supplement thereto filed on January 10, 1948, and received in addition $399.48 as reimbursement for traveling expenses while away from Washington and certain business expenses in Washington such as cab fares, business meals, etc. Of the salary received, $6,535.32 is estimated to be allocable to legislative activities. Of the expenses for which registrant was reimbursed, $194.93 is estimated to be allocable to legislative activities. The legislative activities above referred to include not only activities in support of or in opposition to pending measures but also activities with respect to measures which were neither supported or opposed which registrant was called upon to consider, analyze, etc. The legislative activities as shown above include appearances before congressional committees, preparation for such appearances, etc. (2) The expenses above shown were paid to the Netherlands-Plaza, Cincinnati, Ohio; Chicago Club, Chicago, Ill.; Waldorf-Astoria, New York, N. Y.; various restaurants, taxis, etc. (3) Traveling expenses while away from Washington and such expenses in Washington as business meals, taxis, etc. (4) None. (5) Generally to support all legislation in the interests of the railroads and of a sound national transportation policy and to oppose all legislation contrary to the interests of the railroads and to a sound national transportation policy. Bills supported during the second quarter of 1948 included S. 110, S. 1567, S. 2041, S. 2782, H. R. 221, H. R. 1639, H. R. 5711, H. R. 6766. Bills opposed included S. 2062, S. 2437, S. 2438, H. R. 4092, H. R. 5875, H. R. 5988, H. R. 5993, House Joint Resolution 412, House Joint Resolution 413.

Fort,[7] Josiah, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Tobacco Association of United States, Greenville, N. C. (1) Expenses: Salary, $2,500; stenographer, $700; rent, $225; travel, $463.04; entertainment, $76.03; office expenses, $429.71; total, $4,393.78. (2) Receipted bills available for inspection. (3) See (1) above. (4) [Blank]. (5) To assist in getting fair consideration for American leaf tobacco in connection with aid programs, for delivery through private trade channels.

Foster,[5] Charles E., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) At $339.25—salary for January, February, March 1948, $1,017.75 (after withholding and social-security tax); incidental expenses, January, February, and March, $24.15; travel expense, $42.94. (2) Charles E. Foster. (3) Salary, incidental expenses, travel expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to disabled veterans, their families, and the dependents of deceased veterans.

Foster,[6] Charles E., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, June, 1948 $1,021.95 (after withholding and social security tax); incidental expenses, $32.10. (2) Charles E. Foster. (3) Salary, incidental

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to disabled veterans, their families, and the dependents of deceased veterans.

Fox, O. J., Welfare Federation Act Committee of One Thousand, Post Office Box 916, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) No activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Francis,[4] Joseph H., Morgan, Utah. (1) Five thousand eight hundred and ninety-two dollars and eighty-nine cents received from National Board of Fur Farm Organizations. (2) Three thousand dollars represents salary for acting as executive secretary of organization, April, May, June 1948; $2,892.89 personal expenses, April, May, June 1948. (3) Personal expenses as shown under item 2, included transportation; hotel and meals; telephone; telegraph and minor personal miscellaneous expenses. (4) American Fur Breeder, National Fur News, Fur Journal and Black Fox magazine. (5) Any and all legislation affecting the fur farming industry of the United States.

Franklin,[3] L. S., box 94, route 7, Greensboro, N. C.; National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 94, Route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Received $405 for April, May, and June 1948; paid out $405. (2) L. S. Franklin, salary, $375; stamps and mailing costs, $30; total, $405. (3) Tax reform. (4) None. (5) Reform for taxation.

Fredrickson, Fred J., Valley City, N. Dak.; North Dakota Resources Board, 311 North Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak., and State Water Conservation Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (1) Quarterly salary for April, May, and June 1948, before deductions for withholding and social-security taxes, $1,350; and reimbursed expenses for the same period, $1,900.76. Only a small part of these items was for legislative work. (2) Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C., and other hotels and eating establishments; railroad, air-line, telephone and telegraph companies; taxicabs and busses; mimeographers, lithographers, and office suppliers; post office and express company. Only a small part of these items was for legislative work. (3) Lodging and office space, meals, transportation, communications, mimeographing, office supplies, postage and express. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting irrigation, reclamation, water conservation, flood control, land and mineral development and utilization in North Dakota, and allied legislation.

Freeman, Milton V., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Silver Rod Sales Co., Inc., 660 Newark Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.; Ace Mail Order Co., East Orange, N. J.; Black Cigar Store, Newark, N. J.; Globe Mail Order Co., Jersey City, N. J. (1) $2,500 received on account of legal fees. (For other funds received see attached letter[3] to Clerk of the House of Representatives.) (2) [Blank.] (3) Telephone, telegraph, railroad, taxi fares, and other actual expenses have been advanced by the firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter in the amount of $459.70 and will be charged to and paid by the clients named above. (4) None. (5) Oppose H. R. 5645.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) April, $129.80; May, $173.45; June, $714.15. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Entertainment and transportation. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Fyffe & Clarke (David R. Clarke, John Harrington, Albert J. Smith), Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Gaither, H. Rowan, Jr., 333 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., a copartnership, 822 Mills Building, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received from Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co. for preceding calendar quarter the sum of $310, which was paid to firm of Cooley, Crowley & Gaither, of which registrant is a partner. (2) No expenditures. (3) For legal services rendered in preparation of statement and accumulation of evidence in support of legislation mentioned in paragraph 5. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6253.

Galvin, M. J., 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.; Minnesota Railroads, St. Paul, Minn. (1) None. (All of the undersigned's clients as listed on his registration have paid the expenses reported herein, and the undersigned's salary, on the ratio of the mileage which they have within the State of Minnesota; amount paid is the same as that expended.) (2) March 30 to April 3, 1948, inclusive, St. Paul Union Depot, St. Paul, Minn., railroad transportation, $29.68; Carleton Hotel, Washington, D. C., $92.21; Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., $25.50. May 4 to May 6, 1948, inclusive, Northwest Airlines, Minneapolis, Minn., transportation, $113.45; and Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., $11.40; total, $272.24. (3) Board and room, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads, such as Bulwinkle bill, etc.

Gammons, Earl H., Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $250. (2) Restaurants, hotels, and incidental expenses. (3) Entertainment and out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Gardiner, Elizabeth G., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated June 15, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Garstang, Marion R., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $15.45. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Gavitt, Frank, Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) We have been retained as public relations counsel for Schenley Distillers Corp. for more than 8 years, at a fixed fee of $3,000 per month, plus disbursements. The fee received for the period covered by this report amounts to $9,000. While this fee includes payment for all lobbying activities, it is the identical amount that would have been paid and received if no lobbying activities had been performed. Salaries of employees of Carl Byoir and Associates working full time on general public relations for Schenley Distillers Corp., including work on legislative matters, $5,013.20. Charges of specialty departments of Carl Byoir and Associates for time devoted to work done on Schenley account, $346.50. Expenses for typing, mimeographing, and mailing of material opposing limitation of grain to distillers, and opposing changes in control of liquor advertising, $55. (2) Salaries and bills payable as indicated in (1) above. (3) Reimbursement of expenses incurred as indicated above, in opposing limitation of grain to distillers, and opposing changes in control of liquor advertising. (4) Newspaper articles were distributed during the period covered by this report to approximately 300 daily and weekly newspapers in the United States. (5) Incidental to our engagement as public relations counsel for Schenley Distillers Corp., we worked with Schenley in opposing limitation of grain to distillers, and in opposing changes in control of liquor advertising.

Geary, Paul M., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenses incurred and no money received other than salary originally reported on Form B, filed May 22, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Geaslin, Bon,[5] 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. (1) No expenditures made during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

Geaslin, Bon,[6] 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. (1) No expenditures made during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

Gebhard, Mrs. Paul, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Presbyterian Church, United States of America, division of social education and action, board of Christian education, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Personal expenses refunded: Travel, $197.04; lodging, $57.58; food, $63.65; total expenses, $318.27. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine; special bulletins. (5) Same as (3).

George, Leo E., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW. (1) Salary, April, May, June 1948, $2,499.99; legislative expenses, April, May, June 1948, $450; travel and organization expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $1,033.50. (2) The travel and organization expenses referred to in (1) above were a reimbursement for actual expenses for transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental minor expenses. (3) See above. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve the civil-service retirement system; improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Gerrity, Harry J., 1001 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.; Oregon-Washington Bridge Co., Olympia, Wash. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 569 and S. 570.

Giddings, Ernest, assistant director, legislative-Federal relations division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,318, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $263.60; expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Gilbert, C. C., Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $1,500 salary as secretary Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation as affects industry generally.

Gilliam, A. W., 727 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; American Meat Institute. (1) Received salary of $2,200 from American

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Meat Institute. Expenses attributable to legislative work, $24.75. (2) Restaurants, taxicabs, telephones. (3) Meals, transportation. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry.

Glazier, William, room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $1,105.02; expenses, $411.91. (2) Expenses include those in Washington as well as air transportation and living expenses while out of town. (3) See (2). (4) The Dispatcher, publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and longshoremen and warehousemen specifically; oppose undemocratic legislation.

Glazier, William, room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No salary or personal expenses, $300 or $100 per month received toward cost of office operations. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The Voice, publication of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and maritime workers specifically; oppose all undemocratic legislation.

Goddard,[5] Livingston, Federation for Railway Progress, 2412 Terminal Tower. (1) Salary, $327.77; expenses, $88.67. (2) Travel expenses in the amount of $88.67 paid to various railroads, hotels, etc. (3) Travel expenses, exclusive of any legislative activity. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Goddard[6] Livingston, 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $833.31; expenses, $64.48. (2) For various hotels, railroads, etc. (3) For traveling expenses. (4) Railway progress, volume II, No. 3, May 1948. (5) None.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received. Only expenditures were $21.60 for mimeographing, $42.65 for printing, and incidental expenses for long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and taxis. (2) Batt, Bates & Co., Washington, D. C., for mimeographing; Kirby Lithographing Co., Washington, D. C., for printing, telephone companies, telegraph companies, and taxicabs. (3) See (1). (4) The Journal of Accountancy and the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Advancing the interests of the accounting profession in reference to H. R. 2657 and H. R. 3214.

Goss, Bert C., 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hill & Knowlton, Inc.; 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received no money other than salary as vice president of Hill & Knowlton, plus essential travel and entertainment expenses. I estimate that of my travel and entertainment expenses for the 3 months ended June 30, 1948, less than $100 was expended for purposes that might be interpreted as indirectly influencing legislation. (2) Paid to taxicabs and restaurants. (3) For travel to and from the Capitol, for luncheons, and dinners for committee personnel and Congressmen, etc., (4) Have no record of such publication. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose legislation. Interested in legislation affecting aviation, in proposals to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine, and in other legislation affecting interests of clients of Hill & Knowlton.

Gourley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; American Osteopathic Association, 139 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $3,000 retainer. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4.) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Gray, David G., post office box 2180, Houston, Tex.; (H. O. & R. Co.). (1) Of my total salary $750 might be considered applicable to services in connection with consultations with reference to legislation. (2) Expenses April 1 to June 30, 1948, inclusive; Shoreham Hotel, $1,108.50; taxi fares, $78. (3) Living, communication, transportation expenses. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. My duty was to watch the program of legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Green, Abner,[7] American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Immigration and naturalization.

Green, Angus, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; (1) Receipts: $1,668.99 salary, plus $1,165.57, reimbursement of the expenditures referred to in Nos. (2) and (3) below. (2) Transportation and communications services, post office, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Travel, living and business expenses connected with employment. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting shipping industry which concerns employer.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building; Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, post office box 2450, Honolulu, Hawaii. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation. I appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee in favor of H. R. 5174. I also favored H. R. 49 before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the second quarter of 1948.

Greenman, Shea, Lane, Sandomire & Zimet, 46 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y.; Ion Stanescu, Volney Hotel, New York, N. Y. (1) $105.40 in reimbursement of actual expenses for travel and telephone calls incident to proposed legislation and other matters relating to the status of Mr. and Mrs. Stanescue as aliens. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) S. 2512 (H. R. 6353), private bill authorizing Ion Stanescu and his wife, Catherina, Rumanian subjects, to remain in the United States notwithstanding the immigration laws.

Greenwood, Joseph R.,[5] 1029 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Greenwood, Joseph R.[6] room 1102, 1029 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Sea-Air Legislative Committee, received $500; expended, none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Griffiths, Dr. H. M., National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Received, salary, $1,900. (2) Expenses, one trip to Washington, $50.50. (3) Travel, hotel, and meals. (4) National Economic Council Action Report. (5) Labor Extension Service bill.

Grimes, Weston B., 436 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Received (includes office, travel, and general expenses totaling $2,065.30), $5,390.29; expended (for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act), $5. (2) Taxicabs, $5. (3) Taxicabs to and from the Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation concerning commodity exchanges, international commodity agreements, exports and imports, taxes, and regulation of business generally.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Grinberg,[7] P. Irving, Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Jeweler, Jewelers' Circular-Keystone, Jewelry, Jewelers' Outlook, Jewelers' Newsletter, Executive Jeweler, ANRJA Bulletin, NACJ Bulletin, Mid-Continent Jeweler, Northwestern Jeweler, Southern Jeweler, Pacific Goldsmith, Trader & Canadian Jeweler, Manufacturing Jeweler. (5) Interested in securing relief from excise taxes as applied to jewelry.

Grosscup, Ambler & Stephan,[7] 711 Central Building, Seattle, Wash.; Alaska Transportation Co., Pier 57, Seattle, Wash. (1) Firm received a fee of $650 for professional services in connection with various conferences concerning legislation affecting Alaska shipping. These conferences subsequently resulted in the introduction and enactment of bills in the House and Senate identified as House Joint Resolution 396 and Senate Joint Resolution 219. (2) Expenses totaling $440.23 were not segregated because they were billed with separate charges for other legal work in Washington before the United States Maritime Commission. (3) Expenses covered hotel, meals, taxis, phone calls, and incidentals, and embraced a period from February 20, 1948, through March 13, 1948. (4) None. (5) None.

Haas, Frank E., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as per original registration and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of $1,373.84. (2) Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C.; the Pullman Co.; to various restaurants, taxicab companies, and to various others in nominal amounts. (3) To Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., $376.20; to Pullman Co. for Pullman space, $131.64; to various taxicab and bus companies, etc., for local transportation, $128.90; to various restaurants for meals, $522.65; for postage, telephone, stenographic services, and miscellaneous expense, $214.45. (4) None. (5) Any legislation of mutual interest to class I railroads operating in the western district and their employees.

Haas, Herbert A., Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $559.40 from the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits for expenses incurred during April, May, and June of 1948. (2) Money received spent for hotels, cab fares, entertainment and meals, and train fare on various trips to Washington, D. C., and other points. (3) Necessary expenses while engaged in seeking corrective legislation to H. R. 1362, passed into law July 31, 1946. (4) None. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1948.

Haddock, Hoyt S., CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No portion of time or money expended on legislative activities during quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) To support legislation in interest of seamen; to oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Hadley, Harlan V., 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None, other than one-quarter of the annual compensation of $2,500 as set forth in supplemental registration (Form B) filed April 9, 1948, and miscellaneous expenses not to exceed $12. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Federal tax (excise) legislation, materials control legislation, and such other legislation as the association may hereafter from time to time indicate.

Haines, Samuel P., 4407 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; 20 Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, 171 West Randolph Street,

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $25,000; expended, $13,969.79. (2) Various. (3) Office staff and office expenses. (4) None. (5) Reduction or repeal of the 20-percent excise tax applying to dine and dance rooms of hotels.

Hale, William C., Tennessee Eastman Corp., Kingsport, Tenn. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Revisions in the Tariff Act, draw-back regulation.

Hallbeck, E. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW. (1) Salary, April, May, June, 1948, $1,999.98; legislative expenses, April, May, June, 1948, $1,008.71; travel expenses (transportation), $61.42. (2) Incidental expenses, meals, streetcar, taxi, etc., $550.65; joint Senate and House recording facility, $192; travel and incidental expenses of Mrs. Stewart Robinson, Belleville, Ill., vice president Woman's Auxiliary, NFPOC, $175; meals, hotels, and incidental expenses attending meetings at Atlantic City, N. J., Waterbury, Conn., and Cleveland, Ohio, $88.03; American Railway Express Co., $3.03. (3) Travel and incidental expenses, expenses attending meetings, and incidental expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended for transportation, hotels, meals, and minor incidental expenses. Joint Senate and House recording facility, copies of radio transcriptions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the civil-service retirement system; improve the hours, wages, and conditions of post-office clerks; and to improve the postal service.

Hamlet, Harry G., Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $600. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Corps, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $425; expenses, $280. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below, of the convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially and (b) the opinion of the national board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social and economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harris, Winder R., room 203, 1039 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $313.71; expended $313.71. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Not employed for this purpose principally, but took interest in H. R. 5653, H. R. 377, H. R. 398, House Joint Resolution 412, House Joint Resolution 413, S. 2696, S. 2649, and H. R. 6829, all dealing with merchant marine.

Hart, Merwin K., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) For expenses that are or might be allocable to lobbying activities, $165.35; salary, $1,666.66. (2) Pennsylvania and Baltimore and Ohio Railroads, Willard Hotel, one or more restaurants in Washington and Philadelphia, taxi drivers and miscellaneous. (3) Trips to Washington to keep informed on legislative matters and to Philadelphia to appear before resolution committee of the Republican National Convention, etc. (4) Economic Council letters, issued semimonthly. (5) Legislation for Federal aid to education, Immigration, FEPC, ITO, and public housing.

Hart, Stephen H., 350 Equitable Building, National Livestock Tax Committee, Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) During the quarter the National Livestock Tax Committee paid to me a per diem of $50 for office work and $100 out of town for actual time spent in study, advice, conferences, and correspondence concerning general livestock tax questions including the analysis of the present provisions of Internal Revenue Code and current rulings and decisions concerning Federal taxation of livestock operators. Such activities also included work in connection with proposal of the National Livestock Tax Committee to amend the Internal Revenue Code, recognizing capital gains in sale of breeding livestock and permitting deduction of ordinary recurring ranching expenditures. It is impossible to determine what part of my services related to this problem, but it is my opinion that only a portion of my activity during the preceding quarter could be interpreted as lobbying. During the quarter a total of $1,090 for legal services was paid to me for all my activities and services. I was also reimbursed $407.83 for out-of-town pocket expenses, chiefly traveling expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.]. (4) [Blank.]

Harter, Dow W., 412–14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (1) Receive annual retainer from The B. F. Goodrich Co. for all services as its Washington counsel. Allocation of amount paid for my services between legal and legislative activities is not feasible. Amount received during second quarter of 1948, $1,875. In addition, receive reimbursement for long-distance telephone, travel, taxicab fares, and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co. is interested in legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of synthetic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes. It is interested in various proposals now under study by Congress for a long-range rubber program for this country. It is also interested in the repeal of the present excise taxes on tires and tubes and in other legislative proposals which come before Congress from time to time.

Hawes, Robert N., 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.; Grays Harbor Industries, Inc., Aberdeen, Wash. (1) From Grays Harbor Industries, Inc., $1,666.66 retainer; expenses, $76.49. (2) Joseph T. King, associate, $200; Clements-Pearsons (cocktail party), $150; out-of-pocket, $256.71. (3) Joseph T. King, associate, $200; Clements-Pearsons (cocktail party) $150; taxis, restaurants, telephone, telegraph, and stenographic, $256.71. (4) None. (5) Reference to Olympic National Park.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,800 salary, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $303.06 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, airlines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $250 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $45.92 incidental expenses for months of April, May, and June 1948. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) $45.92 incidental expenses for months of April, May, and June 1948, taxi, carfare, phone calls, meals. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Hayes, William E., Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Co., La Salle Street Station, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as reported in registration; expenses amounting to $850.65. (2) Traveling expenses, hotels, clubs, taxis, telephone, and telegraph, etc. (2) Necessary out-of-pocket expenses in connection with registrants employment. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting registrant's railroad.

Hays, Joseph H., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary as per original registration and reimbursement of expenses in the amount of $1,517.90. (2) Mayflower and Shoreham Hotels, Washington, D. C.; the Pullman Co.; to various taxicab companies, restaurants, hotels, and to various others in nominal amounts. (3) To Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., $283.45; to Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., $116.26; to Pullman Co., pullman space, $164.29; to various cab and bus companies, etc., for local transportation, $134.20; to telephone and telegraph, $168.25; to various restaurants, hotels, etc., for meals, $460.71; for postage, stenographic services, stationery supplies, and miscellaneous expense, $190.74. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting class I railroads operating in the western district.

Hays, William J., 4863 Potomac Avenue NW.; United Public Workers of America, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $875. (2) All money received was for personal salary. (3) Same as (2). (4) None. (5) H. R. 5524.

Hazen, John C., 1008 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Meals, $250.35; hotel, $38.99; taxis, $56; transportation, rail-plane, $71.94; miscellaneous, $18.60; incidental, photograph, $17.50. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The special bulletin of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, published weekly. (5) H. R. 6087, optometry bill, opposed; S. 1388, fur bill, opposed.

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G Street NW, Washington, D. C.; Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $800 per month, which is paid for all services rendered, only a part of which concerns legislation; out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $181.55. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Without salary. Received $53.13 for traveling expense, entertainment, etc.; expended, $53.13. (2) Various. (3) Railroad fare, miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management.

(5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriations for United States Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education.

Heiney, Robert B., National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,625 as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary of association for all work performed; $96.10 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses, $96.10. (3) See above. (4) National Canners Information Letter. (5) Opposing marketing orders on commodities for canning; supporting S. 2386, H. R. 6050, and S. 2409.

Henderson, Elmer W., National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F. Street NW., room 901, Washington, D. C. (1) Travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, $558.85; salary April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, $1,185.40. (2) [Blank.] (3) For travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, $558.85; salary after tax deductions, $1,185.40. (4) [Blank.] (5) Permanent fair-employment legislation, Senate bill 984 and House bill 2824.

Henderson, Joseph D., American Association of Small Business, 602 Carondelet Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary of $1,500 (based on $6,000 per year) received this quarter from the American Association of Small Business. No money expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Small Business Review, official monthly publication of the American Association of Small Business; routine news releases to newspapers and radio stations. (5) To support legislation favorable to small business; to oppose legislation unfavorable to small business, standing always for that which is right for the country and the will of the majority.

Henney, Elizabeth C., 702 Albee Building, Fifteenth and G Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; John J. O'Connor (for National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis), 423 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $975. (2) [Blank.] (3) Received a retainer from National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. (4) [Blank.] (5) To watch legislation on infantile paralysis.

Hensel, Robert E., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $25.68 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85 percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Herndon, Maurice G., 1001–1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Herrmann, Louis F., The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $1.40. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxi fares. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation which may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Hess,[6] [7] Amiel Edgerton, Oil-Heat Institute of America, Inc., 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

[6] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Hess,[6] [7] Amiel Edgerton, Oil-Heat Institute of America, Inc., 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Hester, Ewart A., the law offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: April, May, and June, $2,500. Expenses for quarter: Transportation, telephone, telegraph, and miscellaneous expenses estimated at $502. Purchase of copies of hearings on H. R. 6808, $135. (2) Alderson Reporting Service, Western Union Telegraph Co., Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) Transportation, telephone, telegraph, miscellaneous, and for the purchase of copies of hearings. See (1). (4) None. (5) See supplementary statement paragraph 2 attached to Form B filed by me January 9, 1943. H. R. 6356. H. R. 6808, H. R. 6162, H. R. 6248, H. R. 6263, H. R. 6632, S. 265, S. 2352, S. 2365, S. 2318.

Hewes & Awalt, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, and Maxwell M. Merritt, 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn.; 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) This registrant received no money or other compensation from the Life Insurance Association of America during the calendar quarter ended June 30, 1948. This registrant made $122.07 out-of-pocket expenditures during the calendar quarter ended June 30, 1948, in connection with its employment by the above-named association for which registrant has not received reimbursement. (2) Various. (3) Expenses for transportation, communication, and other purposes, as listed in the attached statement. (4) None. (5) Any revision of Internal Revenue Code affecting life insurance and annuities.

Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C.; see attached statement.[5] (1) See attached statement.[5] (2) See attached statement.[5] (3) See attached statement.[5] (3) Distributed publicity material, but did not cause any articles to be published. (5) See attached statement.[5]

Hinders, Justin, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) June 21 to June 30, 1948. Received $124 salary; no expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Attached list[5] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Hines, Lewis G., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080. Expenses for April 1948, 038.90; May, $53; June, $49.80; total for 3 months, $141.70. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company, when not at office, and other incidentals. (3) As shown in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Hinkson,[7] Ralph H., PER, Inc., 3405 Milton Avenue, Dallas, Tex. (1) None; registration now in process; no previous lobbying activity. (2) None; see (1) above. (3) None; see (1) above. (4) None; see (1) above. (5) To support legislative action to effect dispersement of military purchases, manufacture, and research and development to that area of the United States least vulnerable to attack; to support legislation which will provide for a portion of all military expenditures to be spent in the South and Southwest, competitive bidding requirements of existing law notwithstanding.

Hinman, Ray C., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary (this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act), $1,250; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $332.62; total, $1,582.62. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $332.62. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Hoffmaster, John E., 2203 South Bonsall Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) A total of $448 was received from the Philadelphia Depot Employees Development Association. (2) $204 retained by undersigned as personal compensation at $17 per day; $244 paid by undersigned for railroad fare, meals, hotel room, taxi fare, telephone calls and telegrams, service charges, and tips. (3) For personal compensation and personal living expenses as set forth above. (4) None. (5) To oppose H. R. 512 and S. 286, providing for establishment of quartermaster research and development laboratories at Boston, Mass.

Hollister,[7] R. F., Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received, salary, $1,800; money expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Holloway, William J., 2816 First National Building; Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., and Sante Fe Railway Co., Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.: Attorney's fees, $2,475; expenses, $1,233; Santa Fe Railway Co.: attorney's fees, $3,100; expenses, $2,038.50. (2) William J. Holloway. (3) Attorney's fees and necessary expenses for travel, hotel bills, meals, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Jennings venue bill, Santa Fe Railway Co.; Interior Department appropriation bill, Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. (NOTE.—Have earned other fees but same not yet collected.)

Holman, Charles W., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $431.86. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that affects milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Holmes, George T., Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Hood, J. M., president, the American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received from the American Short Line Railroad Association, $4,125. Expenses incurred for account of the American Short Line Railroad Association and for which reimbursement has been or will be made, $768.23. Impossible to accurately allocate either salary or expenses, but carefully calculated estimate is that 5 percent of salary, $206.25, and 10 percent of expenses, $76.82, total, 283.07, expended for purpose of influencing legislation. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, clubs, transportation, and communication companies. (3) For travel and entertainment in connection with the furtherance of the legislative program of the 310 common carriers by rail members of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting member lines of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (See text of legislative program attached to prior return of that association.)

[5] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Hocks, Homer E., Canners League of Florida, post-office box 1567, Lakeland, Fla. (1) Received, total salary for quarter, $1,500; expended, $52.44 for telephone and telegraph. (2) Homer E. Hooks; Western Union Telegraph Co.; Peninsular Telephone Co. (3) To further league's opposition to two pieces of pending legislation. (4) Winter Haven Chief, Florida Times Union, Fort Pierce News-Tribune, Lakeland Ledger, Bradenton Herald, Tampa Morning Tribune. (5) S. 2173 and H. R. 5688. (NOTE.—Adjournment of Congress on June 20, 1948, terminated our activities with regard to these bills, subject to resumption if a special session of the 80th Cong. is called.)

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle 4, Wash.; Libby, McNeill & Libby Food Products, Chicago, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kodiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (1) Received: None. Expended: $2.19. (2) Western Union. (3) Telegrams. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of Interior, relating to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Hosking, Floyd J., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1.03 as miscellaneous expenses. (2) Christabel Hill, notary public, $1; postage, 3 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report, postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Howard, Paul, American Library Association, national relations office, 1709 M Street NW.; The American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $6,042.75; expended, $4,892.55. (2) Various. (3) Operation of office; not more than one-third of expenditures applicable to legislative activity. (4) ALA Bulletin, Library Journal, San Antonio Express, New York Times, and any other newspaper who use our releases; since we do not subscribe to a clipping service, we do not know who they are. (5) Any legislation affecting American Library Association members and/or the library profession.

Howard,[4] S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa. (1) Received salary of $1,162.50 for the second quarter of 1948 and had expenses of $617.60 for this quarter. (2) Hamilton Hotel, various restaurants, taxicabs, streetcar and pullman fares. (3) Lodging, meals, and transportation. (4) None. (5) All legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular. Working in behalf of proposed laws to amend the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Act.

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $1,500 as salary, and $561.56 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various, see answer to question (3). (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof; my primary function as to legislation is to report status, prospects, etc., to my employer, the American Institute of Laundering. See, also, letter attached to registration Form B, which is made a part hereof.

Howrey, Edward F., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 914 Eleventh Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 914 Eleventh Street SE., Washington, D. C.; fee, none this quarter; expenses, $38.25. (2) Telephone company, $21.75; taxis, $3.80; notary fees, $1; three photostatic copies of almond growers' petition to President, $11.70; total, $38.25. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) Proposals affecting peanuts and tree nuts, particularly those placing limitations and restrictions on importation of nuts.

Huff,[4 14] George B., secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Commission, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none. Money received for reimbursement of actual travel expenses, $142.50. (2) American Airlines, Pennsylvania Railroad, Hotel Statler, taxicab operators. (3) Procurement of travel, housing, and subsistence. (4) The Seymour Daily Tribune and the Brownstown Banner. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Huff,[4 5] George B., secretary, The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual expenses, $48; (2) American Airlines, Hotel Statler, taxicab operators, various filling stations and restaurants. (3) Procurement of housing, travel, and subsistence. (4) Seymour Daily Tribune and Rensselaer Republican. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Huff,[4] George B., secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual travel expenses, $67.43. (2) American Airlines, Hotel Statler, taxicab operators, various filling stations and restaurants. (3) Procurement of travel, housing, and subsistence. (4) None. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Huff, W. T., 806 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D. C.; Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., 101 West Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) $240.55. (2) Taxicabs, restaurants, telephone, and telegraph, Government Printing Office. (3) To attend meetings of Congress and its committees and obtain reports thereof. (4) None. (5) To support the program of the Presidential Air Policy Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board for the advancement of aviation.

Huntress, Carroll B., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.; National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y., acting as chairman for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference without compensation and for reimbursement of expenses. (2) Railroads, hotels, $461.50; New York Telephone Co., Western Union, $22.72; United States Post Office, $12.50. (3) To carry on duties as chairman. [Blank.] (5) Senate Joint Resolution 111; House Joint Resolution 192.

Hushing, W. C., chairman, national legislative committee, American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080; expenses for April 1948, 043.40; May, $31.10; June, $33.20; total for 3 months, $107.70. (2) Taxi driver, phone company (away from office), messengers, and incidentals. (3) As shown in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Hutson,[7] John B., Suite 719, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Tobacco Associates, Inc., Raleigh, N. C. (1) Salary at the rate previously reported on Form B, which registrant filed as a matter of information to the Congress, although of the opinion that he does not come within the purview of the act (Public, No. 601, 79th Cong.). (2) None. (3) None. (4) None.. (5) None.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See schedule A[2] for all money received during preceding calendar quarter and attachment[2] for allocated expenditures. (2) See attachment.[2] (3) See attachment.[2] (4) Regular association publications. (5) Natural Gas Act; general duty to keep the industry informed of any matters which affect it.

Ingles, William, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies. (1) Receipts: Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., $900; American Mining Congress, $900; J. I. Case Co., $900; the Falk Corp., $900; Foremen's League for Education and Associates, $1,800; Inland Steel Co., $900; National Association of Electric Companies, $5,000. Expenditures: Office salaries, $750; lunches, taxi fares, and incidentals (No individual expenses exceeding $10) $360; office rent, $330; telephone, $205.59; office services, supplies, and general expenses, $99.22; traveling expenses, $229.58. (2) See (1) above. (3) Normal office operating expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Ishikawa, Isamu Samuel, 49 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed April 1, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Jackson, Boyd J., Klamath Tribe of Indians of Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) Received salary of $10 per day and per diem of $6 per day from April 1 to June 11, 1948, while serving as official delegate of the Klamath Tribe. Expenditures covered living expenses in Washington, transportation, and small amounts for telegraph. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2502 and H. R. 2775; opposing S. 1222, S. 1210, H. R. 1113, and H. R. 4725.

Jackson, Charles E., general manager, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 228 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) 80 cents; taxicabs to Capitol to attend hearings on Hope bill. (2) Taxicab operators. (3) Transportation to Capitol. (4) None. (5) Attended public hearing on H. R. 6054.

Jackson, Robert C., 1406 G Street NW., National Cotton Council of America, 1406 G Street NW. (1) In addition to regular salary from National Cotton Council as reported on Form B, received expense reimbursements amounting $91.30 that might be considered as relating to legislative activity. (2) Meals for guests, $13.65; taxi fares, $63.30; phone calls, $14.35. (3) Luncheon conferences, transportation, and communications. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During past quarter have supported efforts to repeal taxes and license fees on margarine; supported certain appropriation items for USDA and Bureau of Census; supported appropriation for European recovery program; supported S. 2376, to provide a revolving fund for purchase of agricultural commodities for processing in occupied countries.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[14] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Jackson, Thomas J., elected by Retired Officers League, 1424 K Street NW. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. With this I witdraw my registration. (5) When requested may testify concerning veterans' legislation.

Jhung, Walter, post office box 1706, Washington, D. C.; Korean-American Trading Co., 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (1) April, May, and June monthly salaries of $333.33 received as employee of Korean-American Trading Co., as its public-relations manager; expended, $504.24. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) S. 152 and H. R. 860 (superseded by H. R. 2932) for immigration quota for Koreans and extend them naturalization privileges.

Jobe, William T., National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Employed on a full-time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,800 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the past calendar quarter of 1948 and nothing more. Pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) None. (3) None. (4) No. (5) None.

Johnson, Curtis E., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated June 25, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Johnson, Elmer, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The sum of $416.20 was received during the second quarter of 1948. (2) None. (3) Fee of $100 per month; $116.30 to cover transportation, meals, etc. (4) The annuitant. (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal retirement system.

Johnson, Gilbert R., 874 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Pro rata of annual retainer as legal counsel as set forth in my letter of April 9, 1948, amending initial registration dated January 10, 1947, and reimbursement of traveling expenses amounting to $116.46. (2) Retainer to self; expenses incurred in connection with travel. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) During this quarter I have given attention to legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping as part of my work as legal counsel for Lake Carriers' Association. I do not consider that I am engaged for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation and this report is made without prejudice to that position.

Johnson, James G., Jr., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Graves, Kizer & Graves, Old National Bank Building, Spokane, Wash. (1) Receipts, none. Expenditures: Notary fee, $2; Western Union, $4.87; telephone tolls, $34.11; publications, $1.78; mimeographing, $18; total, $60.76. (2) Telephone company (tolls); Congressional Intelligence (publications); Virginia Bowman, Bowen Building (mimeographing); Western Union (telegrams); notary public (notarization. (3) To obtain and furnish Members of the Congress and of the interested executive departments with information relating to the proposed legislation in question. (4) None. (5) S. 2105 and H. R. 6535.

Johnson, Vernon A., Lockheed Aircraft Corp., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (1) Total received was $3,448.48, all from the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. Of this, $2,750.02 was received as salary. The balance of $698.46 was received for expenses, itemized as follows: $13.02 for auto mileage; $61.85 for taxi and bus fares; $16.31 for telephone calls; $443.15 for entertainment; $50.02 for hotel room rent; $56.12 for travel tickets; and $57.99 for meals. (2) Expense items paid to various taxis, telephone company, restaurants, hotels, travel carriers, etc. (3) Paid in normal course of business travel and business relationships. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) January 1948 annual compensation of $8,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Johnson, Walter R., National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $4,000; expenses, $384.50 for April; $450.30 for May; $815.72 for June. (2) Registrant. (3) Transportation, $373.52; meals for self and guests, $1,207; miscellaneous, $70. (4) None. (5) To confirm and establish titles in States to land beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

Jones, Bascom F.,[5] Tennessee Railroad Association, 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn., Tennessee Railroad Association. (1) During the quarter I have neither received nor expended any money in connection with Federal legislation and have caused no articles or editorials to be included in any publication. While I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, I spent a total of 2 days in Washington during said quarter for the purpose of discussing with Tennessee Representatives (two) the merits of proposed legislation embodied in H. R. 5711. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Jones, Bascom F.,[6] 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn.; Tennessee Railroad Association. (1) During the quarter I have neither received nor expended any money in connection with Federal legislation and have caused no articles or editorials to be included in any publication. While I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, I spent a total of 8 days in Washington during said quarter for the purpose of discussing with Senators and Representatives the merits of proposed legislation embodied in S. 110. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Salary, $2,100; expenses, $2,886.48; total, $4,986.48. (2) [Blank.] (3) The above paid to J. M. Jones as secretary of the National Wool Growers Association for duties in connection with association work. All expense included for all the work in Washington, whether in connection with legislative work or not. (4) The National Wool Grower, coeditor, J. M. Jones. (5) Supported long-range agricultural program; Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act; various and sundry land bills; various and sundry appropriation bills; and any other legislation affecting the sheep industry.

Jones, L. Dan, Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act, $21.85. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) I'm not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Jones, Lyle W., 1737 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Small Business Men's Association, Akron, Ohio. (1) $600 monthly salary less withholding tax and social-security tax; $125 personal expenses during April, May, June, 1948. (2) Lyle W. Jones. (3) Luncheons, taxicabs, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) Pulling Together, monthly bulletin, national Small Businessmen Association. (5) [Blank.]

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported in Form B heretofore filed pursuant to act; expenses reimbursed by employer $215.90. (2) Various taxicab companies; restaurants, hotels, other service establishments. (3) Administrative expenses, transportation, meals, gratuities. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

Kane, John E., District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $478.61 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee. The sum of $478.61 expended on behalf of committee during quarter (detail in schedule A attached).[5] (2) See schedule A attached.[5] (3) See schedule A attached.[5] (4 None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Keehn, Thomas B., 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Church, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,145.86, salary, $236.33 expense. (2) Money paid to self for salary and expenses such as railroad fare, food, taxis. (3) To cover living expenses and special expenses allowable within expense account. (4) Washington report, intercollegian. (5) Same as material filed October 1946. Interested especially in European recovery program, displaced persons legislation, housing, Federal aid to education. More time spent on education of constituents than opposing or supporting legislation.

Keesling, Francis V., Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; City and County of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $2,500 retainer; $1,970.83 reimbursement for travel, subsistence, secretarial, stenographic, telephone, telegraph, and postage expense. (This also covers services with respect to matters under jurisdiction of the executive departments and includes expenses at Washington, D. C., San Francisco, and elsewhere.) (2) No payments made except as set forth in (1) above. (3) In connection with legislation and other Federal matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco. (4) None. (5) Various bills of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including Army civil functions, housing, surplus property, in lieu taxes.

Kelly, Eugene, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; State of California. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) To support S. 1988.

Kennedy, Gilbert F., Esq.,[5] partner of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 15 Broad Street, New York, Washington, D. C., and 1 Garden Court, Middle Temple, London, England; Mr. Louis Dreyfus, of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York, and of Chappell & Co., Lt., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) Received $1,500 by my firm in London on account of various services in connection with matter mentioned in No. (5) below; approximately $95 expended during said quarter.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[5] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

(2) Railroad (Washington, D. C., and New York City); Hotel Carlton, Washington; meals, taxis, and various traveling expenses, approximately $70; also photostats, long-distance telephone calls, taxis, and miscellaneous, approximately $25. (3) Only expenditure paid consisted of above items (2). (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, being a bill to enable wife, Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus, to regain her United States citizenship.

Kennedy, Gilbert F., Esq.,[6] partner of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 15 Broad Street, New York, Washington, D. C., and 1 Garden Court, Middle Temple, London, England; Mr. Louis Dreyfus, of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) Received $1,500 by my firm in London on account of various services in connection with matter mentioned in No. (5) below; approximately $95 expended during said quarter. (2) Railroad (Washington, D. C., and New York City); Hotel Carlton, Washington; meals, taxis, and various traveling expenses, approximately $70; also photostats, long-distance telephone calls, taxis, and miscellaneous, approximately $25. (3) Only expenditure paid consisted of above items (2). (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, being a bill to enable wife, Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus, to regain her United States citizenship.

Kennedy, Harold L., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.; Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Received 3 months' retainer in the amount of $3,000; expended $38. (2) See (3) below. (3) Expended for 50 taxi fares (40 cents each) to and from the Capitol. 12 meals at $1.50 each, comprising a total of $18. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Kent, Arthur H., 1720 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif., American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Payment of $1,265.44 received from American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., May 27, 1948. (2) United Air Lines: Transportation San Francisco to Washington and return and excess-baggage charges $320.44; Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., charges, room, etc. $440.70; out-of-pocket expenses, trip Washington to New York for conference with client $21.30; meals, taxies, telephone, and telegraph charges, Washington, D. C., $483; total, $1,265.44. (3) Out-of-pocket expenses incurred to May 1, 1948, and reimbursed by above payment. (4) None. (5) Support of amendment to section 116 (a), Internal Revenue Code, relating to taxation of earned income of United States citizens from foreign sources.

Kern, Geo. A., Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) Apportionment of annual salary at $20 per day, $200 travel and subsistence, $431.74. (2) Travel and subsistence payments to railroad companies, Pullman Co., hotels, taxis, etc. (3) Travel and subsistence. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the railroad industry.

Ketchum, Inc., 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Education Association, March 8, 1948, $4,000. (2) Ketchum, Inc., $4,000. (3) Services. (4) News releases sent to Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (Information distributed also to Members of Congress.) (5) Current educational problems in furtherance of the passage of H. R. 2953 and S. 472.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Received from Main & Co.: January 15, 1948, $336.12; February 1948, [blank]; March 1948, [blank]; total, $336.12. (2) (a) Romelike Press Clipping Bureau, $7; (b) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $1.12; (c) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $328; total, $336.12. (3) (a) Clipping service, (b) postage, (c) services. (4) News releases sent to Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wall Street Journal, Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, and general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (5) The incentive income tax plan, a program of income-tax revision prepared by Frank Wilbur Main and other partners in Main & Co., certified public accountants, with headquarters office in Pittsburgh.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $833 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes, $85.50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

King,[7] Carol, 220 Broadway, New York, N. Y., American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. (1) No moneys received or expended since registry. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Lawyers Guild Review; the Lamp. (5) Immigration, naturalization, and deportation bills.

King, Joseph T., suite 1028, Barr Building, 912 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; Robert N. Hawes. (1) $200 legal fee for services rendered, received from Robert N. Hawes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to Olympic National Park.

King, Joseph T., suite 302, The Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets, NW., Washington, D. C.; National Retail Lumber Dealers Association. (1) $1,800 salary and $423.12 expenses. (2) Pullman Co., railroads, restaurants, caterer, cab drivers. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business; business luncheons, entertainment. (4) National affairs reports and bulletins. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building supply dealers, such as Emergency Price Control Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, wage and hour legislation, housing legislation, tax legislation, and Second War Powers Act.

King,[7 8] Karl V., 409 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Received of each of the following men, $50, or a total of $550: Bartolome Errea, Elko, Nev.; Marcelino Yturbe, Elko, Nev.; Francisco Lorono, Elko, Nev.; Pete Elguezabal, Elko, Nev.; Zenon Zubieta, Elko, Nev.; Francisco Alluntiz, Elko, Nev.; Damin Gandiaga, Elko, Nev.; Manuel Zulueta, Elko, Nev.; Jose Antonio Odriozola, Battle Mountain, Nev.; Fidel Acordarrementeria, Battle Mountain, Nev.; Pedro Bastido, Battle Mountain, Nev. (2) United Air Lines, travel, Salt Lake City to Washington, D. C., $221.40; New Colonial Hotel, room and meals, $182.50. (3) Travel and living expenses. (4) None. (5) Private bills for the relief of the persons listed in paragraph 1.

King,[7 9] Karl V., 409 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No additional money received. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Private bills.

King,[7 10] Karl V., 409 Boston Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No additional money received. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Private bills.

King, Willford I., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During this past quarter, I received an over-all of $2,729.51, including salary and expenses. (2) I am not a disbursing officer and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kitchen, C. W., United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade periodicals and association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Kline, Allan B., American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $417.18 expended (see item (6) of Form B filed January 1948). (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotel, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, Farm Credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of postwar construction of highways, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department, transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment of Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by Secretary of Agriculture, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, Labor Extension Service, alcohol plants, social security, weed killer, crop insurance, wheat carry-over, international wheat agreement, Parker River project, fiber identification, displaced persons, reciprocal trade agreements, rural electrification, radio, health, housing, standard time, Fair Labor Standards Act, railroad rates, Government corporations.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., Washington counsel for Kirlin, Campbell, Hickox & Keating, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[8] Filed for first quarter, 1947.

[9] Filed for second and third quarters, 1947.

[10] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947, and first quarter, 1948.

to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Kneipp, Leon F., 3700 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Organization of Professional Employees of Department of Agriculture, Administration Building, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. (1) Only money received was compensation for services at rate of $100 per month, total $300. (2) No money paid to any person, company, or appropriation, or otherwise. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Measures relating to interests of Federal professional employees, viz, retirement, pay increases, disability compensation, per diem allowances, etc.

Koch, Robert M., 1424 K. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) It is estimated that, as secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $1,000 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the second quarter of 1948. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $25 reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Krebs,[5] Alfred U., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has stated in Form B that he does not believe Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act applicable to him for the reason that all of his time in connection with legislative activities is spent in appearing before congressional committees or in preparing correspondence addressed to chairmen of such committees. Registrant believes that $166.66 per month represents a fair allocation of his salary to these activities. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) Registrant is not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Krebs,[6] Alfred U., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has stated in Form B that he does not believe the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act is applicable to him for the reason that all of his time in connection with legislative activities is spent in appearing before congressional committees or in preparing correspondence addressed to chairmen of such committees. Registrant believes that $166.66 per month represents a fair allocation of his salary to these activities during the second quarter of 1948. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) Registrant is not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Kreutz, Oscar R., executive manager, National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $4,500 salary and $2,067.06 special expense. Approximately 27 percent of my time was devoted to legislative matters so that $1,215 of my salary would be allocable. Of the special-expense item, none of it could be construed as applicable. (2) None. (3) None. (4) National Letter and National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry.

Krueger, A. H., 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the quarter April–June 1948, I was paid a total of $2,125 as an employee of Millers' National Federation for various services which have no relationship to the activities described in section 307 of title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Since legislative activity is only incidental to my regular employment, no specific amount of my salary is allocated for activities covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. I estimate that such activity took less than 5 percent of my time during the quarter. My expenditures for the quarter amounted to $16.05, for which I was reimbursed by my employer. (2) None. (3) All of the following expenditures were made for members of this industry: $8.75 was paid for meals and $7.30 for miscellaneous items and taxis. (4) None. (5) I assisted in preparation of a statement presented by president of Millers' National Federation before Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Relations in oppositon to international wheat agreement. Helped prepare statement filed with Senate Labor Committee requesting amendment to Fair Labor Standards Act. Generally, I am expected to keep my employer informed on legislation directly affecting the flour milling industry—subsequent activity, if any, subject to employer's direction.

Kruse, Herman C., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary for quarter $2,100 for all services to employer, only part of which pertained to legislation. Reimbursement of hotel, travel, and incidental expenses for quarter, $2,573.45. (2) Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., $1,268.03; railroads and air lines, $497.47; restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, taxis, and incidentals, $807.95. (3) Hotel, travel, and incidental expenses, as stated above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting water and power projects, flood control, and reclamation.

Lacques, Paul H., Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston; 99 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received various sums during the quarterly period (April, May, June) at various times a total of $753.37 from Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston. None of such receipts exceeded $100. (2) Railroad companies; hotels and club. (3) Transportation; accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph charges. (4) None. (5) H. R. 669.

La France, Frances X., Esq., Swan, Keeney & Smith, 911 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.; Narragansett Brewing Co., New Depot Avenue, Cranston, R. I. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2759 and any correlative bill.

Lane, John F., care of Gall and Lane, Steel, Foundry and Scrap Industries' Committee for Expediting Iron and Steel Scrap, 401 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C. (1) (a) Money received as fees for all services possibly within scope of act, $3,000 (estimate). (b) Money expended consisted only of minor actual expense disbursements (such as local transportation, telephone and telegraph charges, etc.) in the estimated amount of $150. (2) Fees paid to Gall and Lane; expense disbursements paid to taxi companies, telephone company, telegraph company, etc. (3) Fees paid for legal research, information, advice, consultations, and memoranda. (4) None. (5) Legislation bearing upon United States ferrous scrap stocks.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C.; A. E. Brooks, 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) No money received and no expenditures except small sums for postage. (2) No expenditures except for postage. (3) Postage. (4) None. (5) Legislation with reference to taxation of nonresident citizens of the United States engaged in business abroad.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 11 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) From National Patent Council as retainer, $1,500; from American Fair Trade Council as retainer, $1,000; from Trinity Improvement Association for rental and other expenses $750 and $500 additional for added services, in this quarter. No expenditures have been made except small sums for postage, office supplies, etc. (2) $408 to Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (3) Rental and garage. (4) None. (5) My employers are all nonprofit organizations, and I was employed in an advisory capacity and not for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation in Congress. Their purposes are principally educational with reference to the objectives of their organizations.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C.; State Rights Association, Houston, Tex. (1) Received $2,500 in payment of remainder of retainer; no expenditures except small sums for postage. (2) No expenditures except for postage. (3) Postage. (4) None. (5) Legislation to preserve and promote the rights of the States under our system of Government, to return to the States such normal functions as they should rightfully assume, to restrict Federal agencies to Federal functions, and to equalize taxation in accordance with State laws.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Meat inspection bill, S. 2256, H. R. 5675, H. R. 6259.

Laugherty,[5] R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., room 1309, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $250. No money expended except for personal maintenance. (Ill during months of February and March.) (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxi fare, postage, telephone and telegraph, cleaning and food. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroad labor, especially Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Act.

Laugherty,[6] R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW, Washington, D. C.; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., room 1309, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $750; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxi fare, postage, telephone and telegraph, cleaning and pressing and meals. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting and detrimental to railroad employees.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $119.70. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Building, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money was paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW. (1) Total receipts $4,919.34; total expenses $925.52. (2) Hotels and air lines. (3) Travel, hotels, and meals. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

endorsed or opposed by the section of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Laylin, John G., Aluminum Research Institute, 701 Union Trust Building. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $88.37. (2) Telephone and telegraph expense, $63.37; travel expense, including hotel accommodations, $25. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has received no contributions for the purposes designated in subparagraph (a) or (b) of section 307, Public Law 601; expenditures, salary, carfare, telephone, telegraph, postage, publications, $3,065.05. (2) Muriel Ferris, salary, and carfare; balance as indicated in (1). (3) As indicated in (1). (4) Trends in Government and Member Magazine, both published by registrant; broadsides on the European recovery program, and reciprocal trade, also published by registrant. (5) See attached program [2] of the League of Women Voters of the United States.

Lee, Ivy, and Ross, T. J. (registrant disclaims that Public Law 601 has any application to it but is filing this form in the event that the act may be deemed to be applicable to it), United States Cuban Sugar Council, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) See appended statement I.[2] (2) See appended statement I.[2] (3) See appended statement I.[2] (4) See appended statement I.[2]. (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public-relations matters pertaining to sugar legislation relating to the Sugar Act of 1948.

Leete, Malcolm R., 41 Mount Vernon Street, Boston, Mass.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated June 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Leopold, Joseph F., 936 Liberty Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle, Cricago, Ill. (1) Nothing received other than regular salary. (2) Nothing paid other than travel expenses, for which I received reimbursement from National Tax Equality Association. (3) Transportation, hotel, and usual travel expenses and incidentals. (4) None. (5) No legislation in particular, only tax equality in general.

Letts, David S., attorney, 901 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; American Transit Association, 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,350 salary as attorney for the American Transit Association; received $254.53 for actual business expenses. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, etc.; hotels and restaurants; merchants and others. (3) Traveling and living expenses away from Washington; expenses in Washington for transportation, fees, dues, entertainment, and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) In connection with proposed legislation affecting the transit industry, registrant may present the views of members of the American Transit Association.

Levine, Seth, CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,365 in salary; $130, expenses; 50 percent of time spent on research work and 50 percent on legislative activities. (2) Expenses paid to taxi companies, telephone company, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxies, telephone calls, periodicals. (4) CIO News, NMU Pilot, IFAWA Fisherman, the American Marine Engineer. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, longshoremen, fishermen, and allied workers and oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Lewis, George J., Kentucky Railroad Association (for fuller details see Form B, filed by me on June 3, 1947), Union Station, Lexington, Ky. (1) No moneys received, except reimbursements for out-of-pocket expense amounting to $393.81. (2) Hotel, restaurant, dining car, pullman, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) For living and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Employed to support legislation favorable to the railroad industry and to oppose legislation detrimental to that industry.

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,149.99; expenses, $267.06; total, $1,417.05. (2) Expenses for railroad tickets, hotels, taxis, porters, telephone and telegraph service, postage, and miscellaneous expenses when away from Washington. (3) Speaking trips, attending conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Peace Action, monthly news bulletin of National Council for Prevention of War. (5) Supports, in pursuance of the purposes of the organization, legislation which promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Linton, D. H., Eastern Gas and Fuel Associates, 250 Stuart Street, Boston, Mass. (1) $141.87 ($50 compensation and $91.87 expenses). (2) Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., railroads, food, taxis, telephone, tips, and miscellaneous expenses. (3) Traveling and incidentals. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4099, H. R. 5475, and H. R. 5392.

Littell, Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Navajo Tribe of Indians, residing in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado (address of superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz.). (1) For quarter ended June 30, 1948, $1,875 as retainer for legal services as general counsel and $649.73 for expenses. (2) To employees of registrant's law office, including stenographers. (3) For legal services in connection with Navajo business. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the Navajos as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting the Navajos is being considered.

Little, Charles R. (executive secretary), Kenwood Road, box 153-M, rural route 508, Cincinnati, Ohio; Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress (Dr. Charles E. Holzer, Sr., president, Holzer Hospital, Gallipolis, Ohio). (1) Total received for salary, $900; total received for expenses, $600; total expenses, $395.84. Actual amounts directly chargeable to lobbying are less than totals shown above. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, etc. (3) Transportation, $94.31; lodging, $73.68; meals, $56.91; tips, $17.20; office (periodicals, communication, postage, stationery, supplies), $153.74. (4) The Waterways Journal. (5) Not solely employed for this purpose, but concerned with any legislation dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley, including appropriation bills.

Little, Walter J., 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Southern Pacific Co., et al. (1) Received from Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Northwestern Pacific, and Western Pacific Railroads, for expenses, $743.88. (2) Various. (3) Hotels and meals, etc. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the railroads.

Lockwood, Maurice H.; the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $200 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News, Fertilizer Review, Agronomic Notes, and Pasture Progress, all published by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington, D. C. I issued and distributed, in the customary manner, a press release relative to the association's report on fertilizer consumption in 1947 and one relative to the program of the association's annual convention of June 1948, but do not know what publications may have published them in whole or in part. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Lodge, F. S., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $150 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Loft, George, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, April, May, June, $1,055.57; travel expense, $345.19. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of discussing developments on universal military training and conscription legislation, and to organize opposition against it. (4) [Blank.] (5) In general to oppose conscription, universal military training, and the militarization of America, and to support the rights of conscience and world disarmament.

Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, and 1216 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $31,775.05, largely for legal services, preparation of brief, legal research, etc. (2) Traveling expenses, mimeographing briefs, etc., $569.59. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

Lovelady, Rufus M., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Lodge 14, American Federation of Government Employees, Balboa, C. Z. (1) $840.04. This amount on the basis of $350 per month for the period April 1 to June 12, 1948, inclusive. (NOTE.—My legislative representative activities ceased on June 12, 1948, and I returned to the Canal Zone on June 14, 1948.) (2) Landlord at 1505 W Street SE., Washington, D. C.; grocery stores; gasoline stations; and others for ordinary necessities of life. (3) Apartment for myself, wife, and children; food and clothing; gasoline and oil for my private automobile; subscription to newspapers, tips, etc. (4) None. (5) Retirement legislation for Canal Zone employees; increase in basic pay for Federal employees; increased injury compensation benefits; legislation to prohibit aliens taking civil-service examinations for appointment on the Canal Zone.

Lucas, James C., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200, salary; $24.90, expenses. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) Transportation. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Lunn, Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz.; Townsend National Recovery Plan on no salary basis, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) No salary, no specified amount, a small commission on dues, for incidental mail and stationery, never enough; I donate balance. (2) [Blank.] (3) I pay for printing cards announcing meetings of club members, stationery, postage, especially in behalf of local pensioners, paying mostly out of my own pocket. (4) None. (5) Townsend National Recovery Plan.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Lyon, A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation; total salary for quarter, $2,250; total expenses for quarter, $596.93. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

Lyon, R. B. H., 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Kinsman Optical Co. 1320 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 5241, Eightieth Congress, second session.

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary of Jonas A. McBride, $2,500; salary of Glenn C. Russell, stenographer, $955. Printing and supplies, $66.73; rent, $270; personal expenses, Jonas A. McBride, $982.23; telephone and telegrams, $85.86; postage, $90. (2) Salaries to Jonas A. McBride and Glenn C. Russell as indicated; printing and supplies to various printers and stationery supply companies; rent to labor, 10 Independence Avenue SW. (3) For maintenance of office of National Legislative Representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,232.50 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $255.13 was expended by me as expense money, during the second quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $510.26 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $255.13 was expended by me as expense money, during the second quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

McCaskill, J. L., associate secretary, department of higher education, National Education Association, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,269, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Estimated for legislative servces, $100. Expenses: None. (2) Self-salary. Expenses: None. (3) No expense incurred. (4) College and University Bulletin. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

McClure, Warren C., box 207, Camden, Ark. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

McDonald, Angus H., 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., the Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) $750, salary; $450, expenses; total, $1,200. (2) Salary and expenses were used by self in a trip to nine States west of the Rockies and in keeping up home obligations. (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; The Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) A Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The preamble shall be amended to read "We, the people of the United States devoutly recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ the Saviour and King of Nations, in order to form, etc."

McGough, Richard, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.; Northern Pacific Railway Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Great Northern Railway Co., the Milwaukee Road, Seattle, Wash. (1) Salary as stated in original registration. Expenditures for meals, $233.50; taxi fares, $25.80; Pullman fares, $61.74; baggage, $5.40; hotel accommodations, $239.98; telegrams and postage, $17.02; miscellaneous, $8.20; notary fees, $1. (2) Various restaurants, hotels, taxi companies, railroad companies, etc. (3) Living and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Washington.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, 630 I Street, formerly 626 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Taxpayers, U. S. A., United States Treasury. (1) Approximately $165. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) To use as I see fit. (4) For a fee, none. (5) [Blank.]

McGrath, Tom J., 324 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates, National Coal Association, Boston, Mass., and Washington, D. C. (1) No payments received. (2) No expenditures (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Participating in the consideration of natural gas legislative matters as the interests of clients may appear to be affected by such legislation.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, a partnership, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; The Holstein-Friesian Association of America, Brattleboro, Vt. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support H. R. 3884.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; The Lincoln Electric Co., 12818 Coit Road, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received $150 fees; reimbursement of traveling expenses, $69.14. Expended, none. (2) McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart. (3) Attorneys' fees $150; reimbursement of traveling expenses, $69.14. (4) None. (5) Pension trust statutes; and Internal Revenue Code, section 23 (a).

McKercher, M. C., 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.; the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Salary, $325 per month; total for quarter, $975. Expenses for quarter ending June 30, 1948, $908.39. No money expended in connection with legislative work. (2) Hotel Hamilton, various restaurants, telephone, telegraph, postage, pullman, streetcar, and taxi fares. (4) Necessary living and transportation expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

McLaughlin, Robert E., 410 Central Building, 805 G Street NW., Washington D. C.; AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended, except petty cash for taxi fares. Since March 1, 1948, I have been acting national legislative director for AMVETS at a modest per diem rate for time actually consumed. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National AMVET and AMVET Letter. (5) To support legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II and their dependents.

McLaughlin, Robert E., National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $250. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) To support legislation beneficial to this client and civil-service employees in general.

McMahon, John A., president, National Association of Postal Supervisors, 171 Milton Street, Boston, Mass.; National Association of Postal Supervisors, box 1225, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $65.16 received from Michael C. Nave, treasurer, National Association of Postal Supervisors, room 326, main post office, Chicago, Ill. (2) John A. McMahon, president, Boston, Mass., Pennsylvania Railroad; New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; American Air Lines; Boston. Hotel Continental, Washington, D. C. (3) Reimbursement for loss of salary while absent from regular post office duty, railroad and air line transportation, hotel accommodations, meals, telephone, and telegraph services. (4) The Postal Supervisor, official magazine of the National Association of Postal Supervisors. (5) Legislation pending in Congress involving salary adjustments, and retirement, all in the interests of the supervisory officials in the field postal service.

McMains, W. H., Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary same as previous report. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the industry represented is reported to members, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as S. 265, S. 2352, S. 2365, H. R. 4388, and H. R. 6852.

McMillan, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,100, with less than one-twentieth of the time and services for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $92.70, reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

McQuatters, Geneva F., 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,050; expense, $210.67. (2) Travel, postage, telephone, telegraph, taxis. (3) Travel, postage, telephone, telegraph, transportation. (4) Independent Woman. (5) Merit system, Women's Bureau appropriations, equal-rights amendment, opposition to discriminations against women, Federal aid in support of public education, jury service for women, child-labor legislation, United Nations participation, retention of women's units as a permanent part of the services, universal military training.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Remington Rand, Inc., 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y., and American Optometric Association, 518 Wilmac Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) None received. (2) Telephone and telegrams, $117.27; taxis and miscellaneous, $5.25; total, $122.52, for American Optometric Association. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) On behalf of the American Optometric Association development fund I have continued to support the action of the District of Columbia Optometric Association in requesting an amendment to the District of Columbia optometry law, for the purpose of raising the standards of the profession, providing better visual care for the residents of the District of Columbia. I supported inclusion in the selective-service legislation of a provision which would require the calling of optometrists on a basis similar to that proposed for calling physicians and dentists. I also favored exempting ophthalmic materials used by optometrists from the proposed District of Columbia sales-tax bill. On behalf of Remington Rand, Inc., I supported an

amendment to the provision in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, limiting the price which the Government could pay for typewriters. The statutory limitations in this respect have been so restricted that it has been practically impossible for the Government to purchase any typewriters.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association, all reimbursed by association, $1,515.10. (2) Railroads, etc., $572.34; hotels and miscellaneous, $942.76. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, and regulation of domestic transportation.

MacMillen,[5] William C., Federation for Railway Progress, 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $616.66; expenses, $418.43. (2) Travel expenses in the amount of $418.43 paid to various railroads, hotels, etc. (3) Travel expenses, exclusive of any legislative activity. (4) [Blank.] (5) None.

Mac Millen,[6] William C. Jr., 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,249.98; expenses, $150.26. (2) For various hotels, railroads, etc. (3) For traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Macnamee,[5] W. Bruce, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) One thousand and fifty dollars received as salary from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., allocable to legislative activities; $267.66 received for expenses (registrant registered with Sea-Air Committee since January 1947). (2) No expenditures except for transportation, hotels, and meals. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Macnamee,[6] W. Bruce, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) One thousand and fifty dollars received as salary from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., allocable to legislative activities; $104.06 received for expenses. (2) No expenditures except for transportation, hotels, and meals. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Madaris, James B., 220 South Alfred Street, Alexandria, Va.; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 107 West Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. (1) One hundred and ninety-seven dollars and twenty-eight cents for salary and $48 per diem for expenses; also about $7.20 for miscellaneous expenses. (2) Paid out our transportation, meals, hotels, and other miscellaneous expenses by James B. Madaris. (3) Living expenses, hotels, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting employees of Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America.

Magee, Miss Elizabeth S., National Consumers' League, 348 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, part time, $366.64; travel, Washington, D. C., May 1–7, $120.49. (2) [Blank.] (3) Travel and living expenses. (4) National Consumers League Bulletin. (5) Supporting minimum wage legislation; extension of social security.

Manly, Milo A., National Council for a Permanent FEPC, 930 F Street NW., room 901, Washington, D. C. (1) Travel, telephone calls, and living expenses April 1 to June 30, 1948, $800; salary after tax deductions, April 1 to June 30, 1948, $1,092.80. (2) [Blank.] (3) Travel, telephone calls, and living expenses, $800; salary after tax deductions, $1,092.80. (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate bill 984 and House bill 2824.

Margolin, Leo J., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement; employment terminated June 30, 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6369, Temporary Displaced Persons Admissions Act.

Margolin, Mrs. Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,125 (gross, before income-tax deduction) in salary received from National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y., none of which was spent in this work; $39.42 received from above, spent for carfare, postage, and supplies. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

Markham, Baird H., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule [3] for answers to items 1 to 5. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marks, Herbert S., 305 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; The Detroit Edison Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Fee not yet received for general legal services to client; expended in connection with all matters for client, $170.50. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $77.81; travel expenses, $82.79; miscellaneous, $9.90. (3) Telephone and telegraph, transportation, taxis, postage. (4) None. (5) General legal services to this client include services in connection with proposed amendment to exempt limited interstate and international electric connections under the Federal Power Act.

Marks, Raymond E., Southern Pacific Co., 139 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nev. (1) Expended and was reimbursed $1,151.57 which was expended as follows: Meals, $480.50; hotel, $210; pullman and transportation, $272.50; streetcar, taxicab, and bus fares or gasoline, $66.80; tips, $85.50; miscellaneous expenditures including telephone tolls, postage, incidentals, $36.27. (2) Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C.; various restaurants and hotel dining rooms; pullman and transportation companies; taxi drivers, porters, bellboys, waiters, telephone companies, et al. (3) Meals and lodging, pullman and transportation accommodations, taxi and bus services; telephone calls, postage, porters, bellboys, waiters, and other services. (4) None. (5) Federal legislation affecting the interests of Nevada railroads, viz, Southern Pacific, Union Pacific, Western Pacific.

Marran,[5] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of which registrant is an associate, did not receive or expend any sums during the preceding calendar quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation proposing to amend section 116 (a) and section 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code, pertaining to United States citizens earning income from sources outside the United States and withholding required on such income.

Marran,[6] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended $25.68 in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) New York Telephone Co., $24.08; Western Union Telegraph, $1.50; carfare, 10 cents; total, $25.68. (3) Telephone toll calls, $24.08; Western Union messenger service, $1.50; carfare, 10 cents; total, $25.68. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85 percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Marsh, Benjamin C., Peoples Lobby, Inc., room 31 810 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts, largest contribution $836.98, $3,142.58; salaries and wages, $825.15; bulletins and printing, $911.25; postage, $415.25; rent, $165; Andrew Walker, $47.55, addressograph $25.77, B. C. Marsh, expenses to two meetings, $27.85, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., $12.62, expenses May 29, conference $40.75, incidentals $83.14. (2) B. C. Marsh, Arlene Ryan, Marie McEnaney, Graphic Arts Press, United States Post Office, J. B. Stein, Andrew Walker, Addressograph Corp., incidentals. (3) Salaries and wages for publicity and clerical work, other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) We have not caused any article to be published but have sent material and releases to hundreds of papers. (5) Support attached program and oppose that against it.

Marshall, J. Paul, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None received; $21.19 expended. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Kirby Lithographic Co. (3) Long distance telephone calls, reproductions of newspaper clipping. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3314, H. R. 6341, S. 1675, S. 230.

Marshall, Mrs. Katharine Lee, 1734 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (United States section), 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (National Administration Headquarters). (1) Salary $670, expenses $131.20. (2) Salary $670, to landlord, grocers, United States Government, savings, etc.; expenses $131.20, to railroads, restaurants, taxicab drivers. (3) Salary $670, for personal living expenses, taxes, savings, etc., $131.20 for my own expenses incurred while attending meetings, conferences held by WILPF and other organizations; my own taxi fare to such meetings and to Capitol Hill. (4) None. (5) Support strengthening UN and its specialized agencies; extension reciprocal trade program; European recovery program; emergency admission displaced persons on non-quota basis; permanent and Federal FEPC; Federal anti-lynch law. Oppose UMT, selective service, United States Arming of Latin American Countries; restrictions of imports.

Marston, R. B., Director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,016.34 which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Estimated for legislative service $403.27. Expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Martin, Robert F., Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. As incident to association activities testified at two congressional hearings on H. R. 6556.

Masoka, Mrs. Etsu, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.; Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Form B, filed January 6, 1948. See attached supplementary sheet.[3] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list.[3] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., post office box 1628, Washington, D. C.; Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 403 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed January 22, 1947. See attached supplementary sheet.[3] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list.[3] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American Jewish Congress, 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received fee for services of $112.50; expended, $25. (2) Rail and hotel expenses on trip to Washington, D. C. (3) Same as 2. (4) Law and social action, March-April, 1948; University of Iowa Law Review, May 1948—book review. (5) Legislation designed to implement the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights; to keep separate church and state, to liberalize immigration laws.

Mason, Walter J., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $2,080; expenses for April 1948, $44; May, $44.50; June, $56; total for 3 months, $144.50. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (away from office) and other incidentals. (3) As shown in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting workers.

Mathews, John Clifford, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America for the Christian Amendment Movement, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (denominational headquarters). (1) Salary received from J. S. Tibby for April, May, and June, $750; from J. S. Tibby for expenses, $60; preaching fee from Kansas City Reformed Presbyterian Church, $15. (2) Salary used for personal and family expenses only. Receipts for expenses and preaching fees used for paying railway fare, cost of hotel rooms, meals, etc., in necessary travel for the Christian Amendment Movement. (3) See above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) In support of House Joint Resolution 239 and Senate Joint Resolution 150 in Eightieth Congress, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States to acknowledge Jesus Christ as Saviour and King of nations.

Maudlin, C. V., 716 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.; Georgia Power Co. and its associate company, Savannah River Electric Co., Electric Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) Receipts and receivable, $2,342.81 from Georgia Power Co., for all services and expenses, including both legislative and nonlegislative activities; expenditures, $84.51, exclusive of stenographic and research services furnished by my office personnel. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union, Federal Power Commission, cab drivers, and various others. (3) Telephone calls, telegrams, publications, taxi, fares, and out-of-pocket miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of the Georgia Power Co. and the Savannah River Electric Co.

Mechem, Frank L., 603 Central Building, Seattle, Wash.; P. E. Harris & Co., et al. (1) As stated in answer to question (4) on Form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per diem basis for services performed and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter by law of legal fees, and the total amount of reimbursement for traveling expenses was $643.88. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering air and railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone, and telegraph tolls. (4) None. (5) The formulation and presentation of proposed legislative program designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

Messer, James, Jr., Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla. (1) Total amount received and expended, $165.28, as per detailed statement attached.[3] (2) See attached list.[3] (3) For purposes stated on attached list[3] in connection with S. 110 (Reed-Bulwinkle bill) pending in the Congress. (4) None. (5) Any legislation in which I might be directed to support or oppose by Florida Railroad Association, generally legislation affecting railroads.

Messer, Ross A., National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Custodial Employees, box 1611, room 527, Victor Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,250; expenses, $635.01; expenses include postage, office supplies, box rent, taxi, postage for mailing publications and bulletins and other necessary expenses for handling legislation and grievances. (2) [Blank.] (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for postal employees, and in handling grievances between the membership and the Post Office Department. (4) The Post Office Custodial News and special news bulletins advising the membership on legislative activities. (5) All beneficial legislation for postal employees and custodial employees in particular.

Middleton, P. Harvey, Railway Business Association, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) The only money received by me during the period from April 1 to June 30, 1948, was $5,666.66 in salary, gross. No part of this salary was spent in legislative activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The only item of legislation dealt with by me in this period was a letter to members of the Railway Business Association, dated April 30, 1948, requesting their continued support of the Reed-Bulwinkle bill (S. 110, H. R. 221) in regard to which the Railway Business Association had appeared before the House committee to state its reasons for approving this legislation.

Miles, Clarence R., Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW. (1) Received: Salary, $4,125; expenses, $148.80. Expended: Transportation, $105.13; meals, $34.79; telephone, $8.88. (2) Taxi companies, railroad, restaurants, and telephone company. (3) Transportation to and communication with the Capitol, other normal and necessary expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Miles, Harold M., Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No money received or spent during the past quarter on any Federal legislative work. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The Reed-Bulwinkle bill; the amendments to the Crosser Act.

Miller, Charles C., 715 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) I have received from my employers during the quarter ended June 30, 1948, prorated to cover time spent in legislative activities during this period, a total of $2,259.54. The full receipts and manner of prorating each expenditure are shown in the attachment.[3] (2) $125.37 to various hotels and restaurants for guest luncheons; $32.33 for cabs; $26.18 in tips and miscellaneous expenditures; $1.50 for mimeographing; $154.63 for telephone and telegraph; $7.93 for postage; $14.80 for office supplies; $322.50 to the Ring Engineer Co. for rent; and $1,574 to the registrant and his secretary, H. Mathewson, in salaries. (3) [Blank.] (4) Press coverage consisted of general news reports on tire and tube production, on rubber consumption, and in detailing the arguments presented by tire manufacturers in support of a brief appealing for modification of existing wartime excise taxes on their products. (5) Revision of excise taxes on tires and measures regulating the transportation of flammable textiles and coated fabrics.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.; State Rights Association, Houston, Tex. (1) Received: $1,500 plus $750 expenses from Dallas Chamber of Commerce; $1,500 plus $278.64 expenses from Intracoastal Canal Association; $1,500 plus $972.20 expenses from Texas Gulf Sulphur Co.; $2,500, no expenses, from State Rights Association. Expended: $2,000.84; this sum includes all business expenses in Washington, only a small portion of which would apply to activities within the purview of the act. (2) Carlyn Apartments, Mayflower Hotel, United States post office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, stationers, food and beverage establishments. (3) Apartment rent, $481.50; office rent, $660; taxi fares, etc., $105; telephone and telegraph, $196.04; stamps, stationery, other usual office expenses, $160; entertainment and miscellaneous, $398.30. (4) Monthly article in Dallas magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, appropriations, and taxes.

Milton, Charles J., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3237 and S. 249.

Mollin, F. E., executive secretary, American National Live Stock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Have had no special contributions for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. My compensation as executive secretary of the American National Live Stock Association is $1,000 a month. In addition I received in January of this year a bonus of $1,000 for last year. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities. Only part of the expense of myself as executive secretary of the association on trips to Washington in past quarter could be chargeable to such. Total expense for this purpose was $921.72; telephone and telegraph, $155.50; Washington stenographer, $113.95. (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own official magazine, the American Cattle Producer. (5) Federal meat inspection (S. 2256), capital gains (H. R. 6712), National Land Policy Act (H. R. 6054), Reciprocal Trade Act (H. R. 6556).

Montgomery, Donald E., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks at $100, $1,300; subsistence, 13 weeks, $819; expenses, 13 weeks, $427.67; total, $2,546.67. This amount covers nonlegislative work as described under (4) in form B, as well as legislative work. Legislative work accounts for less than half of total duties. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker, Ammunition and Washington Report (UAW-CIO publications), Economic Outlook (CIO publication), Antioch Review, Labor and Nation. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Mooney, William W.: 505 South Eleventh Street, Tacoma, Wash.; Townsend National Recovery Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Gross amount paid to me in the form of commissions from the Townsend National Recovery Plan headquarters, $953.93. (2) The $953.93 paid to William W. Mooney: Expenses for travel, such as train, bus, auto, and hotel when out of home city, $330.67; withholding tax, $106; social security, $9.05; total expense, taxes, etc., $445.72, leaving a balance out of the $953.93 of $508.21 for personal use. (3) To promote meetings to create more interest in the Townsend plan bills; to help in building morale and organizing clubs and building membership in the clubs. (4) Send articles in at times to be printed in the Townsend National Weekly, with headquarters at 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio; also, at times, announcements of larger meetings to be held in the State of Washington. (5) Townsend National Recovery plan bills, H. R. 16 and H. R. 2476 and S. 690, now in the Eightieth Congress of the United States.

Moore, Chester B., Western Growers Association, 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Regular salary as managing director of Western Growers Association, plus traveling expenses. (2) To all regular accounts of my personal and business life. (3) [Blank.] (4) Western Grower and Shipper. (5) Am paid regular salary; not directly employed to support or oppose any specific legislation; I do oppose or support any legislation of interest to our members.

Moore, Clayton, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Fourth and Main Streets, Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) Actual expenses incurred, $189.27 (salary for full-time services as associate counsel same as amount in last quarterly report and for the purposes more fully set out in registration form). (2) Railroad and Pullman fares, $61.66; hotel, meals, and phones, $126.11; taxicabs, $1.50. (3) Travel, hotel, meals, phones, and taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation affecting R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Moran, Raymond H., 46 Burnside Avenue, Cranford, N. J.; International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Ninth and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200 (April 1 to June 1, 1948); expenses, $94.50; no other expenses other than living expenses. (2) Hotel Hamilton, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph, postage, meals, laundry, etc. (3) All living, transportation, telegraph, and telephone expense. (4) None. (5) All legislation pertaining to railroad labor, particularly all bills affecting the now-existing Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts.

Morelock, Phil D., 1009 Commerce Building, Kansas City, Mo.; Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo. (1) None with respect to this or any other matters before the legislature. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2192, for the relief of Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Morgan, George W., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made registrant received only his salary and expenses; the portion of registrant's salary applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601 is estimated to be less than $1,250; the portion of registrant's expenses applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating such registration is estimated to be not more than $443.18. (2) No expenditures except for transportation, hotels, meals, and similar out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See item 2. (4) A copy of the only issue of any publication in which the registrant caused any article or editorial to be published during the quarter for which this report is filed is annexed hereto[8] and made a part hereof. (5) The registrant is employed as president of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation; during the quarter for which this report is filed the registrant did, however, support bills to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; this is the first quarter since the effective date of the act during which the registrant has engaged in any activity in furtherance of any object necessitating registration.

Morgan, Gerald D., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Alaska Transportation Co.; Pier 58, Seattle, Wash. (1) Engaged in legislative activity on behalf of Alaska Transportation Co. for approximately 14 days, for which firm of Morgan & Calhoun received $1,400; expended during this period $425.51 for telephone and teletype messages, for which the firm received reimbursement from Alaska Transportation Co.; this sum includes expenses in connection with nonlegislative matters, but an allocation is impossible. (2) $425.51 paid to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., for telephone and teletype service. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Legislative activity consisted of conferences with various persons in the Maritime Commission and the Department of the Interior, as well as various Members of Congress respecting legislation to take the place of Public Law 12, Eightieth Congress, relating to Alaska shipping, when that law expires on June 30, 1948.

Morgan, Gerald D., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; the Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) $253.37 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services for the Toilet Goods Association, Inc., during the quarter; allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible; expended $1.38 for telephone call, which was reimbursed by the Toilet Goods Association, Inc. (2) $1.38 paid to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Legislation providing for relief from the existing 20-percent retail tax on toilet preparations.

Morris, Curtis, East Texas Chamber of Commerce, Box 1592, Longview, Tex. (1) Expenses: Hotel, $480.19; transportation, $313.17; meals, $212.75; taxies, $58.30; miscellaneous, $102.70. Compensation, regular salary. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Anything affecting the business or civic interests of east Texas.

Morris Plan Corp. of America, the, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received. (2) Appeal Printing Co., $1,796.78 (this payment made from corporate funds. (3) Printing. (4) None. (5) The corporation in its interests and in the interests of its stockholders opposes the adoption of bank holding-company legislation in the forms represented by S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Morse, Henry Hoyt, 99 Pearl Street, Gardner, Mass., Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove builder. (5) None.

[8] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Mosier, Harold G., Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.; The Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) As previously reported, registrant receives compensation of $1,000 per month for his services. In the course of performing these services registrant has expended $482.34 for travel, subsistence, communications, etc., for which he has been or will be reimbursed. Payment of these amounts so expended has been made directly to the hotels, railroads, restaurants, etc. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Mote, Lynn E., 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Association of American Shipowners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary from April 16, 1948, through June 30, 1948, at a rate of $8,000 per annum plus expenses totaling $157.64. (2) Expenses paid to taxicabs, hotels, railroads, telephone and telegraph services. (3) For services named in (3) above, only an insignificant portion of which was spent pursuant to activities within the purview of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, which activity is only a minor portion of employee's duties.

Mote, Lynn E.,[10] 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made registrant received only his salary and expenses. The total salary received by the registrant during the quarter was $1,565.99 and the total expenses received by him amounted to $157.64. Only a small portion of such salary and expenses is applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration. (2) No expenditures except taxicabs, railroads, meals, and similar out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See item (2). (4) None. (5) The registrant is employed as manager of the Washington office of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the quarter for which this report is filed, the registrant did support bills to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. This is the first quarter since the effective date of the act during which the registrant has engaged in any activity in furtherance of an object necessitating registration.

Munro, Walter J., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (1) No money received or expended in connection with legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. My work pertains entirely to public relations.

Murph, Daniel S., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $100 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Chiropractic Insurance Co. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Chiropractic Journal and Chiropractic News. (5) None specified. At present time supporting S. 1428, the Langer bill, and H. R. 5468, the Patterson bill.

Murphy, Ray, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the first quar-

[10] Amended form.

ter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

Myers, Abram F., Dupont Circle Building, Washington 6, D. C. (formerly 729 Fifteenth Street NW.); 18 regional theater associations named in Form B; Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors. (1) Was reimbursed from general funds of associations for expenditures in connection with hearing on H. R. 5014. See below. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co., $97.06 (telegrams notifying clients of hearing); $64.40, Federal Reporting Co. (transcript of hearing); total, $161.46. (3) All in connection with notifying witnesses of hearing and purchase of transcript of their testimony. (4) None. (5) Appeared with others as a witness in support of H. R. 5014, to amend the copyright law. The bill was adversely reported by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Myrup, Andrew William, 932 Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union, 2719 North Wilton Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $108 a week; $1,404 per quarter. (2) To the registrant. (3) Salary for conducting the research department of the international union with the following duties: To collect statistical data and compile same for use of the member locals in negotiations, such surveys to cover hours and earnings, contract clauses, economic data on industries in which our members work. Also to act as liaison between our organization and various Government agencies, such as NLRB, Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, Social Security, etc., and to watch the progress of Federal and State legislation. (4) None. (5) None.

National Association of Real Estate Boards: Its Realtors Washington Committee, and the public relations department;[5] Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) Schedule attached.[3] (2) Schedule attached.[3] (3) Schedule attached.[3] (4) Attached list shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Real Estate Boards: Its Realtors Washington Committee, and its public relations department;[6] Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) Schedule attached.[3] (2) Schedule attached.[3] (3) Schedule attached.[4] (4) Attached list shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Stevedores, 90 West Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) $10,750 received, see statement A attached;[3] $317.93 expended, see statement B attached.[3] (2) See statement B attached. (3) See statement B attached. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4387, S. 2386.

National Postal Committee for Books, Room 305, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (See registration for statement of membership of committee.) (1) No receipts during said period; expenditures, $8.57. (2) American Book Publishers Council. (3) For mimeographing, mailing, and telegrams. (4) None during said calendar quarter. (5) The committee opposes unfair increases in postal rates and discrimination in postal rates such as contained in H. R. 2408 and H. R. 3519.

National Savings and Loan League,[8] 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; member savings and loan associations of the league. (1) Financial statement attached.[3] (The item of $200, Federal legislation committee, represents payment to C. H. Ellingson for reimbursement for legal services.) In the report filed by Mr. O. R. Kreutz, it was stated that no portion of his expense was allocable to legislation during the quarter. Perhaps $125 of the National Letter charge may be allocable and $375 of officers' salary. (2) See (1). (3) Legal services and legislation as stated in (1). All other expenditures were for routine league business not connected with legislation. (4) National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Bills to improve the facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home ownership are supported while legislation inimicable to the interest of the savings and loan industry is opposed.

National Savings and Loan League,[11] 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; member savings and loan associations of the league. (1) Financial statement attached.[3] Approximately $1,125 of officers' salary and $147 of National Letter expense may be applicable. (See previous reports.) (2) Batt, Bates & Co. and Darby Printing Co. (3) Printing National Letter. (4) National Savings & Loan Journal and National Letter. (5) Support S. 801, S. 802, S. 203. S. 804, S. 913, S. 1149 and President's reorganization plan No. 3. Oppose some provisions of S. 866 and H. R. 3756.

National Savings & Loan League,[12] 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Financial statement attached.[3] The following portions of the indicated items may be applicable: Of officers' salaries, $1,215; of National Letter, $150. (2) Oscar R. Kreutz, executive manager of the league (salary); Batt, Bates & Co., and Darby Printing Co. (for National Letter). (3) Salary, printing, and distribution of National Letter. (4) National Letter and National Savings & Loan Journal. (5) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing; and oppose legislation inimical to interests of savings and loan industry.

Nau, Carlton L., American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW. (1) See attached sheet.[3] (2) See attached sheet.[3] (3) See attached sheet.[3] (4) None. (5) See attached sheet.

Neal, William S., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y., and 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,757.50. (2) Received from salary; expenses paid for taxi, railroad transportation, hotel rooms, lunches, dinners, telephone, similar miscellaneous items; expenditures for quarter, $382.50; salary, $3,375. (3) As above for incidental and social purposes. (4) National Association of Manufacturers' News (regular contributor). (5) NAM program: For tax reduction, for reduction of Government expenditures, against economic-controls legislation, against continuation of Office of Technical Services, for European recovery program, National Science Foundation. Note: It is my opinion that a small part of my time and expenses can be charged to duties requiring registration.

Neel, Samuel E., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See attached sheet.[3] (2) See attached sheet.[3] (3) See attached sheet.[3] (4) Washington News Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; Letter to Members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; the Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage banking industry.

Nelson, G. W., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposing antilabor legislation and favoring legislation of benefit to labor.

Nelson, Herbert U., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Reimbursement by employer for travel expenses and per diem, $2,273.91; salary, 20 percent of time devoted to legislative activities, $1,250; per diem, 71 days, trip to Europe to study housing, $1,420; total, $4,943.91. (2) See attached itemized statement.[3] (3) See attached itemized statement.[3] (4) Attached list[3] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Newton B. Wayne, National Association of Cooperatives, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) April 6, $22.05 expense account; April 15, $115.23 expense account, $350 salary; April 22, $22.20 expense account; April 30, $353.34 salary; May 4, $305.89 expense account; May 14, $367.87 salary; May 19, $79.84 expense account, $137.03 expense account; May 28, $64.64 expense account, $367.86 salary; June 15, $367.86 salary, $101.29 expense account; June 30, $367.87 salary. (2) R. Wayne Newton. (3) See (1). (4) Wall Street Journal, The Place for Cooperatives. (5) Employed to counteract the anti-farmer-co-op lobbying activities of the National Tax Equality Association; Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, whether lobbying individually, as officers and employees of the National Tax Equality Association or as a firm of organization and industry counselors claiming the National Tax Equality Association as a client; all State and local tax equality associations and all National, State, and local small business or other associations however known which are subsidized from, or contributors to, the lobbying funds of the National Tax Equality Association.

Nixon, Russ, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received for lobbying purposes; none expended for lobbying purposes. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Noble, William R., National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $89.80. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, luncheons, and hotel. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer. (5) Have taken position on wage-and-hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) June 1948 edition, Business

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for first quarter 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter 1948.
[8] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[12] Filed for first and second quarters, 1948.

School Executive. (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Federation of Private School Associations, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,165.83; no expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Noffsinger, J. S., National Council of Technical Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Home Study Council, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Norgord, Christian P., 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW.; the American Humane Association, 135 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y. (1) During the first quarter of 1948, total receipts $678.35. (2) Per diem for self, $545.80; to railroad companies and Washington firms for travel and supplies and service, $133.55. (3) As indicated above. (4) None. (5) S. 1447 and H. R. 5952.

Northham,[4] Harry E., Suite 704, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $2,500; traveling, hotel, and subsistence expenses, $300. Only approximately 10 percent is devoted to legislative activities in behalf of my association. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, hotels, etc. (3) Travel, subsistence, and lodging. (4) Monthly news letter of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, issued to the membership of the association. (5) About 10 percent of my time is devoted to supporting or opposing legislation which deals with medical care.

Nortman,[4] Walter, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) The undersigned received as salary, on a pro-rata basis for the time spent on Federal legislation at the rate of $20 per day, the total sum for the 3-month period, April 1 to June 30, 1948, the sum of $300, for 15 days devoted to Federal matters; the undersigned expended a total sum of $245.30 during such period. (2) Expenses were incurred for various miscellaneous matters such as meals, lodging, and traveling expenses, all of which was in amounts of less than $10 for any single item, except hotel bills for lodging of May 6, Mayflower Hotel, $21.20; May 12, $14.30; and June 17, Wardman Park Hotel, of $5.30. (3) Expenditures were made for meals, lodging, taxi fares, and similar miscellaneous items. (4) The Milwaukee Journal, June 23, 1948. (5) S. 110, known as the Reed-Bulwinkle bill.

Noyes,[3] Charles E., American Institute of Accountants, American Institute Publishing Co., 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Total salaries, $2,500. (2) No money paid for legislative work. (3) None. (4) Journal of Accountancy, Certified Public Accountant. (5) Legislation relating to rights of certified public accountants to practice before Federal agencies (H. R. 2657, H. R. 3214, H. R. 5732).

Nyce, Peter Q., 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received and none expended. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to lands of the United States.

O'Brien, John, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Riegel Textile Corp., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received; long-distance telephone call, $1.38. (2) New York Telephone Co. (3) Same as (1). (4) None. (5) Proposals for relief of work-glove manufacturers on account of payments made in settlement of controversy with Office of Price Administration.

O'Connor,[7] Edward H., Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received during quarter, $2,499.96; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $547.62. (2) Paid out $547.62 in traveling expenses to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous items of personal expense. (3) For personal traveling expenses of the undersigned incurred in carrying out my work for the Insurance Economics Society of America. No moneys expended during this quarter for lobbying activities. (4) None. (5) The Howell bill, H. R. 3150, and its companion Senate bill, S. 670, by Senator HAWKES; S. 1320 and its companion, H. R. 3548; H. R. 6355; Senate Resolution 249.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 396 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,500 compensation; $205.27 expenditures (allocation of the registerable part of the compensation can only be a best estimate; it follows the allocation adopted in 1947 under identical terms of employment). (2) [Blank.] (3) $42 taxicab fares, telephone tolls, and telegrams; $163.27 for the Public Printer (copies of S. 2582). (4) None. (5) H. R. 2860, amendment to section 1 (b) in Eightieth Congress, second session; House Joint Resolution 131 in Eightieth Congress, second session; H. R. 6556, H. R. 6379, S. 2682, Eightieth Congress, second session.

O'Gara, Herrick J., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes; $12 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Ogg, William Raymond, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $22.35 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (This covers the period April 1 to May 15, 1948.) (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, farm credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of postwar construction of highways, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department, transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment of Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by Secretary of Agriculture, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, Labor Extension Service, alcohol plants, social security, weed killer, crop insurance, wheat carry-over, international wheat agreement, Parker River project, fiber identification, displaced persons, reciprocal trade agreements, rural electrification, radio, health, housing, standard time, Fair Labor Standards Act, railroad rates, Government corporations.

O'Hara, Bart W., secretary-treasurer, Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 450 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation that may be designed to bring about tax equality concerning corporations.

Oliver, Fred N., 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; senior partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York City, and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Estimated $525 from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and an indeterminate part of $3,250 from Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc. (See appendix.[3]) (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation but is to appear before congressional committees on legislation in which the mutual-savings banks and railroad-security owners have a legitimate interest.

Oliver, John P., 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) April 1948, $583.33 plus $34.75; May 1948, $583.33 plus $28.75; June 1948, $583.33. (2) The grocer, the baker, the landlord, the taxi driver, etc. (3) Living expenses for self and family, transportation, taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received: Fees amounting to $2,500 from National Council on Business Mail, Inc. Expended: Approximately $125 in taxicab fares. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to postal rates and regulations.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Electric Power Board, Sixth and Market, Chattanooga, Tenn. (1) Received fees amounting to $1,875 from Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association. Expended approximately $100 in taxicab fares. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to public and private power.

Owens, T. R., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, URWA Building, High and Mill Streets, Akron, Ohio. (1) Salary, $960; expenses, $888. (2) Hotels, railroads, and other traveling expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) United Rubber Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) To Elton T. Cowan Co. for 1,000 envelopes, $22; to Ardlee Services for 3,000 pamphlets, $130; to Mrs. Oxholm for stamps, $12; travel, $8; membership contributions, $131. (2) As indicated. (3) As indicated. (4) [Blank.]

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

(5) Federal legislation specifically affecting children and child welfare.

Parel, James Donald, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $54.32 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation, luncheon-conferences. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting, resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, farm credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of construction of postwar highways, transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment of Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by Secretary of Agriculture, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, Labor Extension Service, alcohol plants, social security, weed killer, crop insurance, wheat carry-over, international wheat agreement, Parker River project, fiber identification, displaced persons, reciprocal trade agreements, rural electrification, radio, health, housing, standard time, Fair Labor Standards Act, railroad rates, Government corporations.

Parker, James P., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A total of $1,500 has been received as fees. Expenditures were as follows: April 14, $9.50, long-distance calls; May 14, $100, Chicago directors meeting; July 1, $10, cabs, tips, etc. The amount for the above expenses has been refunded. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Veterans' education and training program outlined in Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

Parks, Gilbert L., P. O. A. U., 1628 Sixteenth Street NW., or 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary only ($100 per week gross). Salary net for second quarter, $1,061. (2) Gilbert L. Parks. (3) Performs duties of office manager, general public relations. (4) Placed paid advertising in various other publications. (5) Concerned only with educational program designed to activate concern for religious freedom in terms of the first amendment to the Constitution.

Pastor,[1] Richard, volunteer worker for the Veterans' Committee Against the Mundt-Nixon Bill, 213 East Twenty-fifth Street, New York City. (1) Received $137.05 for expenses. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) The Mundt-Nixon bill.

Patterson, Belknap & Webb, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; the American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received; expended $103.04. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, United Air Lines, taxis, stenographers, telephone company. (3) Transportation expenses and stenographic and telephone charges. (4) None. (5) As counsel for the purpose of obtaining an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act whereby alien property in this country formerly owned by persons under persecution by an enemy government, in cases where the owner is dead and left no heirs, may be turned over to the organizations for the relief of survivors. H. R. 6817 was introduced this session.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

Patton, James G., Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $144.85 reimbursement for expenses. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, phones, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Peebles, Ivey Edwin, Maryland Public Expenditure Council, Inc., 636 Equitable Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activity at Federal level in this quarter, and none contemplated in future. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Peterson, Dutton S., Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, April, May, June, $833.34; travel expense, $634.59. (2) Carfare, $248.05; room, $45.50; meals, $69.95; telephone and telegraph, $115.10; miscellaneous, $155.99; April-June total, $634.59. (3) Travel is for the purpose of discussing developments on universal military training legislation and to organize opposition against it. (4) The organization sends a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription, and the militarization of America.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $1,222. Received $596.22 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $350.30 of this amount was for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Hotels, railroad, restaurants, cab drivers, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) CIO News and the Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Peterson, Oliver A., Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, January 26–February 26, 1948, $807.75; travel and transportation expenses, January 26–February 26, 1948, $623.83. (Services terminated February 28, 1948.) (2) Salary received used for personal expenses, no part of it spent on behalf of the committee for the Marshall plan to aid European recovery. Travel and transportation expenses covered my actual expenses traveling on behalf of the committee. (3) Same as (2) above. (4) None, except through ordinary press channels. (5) Legislation to provide for a European recovery program.

Peterson, William J., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my regular salary as executive secretary for the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, for which I performed my regular duties as chief administrative officer of the chamber, which said duties were related only incidentally to Federal legislation. Aside from my regular salary nothing was received nor spent for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Petty, Don, National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 received for services as attorney for the National Association of Broadcasters for quarter ending July 1, 1948. $947.68 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, communications companies, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth in (1), above, were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as general counsel handling all of the legal affairs of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involved Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None. (5) None. I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radio broadcasting industry. During the past quarter I testified before the House Appropriations Committee relating to the Copyright Office.

Pierson, A. T., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $1,815; expenses, $114.65. (2) Hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, taxis, telephone, etc. (3) Expenses for traveling and as shown in item 2. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Pirnie, Warren Bruce, president, Pirnie, Lee & Co. Federation, Inc., U. S. A., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Hunan Provinces as Negotiating Agents for Reconstruction of China. (1) No money received from my constituents in China during this quarter or since I began to act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) A China recovery program part of record before Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives presented by N. F. Allimon (80th Cong.). (5) [Blank.]

Place, Henry C., care of Townsend, Elliot & Munson, 1100 Provident Trust Building, Seventeenth & Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.; National Association of Electric Companies. (1) The firm received from the National Association of Electric Companies $6,225 for legal services for the quarter ending June 30, 1948, and reimbursement of $1,027.74 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all legal services to the association, only a part of which fee and expenses was for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $449.96; subsistence expenses away from Philadelphia, $453.74; telephone and telegraph, $118.79; miscellaneous, $5.25. (4) [Blank.] (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which our firm is counsel, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association, therefore, is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

Pogue, L. Welch, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $4,500 fee received during quarter, plus disbursements as follows: Taxicabs, $13.65; telephone, $4.02; and notary fees, $2. (2) [Blank.] (3) See memorandum attached to Form B in your office. (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B in your office.

Pollitzer,[1] Anita, national chairman, National Woman's Party, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Woman's Party, May 24, 1948, $100 (reimbursement for traveling expenses). (2) [Blank] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. See attached statement.[2]

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

(1) Receipts, $3,853.01; disbursements, $826.77. (2) See attached statement.[3] (3) See attached statement.[3] (4) None. (5) S. 2173, H. R. 5533, S. 2202, H. R. 6556.

Posner, Stanley I., attorney, Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Linen Supply Association of America: Fees, $1,500; disbursements, $180.88. Institute of Industrial Launderers: Fees, $1,500; disbursements, $163.88. National Council of Technical Schools: Fees, none; disbursements, $25.28. National Council of Business Schools: Fees, none; disbursements, $16.85. (2) No disbursements for purposes of section 307. (3) None. (4) Mimeographed bulletins of Linen Supply Association and Institute of Industrial Launderers; also Linen Supply News. (5) Labor legislation on behalf of Linen Supply Association and Institute of Industrial Launderers; veterans training programs on behalf of National Council of Technical Schools and National Council of Business Schools.

Powell, E. Henry, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,800 received from Oliver & Donnally as partner's drawing account and distribution; $156.54 received and expended for travel, etc.; $2,800 is the entire amount received by registrant from Oliver & Donnally for all his legal services rendered during the quarter. A small proportion of this amount (not more than 5 percent) was for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act. The $156.54 represents reimbursement of legitimate expenses actually incurred by registrant such as travel, hotel, and meals. (2) See answer to question 1. (3) See answer to question 1. (4) None. (5) Any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

Pratt, Foster J., International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, A. F. of L., Room 908, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As president he receives a monthly salary ($600) minus withholding and social-security taxes, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Foster J. Pratt. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as administrative and executive head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, A. F. of L. (lobbying is minor and incidental). (4) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, A. F. of L., Weekly Federal News Letters, and Monthly Outlook for the dissemination of organization news including legislation. (5) Beneficial to the employees in the engineering and architectural professions.

Pray,[5] Kenneth L., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $5,000; expenses, allowance $1,260. (2) University Club, National Press Club, Statler Hotel, taxicabs, Pennsylvania Railroad, etc. (3) Dues, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) My services insofar as legislative matters are concerned consist primarily of factually reporting the status and content of proposals affecting Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies.

Pray,[6] Kenneth L., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and Affiliated Companies, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $5,000; expense, allowance, $1,260. (2) University Club, National Press Club, Statler Hotel, taxicabs, Pennsylvania Railroad, etc. (3) Dues, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) My services insofar as legislative matters are concerned consist primarily of factually reporting the status and content of proposals affecting Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and Affiliated Companies.

Proctor, Harry E., attorney at law, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally. No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (5) The registrant contributed articles for the April, May, and June issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied and analyzed a number of bills pertaining to banks, savings and loans associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing.

Pritchard, E. Anthony, National Lead Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) money received by this registrant was for salary and expenses in connection with his duties as assistant to the manager of the Washington Office of the National Lead Co. Impossible to segregate amount for legislative activities. Only $25 was expended during second quarter 1948 on legislative work. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., various garages, taxicabs, and lunch. (3) The money was expended for the purpose of keeping the various company offices advised on legislation, for taxicabs and automobile expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Press, William H., Washington Board of Trade, 204 Star Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,000; expenses, $178.86. (2) Miscellaneous taxi and transportation, lunches, etc. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) Releases sent to Washington newspapers—Evening Star, Washington Post, Times-Herald, and Washington Daily News. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia.

Prentice, Howard A., 1329 E. Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.03 as miscellaneous expenses (see below). (2) Notary public, $2; postage, 3 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report; postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Purves, Edmund R., director of public and professional relations, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Institute of Architects, Same. (1) None, except salary for this period, which amounted to $2,500. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Putt, C. J., the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) Reimbursed by the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. for actual expenses incurred as follows: Carlton Hotel, room and phone, $35.80; Mayflower Hotel, room and phone, $138.23; Pullman Co., $78.39; dining cars, hotels, restaurants, for meals, $279.80; various taxicabs, $57.30; various redcaps and checking stands, $9.50; shows, ball games, and other entertainment, $56.50; cigars, $11; notary fee, $1. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Various bills affecting railroads.

Quigley,[5] Frank, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $616.42. (2) Taxicabs; travel, Washington to New York headquarters (Pennsylvania Railroad, $21.42; Hotel Madison, New York, $36); cafes; clubs; and incidental expenses. (3) Out-of-pocket business expenses, personal conference expenses, publications, stenographic services, etc. (4) None. (5) None.

Quigley,[6] Frank, 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $677.22. (2) Hotels, taxicabs, clubs, and restaurants. (3) Conferring with headquarters in New York, Associated Bell Telephone Companies of the United States and any governmental bodies in connection with matters of information or public relations. (4) None. (5) None.

Quinlan,[7] William A., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See exhibit B attached.[3]) (1) The undersigned has received no payments either particularly or principally for the purposes designated in the act. As to expenditures, see exhibit A, attached.[3] (2) See exhibit A.[3] (3) See exhibit A.[3] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation to bar portal-to-portal liabilities for the period subsequent to enactment of the Portal-to-Portal Act, May 14, 1947, in addition to other legislation, if any, which may be of interest to clients employing the undersigned on general retainers.

Radner & Zito (the firm members and associates are William Radner, Frank J. Zito, J. Franklin Fort, Odell Kominers, and Mary L. Schleifer), room 528, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting maritime industry, particularly in relation to wage-and-hour law.

Raebeck, Helen, National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $850. On leave as of March 1. Pro rata salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Spotlight, a house organ of the National Council of Jewish Women, a small part of which is devoted to asking membership support of certain legislative measures. (5) None. My job is to keep the membership informed on legislative developments and indicate action they can take in support of certain bills.

Raesly, Leon, 1218 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) H. R. 669.

Ragland, Edward F., Associated Tobacco Manufacturers, 109–110 Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None, but am interested in any legislation affecting tobacco industry.

Ramsey, Donald J., Silver Users Association, 1730 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Railroad and airplane tickets, $562.77; hotels, $208.35; meals, $223.06; taxis and tips, $124.35; telephone, $253.47; office expenses, including supplies and expenses of employees, $863.87; meetings, $31.69; total, $2,267.56. Salary (before tax withholdings), $3,000; reimbursement for expenses, $1,846.87; total, $4,846.87. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Silver News Letter. (5) Legislation affecting the silver-using industry.

Ramspeck, Robert, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported. Expended $28.15. (2) Taxi fares to and from Capitol Hill. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the airline industry in the public interest. For specific legislation supported and opposed during this quarter, see exhibit A[3] attached.

Rankin, J. Lee., Beghtol and Rankin, Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

Rapp, Leslie M., Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant's activities in behalf of Jack & Heintz Precision Industries, Inc. (which consisted only of testifying before a congressional committee and hence were not actually subject to the act), ceased as of the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress. Registrant has been reimbursed by the law firm of Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett (by which he is employed) for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in behalf of said client in the amount of $69.83. Said law firm will in turn be reimbursed by said client for such expenses and in addition will be reimbursed in the further amount of $28.72 for client's portion of railroad fare for registrant paid directly by it. Said law firm has not yet received any fee from said client on account of registrant's services. Such fee, when received, will be in connection with said law firm's bill for all legal services for the year 1948 and will be based on the actual time spent by registrant charged for at the customary rate for professional services. On such basis the portion of said fee attributable to the services performed under this registration will not exceed $1,000. (2) Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Pennsylvania Railroad, and various taxi drivers. (3) Hotels, meals, transportation, telephone, and telegrams. (4) None. (5) Proposed legislation treating a successor corporation in a tax-free reorganization as the same taxpayer as the predecessor for purposes of the carry-over and carry-back provisions.

Rapp, Leslie M., Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant's activities in behalf of Paramount Pictures, Inc., ceased as of the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress. Registrant has been reimbursed by the law firm of Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett (by which he is employed) for out-of-pocket expenses incurred in behalf of said client in the amount of $56.40. Said law firm will in turn be reimbursed by said client for such expenses and, in addition, will be reimbursed in the further amount of $9.58 for client's portion of railroad fare for registrant paid directly by it. Said law firm has not yet received any fee from said client on account of registrant's services. Such fee, when received, will be in connection with said law firm's bill for all legal services for the year 1948 and will be based on the actual time spent by registrant charged for at the customary rate for professional services. On such basis the portion of said fee attributable to the services performed under this registration will not exceed $1,000. (2) Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Pennsylvania Railroad, and various taxi drivers. (3) Hotel, meals, transportation, telephone, and telegrams. (4) None. (5) Proposed legislation treating the disposition of property pursuant to a civil decree under the antitrust laws as an involuntary conversion.

Ratcliffe, William O., Baltimore Lumber Co., 1600 New York Avenue NE., Washington, D. C. (1) No accounts. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Ray, L. S., 2015 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $750. (2) Me. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting members of this organization.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Printing, mimeograph, and binding costs for petitions, bulletins, and reprints, $145.82; postage, $38.77; advertising, $25; telephone, $28.79; miscellaneous lunches, dinners, and entertainment, $22.40; total amount expended, $260.78. (2) Advertising, Congressional Secretaries Club, $25; printing, mimeograph, binding costs, etc., paid by National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association from dues collected. No receipts specifically for legislative purposes. (3) Petitions printed were distributed to persons engaged in beauty and barber industry for signatures. Petitions urged members of the Senate to support H. R. 3825, providing for the repeal of the excise tax on cosmetics used in beauty and barber shops. Bulletins urged industry members to contact Senators regarding H. R. 3825, urging their support. (4) National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association Legislative Bulletin, which is issued by registrant in his capacity as Washington representative; Brokmeyer Bulletin. (5) H. R. 3825. Registrant is paid an annual retainer as counsel for the National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association. No determinable amount of compensation is paid or received on account of legislative activities. Normally, the total time used by registrant in activities covered by this law is infinitesimal. However, activity on legislation has consumed 50 percent of registrant's time in this quarter.

Reckord, Milton A., National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received, and none expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Nothing published. (5) Our effort was to add funds to the Army appropriation bill for aid to civilian rifle clubs and to conduct the national rifle and pistol matches.

Reinhold, James P., Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary for calendar quarter as reported in January 10, 1948, Quarterly Report Form C; also reimbursed in the amount of $523.99 expended during calendar quarter, of which $174.66 was expended for purposes other than covered in the act. (2) Paid for meals in hotels and various restaurants, expended for taxicabs and automobile, telephone calls, postage, and telegrams. (3) In furtherance of duties described in Registration Form B, of which personal legislative activity is not my principal purpose but is occasional and incidental. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Rhodes, Hubert M., room 209, 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Credit Union National Association, Inc., post-office box 431, Madison, Wis. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association, Inc., and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work. The amount received and expended by him was $9.08. (2) Various. (3) Trips to House and Senate Office Buildings and Capitol, telephone calls, and notarizing reports required to be filed under the Lobbying Act for the quarter ended March 31, 1948. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

Rice, Richard M., Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) No money was received for salary. No money was received or expended for purposes falling within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality between similar businesses.

Rice, Robert A., Railway Mail Association, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is president, Railway Mail Association, elected by membership for a term of 2 years at annual salary of $8,500. No money received and expended for activities which fall within the terms of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) See No. 1. (3) See No. 1. (4) Registrant writes report to membership of Railway Mail Association in monthly issues of official journal, The Railway Post Office. (5) Activities consist of serving as president, Railway Mail Association, and supporting such legislation as is beneficial to members of this organization. Membership consists of employees of the Railway Mail Service.

Richards, D. D.,[1] 1238 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Mail Order Association of America, 1061 West Thirty-fifth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specifically.

Richman, Paul, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Approximately $125. (2) Paul Richman. (3) Office telephone. (4) Washington Newsletter. (5) Fair employment practices, immigration.

Rising, E. W., Western Beet Growers Association, et al., 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) (a) Western Beet Growers Association, Great Falls, Mont., $186.97; (b) National Water Conservation Conference, $543.15. (2) Received by E. W. Rising and expended for office expenses, postage, stationery in connection with information service furnished members of Western Beet Growers Association and for time of E. W. Rising; no legislation pending in this quarter. (3) Received by E. W. Rising and expended as follows: Stenographic service, $299.94; stationery, $25.40; telephone and telegraph, $30.16; express, $3.20; stamps, $24.06; miscellaneous, $12.75; trip from Washington to Omaha and return, $147.64. (4) None during second quarter 1948. (5) (a) Legislation of interest to beet growers. None in second quarter 1948; (b) legislation in connection with development and conservation land and water resources and in preservation of States rights, tidelands legislation, regional and valley authority legislation.

Rivers, T. E., National Recreation Association, 315 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter ending June 30, 1948, I have received and expended $17.24. (2) Railroad company, taxis, restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) [Blank.] (5) S. 1229 and H. R. 5723.

Roark, L. E., National Founders Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000; expenses, nominal travel, hotel, and meals. (2) Common carriers for travel, hotels for room and meals. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Robb, George Mackay, 121 Warner Avenue, Syracuse, N. Y.; Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Cash on hand April 2, 1948, $135.35. This had been received from Mr. J. S. Tibby, treasurer of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, a few days previous. (2) Of above amount, $75.05 was paid out in incidental expenses. (3) For traveling to Washington, D. C., and mimeographing and mailing letters in the interest of our proposed legislation. (4) The Christian Patriot, edited by Dr. J. C. Mathews, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) Senate Joint Resolution 150 and House Joint Resolution 238.

Robbins, Paul H., National Society of Professional Engineers, 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $500, and expenses, $50, for April, May, and June, 1948, for attention to legislative matters. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer; Legislative Bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

Rogers, Watson, National Food Brokers Association, 537 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received or expended by the undersigned for purpose of influencing legislation except. (a) $12 (4 hours, estimated time, at $3 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,480 received by the undersigned as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., allocable to assistance in preparation of statements which were used in the association's appearance before congressional hearings on amendments to the Wage and Hour Act and on repeal of oleomargarine taxes; (b) $24 (8 hours, estimated time, at $3 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,480 received by the undersigned as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., allocable to preparation of association's mimeographed published material in which Federal legislation was advocated, opposed, or mentioned. (1) See attachment. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). Washington News Letter of United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers; he was later specifically authorized by the executive committee of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., to support or oppose general labor legislation and fair employment practice legislation.

Rudy, John Forney, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 received as salary from National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the second quarter of 1948, allocable to legislative activities. (2) $4 for postcards, for which reimbursed. (3) See item 2. (4) None. (5) As director of public relations of the federation, am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation; during the Eightieth Congress issued several news releases and assisted in preparation of statements to our membership which outlined the provisions of different bills and resolutions before Congress.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building (room 427), Washington, D. C.; Spencer Gordon, counsel for American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Opposing H. R. 2657; my employment ended with the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress. No further moneys will be received or expended by me and consequently no further reports will be filed.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building (room 427), Washington, D. C.; Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 fee received during quarter, plus disbursements as follows: Taxicabs, $29.65; telephones, $47.68; printing, $17.11; travel, $40; entertainment, $57.08; miscellaneous, $6.14, for a total received during quarter of $3,947.66. (2) [Blank.] (3) See memorandum attached to Form B in your office. (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B in your office.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building (room 427), Washington, D. C.; Consolidated Steel Corp., Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $3,080 fee and $77.95 for out-of-pocket disbursements such as long-distance phone calls, telegrams, and taxicabs, received during quarter; this, together with original $1,000 retainer, is total sum to be received. (2) [Blank.] (3) For assisting in passage of H. R. 4377, a private bill for the relief of Consolidated Steel Corp., which was signed by the President on June 3, 1948, and became Private Law No. 328. (4) None. (5) To support passage of H. R. 4377; my employment for this purpose is now concluded, and thus no further reports will be filed by me in this connection; no further funds to be received or expended.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building (room 427), Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) None received; approximately $5.60 expended for taxi fares during quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code relating to the foreign tax credit.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building (room 427), Washington, D. C.; Harbor Boat Building Co. and Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) None received, although work completed and bill for services rendered, submitted in amount of $1,920 fee and $36.68 disbursements, will report further when received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 4379, a private bill for the relief of the companies listed above, which bill was signed by the President on June 3, 1948, and became Private Law No. 329.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I received my salary, commissions, and expenses, as reported on earlier Form B; the corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A. (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue news releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation; sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then I distribute educational material on the question.

Rush, Charles J., Washington Real Estate Board, 1417 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $66.66 per month as executive secretary. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate.

Russell, Francis M., National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $480 (expended for matters relating to legislation). (2) See (3) below. (3) Telephone and telegraph, taxi fares, entertainment. (4) None. (5) As an incidental part of registrant's duties as vice president in charge of Washington office of National Broadcasting Co., Inc., including operation of the company's radio stations in Washington, registrant may engage in activities relating to legislation affecting radio communications companies.

Russell, Horace, 7 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received retainer payable monthly at the rate of $11,000 per annum for one-half time, a small proportion of which is for legislative activity. Also received and expended $100.69. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) Contents of the Legal Bulletin of the United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill.; Private Housing vs. Public Housing, Directors Digest, April 1948, United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill.; Federal Aid to Housing: Pro and Con, Directors Digest, May 1948, United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill., condensed from American Bar Journal, February 1948. (5) Legislation affecting the savings and loan business.

Russell, Richard M., Estate of Charles W. Taintor (administrators, Merchants National Bank and Alexander Whiteside), care of Alexander Whiteside, 30 State Street, Boston, Mass. (1) Money received from administrators of estate of Charles W. Taintor, $103.21 for actual disbursements and $1,000 in full payment for services. Money expended, $103.21 for actual disbursements. (2) Various. (3) Transportation, phones, etc. (4) None. (5) S. 483, a bill to reallocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes, and its companion, H. R. 1597, to the same effect.

Russo, Paul M., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee, Detroit, Mich. (1) Report covers period beginning week ending April 3, 1948, to and including week ending May 22, 1948. Salary (8 weeks at $90), $720; subsistence, $406; expenses, $361.73; total, $1,487.73. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) None. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Ryan, M. O., 1405 K Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,300. April 1 to June 30, 1948, inclusive, total personal expenses for taxis, lunches, dinners, phones, etc., in Washington, D. C., were $600.40, of which insignificant amount was for activities related in any way to lobbying. (2) Taxis, Washington restaurants and hotels. (3) Transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Organizational bulletins for American Hotel Association. (5) Any legislation affecting hotel industry.

St. Clair,[5] Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Automobile Dealers Association, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,250. (2) No expenditures. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of interest to dealers.

St. Clair,[5] Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street N. W., Washington, D. C.; Stran steel division, Great Lakes Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) Received $1,500. (2) No expenditures. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of interest to client.

St. Clair,[6] Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C.; National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,250. (2) Nothing paid. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of interest to retail dealers.

St. Clair,[6] Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Stran Steel Division, Great Lakes Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) Received $1,500, no expenditures. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of interest to the client.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, A. F. of L., 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Pay at the rate of $7,200 per year; expenses $5 a day. (2) None. (3) None. (4) One article in our official publication, The Catering Industry Employees. (5) Support all labor and social legislation; oppose all antilabor and antisocial legislation.

Saville, Russell, American Pension Committee, Inc., 15 E Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary paid by American Pension Committee, Inc., $900. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Comet, the American Pension Committee weekly report. (5) Legislation on old-age pensions and social security generally. H. R. 781 and other bills.

Saylor, Richard D., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and expenses in connection with his duties as manager of the Washington office of the National Lead Co.; impossible to segregate amount for legislative activities; only $65 was expended during second quarter 1948

[5] Filed for first quarter of 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

on legislative work. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., various garages and taxicabs. (3) The money was expended for the purpose of keeping the various company offices advised on legislation, for taxicabs, and automobile expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Scanlin, Theresa F., 12 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; MacArthur for President Campaign Committee, 1333 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (and self), 12 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $50, MacArthur Campaign Committee for President, 1333 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., from Erim Hohensee, executive secretary. Still due me, $8.98 expended for phone calls, cab fares, and postage; $62.54 salary and overtime. (2) To me by Erim Hohensee, executive secretary, MacArthur for President Campaign Committee, 1333 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Promotional work, advocating the nomination of General MacArthur for President. (4) None. (5) Polling Senators and Members advocating the nomination for President of General MacArthur, civil-service legislation for legislative clerks, housing, and welfare.

Schell, S. D., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received approximately $300 of regular salary for services performed on matters relating to legislation. The chief legislation with which my duties were concerned were House Joint Resolution 412 and House Joint Resolution 413, relating to merchant marine legislation, and H. R. 6534 and S. 2728, legislation to clarify provisions of the Wage and Hour Act; in addition to this proportion of my salary, I received as reimbursement for expenses for meals, taxicabs, hotel accommodation, trains, and hotel quarters a total of $37.85; expenses paid out totaled $37.85. (2) Hotels for meals and lodging, restaurants for meals, taxicab drivers for taxi fares, and to porters for tips. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 412, House Joint Resolution 413, H. R. 6534, and S. 2728. Activities consisted of several conferences with Members of Congress who were interested in explanations of these bills and concerned with their passage. Activities also included giving information to members of industry who were likewise interested in the passage of the merchant marine legislation and the wage and hour legislation, and wished to discuss the principles involved in the legislation.

Schoen,[1] Paul W., Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, post-office box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (1) Salary $480 (1 month which was maximum expended on direct legislative work; field expense, $202.23 (travel expense and incidentals in Washington); office expense, $203.87 (clerical help, postage, telegraph, etc.), total $896.20. (2) No payments made to anyone; above items expenditures from regular operating budget used for legislative activity of regular association work. (3) All expenditures other than indicated above for work in behalf of private forestry activities of USFS as in agricultural appropriation and on Clark-McNary fire and planting bills. (4) The Forest Farmer (association publication and press releases of which no record of publication is available. (5) Forestry legislation applicable to or affecting private-timber landowners.

Schoene, Freehill & Kramer, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, and Milton Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad retirement, unemployment insurance, and employers' liability matters.

Schoenhals, E. L., Tax Equality League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Received from Tax Equality League of Utah, $745; this was paid for acting as attorney and in addition for the use of my law offices, for stenographic services, telephone and long-distance phone calls, mailing, addressing, and postage advanced by me, and traveling expense. (2) To my secretary, Jean Powers, telephone company, Kearns Building for office rental, United States postal service. (3) To maintain my office, receive phone calls from members and carry on correspondence with members of the organization. (4) Deseret News, Salt Lake Tribune, and Salt Lake Telegram have carried news items only, but not paid advertising. (5) To obtain tax equality.

Scott, Jack Garrett, National Association of Motor Operators, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No receipts except annual retainer for general legal services as shown in registration statement. No expenditures for legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Generally all legislation affecting the intercity motor bus industry. Thus far this session I have made presentations before congressional committees on S. 110, H. R. 221; excise-tax legislation, H. R. 584 and S. 1126; House investigation of Fair Labor Standards Act, S. 1812; national transportation inquiry; standard and daylight saving time; and S. 2062 and S. 2386.

Scott, John W., Victor J. Evans & Co., et al., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None other than salary received at the total monthly rate of $700 from Victor J. Evans & Co., Harvey B. Jacobson, John N. Randolph, and Patrick D. Beavers. No expenditures made. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) None. (5) As previously stated in my registration statement. (NOTE.—The firm of McMorrow, Berman & Davidson is attempting to cancel contract of employment with me and is not currently paying me any sum of money.)

Scott, Vernon, and Schuler, Loring A., constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott & Loring A. Schuler, organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. See attached statement.[2] (1) For money received, see attached statement;[2] no money was received or expended for purposes within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. (See answer to par. (1).) (3) (See answer to par. (2).) (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to have various types of business corporations taxed on the same basis.

Scott, William C., report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No receipts or expenditures during said period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Sears, W. J., the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, and 715 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) During this period I neither have engaged in any legislative activity, nor have I made any expenditure for this purpose.

Seay, Temple W., 902 Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C.; Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo. (1) None with respect to this or any other matters before the legislature. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2192 for the relief of Massman Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.

See, Harry, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street, SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $20.45. (2) Restaurants. (3) Lunches. (4) None. (5) Opposing antilabor legislation and favoring legislation of benefit to labor.

Selby, Meredith, (Mrs.), Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated June 15, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.]. (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Shackelford, P. L., international representative, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250. Total expense for quarter, $2,649.71. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am employed to handle my many and varied duties as international representative of the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association. My work in connection with legislation is incidental to these other duties and consumes a very small part of my time. It is confined to giving attention to legislation affecting railway employees in which we are interested.

Shaw, Mark R., 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass. (New England office), 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (national office), National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $400; traveling expenses, $114.65; total, $514.65. (2) Railroads, bus lines, gas stations, restaurants, etc. (3) Travel to speaking dates, conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Bulletins of the NCPW. (5) Universal military training (oppose); renewal of selective service (oppose); economic relief of war-devastated countries (favor); admission of displaced persons (favor). Other measures related to peace and world order.

Shields, Robert H., 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Beet Sugar Association. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Shufelt, Bernard E., Ward 44, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Richmond, Va.; Paralyzed Veterans' Associations of America, 99 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received, Paralyzed Veterans Associations of America, $200; Eastern Paralyzed Veterans' Association, $200; expended, $391.05. (2) Various. (3) Accommodations, travel, attendant service. (4) Richmond Times Dispatch, Richmond, Va. (5) Paraplegic housing bill, amputee car bill, charter for Paralyzed Veterans of America.

Shuford, Helen Alcott, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None (compensation and reimbursement of expenses received as stated on registration statement). Employment terminated as of June 30, 1948. (2) Employment terminated as of June 30, 1948. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 6396.

Sifton, Paul, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO, 411 West Milwaukee, Detroit, Mich. (1) $1,200 salary; expenses, $1,098.21; total $2,298.21. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto workers. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Slayman, Charles H., Jr., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. Employment terminated June 16, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6396, Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Smart, Elizabeth A. (Miss), 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C. (Special Committee to Promote the Capper Bill.) (1) Received $665.07 salary. Received and paid out $302.12. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; Washington Times-Herald; E. Morrison Paper Co.; Western Union; Abel & Co., photostat prints; Royal Typewriter Co.; Bethesda Duplicating Co., copies of Rees speech; President's Conference on Citizenship; A. B. Dick Co.; post office. (3) Telephone; subscription; two erasers; telegrams; photostat prints; one coupon book and cleaning fluid for typewriter; 5,000 letterheads, 5,000 6¾ envelopes; luncheon and enrollment fees, banquet; mimeograph stencil sheets, ink, correction fluid; postage. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relation.

Smith, Allen L., Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., post-office box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Anthony W., Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative employment, $75. This is computed as stated in registration statement at $300 a year. No expenditures. (2) None. (3) Compensation as above received for legislative work. (4) CIO-News, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Forestry legislation, river valley development, resource conservation.

Smith, Donald W. (report as attorney for American Nurses' Association), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American Nurses' Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) No receipts during said period. Expenditures: Transportation, $39.08; hotel rooms and meals, $23.87; carfare, 30 cents; telephone calls, 17 cents; taxicab fares, $1.90. (2) The Pennsylvania Railroad; Hotel Belvedere, Baltimore, Md.; Hotel Wardman Park, Washington, D. C.; and various transportation, telephone, and taxicab companies. (3) Transportation, hotel rooms and meals, carfare, telephone calls, and taxicab fares. (4) The American Journal of Nursing, New York, N. Y. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health, on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand, including the extension of social-security coverage and Federal aid to nursing education.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,250 monthly from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for the principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for the purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Harold O., Jr., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) During the past quarter I did not have occasion to engage in any activities which I believed would be construed as lobbying. Serving full time as executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., my activities are those of a trade association executive and any contacts with Members of Congress are purely incidental to my many other activities in connection with trade association work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) In our bulletins and weekly news letters to members, we occasionally report on legislative matters affecting the trade. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. In behalf of our members we opposed the rulings of the Department of Internal Revenue which exempted cooperatives from taxation; also the Department's rulings which placed an unreasonable burden on wholesale grocers in reporting sales of oleomargarine.

Smith,[1] Hilda W., National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 2117 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200 salary. (2) Paid to self. (3) Living expenses for self. (4) Occasional articles sent out through Labor Press Associates; article in Bryn Mawr Bulletin. (5) Bill for a Labor Extension Service in the Department of Labor.

Smith, Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) April, salary, $750 per month; May, salary unpaid; June, salary unpaid. (2) Howard J. Smith, executive secretary, Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Salary. (4) The Case for Water in Central Arizona; Work for Water; California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River. (5) Employed to support Senate bill 1175.

Smith, Lloyd W., room 425, Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $1,650 for the period April 1 to June 30, 1948, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., as well as reimbursement for routine expenses of $404.50 in April, $280.65 in May, and $360.40 in June. (2) Various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, Pullman Co., stationers, etc. (3) In furtherance of duties described in registration Form B, which involve legislation only incidentally and to a limited extent. Affiant states upon information and belief, that none of his activity during the period covered by this report was within the scope of section 307 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Other duties for said company comprise the major part of this work.

Smith, Purcell L., National Association of Electric companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $509.91 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, clubs, railroads, air lines, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $77.06; hotels, clubs, and restaurants, $371.95; gratuities and miscellaneous, $54.40; telephone and telegraph, $6.50. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Robert E., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smith, Robert E., National Conference of Railroad Investors, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $660.90; no expenditures. (2) None. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smith, Russell, 300 B Street SE, Washington, D. C.; Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Snyder, Calvin K., Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached.[2] (2) See attached.[2] (3) See attached.[2] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Snyder, James D., Illinois legislative committee, room 1236, La Salle Street Station, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, 6 days at $50, $300; expenses, $277.92. (2) Various. (3) Carlton Hotel, $21; Pullman Co., $82.87; meals, $108.51; porters, tips, etc., $22.50; taxi, $19.05; telephone and telegraph, $15.12; miscellaneous, $8.87. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Illinois railroads.

Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Aircraft Industries of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Spencer, Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Stack, Thomas George, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. (1) $1,169.89 paid to me by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., covering all expenses incurred during trips to Washington, D. C., and stay there, for the second 3 months of 1948. (2) Thomas George Stack. (3) To get before Congress bills to protect the interest of the rank and file employees of the various railroads throughout the country on pension matters and secure more adequate pensions, as reflected in H. R. 6766. (4) National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., newspaper, Rail Pension News, costing $700 each edition; 3 editions, April, May, June, $2,100; circulation, 72,000. (5) Supported H. R. 6766 passed in this session of Congress and opposed certain unjust parts of the so-called Crosser bill, Public Law 572, of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Starling, Howard M., 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $150 received by registrant during the second quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act, as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock, casualty and surety insurance companies.

Stebbins, Frank L., Illinois Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me for lobbying purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation designed to tax like business organizations on a like basis.

Steele, Raymond E., general counsel, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 228 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) 80 cents, taxicab to clerk of Senate Labor Committee, re Fair Standards Act. (2) Taxicab operators. (3) Transportation to Capitol. (4) None. (5) Wage-and-hour law (Fair Labor Standards Act).

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Steffan, Arthur A., 812 Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., Petrol Corp. (1) Fees, $1,400; expenses, $1,651.84. (2) Railroads, hotels, employees, restaurants, etc. (3) Secretarial, travel, and office expense. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3499 for relief of Petrol Corp. (vetoed July 2, 1948).

Stein, Margaret I., 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $1,000.02; received expenses, $72.79; total, $1,072.81. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National Health Insurance.

Stengle, Charles I., American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $37.20. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) Rides to and from Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Federal employees.

Stewart, Annalee (Mrs. Alexander Stewart),[13] Women's Committee To Oppose Conscription, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) July 1947, railroad fare, $53.68, room, $25; meals, $51.90; carfare, $11.75; tips, $4.70; secretary help, $21.50; postage, telephone, $25. August 1947, no expenses. September 1947, railroad fare, $27.26; room, $10; meals, $33.65; carfare, $1.25; tips, $3.40; secretary help, $50.50; postage, telephone, $35.95. (2) [Blank.] (3) Room and board and actual living expenses while in Washington working to oppose universal military training. (4) [Blank.]. (5) Oppose universal military training.

Stewart, Annalee (Mrs. Alexander Stewart),[14] Women's Committee To Oppose Conscription, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) October 1947, railroad, $4.14; room, $15; meals, $33.90; carfare, $2.35; tips, $2.65; telephone and postage, $23.32; secretary, $13.75. November 1947, railroad, $60.22; room, $25; meals, $23.70; carfare, $3.25; tips, $2.60; telephone and post, $7.70. December 1947, railroad, $114.62; room, $28.75; carfare, $13.15; meals, $37.25; tips, $3.45; telephone and postage, $7.55; secretary, $34. (2) [Blank.] (3) Room and board and actual living expenses while working to oppose universal military training. (4) [Blank.] (5) Oppose universal military training.

Stewart, Annalee, (Mrs. Alexander Stewart),[8] Women's Committee to Oppose Conscription, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) January 1948, railroad, $31; hotel, $23; meals, $43.15; carfare, $13.25; tips, $3.25; telephone, $5.04; postage and supplies, $10.75, February 1948, railroad, $19.90; room, $28.09; meals, $38.55; carfare, $11.65; tips, $2.35; telephone, $3; postage and supplies $13.85; secretary $9. March 1948, railroad $9.03; room $25; meals, $63.75; carfare $19.95; tips, $3.55; telephone, $3.90; postage and supplies, $24.50; secretary, $23. (2) [Blank.] (3) Room and board and actual living expenses while in Washington working to oppose universal military training. (4) [Blank.) (5) Oppose universal military training.

Stewart, Annalee, (Mrs. Alexander Stewart),[9] 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) April 1948, railroad, $59.21; room rent, $26.50; meals, $47.62; taxi and carfare, $20.30; tips, $3.70; telephone, $11.06; postage and supplies, $28.81. May 1948, railroad, $53.19; room rent, $25.; meals, $43.90; taxi and carfare, $16.15; tips, $3.60; telephone, $7.; postage and supplies, $19.93. June 1948, railroad, $27.94; room, $25.; meals, $28.30; taxi and carfare, $11.60; tips $2.25; telephone, $4.80; postage and supplies, $12.24. (2) [Blank.] (3) Room and board and actual living expenses while in Washington to oppose universal military training and selective service. (4) [Blank.] (5) Oppose universal military training and selective service.

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary $3,000.00 (50 percent of time devoted to legislative activities); reimbursement by employer for travel expenses, incidental expenses and per diem, $541.85; travel expenses to study housing and real-estate conditions in Europe, June 7 to August 15, $2,500; total, $6,041.85. (2) See attached itemized statement.[3] (3) See attached itemized statement.[3] (4) Attached list[3] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed; complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) April 1 to June 30, 1948; expended, $43.25. (2) See attached form.[3] (3) See attached form.[3] (4) Attached list[3] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed; complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Stone, Mrs. Margaret F., National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Full salary, $311.56, about half of which was paid me for legislative work; no money expended by me for legislative activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin. (5) See regular legislative program of league already on file with your office; testified before subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of Senate Joint Resolution 67, on the legal status of women; testified in support of House Joint Resolution 335, extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Stoudenmire, Sterling F., Jr.,[7] 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries, Mobile, Ala. (1) Salary, $2,100; expense reimbursements, $100.32. (2) (a) Taxicabs, $49.25; (b) restaurants and cafes, $45.58; (c) miscellaneous, $5.49. (3) (a) Taxicab transportation, $49.25; (b) meals and entertainment of officials and employees of Waterman Steamship Corp., $45.88; (c) miscellaneous and sundry expenses, $5.49. (4) None. (5) I am not engaged specifically "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by Congress." My employment is as attorney in the general counsel's office of Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries, who are interested in any legislation affecting the merchant marine, the operation of aircraft, and transportation generally; such employment of necessity requires presentation of information and facts to members of committees handling such legislation; this work is not the principal part of my employment, but is one of the incidental duties in connection therewith.

Strachan, Paul A., American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1376 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) There has been no change in my status as a legislative representative since my letter to you of March 31, except that this federation is now supporting S. 2896, to establish a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically Handicapped; S. 2319, a survey (census) of handicapped; H. R. 6525, National Cerebral Palsy Institute, and H. R. 6653, National Leprosy Act; neither I nor any officer of this federation has paid any sums to anyone, as affecting legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Sponsoring legislation on behalf of our 28,000,000 physically handicapped citizens; supporting S. 2896, S. 2319, H. R. 6525, H. R. 6653.

Strackbein, O. R., America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 601 Carpenters' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, April to June 1948, $3,870; expenses, April to June 1948, $3,327.81 (consisting of $2,600 in salary and $727.81 in expenses). (2) No payments were made to individuals; expenses were paid out for the purposes listed below. (3) Rent, telephone, telegraph, office supplies, taxicab fares, one trip to Chicago, two to Philadelphia, payment for typing and mimeographing reports, a few lunches a month with individuals. (4) Editorials in the Photo-Engraver, a monthly publication of the International Union of Photo Engravers; two or three articles in the Glass Cutter, a publication of the Window Glass Cutters' League. (5) Tariff legislation (trade agreements, International Trade Organization, etc.).

Stringer, Harry R., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Strong, Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Salary April 1 to June 30, 1948, $825; reimbursement for expense, $300; total, $1,125. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions. (4) None. (5) Registrant is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, incluring all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses, $22.10. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Sturrock, J. E., Texas Water Conservation Association, 605–609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $1,500, less income and social-security taxes; traveling expenses for April, May, and June 1948, $369.68. (2) $369.68 traveling expenses paid to various railroad and taxi companies, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals, lodging, and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association bulletins and pamphlets and various analyses of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support all legislation, both State and national, having to do with the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan, Francis M., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, April, May, June, 1948 (after withholding and social security), $1,716.95; incidental expenses, April, May, June 1948, $53.35. (2) Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington,

[8] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[13] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[14] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

D. C. (3) See (1) above. (4) DAV Semimonthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their dependents, and the survivors of deceased servicemen and women.

Sullivan, Francis M., care of National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, Suite 408, Central Building, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Legal fee, $500. (2) Francis M. Sullivan, same as above. (3) Represent the interests of the association before various Federal governmental departments. (4) None. (5) All legislative duties performed by an associate.

Sutlive, Carey R., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, salary, $2,125, expenses reimbursed by employer, $245.60; expenditures, $245.60. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents and investments.

Swanson, Walter S. J., National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. During the quarterly period just ended, he has expended no money and has made no payments to anyone in connection with any activities coming within the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Prepared articles for Highway Highlights and certain bulletins released by the National Highway Users Conference. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office I have carried out the work outlined above. During the past quarter this has been solely confined to reportorial coverage of congressional activities dealing with Federal highway aid and highway taxation, the only legislation in which I am interested. I have conducted no activity during the quarterly period coming within the purview of the Lobbying Act.

Swomley, John M., Jr.,[4] 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Travel expenses between Washington and New York, Chicago, etc., plus out-of-pocket expenses, $377.92. (2) John M. Swomley, Jr., for personal expenses indicated above. (3) Indicated above. (4) Conscription News, weekly. (5) I serve as acting director of the National Council Against Conscription on a volunteer basis to promote the achieving of the international abolition of conscription, worldwide disarmament, and the defeat of conscription.

Taylor, Hugh W., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky. (1) Amount received from Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association for salary, less social security and tax, $2,250; for expenses incurred, $418.10. (2) See attached statement.[3] (3) See attached statement.[3] (4) None. (5) Legislation which affects tobacco production and foreign trade in leaf tobacco.

Taylor, John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridan Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $500 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social security taxes; $244.14 reimbursement for traveling expenses during April, May, and June 1948; $19.50 incidental expenses for April, May, and June 1948. (2) John Thomas Taylor. (3) $244.14 reimbursement for traveling expenses, three round trips to Philadelphia, Pa., two round trips to Indianapolis, Ind., round trip to Elizabeth, N. J., and round trip to Trenton, N. J.; $19.50 incidental expenses for April, May, and June 1948. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; The National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of The American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of The American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policymaking bodies of The American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $353.92. (2) Various. (3) Travel, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Taylor, Tyre, 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $2,500 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by National Association of Retail Grocers. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expense amounting to $857.14; (b) traveling expenses, $76.70. (2) (a) Landlord, secretary, postage, telephone, etc.; (b) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above. (4) National Grocers' Bulletin (published monthly). (5) Repeal of margarine-license taxes and other legislation of interest to independent retail-food distributors.

Taylor, Tyre, 712 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.; Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) Received $3,862.50 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expenses amounting to $507.14; (b) research and technical assistance, $1,581.27; (c) travel expenses, $76.60. (2) (a) Landlord, stamps, telephone, etc. (b) Henry Bison, Jr.; (c) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above for purposes. (4) Semimonthly News Bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council. (5) The general legislative program of the council, with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Temple,[5] Miss Marjorie L., American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received in salary for the calendar quarter $1,000 (possibly slightly over half of this was for duties in connection with legislative work). (2) None of the money received by me was paid to anyone in connection with legislative work. (3) None. See under (2) (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women, Quarterly AAUW General Director's Letter, issued three or four times a year; sent to leaders in the American Association of University Women. (5) See attached list as printed in the spring, 1948, AAUW Journal, stating in full the legislation supported and opposed.

Temple,[6] Marjorie L., American Association of University Women, 1634 I street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,000 salary (approximately half of my work is in the legislative field). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women (quarterly), General Director's Letter, published three or four times a year, for educational guidance of branch officers. (5) Support: Federal aid to education; housing bill; repeal of oleo tax; Marshall plan; Informational and Educational Exchange Act; renewal of Reciprocal Trade Act; status of women bill; Stratton bill for DP's; WHO; appropriation bills. Oppose: Equal rights amendment and social-security appropriations bill.

Terrell, John U., Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Colorado River Association, $3,500. (2) Ordinary business expenses, including travel, hotels, personal living, fares, business supplies.(3) Same as (2). (4) Wire services, all southern California newspapers, general distribution of news releases. (5) House Joint Resolution 226.

Thompson, Chester C., The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary from the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; $5,000 covering April, May, June, 1948. (2) Miscellaneous expenses, $75.30. (3) Local transportation and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States.

Thompson, Louis E., Small Business Association of New Jersey, Inc., box 188, Glen Ridge, N. J. (1) Contributions received in second quarter of 1948, $35. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co., $2.25. (3) Telegrams to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and to Senator H. Alexander Smith. (4) None. (5) To support any bills that would promote the policies of the Conference of American Small Business Organizations that have been filed with Members of the Senate and House; and to urge passage of House Joint Resolution 131.

Thomson, Mrs. Dorothy W., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $96.35 for miscellaneous expense; expended, $96.35. (2) Various. (3) Telephone calls, cab fares, lunches, and other miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriations for United States Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education bill.

Tinney, William H., The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $519.36 per month, which is paid for all the services rendered to the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., only a part of which have to do with legislation; $172.38 was expended by me as expense money, during the second quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. In addition to this amount, I also received $344.72 for expenses incurred in connection with other duties performed for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., which have no relation to the purposes covered by this act. (2) Various transportation companies, restaurants, garages, communication companies, etc. (3) $172.38 was expended by me as expense money, during the second quarter of 1948, for taxicabs, meals, automobile expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation af-

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

fecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, and Helpers Union, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) My salary is $1,250 per month, or $3,750 for quarter year; I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (2) Fred A. Tobin. (3) I am an attorney representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Union and its affiliated locals before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Labor Relations Board; am the liaison representative between various Government agencies and international union and the affiliated locals. The above includes general services of a nonlegislative nature pertaining to business and operation of International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals; also for part-time services in connection with legislation, both Federal and State, for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals. (4) I do not have any connection with any newspaper. (5) Legislation, Federal and State, which may affect the interests of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals, particularly in the field of labor law.

Tobler, H. Willis, 857 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $59.40 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: Long-range agricultural program, taxation, agricultural appropriations, Commodity Credit Corporation, regulation of commodity exchanges, coordination of agricultural conservation services, Fair Employment Practices Act, farm credit, fertilizer, European recovery program, continuation of postwar construction of highways, transfer of United States Employment Service from Federal Security Agency to Labor Department, transfer of Army Remount Service to United States Department of Agriculture, eradication of cattle grubs, amendment of Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, universal military training, means for controlling inflation, 1-year extension of Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act by Secretary of Agriculture, St. Lawrence seaway, Federal meat inspection, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal aid to education, library demonstration bill, irrigation and reclamation, Labor Extension Service, alcohol plants, social security, weed killer, crop insurance, wheat carry-over, international wheat agreement, Parker River project, fiber identification, displaced persons, reciprocal trade agreements, rural electrification, radio, health, housing, standard time, Fair Labor Standards Act, railroad rates, Government corporations.

Tool Owners Union, Inc., 1802 Massachusetts Avenue, Lexington 73, Mass. (1) Received $4,424.91; expended $4,640.64. See attached schedule.[3] (2) See attached schedule.[3] (3) See attached schedule.[3] (4) 1. Advertisement, Boston Herald-Traveler, June 7, 1948. Copy enclosed. 2. Advertisement, New York Herald Tribune, Weekly Book Review, June 7, 1948. Copy enclosed. 3. Program for Progress (a newsletter for tool owners), volume 2, Nos. 1 and 2. Copies enclosed. (5) No specific legislation.

Townsend,[4] Dr. F. E., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio (Townsend National Weekly), (1) Approximately $1,625. (2) All money used in living expenses and no record kept. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (5) The Townsend plan.

Townsend,[5] Dr. F. E., Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Approximately $1,625. (2) All money used in living expenses and no record kept. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (5) The Townsend plan.

Townsend,[5] R. C., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio (Townsend National Weekly, Inc.). (1) Approximately $1,300. (2) All money used in living expenses and no record kept. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (5) The Townsend plan.

Townsend,[6] R. C., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio (Townsend National Weekly, Inc.). (1) Approximately $1,300. (2) All money used in living expenses and no record kept. (3) [Blank.] (4) Townsend National Weekly, Inc. (5) The Townsend plan.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $447.50. (2) Various persons. (3) Taxis, carfare, miscellaneous phone calls, luncheons, etc. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., partner of law firm of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mr. Louis Dreyfus, president of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York City, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) Received $1,500 from Mr. Louis Dreyfus of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York City, and Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England, in connection with matter mentioned in No. (5) below. $26.40 expended during said quarter. (2) Mackay Radio Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Two cables to London in connection with matter mentioned in No. (5) below. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, a bill to facilitate naturalization of Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; John Frederick Firth-Hand, 1744 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 1742, Eightieth Congress, first session, a bill for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia; the Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania, 308 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the just payment of French spoliation claims.

Turner,[5] Harold J., 325 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.; Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Pacific Building, Portland, Oreg.; Southern Pacific Co., Pittock Block, Portland, Oreg. (for the period December 31, 1946, to March 31, 1948). (1) None on Federal legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular proposed Federal legislation. See statement A to my registration, Form B.

Turner,[6] Harold J., 325 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Long-distance telephone $11.95; telegraph, $3.10. (2) The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co. (3) To obtain information on legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Oregon. (4)None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular proposed Federal legislation. See statement A to my registration, Form B.

Van Arnum, John R., National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, 512 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) As of present date, no active bills.

Vance, C. W., Room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) Salary, $1,134; expenses, $799.85; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxicabs, telephone, telegraph, postage, laundry, cleaning, railroad and Pullman fare, and various restaurants. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railroad labor and particularly to oppose bills detrimentally affecting the existing railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance system.

Van Nostrand, George C., American Airlines, Inc., 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As assistant vice president of American Airlines, on a permanent basis, I received a monthly salary of $1,000, or $3,000 for the quarter for all my activities. Only about one-fourth of my time was spent on activities involving legislation. Expended in connection with activities involving legislation, $110.15. (2) Transportation and telephone calls. (3) Transportation and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting air transportation.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is a member of the law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., which firm receives an annual retainer from the Chase National Bank of the City of New York for professional services. As stated in his registration statement on form B, registrant does not believe he is subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Registrant's Federal tax legislative work comprises only an incidental and minor part of his duties. If any of registrant's activities are subject to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act the portion of the annual retainer from the Chase National Bank that might be attributed to attention to Federal tax legislative matters based on an allocation of time was $250 during the second quarter of 1948, and disbursements pertaining to such activities were $11.32. (2) See answer to (1). Expense payments were made to the firm under the terms of the annual retainer for hotel rooms, meals, transportation, postage, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses of registrant, and of members and employees of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley. (3) See answers to (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal-tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Versen,[7] Albert F., Missouri Valley Chapter, Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) See statement attached.[3] (2) See statement attached.[3] (3) See statement attached.[3] (4) None. (5) None.

Versen,[7] Albert F., St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) See statement attached.[3] (2) See statement attached.[3] (3) See statement attached.[3] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Viles, A. L., the Rubber Manufacturers' Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During this quarter I have engaged in no legislative activities, neither have I made any expenditures for this purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Virkus, Frederick A., Conference of American Small Business Organizations, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Compensation, $3,000; expenses, $298.46. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Wardman Park and Raleigh Hotels, taxi drivers, telephone company, telegraph company. (3) Expenses, primarily travel; some miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business.

Vogt, Joseph F., Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received no money from the Employees Committee for Low-Cost Retirement Benefits and had no expenses incurred on their behalf during the period April, May, June 1948. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Crosser Act, passed into law July 31, 1946. Please accept this as notice of my last filing under Public Law 601 inasmuch as I will not be actively engaged in opposing or supporting any type of legislation after June 30.

Voorhis, H. Jerry,[1] 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; the Cooperative League of the U. S. A. (1) This letter is in lieu of the filing of Form C entitled "Quarterly Report of Persons Registering Under the Lobbying Act" and is to certify that no funds have been spent during either of the quarters ending April 1 or July 1, 1948, by me or on my behalf in connection with activities covered by the Lobbying Act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Walker, Jimmie, voluntary, Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., post-office box 1329, 305-306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax equality among all business.

Walter, Stephen M., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $6,625.02 as an employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $1,294.62 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, book stores, and stationers. (3) Transportation, $502.08; meals and incidental expenses on account of association members in Washington, $510.95; telephone and telegraph, $40.99; newspapers and publications, $28.05; miscellaneous, $212.55. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies of which I am an employee is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Walter, Thomas G., room 1008, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (Government Employees Council of the American Federation of Labor). (1) As operations director, receives a monthly salary ($580) minus withholding tax and social-security tax—expended for personal living expenses. (2) Thomas G. Walters. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as operations director of council—lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) Washington newspapers, international union publications, weekly council bulletin for the dissemination of organizational news, including legislation. (5) Favorable to Federal Government employees and opposition to adverse legislation.

Ward, D. J., 1025 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Imported Nut Section, Association of Food Distributors, Inc., 161 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting imports of tree nuts.

Warfel, George L., president, National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (gross, withholding, and social security tax deducted), $1,250; expense vouchers, covering cab fares, phone calls, luncheon guests, and notary fees, $50.75. (2) George L. Warfel. (3) To improve the special delivery service and promote the welfare of the special delivery messengers in the postal service, including liaison contacts with administrative officials of the Government, and legislative contacts. (4) The Special Messenger, Special News—mimeographed bulletins to membership. (5) Supporting all legislation beneficial to the special-delivery service and special-delivery messengers.

Warfield, Ethelbert (report as attorney for American General Corp.), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American General Corp., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) No receipts during said period. Expenditures: Transportation, $14.03; hotel rooms and meals, $9.28; postage, 30 cents; telephone calls $1.88; carfare, 10 cents. (2) American Airlines Inc.: Hotel Carlton, Washington, D. C.; United States Post Office; various telephone and transportation companies. (3) For transportation, hotel rooms and meals, postage, telephone calls, and carfare. (4) None. (5) To oppose S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Warfield, Ethelbert (report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No receipts during said period. Expenditures: Transportation, $9.02; hotel rooms and meals, $68.02; postage, 32 cents; telegrams, 78 cents; telephone calls, $19.31; miscellaneous travel expenses (transportation, hotel rooms and meals, etc.), $73. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad; American Airlines, Inc.; Hotel Carlton, Washington, D. C.; United States Post Office; Western Union; and various telephone companies. (3) For transportation, hotel rooms and meals, postage, telegrams, and telephone calls. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Warner, Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio (The Prudential Insurance Co. of America). (1) Received from the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J., for professional services; conferences with various Members of Congress in regard to legislation for the period January 1 to March 31, 1948, inclusive, $2,500. Expenses for transportation and traveling to and from Washington, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, entertainment, and expenses in Washington, $482.54; total, $2,982.54. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Services were rendered in connection with housing, credit, labor, railroad reorganization, and general welfare legislation and protective of the interests of the policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Wasserman, Jack, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; self. (1) With the passage of S. 1739 and H. R. 5716 for the relief of Bessie and Patricia Schwartz, my activities in this matter have ended. No additional fees or disbursements other than those already reported are to be paid. This is my final return in this matter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Watson, J. R., Mississippi Railroad Association, room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss. (1) Salary monthly, without segregation; and reimbursement of expenses incurred in the amount of $797.20. (2) Hotel Raleigh, Pullman Co., telephone company, telegraph company, and various restaurants, dining cars, taxicabs, and nominal sums, including tips, to individuals, stationery, postage, and other incidental travel and subsistance expenses in the aggregate sum of $797.20. (3) Hotel, travel, communication, meals, and other expenses incident to my employment, as stated above. (4) None. (5) Employment is on annual basis, primarily for services not related to Federal legislation. Matters of Federal legislation are other and different from and only incidental to principal employment and purpose, but as an incident thereto, legislation pertaining to railroads in Mississippi.

Waybur, Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, District No. 44, I. A. of M., Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,000; $40 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general; not more than 10 percent of time spent on this work. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Webb, William H., National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received for salary, $1,076.60, and $562.85 for expenses; expended $428.40. (2) Various. (3) As indicated in attached schedule,[2] and for miscellaneous office, personal, and traveling expenses. (4) The Waterways Journal; Waterways, the National Magazine of the River; and the Workboat. (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Weingarten, J. W., 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.; 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me during the quarter ending June 30, 1948, on account of lobbying activities; I received my regular monthly compensation described in last report for the duties of my office but neither received nor expended any money in connection with any lobbying activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroad business.

Weitzer, Bernard, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Railroad fares, $23.72; hotel bills (including room and meals), $30.10; taxi fares, $37.95; miscellaneous office expenses, $8.64; postage, $11.69; telephone calls from booths, $10.05; salaries, $2,000. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad; Tudor Hotel, N. Y.; various restaurants; various taxi drivers; various telephone booths. (3) As indicated by the nature of expenses in (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) He is to support such legislation as will carry out the purposes of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution which follows and to oppose any legislation which would tend to frustrate the purposes therein expressed: "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America; to foster and perpetuate true Americanism; to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions; to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[2] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

battles wherever unjustly assailed; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all man; to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of exservicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

Welch, Don, persons named in original declaration, P. O. Box 231, Madill, Okla. (Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Ry. Co., et al.). (1) Received and spent as traveling expenses on a trip from Madill, Okla., to Washington, D. C., and return, from May 4, 1948, to May 19, 1948, $379.15. (2) To hotels, restaurants, the Pullman Co., taxi drivers, etc., as ordinary and usual traveling expenses. (3) For ordinary and usual traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) S. 110, commonly called the Reed-Bulwinkle bill.

Welliver, Edward M., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration; he expended a total of $30.25. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Wescott, James B., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) The law firm of Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, of which firm registrant is a partner, received from Salt Producers Association, Detroit, Mich., $284.12 during the preceding calendar quarter. (2) Various. (3) The expenses incurred were in connection with H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211.

West, Oscar H., 1001–1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter; status of registrant the same as stated in original form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Wheeler, Burton K., Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Shore Line Oil Co., and Craw Co. (both), Las Vegas, Nev. (1) During the period from April 1, 1948, to July 1, 1948, no moneys or things of value were received from said companies; expenses were incurred amounting to $111.62 for the period; registrant has not been reimbursed for said expenses. (2) Does not apply. (3) The expenses incurred were for the following: Taxicabs, $14; traveling expense to Chicago, $84.24; maps purchased, $3.15; mimeographing, $7.50; and postage, $2.73. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5992, S. J. Res. 15, S. 1988, S. 2222 (all measures pertaining to the so-called tidelands oil question).

Wheeler, Edward K., Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Shore Line Oil Co., Craw Co. (both) Las Vegas, Nev. (1) During the period from April 1, 1948, to July 1, 1948, no moneys or things of value were received from said companies; expenses were incurred amounting to $111.62 for the period; registrant has not been reimbursed for said expenses. (2) Does not apply. (3) The expenses incurred were for the following: Taxicabs, $14; traveling expenses to Chicago, $84.24; maps purchased, $3.15; mimeographing, $7.50; and postage, $2.73. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5992, S. J. Res. 14, S. 1988, S. 2222 (all measures pertaining to the so-called tidelands oil question).

Whitehall, Albert V.,[5] 1834 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $1,937.52; reimbursement of travel expenses, $634.28. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitehall, Albert V.,[6] 1834 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $2,187.48; reimbursement of travel expenses, $460.21. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitlock, Douglas, partner of law firm Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock & Howrey, room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Building Products Institute. (1) From the Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C.; total fee, $4,500; allocated $1,500 to legislative and $3,000 to legal and administrative; total expenses, $157.67; allocated $83.26 to legislative and $74.41 to legal and administrative. (2) Legislative: Taxi, $27.65; telephone, $48.91; notary, $4.50; restaurant, $2.20. Legal and administrative: $39.66; $34.75. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Whyte, Louis E., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (allocated), $725; expenses, $44.95. (2) Reported as disbursements by Independent Natural Gas Association of America (miscellaneous) for taxicabs and lunches. (3) Transportation. (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) Am interested in legislation proposing changes in the Natural Gas Act.

Wicklein, L. M. (General vice president, Sheet Metal Workers' International Association), 642 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250. Total expense for quarter, $3.239.28. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am employed to handle my many and varied duties as general vice president of the Sheet Metal Workers' International Association. My work in connection with legislation is incidental to these other duties and consumes a very small part of my time. It is confined to giving attention to legislation affecting railway employees in which we are interested.

Wiley, Mrs. Harvey W.,[5] 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C.; not employed for pay, volunteer worker, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs. (1) Not any. (2) See question (1). (3) See question (1). (4) District of Columbia Federation Clubwoman, January and March 1948. (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, interested especially in legislation affecting the District of Columbia, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body of the District of Columbia Federation.

Wiley, Mrs. Harvey W.,[6] 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C.; not employed for pay, volunteer worker. (1) Not any. (2) See question (1). (3) See question (1). (4) District of Columbia Federation Clubwoman April, May, and June 1948. (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, interested especially in legislation affecting the District of Columbia, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body of the District of Columbia Federation.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Francis M. Goodwin, and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath Tribe of Indians of Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oregon. (1) Received $1,125 as quarterly payment under contract for legal services approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Expended $78.20 as follows: Notary fees, $1.25; taxicabs, $14.70; express charges, $8.83; telegraph, $29.91; telephone, $23.51. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2502 and H. R. 2775; opposing S. 1222, S. 1210, H. R. 1113, H. R. 4725.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Francis M. Goodwin, and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Keshena, Wis. (1) Received $650 for legal services, only a portion of which are devoted to legislative matters. Expended $41 for the following: Notary fees, 75 cents; taxicabs, $18.50; telegrams, $11.68; telephone, $7.38; mimeographing, $2.69. (2) see (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 5300; opposing H. R. 1113, H. R. 4725, and S. 1222.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Radio Service Corp. of Utah, 10 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No money received. Expenses totaled $142.30. Break-down is as follows: Taxicabs, $31.30; lunches and dinners for witnesses and attorneys, $78.10; telephone and telegraph, $78.10; telephone and telegraph, $25.94; mimeographing, $6.96. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Opposing S. 2231, Senate Resolutions 240 and 246.

Willard, A. D., Jr., National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $6,250, received for services as executive vice president of the National Association of Broadcasters for the quarter ending July 1, 1948; $778.90 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, communication companies, hotels and restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as executive vice president, acting as administrative officer at the headquarters of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involve Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None; miscellaneous information is furnished to members through weekly bulletin. (5) None; I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radiobroadcasting industry; during the past quarter I testified at two public hearings relating to uniform time.

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $1,500; no

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin; press release concerning the availability of copies of the Retired Officers Association Bulletin for distribution to retired officers. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Corps, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service. See attached report[3] of activities for specific items.

Williams, Myers & Quiggle, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Paul F. Myers, James Craig Peacock, Martin W. Meyer, John E. Skilling, and Robert H. Meyers, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Food Brokers Association, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington Food Brokers Association, care of R. J. Dannemiller, president, 2653 Connecticut Avenue, Washington 8, D. C. (1) No money was received, but $3.20 for taxicab fares, $27.90 for transcript of proceedings in the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel's office, and $1.80 for telegrams were expended on account of services to National Food Brokers Association, $7.40 was expended for taxicab fares on account of services to Washington Food Brokers Association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) S. 2409, which became Public Law 509 on May 3, 1948.

Williamson,[5] C. J. S., 901 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Annual salary, $7,200; expense allowance, $1,800. (2) C. J. S. Williamson. (3) No expenditures, as that term is used in Public Law 601. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Williamson,[6] C. J. S., 901 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Annual salary, $7,200; expense allowance, $1,800; (2) C. J. S. Williamson. (3) No expenditures, as that term is used in Public Law 601. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Williamson, John C., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 per month as salary, minus social security and withholding taxes; $94.50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Willingham, Carl H., Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 4 Park Avenue, New York City; Oneida, Ltd., Oneida, N. Y.; Willmark Service System, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York City; Clyde Y. Morris, 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md. (1) Received, $4,299.95; expended, $1,174.95. (2) Railroad and planes, $472.44; meals, $165.70; taxis, $155.60; Circle Line, New York (sightseeing tour of New York Harbor), $340.39; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $29.32; railroad porters, $6; Campbell Photostat Service, $5.50. (3) Travel, taxis, and plane cars, meals, telephone, etc. (4) None. (5) Excise taxes, commercial building under Housing Act and wage-hour legislation.

Wilson, E. Raymond, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 2111 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, April, May, June, $1,500; travel expense, $324.50. (2) Carfare, $182.96; meals, $40.12; telephone and telegraph, $17.16; miscellaneous, $84.24; April–June total, $324.50. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Wilson, Eugene E., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Wilson, Everett B., Jr., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, J. B., Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (1) Salary, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, $1,500; expenses paid by National Wool Growers Association and Wyoming Wool Growers Association, $1,318.35. (2) J. B. Wilson, whose principal employment is as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association; lobbying for or against legislation is a part of his duty, but not his principal occupation and for which he receives no added compensation. His expenses, however, are paid by the National Wool Growers Association as chairman of their legislative committee and by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association. (3) Incidentals. (4) J. B. Wilson is secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association and editor of the Wyoming Wool Grower, a semimonthly publication published by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association for its members. (5) To support any legislation affecting wool-growing industry, including wool bills, tariff, public-land legislation, etc.

Wilson, Lacey C., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,012.50; expense, $1,012.50. (2) Lacey C. Wilson. (3) Salary and expenses while working in the interest of the brotherhood. (4) Wilmington Sunday Star. (5) Any legislation affecting labor in general, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen in particular.

Wingert, E. L., 1 West Main Street, Madison, Wis.; Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my share of retainer fee paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving mainly services unrelated to Federal legislation. Aside from that, received nothing for use in influencing Federal legislation and expended nothing for that purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Winn, Arthur L., Jr., Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) La Roe, Brown & Winn, law firm, received from the National Independent Meat Packers Association, $4,500, total of monthly payments for general legal services, of which I received a share as partner. (2) No payment made to any other person. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Meat-inspection bills, S. 2256, H. R. 5675, H. R. 6259.

Winston, James H., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) The law firm of Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago 2, Ill., of which firm registrant is a partner, received from Salt Producers Association, Detroit, Mich., $284.12 during the preceding calendar quarter, as reimbursement for cash expenditures. (2) See (1). (3) The expenses incurred as shown in answer to (1) were in connection with H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with legislative matters, $225.87. All reimbursed by Mississippi Valley Association. One round trip Omaha to Washington, D. C. (2) Railroads, air lines, etc., $130.64; hotels and miscellaneous, $95.23. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, regulation of domestic transportation.

Woodrum, Clifton A., president, American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The registrant, Clifton A. Woodrum, nor his employer, the American Plant Food Council, Inc., neither received nor expended during last quarter any funds for the purpose of influencing directly or indirectly any legislation. Please see letter filed with original registration. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Woodson,[4] George W., 424 North Washington Avenue, Lansing, Mich. (1) I have received from our national office the amount of $1,344.15 since April 1 and all has been spent for hotel, telegrams, telephone, travel, and office expenses. (2) I have employed no one. I have paid no ads for any purpose. (3) Stated above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, Townsend plan.

Woodul, Walter F., Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.; Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex.; Burlington-Rock Island Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co., Forth Worth, Tex.; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex.; the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; International-Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex.; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co., Houston, Tex.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Paris & Mount Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex.; Quanah, Acme & Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co. of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Texas Electric Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Texas South-Eastern

[3] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex.; the Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; the Texas-Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex.; the Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex.; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.; the Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Compensation as previously reported, and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses for months of March, April, and May, 1948, in sum of $2,015. (2) Missouri Pacific Lines, $139.68; Shoreham Hotel, $1,262.78; and to various other hotels, eating places, and others, in amounts less than $10. (3) Transportation, $139.68; hotels, $1,262.78; meals, $282.65; entertaining, $143.81; taxis, telephones, tips, and incidentals, $153.21. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting Texas railroads.

Woodward, Albert Young, Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) In addition to compensation as regular employee of Signal Oil & Gas Co., received $1,019.95 as reimbursement for expenses itemized below. Included in reimbursement and expenses are items which were not directly or indirectly related to passage or defeat of legislation but which amounts are not readily segregated. (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, hotels, taxicab operators, garages, etc. (3) Telephone and telegraph, $46.85; transportation (including cabs, car allowance, mileage allowance, and parking), $284.05; social and business engagements, $532.80; postage, express, and miscellaneous, $156.25. (4) None. (5) In addition to general activities unrelated to legislation, observes, analyzes, and reports on the several items of legislation introduced in Congress affecting oil and oil operations.

Wootton, Edward W., Wine Institute, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 quarterly, salary as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute—principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco. (2) Received by the undersigned for all personal services rendered as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above. No expenditures were made by undersigned to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) Proposed amendments to Internal Revenue Code affecting wine and brandy production, and also with respect to S. 265, S. 2352, and S. 2365; also with respect to extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Wormhoudt, Marion P., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; R. W. Britton, 1416 Cherry Street, Erie, Pa. (1) None received and none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to partnerships.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C., 410 Gulf States Building, Dallas, Tex.; Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) $1,000, fees for services (received by firm of Case & Wozencraft). $884.88, reimbursement for traveling, telephone, and telegraph (including that paid to firm of Case & Wozencraft). (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved, Western Union and telephone company. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Wright,[5] Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; volunteer worker. (1) January, February, and March 1948: For postage, office supplies, and periodicals pertaining to work of chairman of legislation, $50.63. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) See answer No. 1. (4) [Blank.] (5) Not "employed" for pay. A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The General Federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

Wright,[6] Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) April, May, and June 1948: Postage and miscellaneous, $7.12; travel expense to General Federation convention in Portland, Oreg., $325.61; total, $332.73. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The General Federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Yeaman, Addison, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville, Ky. (1) Registrant has received no moneys and has expended no moneys except his regular salary and traveling expenses, which were paid without regard to registrant's activities under the so-called Lobbying Act. (2) See question (1) above. (3) See question (1) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912.

Yonkers, Andrew J., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary (this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act), $875; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $591.47; total, $1,466.47; money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $591.47. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: salary, $2,666.68; expenses, $36.58. Expended: Transportation, $12.40; meals, $11.50; telephone, $12.68. (2) Taxi companies, restaurants, telephone company. (3) Transportation to and communication with the Capitol; other necessary normal expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Young,[5] Robert R., 2412 Terminal Tower, Federation for Railway Progress, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) [Blank.] (5) None. However, he has publicly supported the Mahaffie bill and opposed the Bulwinkle bill.

Young,[6] Robert R., 2412 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, none; expenses, $113.31. (2) For various hotels, railroads, etc. (3) For traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Zook, John D., Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Actual and necessary traveling expenses on employer's business. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to the organization.

[5] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 27, 1948

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, grant that in our thoughts and toils during this day we may have the companionship of Thy Spirit to counsel us in the ways of truth and righteousness.

Show us how we may mobilize the moral and spiritual resources which Thou hast placed at our disposal for the dawning of that blessed day of prediction when all the members of the human family shall live together in friendship.

Inspire us with courage to believe that the prospects of its consummation and final triumph are as glorious and wonderful as the promises of the Lord God Omnipotent.

To Thy name we shall ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 26, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communications that he might be pleased to make, and that the Speaker had appointed Mr. HALLECK, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. MCCORMACK the members of the committee on the part of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 220) providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, July 27, 1948, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States may be pleased to make to them, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. BARKLEY appeared in the center aisle, and Mr. WHERRY said:

Mr. President, the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House has reassembled and is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make has performed that duty, and the committee was informed by the President that he would address the two Houses in person at 12:30 o'clock p. m. today.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution which has just come over from the House, House Concurrent Resolution No. 220, be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 220), which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two

Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, July 27, 1948, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States may be pleased to make to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P. M. TOMORROW

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that when the joint meeting of the two Houses to be held under authority of House Concurrent Resolution 220, just adopted, is dissolved, the Senate stand in adjournment until 1 o'clock p. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hoey	Pepper
Ball	Holland	Reed
Barkley	Ives	Revercomb
Brewster	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Capper	Langer	Stennis
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McGrath	Thye
Ecton	McMahon	Tobey
Ellender	Magnuson	Tydings
Feazel	Martin	Umstead
Ferguson	Maybank	Vandenberg
George	Millikin	Watkins
Green	Moore	Wherry
Gurney	Morse	Wiley
Hatch	Murray	Williams
Hawkes	Myers	Young
Hayden	O'Conor	
Hickenlooper	O'Daniel	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official state business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Without objection, the Senate will stand in informal recess for 5 minutes and will leave the Chamber at 12:20 o'clock to participate in the joint meeting of the two Houses.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

The informal recess having expired, at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., on motion by Mr. WHERRY, the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Carl A. Loeffler), the Sergeant at Arms (Edward F. McGinnis), and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to attend the joint meeting of the two Houses and to hear the address to be delivered by the President of the United States.

(The proceedings in the House of Representatives and the address delivered by the President of the United States at the joint meeting of the two Houses appear on p. 9441 of the House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

ADJOURNMENT

The joint meeting of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.), under the order previously entered, stood in adjournment until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 28, at 1 o'clock.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 27, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

As citizens we return thanks unto Thee, O Lord, for the heritage of yesterday, for the blessings of today, and for the promises of tomorrow. Because we believe that these are precious in Thy sight, and because they are dear to us, we pray for strength to hold our gains and for perseverance to make our dreams come true.

By the help which is from above, may these Thy servants set a watch over their lives, and in reverence and in quiet faith may they walk in the way of Thy commandments. May they realize that in all human planning nothing is done right and nothing will prove durable unless it follows Thy pattern of justice, mercy, and wisdom.

May our hearts become Thy dwelling place this day that we may live helpfully and honorably. We offer our prayer in the name of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on July 27, 1948.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

At 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the President pro tempore of the Senate and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The President pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. On behalf of the Senate, as members of the same committee, the President pro tempore appoints the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

At 12 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair presents the President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 734)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Eightieth Congress, the urgent needs of the American people require our presence here today.

Our people demand legislative action by their Government to do two things: First, to check inflation and the rising cost of living; and, second, to help in meeting the acute housing shortage.

These are matters which affect every American family. They also affect the entire world, for world peace depends upon the strength of our economy.

The Communists, both here and abroad, are counting on our present prosperity turning into a depression. They do not believe that we can—or will—put the brake on high prices. They are counting on economic collapse in this country.

If we should bring on another great depression in the United States by failing to control high prices, the world's hope for lasting peace would vanish. A depression in the United States would cut the ground from under the free nations of Europe. Economic collapse in this country would prevent the recovery throughout the world which is essential to lasting peace. We would have only ourselves to blame for the tragedy that would follow.

In these tense days, when our strength is being tested all over the world, it would be reckless folly if we failed to act against inflation.

High prices are not taking "time off" for the election.

High prices are not waiting until the next session of the Congress.

High prices are getting worse. They are getting worse every day.

We cannot afford to wait for the next Congress to act. [Applause.]

The Eighty-first Congress will not get under way for nearly 6 months. Before the new Congress could take action against high prices, it would have to draft new bills, study them, hold hearings, debate, and decide whether to pass them. It would be at least 8 months from now before the new Congress could pass the laws we need.

Eight months more of inflation would be much too long.

It was 8 months ago—November 1947—that I called a special session of this Congress and recommended a comprehensive anti-inflation program. But that program was not enacted. If it had been enacted, we would have lower prices today. [Applause.]

Since last November, prices have gone even higher. As every housewife knows, food prices rose rapidly throughout 1947. They are climbing even faster now. Month after month the cost of clothing, fuel, and rent keeps on going up.

The cost of living is now higher than ever before in our history. There are not very many rich men in the Congress of the United States. Most of you have to live on your salaries. All you need do is just go home and ask your wife how living costs are now as compared with what they were January 1, 1947.

We cannot risk the danger, or suffer the hardship, of another 8 months of doing nothing about high prices. [Applause.]

Prices are already so high that last year more than one-fourth of the families of this country were forced to spend more than they earned. Families of low or moderate income are being priced out of the market for many of the necessities of life. They are not able to buy as much as they could 2 years ago, and they are paying a lot more for what they can buy.

At the same time industrial prices, which affect all business and employment, are rising and rising fast. Large price increases have recently been announced by industries that set the pace for the whole economy. Within the last few days, the steel industry, for example, increased its prices, on the average, by more than $9 a ton.

The rise in industrial prices is just as important, in the long run, as the high cost of living. It is already squeezing the independent businessman. It threatens to destroy a fair balance between industry and agriculture. It can end only in catastrophe if allowed to continue.

In the face of these facts, it is foolish to point at every feeble straw as a sign that the danger is disappearing. In February some people said that the break in commodity prices meant that inflation was almost over. They were wrong. Prices rose again.

There are still some people who repeat the old argument which was used by those who killed price control 2 years ago. They said that if we would only take controls off, production would increase, prices would go down, and there would be more for everybody at a lower cost.

The record shows unmistakably that this argument was false.

Production has increased somewhat, and we want it to increase still more. But even with full employment, full use of available materials, and practically full use of plant capacity—all of which we have today—prices are still climbing much faster than production. It is obvious that we cannot rely solely on more production to curb high prices. Instead, we must attack inflation directly.

If we do not stop inflation, production and employment will both fall sharply when the break comes.

Positive action by this Government is long overdue. It must be taken now. [Applause.]

I therefore urge the Congress to take strong, positive action to control inflation. I have reexamined the anti-inflation program I proposed to the Congress 8 months ago. In its essentials that program is as sound now as it was then. It has been revised and strengthened in the light of changing circumstances. The program I now propose is as follows:

First, I recommend that an excess-profits tax be reestablished in order to provide a Treasury surplus and provide a brake on inflation.

Second, I recommend that consumer credit controls be restored in order to hold down inflationary credit.

Third, I recommend that the Federal Reserve Board be given greater authority to regulate inflationary bank credit.

Fourth, I recommend that authority be granted to regulate speculation on the commodity exchanges.

Fifth, I recommend that authority be granted for allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production, or the cost of living.

Sixth, I recommend that rent controls be strengthened, and that adequate appropriations be provided for enforcement, in order to prevent further unwarranted rent increases.

Seventh, I recommend that stand-by authority be granted to ration those few products in short supply which vitally affect the health and welfare of our people. On the basis of present facts, and unless further shortages occur, this authority might not have to be used at all.

Eighth, I recommend that price control be authorized for scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production or the cost of living. I have said before, and I repeat, that many profit margins have been adequate to absorb wage increases without the price increases that have followed. Rising wages and rising standards of living, based on increasing productivity and a fair distribution of income, is the American way. Noninflationary wage increases can and should continue to be made by free collective bargaining. Where the Government imposes a price ceiling, wage adjustments which can be absorbed within the price ceiling should not be interfered with by the Government. The Government should have the authority, however, to limit wage adjustments which would force a break in a price ceiling, except where wage adjustments are essential to remedy hardship, to correct inequities, or to prevent an actual lowering of living standards.

The measures I have recommended make up a balanced program to attack high prices. They are all necessary to check rising prices and safeguard our economy against the danger of depression. If they are made the first order of business by the Congress, as they should be, they can be promptly enacted. Every week of delay will mean additional hardship for the American people. [Applause.]

The second reason why I have called the Congress back is that our people need legislation now to help meet the national housing shortage.

We desperately need more housing at lower prices—prices which families of moderate income, particularly veterans' families, can afford to pay. [Applause.] We are not getting it.

Even more urgently, we need more rental housing, especially low-rent housing. We are not getting it.

Most of the housing now being built is for sale, or for rent, at prices far above the reach of the average American family.

I have recommended time and time again that the Congress pass a comprehensive housing bill which would help us obtain more housing at lower prices—both for sale and for rent.

A good housing bill, Senate bill 866, known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, passed the Senate on April 22. This bill would provide aid to cities in clearing slums and in building low-rent housing projects. It would give extensive aid to the private home-building industry. It includes provisions for farm housing and for research to bring down building costs. It contains many other provisions, all aimed at getting more housing at lower prices and at lower rents.

This is the bill we need. We need it now, not a year from now. [Applause.]

If this legislation is passed this summer, it will be possible to start immediately the production of more houses of the kind our families need, at prices they can afford to pay. If it is not passed now, the Eighty-first Congress will have to start all over again with a new housing bill. In that case, we might lose a full year in meeting our national housing need.

This Congress can complete action on this comprehensive housing bill in a few days. I strongly urge that it do so. [Applause.]

I have called the Congress back primarily to deal with high prices and with the housing shortage. Delay on either of these items would be most dangerous. In addition, there are other important legislative measures on which delay would injure us at home or impair our world relations.

I therefore recommend that the present session, without allowing anything to interfere with its vital work on legislation concerning high prices and housing, take action on certain other important measures. These measures can speedily be enacted now because of the amount of study already given to them by the Congress.

First, the Congress should provide Federal assistance to the States in meeting the present crisis in education. [Applause.] The children in our schools, and the men and women who teach there, have been made the victims of inflation. More children are entering school than ever before. But inflation has cut down the purchasing power of the money devoted to educational purposes. Teachers' salaries, for the most part, have lagged far behind increases in the cost of living. The overcrowding of our schools is seriously detrimental to the health and the education of our boys and girls. Every month that we delay in meeting this problem will cause damage that can never be repaired. Several million children of school age are unable to attend school, largely because of lack of facilities or teachers.

To meet these vital educational needs, the Congress should complete action on Senate bill 472, which passed the Senate on April 1. All that remains to be done is its passage by the House of Representatives.

Prompt action by the Congress is also needed to help another group of our people who are suffering from inflation. These are the workers who depend on the protection of a minimum-wage law. The present minimum wage is pitifully inadequate in the face of today's high prices. Proposals to raise minimum wages have long been before the Congress. I urgently recommend that the minimum wage be raised to at least 75 cents an hour at this session. [Applause.] Senate bill 2062 and its companion House bills would be suitable measures for this purpose.

I urge also that action be taken by the Congress to relieve other victims of inflation. These are the people who depend upon the benefits being paid under the old-age and survivors insurance system. The average old-age retirement benefit for a man and his wife is only $39 a month. For a widow with two children, the average monthly benefit is only $49. These benefits are utterly inadequate. I urge that they be increased by at least 50 percent and that the age at which women can receive benefits be lowered from 65 to 60 years. [Applause.] I also hope that the protection of this system will be extended to the millions who are not now covered.

In our relations with the rest of the world, action is also needed at once, and can be taken quickly, to afford additional proof that we mean what we say when we talk about freedom, humanity, and international cooperation for peace and prosperity. Three measures are involved.

First, the Displaced Persons Act in its present form discriminates unfairly against some displaced persons because of their religion, land of origin, or occupation. These provisions are contrary to all American ideals. This act should be promptly amended to wipe out these discriminations. [Applause.] Furthermore, the present act permits the entry of only 200,000 persons, and charges them against future immigration quotas. I believe strongly that the act should provide for the entry of 400,000 persons over a 4-year period, and they should be outside the normal immigration quotas. [Applause.] The act can and should be amended promptly.

Second, many people in the world must wonder how strongly we support the United Nations when we hesitate to assist the construction of its permanent home in this country. Legislation can and should be passed at once to authorize a loan by the United States Government to the United Nations, for the construction of UN headquarters buildings in New York City.

The international wheat agreement is another vital measure on which the Congress should act. This agreement is designed to insure stability in the world wheat market in the years ahead when wheat will be more plentiful. It would guarantee American farmers an export market of 185,000,000 bushels of wheat at a fair price during each of the next 5 years. Since the agreement is in the form of a treaty it requires only ratification by the Senate. Although this agreement should have been ratified by July 1 of this year, we have good reason to believe that it can still be made effective if it is now ratified promptly.

Also, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress three other problems on which action can and should be taken at this session.

The Congress should reconsider its recent actions which cut sharply into our national electric power policy. There is an acute shortage of electric power in this country now. I am therefore resubmitting to the Congress appropriation requests for certain power projects which must be provided right away. These requests include the TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., and certain other projects on which congressional reductions, if allowed to stand, will delay the production of power for a year or more. These appropriations should be promptly enacted, and at the same time certain crippling limitations should be removed from the law. [Applause.]

In the last days of the session, before adjourning in June, the Congress passed a bill raising the salaries of some Federal employees. However, this bill neglected long overdue reforms in Federal pay scales and discriminated unfairly against certain groups of employees. The Congress should take this opportunity to enact more equitable and realistic Federal pay legislation.

Finally, I wish again to urge upon the Congress the measures I recommended last February to protect and extend basic civil rights of citizenship and human liberty. A number of bills to carry out my recommendations have been introduced in the Congress. Many of them have already received careful consideration by congressional committees. Only one bill, however, has been enacted, a bill relating to the rights of Americans of Japanese origin. I believe that it is necessary to enact the laws I have recommended in order to make the guarantees of the Constitution real and vital. I believe they are necessary to carry out our American ideals of liberty and justice for all. [Applause.]

I hope there is no misunderstanding of the recommendations I have made. I have asked the Congress to return, first of all, in order to meet the urgent need of our people for relief from high prices and the housing shortage. I urge the Congress not to be distracted from these central purposes.

At the same time, as I have stated, the Congress can and should act on certain other important items of legislation at this special session.

There are still other problems of great moment which vitally affect the welfare of the Nation. I have discussed them in previous messages to this Congress. I have made recommendations for legislation to meet them. I do not repeat them now—because the purposes and limited time of this special session do not readily permit action on them.

However, I feel just as strongly as ever that all of these measures are necessary. If the Congress finds time to enact any of them now the country will greatly benefit. Certainly, the next Congress should take them up immediately.

These include: a comprehensive health program, based on health insurance; a fair and sound labor-management relations law—in place of the Taft-Hartley law, which has proved to be unfair and unsound and which should be repealed; a real long-range farm program; a stronger reciprocal trade agreements act; a universal training program; a national

science foundation; strengthened anti-trust laws; and approval of the St. Lawrence waterway treaty.

The vigor of our democracy is judged by its ability to take decisive actions—actions which are necessary to maintain our physical and moral strength and to raise our standards of living. In these days of continued stress, the test of that vigor becomes more and more difficult. The legislative and executive branches of our Government can meet that test today.

The American people rightfully expect us to meet it together. I hope that the American people will not look to us in vain. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m., the President retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The members of the President's Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m., the Speaker announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the President pro tempore and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Message of the President of the United States be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

A PEACETIME EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I note that the President has recommended an excess-profits tax to provide a brake on inflation. An excess-profits tax in peacetime is one of the most inflationary measures we could adopt.

I will briefly enumerate some of the main objections to an excess-profits tax in peacetime:

First. It will stifle new growing and expanding corporations. This will be accomplished by making it impossible for them to secure capital either through the sale of equities or from borrowing. Few organizations would want to lend money to businesses when a large part of their profits would have to be paid to the Federal Government before paying any part of the principal of the debt. From the competitive angle, the new and growing corporations would be unable to compete with their old established competitors with large base period or invested capital credits.

Second. An excess-profits tax in peacetime, to use the language of that distinguished Democrat, the late Senator Glass:

> It encourages wasteful expenditure, puts a premium on overcapitalization, and a penalty on brains, energy, and enterprise, discourages new ventures, and confirms old ventures in their monopolies.

Third. No stronger condemnation of a peacetime excess-profits tax could be made than the one advanced by former Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, now Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, in his recommendation for the repeal of the excess-profits tax in 1945. In this connection he said:

> Repealing the excess-profits tax means getting out of the tax system a tax which certainly in its present form has no place in the peacetime system.
>
> The case against the excess-profits tax for 1946 goes beyond the facts that it is primarily a wartime control and that it is erratic and inequitable. It is also an obstacle to that reconversion and expansion of business which is so necessary for a high level of employment and income.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Clearly, the repeal of the excess-profits tax will stimulate production. Today we are starved for new houses, new cars, new radios, and the like. The best defense against the use of our wartime economy, the excess-profits tax has been an erratic and in many instances an inequitable tax. The difficulty is that calling profits excessive does not make them excessive. Calling profits normal does not make them normal. Normal profits and excessive profits look alike. There is no chemical reagent to distinguish them.
>
> The excess-profits tax, to be sure, has a formula—a very complicated formula in its entirety—for distinguishing normal and excessive profits. But that formula is seriously defective.
>
> One serious defect of the excess-profits tax for the postwar period lies in the weakness of the average earnings credit, which uses prewar profits as a measure of normal profits. A corporation may continue to earn free of excess-profits tax 95 percent as much as it averaged during the years 1936–39, and this amount is often enlarged by various relief provisions. A corporation with a high prewar earnings experience may thus earn 20 percent, 30 percent, or more on its invested capital without paying any excess-profits tax. New and rising corporations do not have the benefit of such a credit.

Fourth. To the extent the excess-profits tax is passed on to the consumer, the excess-profits tax instead of decreasing prices, will actually increase them and thus make it more difficult for the consumer to purchase the things he needs for his family. Thus, instead of helping the victims of high prices and high-living costs, the excess-profits tax would intensify their problem by adding impetus to the inflationary spiral.

I am against imposing any tax which penalizes production, which is inequitable in its distribution of the burden between particular companies and which stands a good chance of further increasing prices.

THE NEW DEAL AND INFLATION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the New Deal administration from the very first has deliberately promoted inflation. It has been the avowed aim of the New Deal to raise prices. Its planners have sat up nights for the past 16 years devising ways and means to increase the cost of living by propaganda and by legislation. No other administration in the history of this Republic has done so much, either in war or in peace, to promote inflation as has the New Deal. Its general and fiscal policies have been inflationary. The New Deal has used artificial stimuli to create high prices. The Brain Trusters, not satisfied to raise prices by monetary and fiscal policies, spread the propaganda that prices must rise.

Who went on the air and urged the public not to save but to spend? It was the "brain trusters" of the New Deal. What administration created the device known as the NRA, with its production limitation, minimum price agreements, and price-fixing features? The New Deal, of course. This was particularly true in the field of agriculture by imposing production limitations and employing price-pegging operations. Not satisfied with these steps to inflate prices, it increased business taxes, particularly the excess-profits and the undistributed-profits taxes, which not only increased costs of production, but these measures were also designed to force money into circulation.

Then, too, what about the pump-priming operation of the New Deal to raise prices?

In order to raise the money which the New Deal pumped into circulation to raise prices, the administration had to resort to deficit financing on a peacetime scale never before approached. Thus, early in the New Deal administration the national debt was increased some $19,000,000,000 to carry out its inflationary program. Throughout the New Deal administration every variety of legerdemain has been put in operation to inflate the prices of the necessities of life. What about the effect of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 as a continuing inflationary measure? Under this act the President devalued gold 40.6 percent, setting the mint price at $35 an ounce nine-tenths fine, an increase of 69.4 percent over the former price of $20.67 an ounce which had prevailed since 1837. The fact that the gold so purchased was to be sterilized has not removed its inflationary effect.

It is detrimental to the American people, but it has financed and is financing Russia. The effect is that the devaluation of newly mined gold is worth more in terms of dollars.

Sellers of gold to the Government receive more dollars than formerly and among the foreign beneficiaries of this inflationary scheme is Russia. In addition, the price of $35 an ounce for gold brings high cost mines into production, mines that could not afford to operate at the old price, thus increasing the available supply. Thus this new purchasing power created either swells the amount of currency in circulation or is deposited in banks, thereby further enlarging the credit base. Just another New Deal high-cost-of-living device.

I may mention that in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934—Public Law 87, Seventy-third Congress, section 10–a—part of the profit accruing to the Treasury as

a result of devaluation was to be placed in a stabilization fund. The inflationary aspect of this fund was expressed by Mr. Owen D. Young:

Insofar as the stabilization fund is used to buy gold abroad, the matter is even worse, for the gold that is bought replenishes the fund, and, therefore, you have something like perpetual motion in credit expansion, through the use of a stabilization fund. (Senate hearings on Gold Reserve Act, 1934, p. 327.)

It is a crime for an American citizen to have gold in his possession, but he is taxed to pay a premium price for Russian gold and then suffer from its inflationary effect because of such purchase of foreign gold.

Then to increase the cost of living the New Deal administration embarked on a silver program. When silver is purchased by the Treasury it is purchased by the issuance of new currency. No matter how this new money is used it is a tremendous contribution to the inflation of prices.

The fiscal program of the New Deal down to the present minute has been one of inflation. Every well-informed person knows that there is a limit to the amount of taxes that can be levied without absorbing the profits which should be put back into business for increased production. Production of goods of which there is a shortage is one way to meet the problem of inflation. If too much of the surplus, which is the excess of net income over consumption, is taken in taxes, the margin available for capital investment is perilously reduced.

If the sources of capital investment are dried up, the flow of all income may eventually cease. Yet in the face of these facts President Truman repeatedly vetoed a tax-reduction bill, which had not his veto been overridden by Congress would have slowed down production and thus eventually increased inflation. Has President Truman sought to assist in the reduction of Government expenses? What does the record show? The facts are that at the end of April there were 2,050,420 civilian employees on the Government's pay roll. There has been a net increase of 54,920 since December 31, 1947. New employees have been put on the Federal pay roll as follows:

The rate of increase in January was slightly more than 200 a day. In February the increase rate was about 400 a day. In March it was 500 a day. In April it was 650 a day. This load upon the taxpayers will continue throughout this election year. It must not be forgotten that Franklin D. Roosevelt in his first two terms spent $62,000,000,000. This vast program of deficit financing was inflationary. This was during peacetime when the New Deal program was to create prosperity by reckless public spending and inflation. Yet there were between eight and fifteen million unemployed all the time.

This was at a period when people were paid to produce less. The inflationary philosophy of scarcity was substituted for the philosophy of plenty. Cotton planters were paid to plough under the crops. The packers were paid to buy up and render unfit for human consumption vast quantities of hogs. Large firms were paid enormous sums not to produce sugar. President Truman, as a spender of public funds, has surpassed the Roosevelt peacetime spending.

Talk about the high cost of living. Can it be otherwise when the warehouses in hundreds of foreign cities are bulging with American goods which are not wanted over there but are sorely needed here?

Now after carrying on a program of inflation for 16 years by means of spending, currency manipulation, crop and livestock destruction, deficit financing, pump priming, devaluation of gold, Silver Purchase Act, price fixing, subsidies, pay-roll expansions, blank checks, WPA, NRA, UNRRA, and the creation of innumerable bureaus, I believe that just so long as President Truman occupies the White House the high cost of living will not only increase but continue. He possesses every conceivable inflationary power, none of which does he want to surrender, but instead he now asks for more powers to regiment the people. Does he want the power to fix wages or does he wish the power to fix the price of everything except wages?

CONGRESS CALLED—WHY?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that Congress has been called in special session by the President. He chose a most unusual setting in which to announce the call, during the turbulent Democratic National Convention recently held at Philadelphia. This was most unfortunate, for everyone realized that it was political in its every aspect.

But the people of the country really want to know why the President has called Congress in special session. In the editorial columns of one of the great newspapers of the Southwest, the Tulsa Daily World, of my home city, Tulsa, Okla., there appeared in the issue of July 17, 1948, a very realistic analysis of the situation. The editorial answers the people's question, "Why?" I am pleased to quote the editorial, as follows:

CONGRESS CALLED—WHY?

It is possible the special session of Congress, called for July 26, will have some political importance. It can have little valid bearing on what President Truman fatuously calls public welfare. The session is bound to be partisan and prejudicial.

In making the call the President listed a lot of controversial measures, none of which can properly be classed as emergency. Apparently the public power question is to be on the schedule, and it can well be the bitterest of issues. There is a disposition to jam over more authorities and the resistance will be stiff. The tentative list of subjects for legislation carries civil rights, price controls, Federal aid to schools, minimum wages, displaced persons. All these subjects are explosive.

The immediate political urgency probably is the so-called civil-rights legislation. The President is plenty mad at Congress as a whole, at probably half the Democratic Members, and particularly all southerners. Undoubtedly he will try to put over some sort of force bill designed to please the Negro voters of the North and the racial minority voters in the larger cities. This, of course, will afford room for all sorts of Congressmen to sound off. The results will probably be small in comparison to the noise and the unwise expenditure of energy. This wicked debate is timed for just before the election.

From any standpoint except practical and fanatical politics, the special session is already foredoomed to failure. Ostensibly the President is trying to give Congress—which he calls the worst ever—another chance to win his approbation. He was roughly handled in the regular session; he didn't get much of his program over, and he suffered reversals on his vetoes. The anger, formally aimed at the Republicans, reaches a lot of Democrats. It is certain many Democrats will fight back at the President with renewed wrath.

That Philadelphia convention caused a lot more sore spots. Seemingly, Mr. Truman has abandoned whatever philosophy and tolerance he may have had and is determined to be a big, ruthless boss. He will fail. His own party is very sore at him, and the Members of Congress, on the Democratic side particularly, are in no mood to be pushed around. At this distance, it looks like a matter of all loss and no gain.

There are indications a new Democratic leader will be put in the ring. Senator RUSSELL, who was named at the head of the forlorn anti-Truman movement, spoke out sharply and put the call for the session on a sectional, racial basis. He said the Republicans and Truman Democrats are practically in a conspiracy to see who can kick the South the hardest. Senator VANDENBERG, President of the Senate, was incisive, caustic, bitter. Thus at least two leaders of opposing parties are on record right now in condemning the President's action as callow, uncivil, futile.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a column by George Sokolsky.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include some newspaper material.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of a speech made before the Rotary Club of Hobart, Delaware County, N. Y., on Federal public housing.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by our colleague, Hon. BEN JENSEN, before the South Dakota Republican Convention.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD on the subject of the President's message.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the President's message.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of the President's message.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one, to include an editorial from the Boston Post; and in the other, an editorial from the Chelsea Record.

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. SABATH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article and an editorial.

Mr. DORN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HARDY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD my own remarks, together with editorials in each instance, which had previously been requested before the adjournment of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to insert them in the RECORD at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances on two different subjects.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Thursday, July 29, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1702. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, Munitions Board, National Military Establishment, transmitting a report detailing the activities with respect to stock piling between January 1 and June 30, 1948, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAGEN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 954. A bill to permit weekly newspapers to suspend publication for not more than two issues in any one calendar year without loss of second-class mail privileges; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7043. A bill to authorize the sale of the war housing project known as Custerdale in Manitowoc, Wis., to the city of Manitowoc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 7044. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act by liberalizing benefits, by increasing amounts beneficiaries may earn without loss of benefits, and by lowering the age of eligibility of women beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOFF:

H. R. 7045. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of Idaho the former United States naval training center at Farragut, Idaho, determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. R. 7046. A bill to repeal the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 7047. A bill to provide that certain persons who served in the merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7048. A bill to repeal the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 7049. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7050. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 7051. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. J. Res. 436. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the nomination and election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 437. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the Battle of Stony Point; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment sine die of the two Houses of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 703. Resolution for the relief of Beatrice Kelley; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Res. 704. Resolution authorizing a full and complete investigation and study of the conduct in office of Judge J. Waties Waring, of the eastern district of South Carolina; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7052. A bill for the relief of George Geiger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7053. A bill for the relief of Ella Spielman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 7054. A bill for the relief of the estate of Thomas O'Hare, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 7055. A bill for the relief of Avak Hagopian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2130. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Thomas J. Reardon, of Hartford, Conn., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to enactment of legislation concerning the common defense of our divine national economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2131. Also, petition of E. J. Kiernan and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to permitting veterans to remain in temporary or permanent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA

JULY 1, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frank T. Bow	General counsel, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948.	$4,821.30
Oscar L. Hume	Investigator, Jan. 1 to May 1, 1948; staff director, May 1 to June 30, 1948.	3,262.46
Sylvia Deane	Clerk, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948.	2,682.30
J. Robert Brown	Investigator, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948.	2,872.79
R. J. Hodson	Investigator, Apr. 19 to June 30, 1948.	1,202.56
Thomas F. Simpson	Investigator, Mar. 8 to June 20, 1948.	1,720.33
Hubert R. Moody	Investigator, Mar. 15 to June 15, 1948.	1,519.90
George C. Perkins	Investigator, May 1 to June 15, 1948.	751.61
A. J. Watson	Auditor, Mar. 21, 1948.	1,749.48
L. M. Dodge	Auditor, Mar. 14 to May 31, 1948.	1,735.34
Charlotte C. Garver	Secretary, Feb. 24 to Apr. 24, 1948.	586.44
Elizabeth Voth	Secretary, May 1 to June 30, 1948.	622.82
Total		23,527.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$86,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	16,068.28
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948	34,080.42
Total amount expended from May to June 30, 1948	50,148.70
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1948	35,851.30

FOREST A. HARNESS,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JULY 15, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Willis J. Ballinger	Economic counsel	$3,999.78
Arvilla M. Benson	Stenographer	1,661.52
J. G. Crost	Staff investigator	727.84
Leo P. Cullinane	do	3,511.20
Margaret Denny	Stenographer	1,298.38
Virginia F. Flatley	do	1,399.44
James W. Foristel	Executive director	4,021.44
Margaret Koeln	Stenographer	982.97
C. J. Reynolds, Jr.	File clerk	1,247.70
William J. Warmack	Accountant	55.55
Hilfred G. Wood	Stenographer	446.94
Paul O. Peters	Staff investigator	4,021.44

On hand, Jan. 1, 1948	$2,209.34
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	70,000.00
	72,209.34
Amount of expenditures previously reported	
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to July 1, 1948	28,719.83
Total amount expended	
Balance unexpended as of	43,489.51

WALTER C. PLOESER,
Chairman.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 1948

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, we have been privileged to enter upon a new day ladened with innumerable blessings and filled with tasks which challenge the consecration of our noblest manhood.

May this moment of fellowship in prayer be radiant with insight and inspiration as we address ourselves humbly and confidently to every duty and responsibility.

Help us to make a more daring trial of those moral and spiritual values which Thou hast ordained. Show us how we may implement them in the building of a social order in which mankind shall find its joy and peace.

In the name of the Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, Tuesday, July 27, be approved without reading.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the acting majority leader make a statement as to the plans of the majority for today's business.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be happy to do that. We are now proceeding under the morning hour. It was my intention to ask unanimous consent—and if the Senator prefers, I shall make the request now—that at the conclusion of the morning business——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to state that the approval of the Journal is the first order of business.

Mr. WHERRY. I will state now that a unanimous-consent request will be proposed, which I hope will be agreeable, that at the conclusion of the morning business the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.

I think that statement should be made, because I always want to keep the Senate advised of the contemplated procedure. I think that today what we should do is to proceed with the routine business of the morning hour, such as the introduction of bills and resolutions, and then if there are any speeches to be made they can be made at the proper time, following which the Senate should recess until tomorrow at noon. That is the procedure contemplated by the acting majority leader, and no other business is to be undertaken. So I can assure, and do assure, the distinguished Senator from Georgia that if the Journal is approved I shall immediately ask unanimous consent—and I am satisfied that it will be agreeable—that at the conclusion of the morning business, if the hour of 3 o'clock has not arrived, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2644. So once again I ask unanimous consent that the Journal be approved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I inquire if the Chair ruled that the unanimous-consent request was not in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the Chair's view that the Journal has to be disposed of one way or the other as the first order of business, but, upon reflection, the Chair is of the opinion that a unanimous-consent agreement can probably be entered into by the Senate at any time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was certain of that, and I should like to have the Chair submit the unanimous-consent request proposed by the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. The Chair will submit the unanimous-consent proposal just made by the Senator from Nebraska. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The question recurs on the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska regarding the approval of the Journal. Without objection, the Journal is approved.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under Public Law 636, the President pro tempore must appoint four Senators as members of the Washington and Lee Bicentennial Commission. The Chair appoints the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

REPORT ON FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the second quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-aid program authorized by Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress, approved December 17, 1947.

This report covers the period from January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1948, during which the flow of United States supplies to Austria, France, and Italy accomplished the purposes of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947—"to alleviate conditions of hunger and cold and prevent serious economic retrogression."

Pursuant to section 5 (d) of the act, this report also includes the statements of the governments of Austria, France, and Italy on the method of distribution and use of commodities made available under the act; the itemized list of commodities supplied each government, the average price at which each commodity was sold, and the gross proceeds derived from their sale; and the disposition of local currencies derived from these sales.

The supplies provided by the United States have freed the peoples of these

three countries temporarily from the fear of starvation and want and enabled them to hold their economy intact until a long-range program could help them and other countries to a general European reconstruction. To the peoples of these countries, however, the gift of these supplies by the people of the United States meant something more—this aid represented also a symbol of hope for their future.

To us, the American people, our aid was an act of faith in a future in which freemen shall prevail. The freely expressed will of the Italian people in their national election has already confirmed that faith.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1948.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

WITHDRAWAL OF PLAN FOR CONSERVATION OF GRAIN BY BREWING INDUSTRY

A letter from the Attorney General transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture withdrawing compliance with the voluntary plan for the conservation of grain by the brewing industry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS FOR UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION PROJECTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for United States Atomic Energy Commission projects and of the request for compliance therewith which the Secretary of Commerce has issued to various members of the steel industry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EMPLOYMENT OF SPECIAL ASSISTANTS BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from January 1 to June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 10 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Three letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Viggo John Schmidt, Armando Pinto y Bisquerra, and Angele Charlotte Douthe nee Rivis or Simone Rivis or Simone Douthe, whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on December 15, 1947, January 15, and February 15, 1948, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Camilo Orestes Rafael Faneral y Bertini from a report relating to aliens whose deportation was suspended by the Attorney General more than 6 months ago, and transmitted to the Senate on May 15, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS FOR WARM-AIR HEATING EQUIPMENT FOR RESIDENTIAL HOUSING

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for warm-air heating equipment for residential housing and of the request for compliance therewith issued by the Secretary of Commerce to the various steel producers and steel consumers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LIBERATION MEMORIAL STAMPS FOR GUAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a petition of the Guam Congress regarding a joint resolution passed by that Congress for the printing and issuance of Liberation Day memorial stamps on July 21, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL SUBMARINE CHASER TO UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the University of North Carolina had requested the Navy Department to transfer a submarine chaser for use by that university in connection with oceanographic and topographic studies and with surveys of the fishing grounds which are under the jurisdiction of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF PROFESSORS AND INSTRUCTORS AT UNITED STATES NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the number of professors and instructors and the amount of compensation for each, employed at the United States Naval Postgraduate School as a separate activity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

JOHN I. MALARIN

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of John I. Malarin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by the Post Office Department under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PENALTY MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 364, approved June 28, 1944, a report showing the quantity of penalty inscribed material on hand and on order on June 30, 1947, the number of pieces procured, estimated mailings, and estimated cost of handling for the period July 1, 1947, to March 31, 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON GOOSEBERRY PROJECT, UTAH

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the Gooseberry project, Utah (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACTS OF LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the acts of the fourth regular session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, February 9 to April 15, 1948 (with an accompanying volume); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the forty-seventh annual report of the Governor of Puerto Rico, fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ORDINANCES OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of tort claims paid by that Department under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of May 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON STOCK PILING BY MUNITIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Military Establishment Munitions Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report detailing the activities of that Board with respect to stock piling for the period January 1 to June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TIN SMELTER AT TEXAS CITY, TEX., AND PROGRAM FOR PURCHASE AND SALE OF TIN METAL

A letter from the Vice Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and the program for the purchase and sale of tin metal in the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON COORDINATION OF FORWARDING OF WATER-BORNE EXPORT AND IMPORT FOREIGN COMMERCE

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report (No. 15) of the action taken by that Commission under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON MERCHANT SHIP SALES

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report on that Commission on its activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON THE MERGER MOVEMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Merger Movement: A Summary Report" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL STEEL CARTELS

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of that Commission entitled "International Steel Cartels" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM IMPLEMENTS

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report entitled "Manufacture and Distribution of Farm Implements" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT CARTEL

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of that Commission entitled "The International Electrical Equipment Cartel" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS ON PRODUCTION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY AND CAPACITY OF GENERATING PLANTS AND POWER MARKET SURVEY, COLORADO RIVER

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting two reports entitled "Production of Electric Energy and Capacity of Generating Plants in the United States," for the year 1946, and "Power Market Survey, Colorado River, Upper Basin, Part I—Power Requirements" (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourteenth annual report of that Administration for the calendar year ended December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

A letter from the president of the National Academy of Sciences, transmitting a report of that Academy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 199)

A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth semiannual report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Irish-American Unified Society, Yonkers, N. Y., favoring the unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Manhattan Wallace for President Conference, New York, N. Y., favoring the abolition of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by F. Ben Brillantes, secretary general, Philippine Ex-Political Prisoners' Association, Manila, P. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant benefits to Filipino internees in Japanese prisons during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Morton I. E. Erlichman, of Philadelphia, Pa., relating to the loyalty probe of Government employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Alliance of Postal Employees, in convention at Richmond, Va., protesting against the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon un-American activities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by District 50 of the Lions International, Wailuku, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation providing statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A paper in the nature of a petition from Arizona-United States Cancer Cure Society, signed by James O. McDowell, of Bisbee, Ariz., praying for the enactment of legislation to purchase a cancer-cure salve from Dr. Agnew, of Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the national conclave of Kappa Delta Rho Fraternity, in Chicago, Ill., favoring an increased exemption on income-tax payments to students in all accredited institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American Legion, Washington, D. C., signed by John Thomas Taylor, director, National Legislative Commission, praying for the enactment of House bill 4488, to create the Veterans' Homestead Act, and recommending the enactment of other legislation beneficial to veterans of World Wars I and II (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Conference for the Preservation and Advancement of Independent Business, of New York, N. Y., relating to inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Thomas J. Reardon, of Hartford, Conn., relating to price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Mr. and Mrs. Max J. Oberhauser, of Butte, Mont., praying for the enactment of legislation to reduce postage rates on gift parcels to foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Western Plant Board, Reno, Nev., favoring authority for airplane inspection by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWKES:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to proceed with all possible dispatch to the preparation and adoption of necessary legislation designed to encourage and make adequately effectual a comprehensive program of merchant shipbuilding in this country's shipyards and of expanding our merchant marine

"Whereas through the sale of our tankers and cargo carriers abroad, the export of our steel, and the failure to grant authority for the construction of needed merchant tonnage at home, our merchant marine and our shipbuilding activities have suffered drastic decline; and

"Whereas while our position in world shipping has thus deteriorated, other nations have achieved new highs in ship construction; and

"Whereas we have learned that we must depend upon our own resources of ships and shipbuilding for our national defense and security; and

"Whereas the present world situation requires that the United States stand fully prepared against any emergency: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby urged to proceed with all possible dispatch to the preparation and adoption of necessary legislation designed to encourage and make adequately effectual a comprehensive program of merchant-shipbuilding in this country's shipyards and of expanding our merchant marine.

"2. That the Secretary of State be and is hereby directed to transmit immediately following the passage of this joint resolution a copy thereof, properly authenticated, to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress, and the Maritime Commission.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

"Approved July 16, 1948."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.)

RESOLUTION OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, HAGERSTOWN, MD.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, in convention at Hagerstown, Md., May 7–9, 1948. It calls attention to a matter of vital interest, particularly to disabled veterans, and requests that employers in private industry, as well as in the Federal and State Governments, give preference in employment to members of the armed forces returning to civilian life, with highest priority for those who have been disabled in the service.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas there appears to be a tendency on the part of employers in private industry, as well as in the Federal and State Governments, to forget the promise made by the citizens of this country through their legislators and the Congress that when the members of the armed forces would return to civilian life that they would be given preference for civilian employment and this preference as to those disabled in service would receive the highest of all such preference;

"Whereas this tendency is being evidenced by action of employers not only in private industry but also the State and Federal Governments and by various bills which have been introduced in the legislature and the Congress, to weaken that preference and in some cases to eliminate: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, in convention assembled at Hagerstown, Md., these 7th to 9th days of May 1948, That we reaffirm employment resolution No. 21, adopted at the 1947 national convention of the Disabled American Veterans and hereby repeat that resolution part as the resolution of this department convention:

" 'Now, therefore, be it

" '*Resolved by the Disabled American Veterans assembled in its twenty-sixth annual*

convention at Las Vegas, Nev., August 17, 1947, That we do hereby condemn any and all efforts that may be made by any other organization or individual to endeavor to take away any benefits that have previously been extended by Congress, or by any Federal agency, to service-disabled veterans, under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, or of any other laws, Executive order, regulations, instructions, or policies; and be it further

"'*Resolved by the Disabled American Veterans assembled in its twenty-sixth annual national convention at Las Vegas, Nev., August 17–23, 1947,* That the Disabled American Veterans shall use every resource to fight against any efforts to enact any laws in the United States Congress, or in any State, or any action through any governmental agency of the Federal Government, of any State, or of any municipality which would eliminate any rights, privileges, preferences, or benefits for any service-disabled veterans'; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution with an appropriate statement be personally presented by the department commander and the appropriate member of his staff to the Governor of the State of Maryland and to each Member of Congress from the State of Maryland.

"HAILE CHISHOLM,
"Commander, Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chapter, No. 10, Disabled American Veterans."

The above resolution passed by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, assembled at Hagerstown, Md., department convention, May 7–9, 1948.

JAMES F. AUBREY, Sr.,
Department Commander, 1948–49 Term.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of June 1948, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
June 30, 1948.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of June, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Leona V. MacKinnon, 1443 Spring Road NW.; Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency; annual salary, $5,905.20.

Fedele F. Fauri, 3227 Northampton Street NW.; Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; annual salary, $9,975.

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JUNE 30, 1948.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from December 31, 1947, to June 30, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
George F. Meredith, executive director	$10,000.00	$5,000.00
Raymond R. Dickey, chief counsel	9,050.11	4,525.06
Bertram H. Wimer, chief investigator	8,418.10	4,209.05
Albert J. Wolken, special investigator	8,418.10	4,209.05
Albert E. Johnson, special counsel	[1] 25.00	3,600.96
Catherine Guyon, consultant	6,522.05	3,261.03
Homer Zopf, special investigator	[1] 25.00	1,647.18
William Broadgate, special counsel	[1] 25.00	1,659.65
Paul Hadlick, special counsel	[1] 25.00	1,333.30
Maxwell Dickey, special investigator	[1] 25.00	888.87
Allene J. Loveland, secretary	3,792.09	1,896.05
Pearl Mae Nichols, secretary	3,792.09	1,896.05
Dorothy Holshouser, editorial secretary	3,792.09	1,896.05
Mrs. Grace McNamara, secretary	3,212.80	1,606.40
Mrs. Alma Youse, secretary	3,212.80	1,606.40
Charlotte Southmayd, clerk	3,212.80	1,606.40
Virginia Lee Bauer, file clerk	2,633.40	1,316.70
Gene Wynes, messenger	2,004.20	229.01
John M. Payne, messenger	2,004.20	923.05
Jeanne M. Larson, clerk-typist	2,467.87	482.30
Marvel B. Spacensky, clerk-typist	2,467.87	113.00
John M. Frier, special investigator	[1] 25.00	968.10

[1] Per diem.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$215,000.00
Amount expended	142,027.08
Balance unexpended	72,972.92

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. McCLELLAN introduced Senate bill 2898, to increase personal income tax exemptions, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 2899. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 the qualifying age for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2900. A bill to authorize the construction by the Tennessee Valley Authority of a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2901. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. IVES, and Mr. TOBEY) introduced Senate bill 2902, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 2903. A bill to repeal the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2904. A bill to authorize the sale of the war housing project known as Custerdale in Manitowoc, Wis., to the city of Manitowoc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself, Mr. BALL, Mr. THYE, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 2905. A bill to provide emergency relief for livestock farmers in drought-stricken areas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2906. A bill for the relief of Public School District No. 17, Winnebago, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. O'CONOR introduced Senate bill 2907, to provide pay increases for employees of the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate bill 2908, to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity on the pricing policies of certain large corporations, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia introduced Senate bill 2909, to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for Mr. MCKELLAR):

S. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to build a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution requiring persons and organizations registered as lobbyists to file weekly reports with the Clerk of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE OF PERSONAL INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, which I send to the desk and ask for its appropriate reference.

The bill (S. 2898) to increase personal income-tax exemptions, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement as to the purposes of the measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arkansas to make a brief statement concerning the bill he has just introduced? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Have we reached the order of petitions and memorials?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order of petitions and memorials was reached, and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] asked unanimous consent to address the Senate in connection with the measure he has introduced.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to ask the Chair if following the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas the presentation of petitions and memorials would still be in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Following the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas the presentation of petitions and memorials would still be in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the bill which I have just introduced is to increase the personal exemption of Federal income-tax payers. After three long battles in the Congress we finally enacted into law at the regular session of Congress, over Presidential veto, a tax bill giving relief to all personal income-tax payers. There was a sharp difference of opinion with respect to the merits of the bill. There are those who still contend that it was and is simply a bill to help the rich and for the relief of the rich and not a bill to help the small-income taxpayer, who needs relief the most. Notwithstanding the criticism that has been made of the bill as finally enacted, respecting which I also voted to override the President's veto, I am sure we can all agree that the bill did not give as much relief to small-income earners as they deserve, and as much as we would have liked to have given them. But, Mr. President, those who criticize other provisions of the bill also would criticize the Congress for having removed the grossest inequity and discrimination that has existed in our tax structure. I refer, of course, to the split-income provision granting this right to the husbands and wives of 38 States of the Union, a privilege only enjoyed heretofore by 12 States that have community-property laws. It is also to criticize and condemn the effort of this Congress to give relief in small measure, at least, to the low-income groups of this Nation who now have to pay income taxes on their salaries and their small incomes, all of which are needed if they are to purchase and have the actual minimum essentials of life.

With the high national income which we have in this Nation today, with wages higher than ever before in the history of the Nation, with farm income at a peak, and with the cost of living, about which we hear so much, at possibly the highest level in the history of the Nation, the small-income groups are in real distress. If this is an extraordinary session of Congress to deal with urgent matters and to give relief to those who are oppressed, then this is a good way to start. Let us increase the personal income-tax exemptions so as to give relief to those who need it most.

The President of the United States has criticized the bill which was passed, but he has offered no substitute for it. He has offered nothing which would grant relief to the groups which he says were "stabbed in the back." Obviously he does not want tax relief for anyone.

I do not know what the program of the Republican majority in Congress is or will finally be. I do not know whether we are to stay here and deliberate and try to legislate under the conditions; but if we are, I ask the Republican majority to take up this bill, give it appropriate hearings in committee, and bring it to the floor of the House and Senate so that we may vote upon it at this session. If there is an emergency, if there is distress, and if there is an effort to give relief to a large group, of millions of our taxpayers, in my opinion this is the way to do it.

I shall ask to have incorporated in the RECORD an analysis of the bill. I shall not take time to read it, but I shall make a brief statement about it.

The bill as introduced would increase personal exemptions from the present figure of $600 per taxpayer to $1,000 for a single taxpayer, and $1,000 for each husband and wife. It may be said that that is a pretty big increase. It is, but it will afford relief that is badly needed.

The next question which arises is whether, under the present economic conditions and the heavy cost of Government today, together with the extraordinary programs which we are undertaking to finance, the Government can afford it. In other words, if this bill should pass, what would be the loss of revenue to the Federal Treasury? Having that question in mind, I have obtained estimates from the Treasury Department, and also from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the Congress. Those estimates vary somewhat, but I shall place them in the RECORD. In obtaining the estimate as to the amount of loss of revenue which would result if the bill which I am introducing today should be enacted, I also asked for an estimate as to the amount of loss of revenue which would be incurred if personal exemptions were increased to $900 per person, instead of $1,000. Then, as a very minimum, I asked what the loss would be if personal exemptions were increased to $750 per person. Let me give the estimates of the Treasury Department.

If personal exemptions were increased to $1,000 per person, the loss of revenue based upon present national income would be $3,600,000,000, and 12,600,000 taxpayers would be removed from the tax rolls.

If personal exemptions were increased to $900 per person instead of $1,000, the loss of revenue which would result would be $2,800,000,000, and 9,800,000 taxpayers would be removed from the tax rolls.

If the committees, after hearings and due study of this legislation, should conclude that we could not at this time absorb that much loss, in view of the anticipated cost of government and anticipated revenues, then, as a very minimum to give relief to those groups of our citizens, I suggest that the committee amend the bill so as to increase exemptions to $750 per person. If that were done, according to the Treasury estimate, a loss of revenue of only $1,500,000,000 would be incurred, based upon present national income; and 5,500,000 taxpayers would be removed from the tax rolls.

Mr. President, a great many things are done and said in a campaign year for political purposes. We hear that charge on every hand. The whole atmosphere here is now charged with such accusations. I am not introducing this bill for political purposes. I have no opponent in this election. However, I know the hardship which is now being imposed on our income earners because of the high cost of living and because of the Federal tax which is withheld from their pay envelopes. I am introducing this bill in absolute sincerity, and in the hope that if this Congress is to try to attend to those things which are of importance and are pressing, the Congress will take action on this bill. The bill would not go into effect until next year. It would afford no relief for this year's taxes, but would take effect for next year.

As I stated a moment ago, I do not know what course this Congress is to take or what will be the policy and procedure of the majority party. It may be that this will be nothing but a civil-rights session and a political dog fight from beginning to end. However, we can much better serve our country and serve the interest of humanity and human rights by dealing with legislation of this character and giving relief to the poor people of the Nation who are in distress, instead of wasting time in a political dog fight which would be a disgrace to the Congress of the United States.

The primary responsibility must rest upon him who has forced the issue and forced us into that situation; but the Republican Party can rise to true statesmanship at this hour. It does not have to force this battle; it can rise to true statesmanship and take up measures which are of importance in present world conditions and the condition in which this Government and this Nation finds itself. Thus the Republican Party can raise itself in the esteem of the American people. It is up to them. They have the majority. They have the power. I plead with them to take up measures of this character and others which will not tend to embitter any section of the country and will not serve to bring more strife and to emphasize abroad the disunity of our people. All that would be accomplished by such a course would be to furnish propaganda material to the enemies of this Nation, who would make far greater gains than either the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, or anyone else would make by forcing legislation which is so reprehensible and distasteful to as loyal a section and group of Americans as can be found anywhere in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief analysis of the bill, together with Treasury Department estimates of loss of revenue.

There being no objection, the analysis and estimates were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 2 of the attached bill would increase the basic personal income-tax exemptions for a taxpayer and his spouse from $600 each to $1,000 each. The remaining sections of the bill are of a technical nature, designed to implement the increase in exemptions provided for by section 2. The bill would not increase the exemptions now provided for old age, blindness, or dependents, but I recommend the appropriate committees study this with a view to making reasonable increases for them. A section by section analysis of the bill follows:

The first section gives the bill a short title "The Tax Reduction Act of 1949."

Section 2 provides for the increased personal exemptions described above.

Subsection (a) of section 3 increases the minimum gross income for which a declaration of estimated tax is required from $600

per annum to $1,000 per annum in order to make it correspond to the increased exemptions provided for by section 2.

Subsection (b) of section 3 amends sections 1622 (a) and 1622 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for withholding exemptions corresponding to the increased exemptions provided for by section 2.

Subsection (c) of section 3 amends section 1622 (h) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code by dividing the substance of subparagraph (D) into two subparagraphs (D) and (E) relating, respectively, to the basic withholding exemption for the taxpayer's spouse and the withholding exemptions for old age and blindness of the taxpayer's spouse. This change makes it easier to refer to these exemptions in the table contained in section 1622 (b) (1) of the Code as it would be amended by section 3 (b) of the bill. Subsection (c) of section 3 also changes the language of section 1622 (h) (2) of the Code to make it applicable to the increased withholding exemptions provided for by section 3 (b) of the bill.

Subsection (d) of section 3 increases the minimum gross income or payment for which individual, fiduciary, and information returns are required from $600 per annum to $1,000 per annum, in view of the increased exemptions provided by section 2.

Subsection (e) of section 3 raises the credit allowed to an estate in lieu of the exemptions provided by section 25 (b) (1) of the code from $600 to $1,000 so that it corresponds to the increased personal exemption.

Subsection (f) of section 3 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to make such changes in the optional tax tables and the wage bracket withholding tables as may be necessary to reflect the increased exemptions provided for by section 2.

Section 4 of the bill makes the bill applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948.

Section 5 provides that the bill shall be applicable on a pro rata basis to taxable years beginning in 1948 and ending in 1949.

Respectfully,

HARKER T. STANTON,
Assistant Counsel.

JULY 27, 1948.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON
INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, July 23, 1948.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: The following estimates are furnished pursuant to your telephone request of July 19, 1948, to Mr. Smith of this office.

The estimated revenue loss in a full year of operation with personal income of $209,000,000,000 from various changes in the present law per capita exemptions for individuals is as follows:

1. Seven hundred and fifty dollars for single persons, $1,500 for married couples, and $600 for each dependent. Revenue loss, $1,847,000,000.

2. Nine hundred dollars for single persons, $1,800 for married couples, and $600 for each dependent. Revenue loss, $3,604,000,000.

3. One thousand dollars for single persons, $2,000 for married couples, and $600 for each dependent. Revenue loss, $4,758,000,000.

Respectfully yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

JULY 23, 1948.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your letter of July 19, 1948, requesting the estimated revenue loss from three plans for increasing the personal exemption of single persons and married persons from the present level of $600 per capita.

The following table presents estimates for the calendar year 1948 of the decreases in tax liability and in the number of taxable-income recipients from present law under each of the three personal-exemption plans:

Personal exemptions			Estimated calendar year 1948 decrease in tax liability from present law	Estimated calendar year 1948 decrease in number of taxable income recipients from present law
Single persons	Married couples [1]	Dependents		
			Billions of dollars	*Millions of income recipients*
$750	$1,500	$600	1.5	5.5
$900	1,800	600	2.8	9.8
$1,000	2,000	600	3.6	12.6

[1] It is assumed that the first dependent of a single person would qualify the taxpayer as the head of a family and entitle him to the married couple's exemption.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS SHERE,
Director of Tax Research.

AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. This is a simple amendment changing the date of eligibility of the displaced persons now in the camps in the American zones in Germany and Austria. The act, which was passed, fixed the date as December 22, 1945. Our bill calls for a change in this date to April 21, 1947, in order to make eligible a substantial number of displaced persons, estimated at 180,000, who came into our zones in Germany and Austria after 1945. Practically all of this group are persecuted Jewish people who fled into our camps, particularly from Poland, because of the fear of anti-Semitism. Since there are now only about 200,000 displaced persons of Jewish faith in our charge, the present law as it stands would exclude about 90 percent of the total. It is inconceivable that the United States should bar the eligibility of these unfortunate persecuted people who are people without a country and who above all others suffered from the tragic Hitler regime and its aftermath.

It is our belief that the passage of this bill will bring about a fuller cooperation of the other nations of the world with the United States in providing resettlement for all the DP groups. In this way we can cooperate most fully with the International Refugee Organization and can move toward a final solution of our responsibility for those who are in the American zones in Germany and Austria.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Debate is not in order during the morning hour. May the Chair again respectfully suggest to Senators, it is perfectly obvious that during the special session it is going to be absolutely necessary to observe the rules of the Senate with some degree of fidelity. No discussion is possible in the morning hour, except by unanimous consent. If any Senator wishes to make remarks in the morning hour, the Chair asks that he obtain unanimous consent before he does so.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, would the Chair allow a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Certainly.

Mr. TOBEY. Would it be inconsistent with the ruling of the Chair, just uttered and expressed, for me to ask the Senator from New Jersey to yield to me, in order that I may ask the privilege of having my name joined to the names of other Senators in favor of the bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks it is against the rules, but under the circumstances the request will be considered, in order to save time, and agreed to.

Mr. TOBEY. As the Spaniard would say, muchas gracias.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator for asking to be identified with the introduction of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That takes care of that.

The bill (S. 2902) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. SMITH (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. IVES, and Mr. TOBEY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMPLOYEES

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide increased compensation for District of Columbia employees, on the same basis as that granted to other employees of Federal agencies and departments.

Having participated both as a member of the Senate Civil Service Committee and as a conferee on the pay increase bill in the closing hours of the session, in the prolonged discussions incident to consideration of the proposed increase, I am convinced that the cost-of-living increment given to other Federal employees is merited just as richly by the workers in the various District of Columbia offices and agencies.

The continuing upswing in the cost of practically all living essentials makes it imperative that these employees of the District of Columbia be given some assistance toward balancing the family budget.

The bill (S. 2907) to provide pay increases for employees of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. O'CONOR, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLICITY OF PRICING POLICIES OF CERTAIN CORPORATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a

bill to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity of the pricing policies of certain large corporations, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill together with the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2908) to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity on the pricing policies of certain large corporations, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress recognizes (1) that mounting prices and mounting profits are undermining the purchasing power of the Nation and are setting the stage for a new depression, all at a time when international recovery and world peace depend in great measure upon stopping inflation, and (2) that a few giant corporations have control over the production, the distribution, and the price of basic commodities upon which all American economy depends. The Congress believes that inflation will be checked if the pricing policies of these corporate giants are publicly reviewed before increased prices may be made effective, and to that end the provisions of this act are enacted.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

(1) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

(2) The term "essential commodity" means any commodity which basically affects the cost of living or industrial or agricultural production ", as determined and made public from time to time by the Federal Trade Commission."

(3) The term "person" includes individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

PROHIBITION AGAINST CERTAIN PRICE INCREASES WITHOUT NOTICE

SEC. 3. No corporation in any industry engaged in the production of essential commodities for commerce, 30 percent or more of the annual output of which is produced by five or less of the producers in such industry, shall, either directly or through any subsidiary, affiliate, individual, or other person, fix any price for any essential commodity in excess of the price charged therefor by such producer in the ordinary channels of trade on July 27, 1948, until such corporation has complied with the provisions of section 4 of this act and until a public hearing has been held as required by such section. The Federal Trade Commission shall determine and make public from time to time the industries to which this section applies.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO INCREASE PRICES—PUBLIC HEARING

SEC. 4. (a) Any corporation desiring to make any price increase referred to in section 3 shall file with the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Federal Trade Commission a notice of intention to increase prices, particularly describing the commodity or commodities to which any increase is to be applied and indicating the extent and proposed effective date of such increase. Not later than 30 days after such notice has been given the Federal Trade Commission shall call a public hearing on the proposed increase at which it shall be the duty of the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce to examine such corporation with respect to the reasons for and the justifiability of the proposed increase and to take testimony on the impact of such increase on the economy of the Nation. At such public hearing all persons desiring to be heard shall be allowed to appear and give testimony either for or against the proposed increase under rules to be prescribed by the Federal Trade Commission.

(b) For the purpose of any such hearing the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable to the powers and duties of the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce under this act; and the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce may designate examiners or other personnel from their respective agencies to administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

(c) The Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce shall make a joint report to the Congress upon such hearing and shall submit in connection therewith their joint or separate recommendations, if any, for additional action.

PENALTIES

SEC. 5. Any corporation violating the provisions of section 3, and any officer or agent of such corporation or any person acting for or employed by such corporation who shall knowingly and willfully participate in any such violation, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

PROTECTION AGAINST REPRISAL

SEC. 6. Any corporation which either directly or indirectly refuses to do business with any person by reason of the fact that such person has given testimony at any hearing held under section 4, and any officer or agent of such corporation or any person acting for or employed by such corporation who shall knowingly and willfully participate in such action, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both; and any such person who shall be injured in his business or property by the action of such corporation in so refusing, may sue therefor in any district court of the United States in the district in which the defendant resides or is found, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the costs of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATION

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated so much as may be necessary to enable the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce to carry out their respective functions under this act.

The statement by Mr. O'MAHONEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEOPLE OR THE PROFITEERS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Congress is face to face with the issue: The people or the profiteers.

Both major parties have recognized the plain fact that the cost of living is higher now than at any time in history. It will not do for Congress to waste its time in fruitless debate about who or what is responsible for this condition. It is here. The question is, What are we, the only legislative power of the Nation, going to do about it? We must act or drift. If we act, we can stop inflation now. If we drift, it will become steadily worse and create a constantly growing demand for more and more drastic action.

I am introducing a bill to hold inflation immediately by stopping price increases on basic commodities, the supply of which is controlled by a handful of corporate managers and the prices of which are likewise fixed by management.

When three or four giant corporations can fix the prices and the supply for the basic commodities in daily use by 140,000,000 Americans—and this is the situation—it is time to realize that the people of the United States have become the subjects of private economic government over which their Congress declines to exercise any restraining influence, although it has the constitutional power to do so.

As I have already pointed out, three meat-packing corporations produce 43 percent of all the processed meat consumed by all the people of the United States. They also fix the prices, and their corporate reports show that they are making record profits. There are 121 basic products in common use throughout the United States by business for industrial production and by the people for their daily living which are under such concentrated control that in 1937 more than 75 percent of the total output of each commodity was manufactured by only four firms. These commodities range from meat and corn sirup to steel, milk bottles, and cigarettes to gasoline, tires, tin cans, and window glass. There is scarcely a commodity in daily demand from the building of homes to living in them that is not subject to this concentrated control.

My proposal is simple—it is merely that no corporation engaged in the production of essential commodities, 30 percent or more of the annual output of which is produced by five or less of the producers in the industry, may increase the price for such a commodity without first filing with the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Federal Trade Commission a notice of intention to increase the price, and no such price will be permitted until within 30 days after the filing of such notice the Federal Trade Commission shall have called a public hearing on the proposed increase at which the producer shall be subjected to examination as to the reasons for and the justifiability for the proposed increase.

This proposal requires no new machinery. The Federal Trade Commission now has the power to conduct such investigations. The only thing new about this proposal is that the hearings shall be held before profiteering takes place and not afterward when it can do the people no good.

It will be effective because the giant corporations which control the supply and fix the prices of the commodities 140,000,000 people must buy will be unwilling to subject themselves to cross examination about their pricing policies and their gigantic profits.

The National City Bank of New York City, in its economic letter of June 1948, reported that the net income after taxes of the 100

largest manufacturing corporations increased in 1947 91 percent over the net income after taxes in 1945. The jump was from $1,943,000,000 in 1945 to $3,730,000,000. The income of these corporations is so great that they are plowing it back into plant expansion and thus gaining a still larger control over the production of industrial commodities in the United States.

Congress has not hesitated to enforce a cooling off period on organized labor which may not sell its commodity for the price it demands under the Railway Labor Act and the Taft-Hartley Act until a certain period of time has elapsed. If we can freeze the wages of labor, certainly we can freeze the prices at which concentrated business organization sells its products particularly when the public interest demands that Congress halt inflation.

These corporations are collectivist institutions which are managed not by their owners, the stockholders, but by hired executive managers. They are setting the pattern for political collectivism and unless Congress acts to stop this concentration of economic power the battle to prevent political collectivism in the United States will be on us before we know it.

The measure I suggest is a perfectly constitutional proposal. The men who drafted the Constitution of the United States gave to Congress the power to regulate commerce. This power does not belong to the President. It does not belong to the courts. It belongs to the Congress, and if the Members of Congress choose not to exercise this power, they will not only be abandoning the people to the profiteers but they will be abandoning their constitutional duty to protect a democratic economy in a democratic system.

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FINANCE ACT

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "Educational Facilities Finance Act," and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared in explanation of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2909) to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

I am offering today an educational facilities finance act, which might be an alternative to the Educational Finance Act passed by the Senate last April which has not been acted on by the House.

I voted against the Taft bill primarily because I knew the States could not get the kind of aid it proposed without Government control, which ultimately would involve the question of segregation. Even if the House should pass the bill in the form approved by the Senate, without injecting the segregation issue, there is no assurance that a future Congress will not amend the provisions under which the grants are made.

Moreover, the Taft bill would not solve the problem of Virginia or of other Southern States. It is not sufficient merely to increase the salaries of present teachers. We must have a more efficient system, which necessitates the consolidation of small units and that means new buildings for the grade schools as well as for the high schools. This building program is the biggest need.

Under the plan proposed in my bill, schools could be built promptly by local agencies which would be allowed to repay their share of the cost in easy installments over a 20-year period. This would release funds that could be used for increasing teachers salaries and for other purposes.

Unlike the Taft bill, my proposal would not involve the Federal Government in a program of recurring annual contributions that would permanently increase the national budget. Nor would localities become so dependent on a Federal contribution that they would find themselves helpless to resist some future attempt to tie strings to the funds, dictating qualifications for teachers, prescribing curricula, or forbidding segregation.

I knew I was doing an unpopular thing in voting against the Taft bill because everyone recognizes the need for improving our education system. But I felt the long-range danger of that plan outweighed the advantage my State would immediately enjoy through receiving Federal funds that would be larger than the State's proportional contribution.

I feel that my bill has the advantages without the dangers of the Taft plan.

We need better schools in every part of the Nation and especially for the colored people of Virginia and the South. My State and others are trying to provide the necessary facilities with inadequate funds and I know of no better way to help them than by such a building program as I have proposed.

My bill would designate the RFC as fiscal agent for distributing $300,000,000 of outright grants and for advancing another $300,000,000 of loans to be secured by bonds of school districts. The interest rate on these bonds would be fixed at 2½ percent, making the money available as cheaply as possible without any cost to the Government for this portion of the program. The RFC is the best agency, it seems to me, for handling this program without exerting any pressure on the States or giving the Federal Government even a latent power to usurp the functions of local self-government in the important field of education.

Funds would be divided among the States on the basis of the proportion of the number of children of school age (5 to 17) in each State to the total number of children of this age in the Nation. Allocations within each State would be made by the State board of education or the agency performing similar functions and each local project would require approval by the State agency.

THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I have just returned from several weeks spent in my home State of Indiana. On every hand and on the tip of almost every tongue there one hears the question, "Are we going to have war?"

For many months the newspaper correspondents and the radio commentators have poured out millions of words relative to the tense situation that now exists between this country and Soviet Russia.

Repeated requests have been made to the State Department and the administration by this body and by Members of the House of Representatives for complete information relative to the controversy over the situation in which we find ourselves in occupied Berlin.

Three years ago representatives of the United States took the lead, acting with representatives of 49 other nations, in writing at San Francisco the Charter for the United Nations. This great world organization was launched in the belief and hope it would be a potent organization for settling international disputes and avoiding future armed conflict. It is time now to test the capabilities of the United Nations as an organization that can resolve international differences around the conference table and avoid the war which so many in our country believe is so imminent.

If the United Nations is a potent organization, then the American-Soviet controversy should be submitted to it for amicable settlement. If it is powerless to settle such differences, then in my opinion it is an impotent organization, lacking the possibilities of fulfilling the hope so fervently expressed at San Francisco and throughout the world 3 years ago.

I now offer a resolution declaring it to be the sense of the United States Senate that the present controversy between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair in his capacity as a Senator from Michigan would have to object if there should be no other objection raised.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I inquire if the Senator from Indiana desires to have the resolution taken up for consideration immediately without reference to the committee?

Mr. JENNER. I have asked unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I consider the problem one of the most important ones confronting this Nation and the world.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, without in any way passing on the substantive merits of what the Senator from Indiana says, it seems to me that a matter of this kind, being of such far-reaching character, should have the benefit of committee investigation and study.

Mr. JENNER. Why far reaching?

Mr. LODGE. I think it is very far reaching. I think it has all sorts of implications which involve the security and the peace of the world, and it seems to me that the resolution ought to have the benefit—and I say it is in the friendliest spirit to my friend from Indiana—of committee investigation and study. So for that reason at this moment I should feel constrained to object.

Mr. JENNER. The United Nations organization was set up 3 years ago. It is a functioning organization. Only recently it has been recommended that we appropriate $65,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money to build it a permanent home. So it is time to test the organization. If it is to exist as a going organization, if it is to fulfill the hope of peace of the people of the world, let us give it a chance to act and not to continue to circumvent every time an international problem arises.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a point of order. Are not the present proceedings out of order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The discussion is out of order. The question is whether or not unanimous consent shall be given which the Senator from Indiana is asking.

Mr. LODGE. I object.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, is the request for immediate consideration out of order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over under the rule, or be referred, whichever the Senator from Indiana prefers. Which does the Senator prefer?

Mr. JENNER. I prefer that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will go over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 267), submitted by Mr. JENNER, was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the present controversy between the United States and the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics with respect to restrictions imposed upon the movement of personnel, supplies, and materials between the occupation zones of Germany and the occupation sectors of Berlin should be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations organization and that the President should instruct the United States Representative in the Security Council to take such action as may be necessary to present this matter to the Security Council for immediate consideration and settlement.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the President of the United States has called the Congress into extraordinary session. When I heard the President announce at the Philadelphia convention that he would call the Congress into session on the 26th day of July, I immediately made the statement that I would offer a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the two Houses of Congress immediately after they were called into session. I made that statement because I believed it would not be in the best interests of the people of the United States to have the Congress convene in session at this particular time.

If we could accomplish the two things the President has set forth in his message to Congress and has asked the Congress to accomplish, that would be all right. Let us read them now, as set forth in his statement:

The urgent needs of the American people require our presence here today.

Our people demand legislative action by their Government to do two things. First, to check inflation and the rising cost of living; and second, to help in meeting the acute housing shortage.

Those are the two things the President set forth. In his message other things are enumerated, but only by slight reference. Those two things could be the only reason for calling an extraordinary session of Congress.

I notice in the morning newspaper that it is stated that the Republican leaders of Congress plan a quick adjournment. The headline reads:

Republican leaders plan quick adjournment; special session is branded political maneuver; Truman asks for controls, housing action.

Those are the only two things mentioned there.

If the Congress could get down to business and could pass a proper housing bill and could do something about the rising cost of living, then the Congress could very well stay in session and do something. But judging from the rumors I hear, instead of taking up those two subjects, the Senate will attempt to take up the whole civil-rights program, which happened to be mentioned briefly on page 6 of the President's message to Congress, at the tail end of his message, so to speak. The President did not urge very strongly that anything be done about civil rights, as we observe if we read his message closely. That situation is not a national emergency at the present time.

Mr. President, what will develop here if an attempt is made at this session of the Congress to have the Congress, and particularly the Senate, enact civil-rights legislation? What will happen at this session? I fear that what will happen will be that the majority party in the Senate will bring up such matters as antilynching legislation and anti-poll-tax legislation. Probably anti-poll-tax legislation will be proposed first, judging from the word which comes on the grapevine, from which I receive my information. If we start the fight on anti-poll-tax legislation, the Republican Party knows what will happen, for it has a little bit of sense. The Republican Party knows very well that that will bring about a prolonged debate in the Senate. When that happens, let them not attempt to lay the blame at the feet of the southern Democrats, for we shall not be the ones who will undertake to bring up such legislation. I wish the world to know who brings those bills to the front, in an attempt to block the consideration of legislation needed at the present time in the United States.

I now offer my resolution, and I wish to read it to the Senate. It corresponds somewhat to the Republican adjournment resolution of the last session, so the Republicans cannot object to it. They can call the Congress back in session, if that should become necessary. I now read my resolution:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 60

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, July 31, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassamble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. President, it will be noted that my resolution gives to the majority party the right to reconvene the Congress, and, of course, the President can recall it in case of dire emergency. At the present time, immediately after the two national conventions and before the general election in November, Mr. President, you know as well as I do that there will be some nice politics played here, which probably will not be for the interests of the people of the United States, because—let us face facts—the majority party in the Senate, since I have been serving here, has not always acted for the best interests of the common people of America.

Let me again warn you, Mr. President, that we have had a bipartisan foreign program; but if the Congress stays in session 4 weeks, 5 weeks—it is out of the question to pass the necessary legislation in 2 weeks, 2 months, or what not—the Nation, and especially the Senate of the United States, will be stirred to such fever heat that the bipartisan foreign policy will no longer exist. The peace of the world will then probably have been jeopardized, and probably seeds will have been planted which will eventually develop and grow into a third world war. That is how serious the situation is as I see it.

Not only that; we want peace not only here in the Senate, we want peace on the home front. Mr. President, when such issues as civil rights are brought up, if you go down into my State you will find out what I am talking about. You will find down there that that issue is so hot they will hardly let me sit down when I return home. That issue is hot, it is stirring up strife and discontent here in the United States, making a fertile bed in which the Communists may plant their seed. Those who bring up that issue, I here and now tell them, are aiding and abetting the Communists. Communists thrive where there is discontent.

That being so, as I see it at the present time, nothing good can come out of this session of the Congress. For that reason, I am submitting this resolution, asking that it be printed and lie over, to be taken up either tomorrow or Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and will lie over under the rule.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. HAYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair respectfully suggest that debate is not in order until the morning hour is concluded. The morning hour is nearly concluded. Debate will be in order shortly.

EMPLOYMENT OF PAGES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 268), as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms hereby is authorized to employ 21 pages for duty in the Senate Chamber, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from July 22, 1948, to and including the third day following the final recess or adjournment of the Congress, at the basic rate of $1,800 per annum.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The rules require that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee, but, by unanimous consent, the rules can be waived.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rules be waived.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that the rules be waived. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained permission for a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to hold sessions while the present session of Congress continues.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a matter which comes over from the previous session, and asks the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. When House bill 6959, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, came over from the House, the Senator from Louisiana objected to the second reading of the bill. Therefore the bill has never been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is the Chair's understanding that the Senator from Louisiana is now willing to have the bill read the second time and referred to the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask that the bill be read the second time, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will now be read the second time by title.

The bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was read the second time by title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill is referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction over housing matters.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 261), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of S. 2833, a bill to amend section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and that said bill be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the resolution go over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will go over.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech of acceptance delivered by President Truman at the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH OF SENATOR BARKLEY AS TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech delivered by him as temporary chairman of the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR BARKLEY'S SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE AT DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech of acceptance delivered by him at the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE 1948 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McMAHON BEFORE THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MCMAHON before the Democratic National Convention on July 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SITUATION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him on the subject of the Democratic Party, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE 1948 PLATFORM OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the 1948 platform of the Republican Party, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY GOVERNOR DEWEY

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, accepting the nomination as President of the United States, delivered at the Republican Convention, Philadelphia, Pa., June 25, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY GOVERNOR WARREN

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the speech by Gov. Earl Warren, accepting nomination as Vice President of the United States, at the Republican Convention, Philadelphia, Pa., June 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ISSUED BY REPUBLICAN LEADERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued on July 27, 1948, by the Republican leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives with a view to its presentation to their respective Republican conferences for consideration, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECORD OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the record of the Eightieth Congress, delivered by Senator WHERRY before the Republican National Convention, at Philadelphia, Pa., on June 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

KEYNOTE SPEECH BY FRANK M. DIXON AT SOUTHERN STATES CONVENTION

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the keynote speech delivered by Frank M. Dixon at the Southern States Convention held at Birmingham, Ala., July 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of civil rights, delivered by Samuel B. Pettengill over the ABC network on July 25, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS AND STATES' RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast on the subject of civil rights and States' rights, delivered by Samuel B. Pettengill over the ABC network on February 29, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE AND EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Worcester Telegram of June 21, 1948, relating to the counting of electoral votes for President and Vice President, together with a statement prepared by himself, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT UNITY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Harmony at the Conference Table," written by him and published in the July 1948 issue of the magazine Partners, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AND STATE TAXATION—LETTER FROM ROBERT B. DRESSER

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding State and Federal taxation, addressed by Robert B. Dresser, of Providence, R. I., to Governor Hildreth, of Maine, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM ECONOMICS—ARTICLE BY HENRY HAZLITT

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Democratic Platform Economics," written by Henry Hazlitt and published in Newsweek for July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND THE CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY JOHN O'DONNELL

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by John O'Donnell, written under the headline "Capitol Stuff" in the July 28 issue of the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARRIVAL OF JET PLANES IN GERMANY—ARTICLE BY ANSEL E. TALBERT

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the arrival of 16 American jet planes in Germany, written by Ansel E. Talbert, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAX ON MARGARINE AND COLOR—STATEMENT BY HUNTER A. GIBBES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the Federal tax on margarine and color, by Hunter A. Gibbes, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—WHEN AND HOW?—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Civil Rights—When and How?" published in the Christian Science Monitor of July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONVENING OF CONGRESS—LETTER FROM T. J. WERTENBAKER

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by him under date of July 16, 1948, from Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, relating to the convening of Congress by the President, which appears in the Appendix.]

SEGREGATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to commend and congratulate Gen. Omar Bradley, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States. After the long struggle we had in passing selective service legislation some 2 months ago, the statement in yesterday morning's newspapers that the President of the United States by Executive order had attempted to undo what the Senate did when the amendments were defeated here, makes it necessary for me, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, to say here that it was my understanding with the Army officials at all the committee meetings that they would retain segregation. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read General Bradley's statement, but I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, so that the people of the United States may know what General Bradley thinks and what General Eisenhower testified to before our committee, regardless of what President Truman may say.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY TO KEEP SEGREGATION, BRADLEY SAYS—NUMBER OF DRAFTEES MAY BE FURLOUGHED BECAUSE OF HOUSING

FORT KNOX, KY., July 27.—Chief of Staff Gen. Omar Bradley told a news conference today that the Army will keep racial segregation as long as the Nation does.

"The Army is not out to make any social reforms," said Bradley. "The Army will put men of different races in different companies. It will change that policy when the Nation as a whole changes it."

Lt. Gen. Willard Paul, director of personnel, said the Army might find it necessary to furlough a number of new draftees as soon as they are inducted because housing and training facilities possibly will not be available.

Bradley and Paul are here attending a 3-day conference of high-ranking officers studying the possible adaptation of universal military training policies to all Army training.

Bradley told the Army's top brass that they must treat incoming selectees in a way that will send them back to civilian life as friends of the Army.

"Sure, we will have discipline and the caste system and we will keep the men busy," Bradley declared, but he added "we must treat our men as individuals and not as rows of men lined up on the parade field before us."

The Army's Chief of Staff said the Army had itself to blame for its status as "the favorite whipping boy of the country." He told the high-ranking officers they must work to sell the Army to the public, "instead of blasting their superiors and bragging about low prices in the post exchange."

Bradley said the caste system will remain in the Army, "and we need to make no apologies for it." The caste system, Bradley said, is the same in industry, "and really it's only the just reward for those who work hardest."

Separate clubs will be maintained for officers and enlisted men to maintain respect for rank, Bradley said, but he added he saw nothing wrong with officers and enlisted men who are close friends attending private parties together.

PROPOSAL FOR IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST FEDERAL JUDGE J. WAITES WARING

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of a telegram received by me from Mr. Alan Johnstone, of Newberry, S. C. I also request that my answer to Mr. Johnstone be printed.

In his telegram Mr. Johnstone requested me to bring impeachment proceedings against Federal Judge J. Waites Waring. In my reply I reminded Mr. Johnstone that, under the law, any such action must necessarily begin in the House of Representatives.

I have previously condemned Judge Waring for his actions in reaching beyond the jurisdiction of his court, and I still feel that he exceeded his authority in his orders to the Democratic Party of South Carolina. There is no precedent in South Carolina for his actions in a civil case.

I simply wanted to take this opportunity to say to the people of South Carolina and to my colleagues in the Senate that such action as has been requested of me can originate only in the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the telegram and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWBERRY, S. C.

The Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Impeach Judge Waring in the Senate. These orders by which he makes war on South Carolina, white and black, and in which he has gone beserk and dishonors the memory of Woodrow Wilson, Senator Smith, and yourself. This setting aside of our best traditions of a good life together, fair play, and a fair hearing. For it is not the good conduct which the Constitution demands of a judge with life tenure. All our people, including Negro citizens, deserve better conduct than this and can no longer risk the prejudice it stirs up.

ALAN JOHNSTONE.

JULY 26, 1948.

ALAN JOHNSTONE,
Care of County Chairman,
County Campaign, Newberry, S. C.:

Yours. You are a lawyer and should know that impeachment proceedings must be brought in the House of Representatives.

BURNET R. MAYBANK.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERALISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech which I delivered on July 8, 1948, before the National Education Association at Cleveland, Ohio, on the subject, The Republican Party and Constitutional Liberalism.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow teachers, and guests, I address you as fellow teachers because over a period of more than 20 years I too was entrusted with the great responsibility of teaching young men and women in the classrooms of three universities. I think I understand and appreciate some of the problems which confront the teaching profession and the school administrators of our country.

Of one thing you may be sure and that is I am well aware of the fact that neither the Democratic Party nor the Republican Party has measured up as yet to its clear responsibility to put into effect a national policy which will assure an equality of educational opportunity for America's boys and girls.

I hold to the proposition that an educated citizenry is democracy's greatest strength and our Nation's greatest potential wealth. I say potential wealth because the sad fact is that we still must talk about equality of educational opportunity in America in terms of a future goal because equality of educational opportunity does not exist in fact in our country today.

It is not necessary for me to point out to you teachers and school administrators that in a very real sense the educational opportunities of an American boy or girl are still determined in a large measure by the State and locality in which he or she is born and raised through the period of schoolhood.

Unfortunately, the question as to whether or not those educational opportunities will be rich or poverty stricken depends upon the tax-producing economic assets of their local communities.

There are other barriers to providing our children of America, no matter where they live, with an equality of educational opportunities such as discrimination because of race, color, or creed.

However, the primary cause for the great disparity in educational opportunities in this country is the failure of the Congress of the United States to date to recognize the importance of making democracy work in this country by passing a fair and adequate Federal aid to education bill so that all of our boys and girls can enjoy the freedom, inspiration, and intellectual wealth which are the natural and inevitable products of enlightened minds.

Oh, yes, I know that S. 472, the Federal aid to education bill which several of us, including Senator THOMAS of Utah, cosponsored in the Senate this year under the authorship of Mr. TAFT, of Ohio, was not a perfect bill in that it did not meet with the complete approval of all school authorities and of all educational groups in America. However, it was a vitally important bill in that it sought to establish the principle which needs to be established that our Federal Government does have a responsibility in providing funds on an equitable basis, subject to State administration, control and spending, so that there can be provided throughout the country at least a uniform minimum standard of educational opportunity for all our children.

I was happy to work for the passage of that bill through the Senate, knowing full well that if we could write it into the statute books of our Government we could perfect it in the future from time to time as we learned from experience through its administration.

If we were to wait for perfection in the bills which are considered by Congress or for unanimity of opinion of all parties interested

in a given bill, such as the Federal aid to education bill for example, we would never succeed in making social progress through legislation.

We were successful in passing S. 472 through the Senate but it died a smothering death in the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

However, the issue of Federal aid to education is not dead and candidates for high political office of both major political parties must be required to face the issue until our Government keeps faith with the educational needs of the children of America.

Not only our politicians but our people, generally, need to ponder the truth of the teachings of Jefferson when he said:

"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be. Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppression will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

I hope you will pardon this rather long introduction to the subject matter of my address, The Republican Party and Constitutional Liberalism.

However, as a constitutional liberal, I thought it particularly appropriate that I make clear to my audience at the outset of my speech my position on the issue of Federal aid to education.

I do not wish to give the impression that all members of the Republican Party in the last session of Congress share my view on this issue because, if they did, S. 472 would be a law today. Nevertheless I also wish to point out that if a sufficient number of Democrats in the last session of Congress had shared the views of those Republicans who were supporting Federal aid to education, S. 472 would have been enacted into law. In other words, I would point out to you that most issues involving social legislation, such as the Federal aid to education bill, cut across party lines in the Congress of the United States.

Although some politicians and party partisans seek to convince the American people that their party, be it Republican or Democratic, is chiefly responsible for all the good things accomplished by the Congress and the opposition party is responsible for all the shortcomings of the Congress, I hope that I shall always be nonpartisan enough to face the fact that coalitions and alinements of both Republicans and Democrats in the Congress of the United States are responsible for the passage of sound social legislation which seeks to promote social justice. I wish to add quickly that coalitions and alinements of both Republicans and Democrats also frequently succeed in blocking, smothering, or defeating legislation which seeks to promote the common good.

I do not think we help the cause of truth any in political campaigns by seeking to give the American people the impression that one's own party and the men in it are the only sincere advocates of the country's best welfare and that the opposition party and its leaders seek to destroy our constitutional rights as a free people.

Such blind partisanship and political extravaganza make a very bad impression upon fair-minded voters and particularly upon independent voters, who hold the balance of power in every election, because such tactics are revolting to the average American's sense of fair play and sportsmanship.

Thus, from this platform tonight I would give the gratuitous advice to the thousands of campaign workers in my party who are going to wage a great campaign for a Republican victory in November to remember that we are not running against Franklin Roosevelt.

The members of my party, including candidates as well as campaign workers, should remember that Franklin Roosevelt was the choice for President of millions of American voters on four different occasions. Irrespective of what differences of opinion we may hold as to his position and record on certain great issues, he, nevertheless, will be recorded in history as both a great American President and as a great world statesman.

I say that as a Republican who openly campaigned against him in 1944 when I campaigned in that year, as I shall again in the campaign this year, for that great leader of the Republican Party, the distinguished Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey.

However, my party needs to remember that Franklin Roosevelt is dead and he is entitled to the solemn respect due the dead and his record is entitled to be adjudged by history.

Likewise, I would advise my party that in the campaign about to start it is not running against the New Deal because the New Deal also is dead.

I think the American people, particularly the independent voters, are weary of the type of Republican political speech which predominated entirely too much at the recent Republican convention and which took the form of adjective rattling of the skeleton of the New Deal.

Intellectual honesty should compel us all to admit that a considerable portion of the social legislation which was passed during the Democratic administration in the 1930's is here to stay, and there is not one word in the Republican platform which indicates any intention on the part of my party to repeal it.

Furthermore, intellectual honesty should compel us also to admit that the plans for such legislation in many instances were first made during the Hoover administration, and had it not been for the tragic economic collapse which confronted Hoover in 1932, for which he has received much unjustifiable blame, many of the reforms of the thirties would have developed under a Republican administration.

When I say that, I do not attempt to take any credit away from the Democratic Party which is due it, but I state what I think any student of the political history of that era must admit is true.

In contrast with the blind partisanship which characterized some of the speeches at the recent Republican convention, and I predict that there will be similar partisan speeches at the forthcoming Democratic convention, I would call your attention to the great speech of statesmanship and sound Republican philosophy which ex-President Herbert Hoover enunciated at the Republican convention at Philadelphia.

Time does not permit me to review it in detail but I recommend it to you for required reading if you seek understanding of the constitutional liberalism of the Republican Party. In passing, I would pause on this occasion only to quote the following paragraphs from President Hoover's Philadelphia speech:

"The problems which confront us far transcend partisan action and I do not propose to speak in that sense tonight.

"What is done here, what you do here, will affect the destiny of our country beyond any estimation of this moment. For you are more than ever before the trustees of a great cause, the cause for which this party was founded, the cause of human liberty.

"The only obstacle to the annihiliation of freedom has been the United States of America. Only as long as the United States is free and strong will human liberty survive in a world frustrated and devastated by these two wars.

"It is our interest and, above all, in the interest of liberty throughout the world, that we aid in giving strength and unity to the nations of western Europe. It is only thus that we can restore a balance of power in the world able to resist the hordes from the Eurasian steppes who would ruin western civilization.

"There are other warning signs. Our reputed prosperity has begun to walk on two stilts: one is the forced draft of exporting more than our surplus through relief; the other is a great armament program. We cannot go higher on these stilts, or we will break a leg getting down.

"We should have no illusions. To the devasting Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, modern civilization has added two more. They are high taxes and inflation. They are close by.

"Therefore, with full compassion for those nations in difficulties, certain matters in aid to them must be recognized on both sides of the world.

"Our task is solely to aid their reconstruction. We can provide only bare necessities. There is no room for nonessentials, profligacy, or inefficiency.

"We must insist that reconstruction of western Europe be as a whole. That must include the restoration of the productivity of Germany, or Europe will die. We need neither forget nor condone Nazi guilt, but a free world must not poison its concepts of life by accepting malice and hatred as a guide. Otherwise, not only will our efforts fail, but the American taxpayer will be bled white supporting an idle and despairing German people.

"Our difficulty lies not so much with obnoxious Communists in our midst as with the fuzzy-minded people who think we can have totalitarian economics in the hands of bureaucracy, and at the same time have personal liberty for the people and representative government in the Nation. Their confused thinking convinces them that they are liberals—but if they are liberals, they have liberalism without liberty. Nor are they middle of the roaders as they claim to be: they are a half-way house to totalitarianism.

"They should note that in every one of the countries of Europe where 400,000,000 people are now enslaved by the Communists, it has been the totalitarian liberals who provided the ladders upon which the Communist pirates have boarded the ship of state.

"Great as your problems are, they are no greater than Americans have met before your time. You are no less able or courageous than they were.

"Therefore, I repeat, what you say and do here is of transcendent importance.

"If you produce nothing but improvised platitudes, you will give no hope.

"If you produce no leadership here, no virile fighter for the right, you will have done nothing of historic significance."

Thus, in keeping faith with the challenge and statesmanship of President Hoover's speech, I would reiterate that in the forthcoming campaign my party is not running against the New Deal.

To the extent that the Republican Party is running against anything, it is running against the record of the Truman administration. However, my party should do much more than run against the Truman record in this campaign. It must, and I am sure it will, wage this campaign in support of certain specific issues basic to the international security and domestic economic stability of our country, including specific administrative policies of government essential to attaining those objectives.

I offer to you the Republican platform adopted at Philadelphia as a broad outline of the Republican campaign. Oh, yes, I know that platform consists of an obvious reconciling and adjusting of divergent points of view within the Republican Party. If that were not true, then it would not have been the product, as it is, of democratic processes working within my party. If that were not true, then our Republican platform would be the product of machine politics, which it is not. We should recognize that if democratic processes are to function properly then political platforms, as well as legislation, must always be the result of fair compromises.

I am pleased to offer to this audience the 1948 Republican platform as a forward-looking, progressive statement not only of sound Republican principles, but also of a desirable political program for the United States for the next 4 years.

Of course, it is true that if it were left to my personal preference, I would modify some portions of that platform, and I would add other things to it which are not in it, such as a guaranty of civilian control of atomic energy developments.

However, in its entirety, I think our 1948 Republican platform is the most specific, progressive, and encouraging platform which any political party has offered to the American people in my lifetime. I think it clearly tolls the death knell of the "old guard" Republican philosophy as the dominant viewpoint of the Republican Party. I think it is a platform within whose framework constitutional liberals can accomplish, by way of sound, progressive social legislation, what I consider to be one of the primary objectives of representative government.

I pause for a moment on that point because, as a constitutional liberal, I wish to emphasize to this audience what I consider to be the basic tenet of Republican constitutional liberalism.

I insist that a constitutional liberal must at all times seek to protect the economically and politically weak from the exploitation of the economically and politically strong, but do it within the framework of a private-property economy and in keeping with the legal principles and guarantees of the Constitution, including its precious Bill of Rights.

I submit that the Republican platform adopted at Philadelphia seeks through its statement of policies to attain that objective of constitutional liberalism.

Time does not permit any lengthy review in this speech of the Republican platform. However, I do point with pride to the fact that our platform this year is concise, refreshingly specific, and free of the weedy verbiage which so frequently characterizes political platforms.

I do wish to comment briefly on a few sections of the platform. I think the preamble of the platform which takes the form of a declaration of principles is a statement of objectives of representative government worthy of study in every civics classroom of America. I think this declaration of principles sets the entire tone and progressive outlook of the platform. Permit me to quote a paragraph or two from it:

"To establish and maintain peace, to build a country in which every citizen can earn a good living with the promise of real progress for himself and his family and to uphold as a beacon light for mankind everywhere the inspiring American tradition of liberty, opportunity, and justice for all—that is the Republican platform.

"To this end we propose as a guide to definite action the following principles:

"Maximum voluntary cooperation between citizens and minimum dependence on law; never, however, declining courageous recourse to law if necessary.

"Our competitive system furnishes vital opportunity for youth and for all enterprising citizens; it makes possible the productive power which is the unique weapon of our national defense, and is the mainspring of material well-being and political freedom.

"Government, as a servant of such a system, should take all needed steps to strengthen and develop public health, to promote scientific research, to provide security for the aged, and to promote a stable economy so that men and women need not fear the loss of their jobs or the threat of economic hardships through no fault of their own.

"Our foreign policy is dedicated to preserving a free America in a free world of freemen. This calls for strengthening the United Nations and primary recognition of America's self-interest in the liberty of other peoples. Prudently conserving our own resources, we shall cooperate on a self-help basis with other peace-loving nations.

"Constant and effective insistence on the personal dignity of the individual and his right to complete justice without regard to race, creed, or color, is a fundamental American principle."

The platform then proceeds to commit my party to support a progressive stand on labor's rights, soil conservation, reclamation, power development, flood control, government finances, inflation, housing, veterans' care, civil rights, old-age benefits, and the other major domestic issues which we all know must be faced and solved by the adoption of progressive measures in the next and future Congresses.

The plank on education states, "We favor equality of educational opportunity for all and the promotion of education and educational facilities."

This plank is not as specific as I, and probably many of you, would write it.

However, I interpret it as an approval of the principle of Federal aid to education because I think it is clear that we cannot obtain the objective of equality of educational opportunity for all, to use the language of the platform, without the Federal Government supplying some financial support to those localities in the country which cannot finance those minimum standards of educational opportunity which good citizenship training requires for all of our boys and girls.

The last section of the platform deals with the issue which supersedes in importance all other issues confronting us.

It is the issue of international policy and the course we follow on that issue will determine not only whether we have peace or war but also will determine the form of our survival in the history of nations.

Shall we continue to fulfill our true destiny as a Government of free people capable of being the leading force in establishing a world order of peace; or shall we permit the trials, tribulations, and international exasperations of the moment to cause us to make one or both of two serious mistakes which powerful forces in this country seem bent on our making? There is no denying the fact that there are those in this country who would have us meet the international crisis which faces us by adopting a policy of blind nationalism and a program of isolationism which characterized our international policy for almost 20 years before Pearl Harbor.

Senator THOMAS and I, who have served in the Senate these past few years, know something about the power and influence of the isolationist forces in this country. They are not limited just to my party. However, I am willing to confess that since 1920 my party has been seriously jeopardized by the forces of isolationism. Nevertheless, during the past 3 years a clear majority of the Republicans in the Congress have demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that the international views of Wendell Willkie of 1940, Thomas Dewey of 1944, and of that great giant of the Senate, ARTHUR VANDENBERG have become the foreign-policy views of the Republican Party.

However, if there was so much as a lingering doubt about the repudiation of isolationism by the Republican Party, the platform on international policy which my party adopted in Philadelphia at our recent convention makes crystal clear that the foreign policy of our Government under a Republican administration will be based upon the recognition that my party is dedicated to the principle that we believe in collective security against aggression and in behalf of international justice through law.

There is another force at work in America which I think jeopardizes peace and freedom in the world as much as does blind nationalism. It is represented by the attitude of those who seem to think that we can win the peace by dictating the terms of peace.

Do not misunderstand me. I am unalterably opposed to adopting an appeasement policy in negotiations with Russia. I strongly favor building up our national defenses so that in a moment's notice we can defend and enforce the peace if Russia should persist upon a policy of aggressive action against the rights of free men in a freedom-seeking world.

Thus, as a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and in the face of much criticism, I worked for and supported what I considered to be the most fair and adequate military defense legislation which could be passed in the last session of Congress.

As a member of that Armed Services Committee, I have not blinded myself to the fact that it is of vital importance that we make perfectly clear to the world, including Russia, that we seek a justiciable settlement of all international issues through the peaceful procedures of the United Nations rather than by resorting to force.

I think that Members of the Congress, particularly those of us who serve either on the Armed Services Committees or on the Foreign Relations Committees, should be forthright enough to tell the American people that we are satisfied, on the basis of our knowledge of the facts which have come to us as members of those committees, that the only victor of a third world war, no matter how soon it might come, would be the victory of chaos.

If we should be forced into that war, then I want my country as prepared as it can be to defend our people and save as much for them for the future as is humanly possible. However, let us not forget that a third world war would bring unthinkable destruction and human suffering upon all nation participants. In fact, I do not see how there can be any innocent bystanders in another war.

Granted that we could win a military victory, but a bloody and costly one, over any nation or group of nations which might decide to wage war against us, I think the realistic fact is inescapable that what you and I enjoy as the American way of life with all of its freedoms and economic advantages would disappear from our country for many generations to come.

I say that because I think a third world war would result in a complete regimentation of our American life and in the complete bankruptcy of our economy.

Every other nation, including Russia, knows that a similar fate would be visited upon it. Therefore, I think the challenge of world statesmanship today calls upon the people and the leaders of the United States to check the trend toward war.

It is not as a partisan that I express this conviction, but it is my firm belief that a change of administration in November is of paramount importance from the standpoint of our international problems, because it would permit of a new approach to our international problems by new leaders who are not handicapped by past mistakes.

In saying that, I do not criticize anyone for mistakes which may have been made in some of our international negotiations. Mistakes would have been made if a Republican administration had been in control of the White House during the many international crises which have confronted us since Pearl Harbor. It is not fair nor right for us to ask the American people in this campaign to look through their hindsights at the mistakes which have been made and on the basis of those mistakes ask for the election of a Republican President, Vice President, and Congress.

It is not on that partisan basis that I stress the importance of a Republican victory but I do point out that we cannot escape the realities of the situation and therefore I

think that a new administration, with new leaders, can best profit from the mistakes on international issues which have been made and can best assure the American people that there is still a chance of winning the peace and of averting war.

I think my party in its Philadelphia platform has laid down a program of international policy which recommends itself to all Americans. I shall not read it all, but I do wish to emphasize the following three paragraphs and I quote from the platform:

"We dedicate our foreign policy to the preservation of a free America in a free world of free men. With neither malice nor desire for conquest, we shall strive for a just peace with all nations.

"We believe in collective security against aggression and in behalf of justice and freedom. We shall support the United Nations as the world's best hope in this direction, striving to strengthen it and promote its effective evolution and use. The United Nations should progressively establish international law, be freed of any veto in the peaceful settlement of international disputes and be provided with the armed forces contemplated by the Charter.

"We pledge that under a Republican administration all foreign commitments shall be made public and subject to constitutional ratification. We shall say what we mean and mean what we say. In all these things we shall primarily consult the national security and welfare of our own United States. In all of these things we shall welcome the world's cooperation. But in none of these things shall we surrender our ideals or our free institutions."

The Republican platform focuses attention on three points upon which I think the American people need to ponder.

First, we make clear that we are dedicated to a foreign policy which seeks to preserve a free America in a free world of free men. We recognize that we cannot turn America into a vacuum of freedom.

If personal liberty and the dignity of the individual, which are the essence of freedom, are to be ground under the heel of aggressive police states in other parts of the world, such freedoms will not for long endure in America.

Further, we recognize in our platform and are committed to the proposition that the United Nations should progressively establish international law.

I hold to the view that the peace will never be won until we put into practice and operation the provisions of the United Nations Charter which make available to the nations of the world international judicial processes for settling many of the disputes which are creating the frightening crises confronting us this very hour.

I refer specifically to the World Court provisions of the United Nations Charter. In July 1945 I succeeded in securing the passage through the Senate of the United States of a resolution committing our Government to the acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in respect to all international disputes covered by article 36 of the statute of the International Court of Justice, which statute was made a part of the United Nations Charter.

My resolution at first was met with tactics of delay and opposition in the Senate but with the assistance of such forward-looking Senators as Senator THOMAS of Utah, who is associated with me on this program tonight, we were able to secure the adoption of my resolution committing our Government to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court in cases of international disputes in which an opposing nation had likewise accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.

It is to be regretted that Russia is the only great power in the world today who has not committed herself to the policy of submitting international disputes of the nature of those covered by the World Court Charter to the World Court for decision.

However, the Republican platform recognizes the importance of our developing international law and I submit that since we signed the United Nations Charter, we have not exercised the leadership which we should have exercised in offering to submit many of our differences with Russia to the processes of international law provided for in the United Nations Charter.

Take, for example, the issue over Berlin. It would appear that at least on the surface Russia seeks to justify her position on alleged commitments on the part of the United States and Great Britain at Potsdam and possibly on commitments which our representatives are alleged to have made at Yalta.

The people of the United States, yes, the people of the world, are entitled, in the interest of peace, to have such an issue settled by international judicial processes rather than by the rattling of military forces.

Listen to what article 36 of the statute of the World Court, a part of the United Nations Charter, provides:

"1. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force.

"2. The states parties to the present statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

"(a) the interpretation of a treaty;

"(b) any question of international law;

"(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

"(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

"3. The declarations referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain states, or for a certain time.

"4. Such declarations shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the parties to the statute and to the Registrar of the Court.

"5. Declarations made under article 36 of the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and which are still in force shall be deemed, as between the parties to the present statute, to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the period which they still have to run and in accordance with their terms.

"6. In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court."

Certainly the issues of Berlin fall within the provisions of the World Court section of the UN if all countries to the dispute would agree to submit the Berlin issue to the World Court for decision.

It is true that Russia might refuse but I think our Government should give her a chance to accept. In fact, I think that many of the differences between Russia and the United States should be submitted to the World Court for judicial determination because many of them involve justiciable issues, particularly suited to settlement by an international judicial tribune.

If Russia should persist in making her own interpretations and decisions as to what the Yalta, Potsdam, and other agreements mean and persists in resorting to force in an attempt to have her own way, then we must continue to prepare ourselves to meet that type of challenge to the world's peace.

At the same time, I think we should do all that we can to carry out the promise of the Republican platform to progressively establish international law as an instrument for solving our international disputes.

Further, let me point out that the pledge of the Republican platform that all foreign commitments should be made public and subject to constitutional ratification is of utmost importance to the development of a sound foreign policy.

I do not see how there can be any denying nor ignoring the fact that in recent years too many international agreements and understandings have been reached by the executive branch of our Government without the knowledge of the Congress of the United States or of the people of the country. Woodrow Wilson's clarion call for open covenants openly arrived at, which won universal approval of all of our people, has become but an echo of history in American foreign policy in recent years.

My party in its platform proposes to reestablish the check-and-balance feature of the Constitution in respect to international agreements and proposes to resolve all doubts in favor of the treaty-making procedures rather than resort to the legalistic defense which has been used as justification for the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam, for example, without submitting them to the Senate for ratification.

Thus, I conclude my discussion of the issues raised by the Republican platform by expressing the conviction that the progressive approach to our many problems, domestic and international, pledged by that platform, recommends a Republican victory in November.

In closing I would advise the politicians of both parties to remember that the forces of political education, the impact upon our people of world events with all their implications for the future, the strains and stresses of our complex living problems and the fears and sense of insecurity that gnaw at the hearts of most Americans these days, leave little patience for political platitudes.

It is solutions to specific problems and issues which the American people want from their politicians. It is less politics and more statesmanship which the people want. It is an exercise of honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues in accordance with the facts as they present themselves on specific issues that the American people want from their politicians. It is cause to effect reasoning rather than buck-passing ability and rationalization which the people want.

They are sick and tired of being told that depressions are part of the price we pay for liberty because they know it need not be so if more politicians would represent the people rather than have so many represent special interests which are still powerful enough in America to elect many men to office. The people know that there is no excuse for so many millions of our homeless being priced out of owning a home or being forced to pay triple prices for shacks that frequently are not so well constructed as chicken houses on a modern poultry farm. They know that the inflation boom which has turned the American dollar into a 50-cent piece, based on 1939 values, could have been and still could be checked in part by a Congress willing to recognize that free enterprise does not mean license for the owners of capital and sources of production to profiteer at the expense of the many as the result of a short supply created by an unbalanced war economy.

The people are disturbed by the encroachments upon inalienable rights set forth in the Constitution by powerful economic interests which are able to force through the Congress laws which transgress those rights. The people are beginning to see that many politicians are rationalizing legislation which invades the realm of inalienable rights by trying to convince the American people that the economic welfare of the country, the complex industrial system of the country, the material comforts of the country, the

uninterrupted production of the country justify and make reasonable a limiting of inalienable rights.

This materialistic approach to democracy is creating great tensions in our body politic. Many people are disturbed. Resentment is growing. All is not well in our democracy. Politicians and our political parties need to take heed of the fact that as the American people have risen in defense of inalienable human rights embodied in the spiritual values of democracy as epitomized in our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution when those rights were endangered by totalitarianism abroad, so, too, will they in due course of time repudiate any attempt to transgress those rights through government by the privileged few at home.

We are witnessing in America today a resurgence of Hamiltonianism and a suppression of Jeffersonianism. It is not surprising that economic dislocations, inflationary prices, failure as yet to win the peace, labor excesses, monopolistic profiteering, inequitable taxes, Russian aggression, growing class-conscious conflicts at home and abroad, the danger of another war, and the on-every-hand manifestations of greed and selfishness have left the average voter perplexed, disillusioned, and sick at heart over politics and politicians.

Our politicians will discover that the American people will never endure any form of economic fascism or any form of communism, because the people know that economic fascism, even by big business, and any form of communism, even by a class-conscious third party in America, will mean the end to personal liberty. The Lincoln view of the superiority of human rights over property rights is no political cliché in our American ideology of representative self-government. Any sacrifice of individual freedom to the economic advantage of the owners of property or to the economic comfort of the general public strikes at the roots of the inalienable personal rights set forth in our Constitution.

We cannot have those rights and eat them, too. We cannot respect them only when it is economically advantageous to do so and still preserve them. Lip service of praise for individual liberty, followed by legislation which sets forth procedures so restrictive in nature as to make effective exercise of individual liberty impossible, will never check encroachments upon the democratic way of life.

I think that in America today there is being renewed a struggle between Hamiltonian theories of political aristocracy and Jeffersonian theories of human rights; between the static constitution of John Marshall and the dynamic constitution of Holmes and Brandeis; between the exploitation of our people by a laissez faire economy and the paramount duty of a representative government to promote the general welfare by protecting the weak from the exploitation of the strong.

I like to put my view as to the trend in American politics, as I see that trend, in terms of a fight being waged by constitutional liberals on the one hand and political reactionaries and leftists on the other side. My definition of a constitutional liberal is a person who believes in applying the guaranties and legal principles of the Constitution to human rights and property rights in America. He is a person who believes in the good old Lincoln doctrine that we can best protect property rights by first protecting human rights.

A constitutional liberal recognizes that the ideology of communism cannot be reconciled with the liberalism of our Constitution because the dignity of the individual, the inalienable rights guaranteed to the individual by our Constitution, and the right to exercise a freedom of choice through a free ballot box in determining one's political destiny are all foreign to the ideology of communism.

The constitutional liberal asks the American people these days never to forget that the police state methods of communism, the totalitarianism of communism, and the principle of master rule by the state, on which communism is based, cannot be reconciled with the liberalism of our American Constitution.

I invite all forward-looking citizens to join with Republican constitutional liberals in opposing at every turn the political tactics of the communistic ideology as represented by the Wallace party movement in America. I urge all forward-looking Americans to join with Republican constitutional liberals in gaining a Republican victory in November 1948, so that we can start putting into effect the sound, forward-looking, progressive platform which my party adopted at its historic Philadelphia convention.

EXTRA SESSION SCORE CARD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I omitted mentioning an item a while ago. In yesterday's Washington Post there was printed a brief article entitled "Extra Session Score Card," giving the present status of legislation recommended by the President, indicating which bills have passed the House, which have passed the Senate, which have passed neither House, and whether hearings have been held upon any of them. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRA SESSION SCORE CARD

The White House yesterday issued what is called a score card for special session. It noted that "the legislation urged upon the Congress by the President is in various stages" and then gave this listing:

	Passed Senate	Favorably reported by House committee	Hearings held by this or previous Congress
1. Anti-inflation program.	No	No	Yes.
2. Housing bill	Yes	Yes	Yes.
3. Federal aid to education.	Yes	No	Yes.
4. Increase minimum wage.	No	No	Yes.
5. Social security: Increase persons covered and amounts of benefit.	No	No [1]	Yes.
6. Reform of Federal pay scales.	No	No	Yes.
7. Civil rights program.	No	[2]	Yes.
8. Correction of Displaced Persons Act.	No	No	Yes.
9. UN loan	Yes	Yes	Yes.
10. International wheat agreement.	No	[3]	Yes.
11. Restoration of funds for power projects.	No	No	Yes.

[1] Inadequate bill has passed House.
[2] Anti-poll-tax bill has passed House; antilynching bill has been reported by House committee.
[3] Does not require House action.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed. Under the order of the Senate, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service and for other purposes.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] a few moments ago asked unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the statement issued last night by the Republican leaders of the Congress.

Paragraph 7 of that statement reads as follows:

According to present intentions, the program for the first week will include Senate consideration of the anti-poll-tax bill, already passed by the House, in order that there may be a proper opportunity for all to vote in the November election.

Mr. President, in that connection I desire to invite the attention of Senators to Senate Joint Resolution 132, introduced on May 19, 1944, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on behalf of himself and 34 other Senators. That resolution, the title of which is "Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to removal of the requirement for payment of poll tax," reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State by reason of failure to pay a poll tax.

"Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The Senators who are now Members of the Senate and who joined with the Senator from Nebraska in the introduction of that resolution 4 years ago were the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

There were then in the Senate nine other Senators who joined in the introduction of the resolution, who are not at

present Members of this body. They were former Senator Austin, of Vermont; former Senator Burton, of Ohio; the late Senator Davis, of Pennsylvania; the late Senator Johnson, of California; former Senator Nye, of North Dakota; former Senator Shipstead, of Minnesota; the late Senator Thomas, of Idaho; former Senator Weeks, of Massachusetts; and former Senator Willis, of Indiana.

The joint resolution was introduced on May 19, 1944. The Republican National Convention met at Chicago, and, on June 28, 1944, adopted this plank in its platform:

ANTIPOLL TAX

The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections, and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

It is significant that the Republican convention adopted the same idea that the Senators did here, for undoubtedly many of them were present at the convention and asked that the problem be solved in that way.

When the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration had under consideration House bill 29, making unlawful the requirement of a poll tax as a prerequisite to vote in primary or other elections, I submitted my individual views as to what should be done. The Senate will find my statement in the binder which is on the desks of all Senators. I pointed out in the statement that during the past 6 years the House of Representatives had four times passed an anti-poll-tax bill by more than a two-thirds majority. I also pointed out that in order to obtain consideration of a poll-tax bill in the Senate the adoption of a cloture rule would in all probability be required, which likewise would require a two-thirds majority vote. I expressed the opinion that it would be very much easier to obtain the adoption of a constitutional amendment under a cloture procedure than it would be to obtain consideration of a bill which many Senators believed to be unconstitutional.

I shall not go back over the record, but there will undoubtedly be quoted in the course of time many Republican Senators, some of whom are now Members of the Senate, who sincerely believe that the bill as it passed the House of Representatives violates the Constitution of the United States.

In order to obtain cloture, in order to get the required two-thirds vote in the Senate to have the subject brought under consideration, it will make a good deal of difference to Senators to know what kind of a measure they will be asked to vote for. There are Senators who will not vote for cloture under any circumstances. They are opposed on principle to restricting debate. There are others who will vote for cloture even though they expect to vote against the bill. But the majority of Senators believe that they should favor a measure before they vote to close debate upon it.

I am quite confident that it would be much more feasible to propose a measure to amend the Constitution of the United States than to bring a bill before the Senate proposing to enact a law which many Senators believe would be unconstitutional. Therefore, I want to suggest to the Republican leadership that if they intend to bring forward a poll-tax bill and are anxious to get action upon it, if there can be a gentlemen's agreement that all after the enacting clause of the House bill shall be stricken out and provision for a constitutional amendment, such as was proposed heretofore, shall be substituted, I think that will expedite the consideration of the bill in this body. That is my judgment, based upon long service in the Senate. I have been credited with having some know-how with regard to getting bills through the Congress.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. If a constitutional amendment were adopted, it would require ratification by three-fourths of the States, would it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

I pointed out in my report, Mr. President, how quickly the equal suffrage amendment was adopted. It was adopted by 36 State legislatures within 15 months after Congress submitted the amendment to the States and became a part of the Constitution of the United States. It vitally changed the Constitution and the laws of 29 States in which women were not theretofore permitted to vote.

There are only seven States of the Union today where the poll tax applies, and I confidently predicted in the report—and I believe it to be true—that if a constitutional amendment on the question of the abolition of the poll tax were submitted to the States, it would be ratified in even a shorter time than was the case with respect to the equal-suffrage amendment. At the elections next November the members of the legislatures of practically all the States in the Union will be elected, and the legislatures will be in session in January and February. If a constitutional amendment is now submitted to the States, I predict it will not be a year before it will be ratified. That is why I think it is wise to take the action I have suggested.

Six years have been wasted in dealing with the poll-tax question. The House of Representatives, as I have stated, four times within the past 6 years has passed an anti-poll-tax bill by a majority of more than two-thirds, and there is no question that if the Senate strikes out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substitutes a provision for a constitutional amendment, the House would adopt it, and that would be the end of the controversy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Arizona if the constitutional amendment procedure were followed rather than consideration of the bill which is on the Senate Calendar, is he in any position to give assurance that the constitutional amendment would not be subject to filibuster?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not conferred with other Senators in regard to that matter. We all know that a two-thirds vote of the Senate is required to end a filibuster, if cloture is to be applied, and I am sure there will be much less difficulty in getting a two-thirds vote if the question is on the submission of a constitutional amendment than if it is on the question of agreeing to a bill which many Senators believe to be unconstitutional. That is simply common sense. I, myself, would not vote for cloture to bring the House bill before the Senate, but I would vote for cloture to bring a constitutional amendment before the Senate, and I know there are other Senators who feel exactly the same way about it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator any assurance that the House of Representatives would vote for a constitutional amendment of the kind he suggests?

Mr. HAYDEN. I know that by a two-thirds vote on four different occasions the House has passed a bill which did not involve the question of a constitutional amendment. With that record, it seems to me no Member of the House should object to referring a proposed amendment to the State legislatures, letting them settle the poll-tax question, exactly as they did the question of woman's suffrage.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has not made a recent canvass in regard to the matter, has he?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not made a canvass either in the Senate or in the House. I am submitting my suggestion for myself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator speaks of a two-thirds vote to get cloture. Does the Senator agree with me that even if we got cloture on the constitutional amendment to which the Senator referred, that would not stop a filibuster in the Senate? I asked that because of the fact that under existing rule XXII a filibuster may proceed on other items which are not considered measures under the existing rule of the Senate, such, for example, as the approval of the Journal. Therefore the filibuster could proceed on some other item, even though it might be possible to secure cloture on the particular proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure that the Senator is mistaken about that. If the Senate votes cloture, then each Senator is limited to 1 hour, and when all who desire to speak have concluded, the Senate votes. It has been the experience in the Senate with respect to cloture that after debate was closed the pending measure was passed in a very reasonable time. The difficulty is in getting the Senate in a position where it can vote for cloture.

Mr. MORSE. That is the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. That has nothing to do with a two-thirds vote. It merely has to do with the present state of the rules. As I pointed out in another report I made from the Committee on Rules and Administration, at the present time there is no limitation upon debate with respect to the approval of the Journal, and there is no limitation on debate

on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill. But once the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of a bill, then a cloture petition can be filed, and when it is filed, and two-thirds vote to close debate, debate is closed.

Mr. MORSE. That suggests the hypothetical question I wished to put to the Senator from Arizona, because I think there is great public misunderstanding throughout the country, as of this hour, as to the possibility of preventing a filibuster in this special session of the Congress. I think the President of the United States labors under the same misapprehension, if I read his statement correctly.

As the Senate rules now exist, a filibuster could be conducted, for example, on the Journal. I noticed that at the beginning of the session today the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] reserved the right to object to a unanimous consent request for approving the Journal. Before he would agree to a unanimous consent agreement to approve the Journal he sought to ascertain what the procedure was going to be on the part of the majority party in the Senate for the rest of the day. I assume the Senator had in mind that if today, for example, a motion was to be brought up making the poll tax the order of business it was the intention of the Senator from Georgia to proceed to discuss the Journal at some length. Under the existing rules of the Senate the Journal is not considered a measure within the rules. Therefore cloture would not apply to any motion to approve the Journal.

Until we can get over that parliamentary hump, the proposal of the Senator from Arizona—which on its face seems to be very plausible, I assure him—until we can get over that particular procedural hump, it seems to me it is foolish to talk about applying cloture to the proposed constitutional amendment upon which the Senator from Arizona comments.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator misunderstood me. I stated that in my opinion there would be no vote on an anti-poll-tax bill or anti-poll-tax amendment without the adoption of cloture, so far as I understand the situation in the Senate. As to the obstacles, I entirely agree with the Senator from Oregon. There is no dispute about the status of the rules as they have been interpreted up to this time. But I do say that in order to apply cloture, a two-thirds vote of the Senate is required, and in my judgment I think it would be easier to get two-thirds of the Senators to apply a limitation of debate if there were a gentleman's agreement that what we were going to vote on would be a proposed constitutional amendment, and not a bill which many Senators believe to be unconstitutional.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since I have come to the Senate I have heard that the Senate can do almost anything by unanimous consent. I should like to ask the Senator whether he is optimistic enough to believe it might be possible to get unanimous consent to pass a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to abolish the poll tax?

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not ask unanimous consent. All I can say is that I have seen gentlemen's agreements carried out. There was one when the cloture rule we now have in effect was adopted. There was a long and determined filibuster in the Senate against a shipping bill at the close of a session of Congress. At the beginning of the following session the Republican caucus and the Democratic caucus agreed that something should be done about the rules, and they adopted the present rule XXII. There was a gentleman's agreement that that rule as it was reported to the Senate would be adopted without change, and it was agreed that if any effort were made to change it, it would be voted down.

If a majority on the Republican side, particularly those who joined in the resolution that I have read to the Senate, will agree, there will not be any trouble about getting action, because they constitute the leadership of the Senate. Certainly if there can be an agreement that when the House bill comes before the Senate a majority of the Senate will support a motion to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substitute the proposal which was offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and 34 of his colleagues in the form of a constitutional amendment, the prospect for obtaining the required two-thirds vote for cloture will be vastly improved. Otherwise, I doubt if it will be possible to obtain a two-thirds vote.

Mr. MORSE. As the acting majority leader for the moment, I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Arizona that the problem of a filibuster is a problem on his side of the aisle. Therefore before he makes his proposal to the Republican leadership he should bring to us from his side of the aisle a definite agreement as to the terms and conditions under which a filibuster would not proceed. Until we have such a proposal I do not see how the Senator from Arizona can expect the Republican side of the aisle to proceed with his suggestion. I think it is up to the Democratic side of the aisle to enter into a gentleman's agreement among themselves as to the terms and conditions under which they will proceed to give consideration to a poll-tax measure, whether it be by way of a bill or by way of the Senator's proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has very kindly asked me to assume a position of leadership on my side, which I have no intention of doing. All I am trying to do is to give the Senator the benefit of some advice that is based upon my experience in the Senate, and to get things done. I have been complimented at different times on the fact that I had the know-how. Now I am giving the Senator some of that know-how. I am trying to tell the Senator that it would be easier, it would be less difficult, and just as effective to propose a constitutional amendment as it would be to undertake to try to pass the House bill. If the Senator does not care to accept this gratuitous advice of mine, very well. Nobody is compelling him to do that. I am not now making any bargain with the Senator concerning what we can do or will do. I am simply saying that it will be the part of wisdom for the Republican majority to adopt a course which will secure for them the most votes, if they want some action at this session of the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arizona knows the extremely high regard in which I hold him, and I do appreciate his advice so far as it applies to me and my Republican colleagues on this side of the aisle.

In a real sense, however, the opinion of my good friend from Arizona amounts to passing the buck on this issue from the Democratic side of the aisle to the Republican side of the aisle, whereas the real cause of the deadlock on this issue is to be found in the fact that we have not up to date been able to proceed with poll-tax legislation either in the form of a constitutional amendment or by a bill, because of the constant threatened filibuster on the Democratic side of the aisle. Therefore I think it is not unreasonable for the Republican side of the aisle to make the suggestion which the junior Senator from Oregon has made to the Senator from Arizona, namely, that it is up to the Democratic leaders to come forward and present to us on the Republican side of the aisle a gentleman's agreement proposing the terms and conditions which the Democrats wish to offer for consideration of poll-tax legislation. Such a proposal should make perfectly clear that if we accept it there will not be any filibuster on the issue or if there is that a sufficient number of Democrats will join with us in applying a rule of cloture. To accomplish that result it may be necessary to change the Senate rule on cloture in order to include within the rule all matters of business such as a request for approval of the Journal. As I have already pointed out, the present rule XXII makes it impossible to apply cloture to debate on the Journal because it has been held that consideration of the Journal is not within the term "measure" as that term is used in rule XXII governing cloture.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that I did not get on my feet with any intention of "passing the buck." On the contrary I will not take the "buck" he has attempted to pass to me, and pass it along.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. First, the ultimate purpose is to abolish the poll tax.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Those who are in favor of abolishing the poll tax, as I understand, are very much concerned over the fact that if it is to be done by constitutional amendment—I do not think it has to be done in that manner, although I would be perfectly willing to vote for such an amendment—13 States can prevent the adoption of a constitutional amendment, although two-thirds or three-fourths of the people may be in favor

of it. Still 13 States can block the adoption of such an amendment. It is said that perhaps they will not do so. I should like to have first the Senator's opinion as to whether the Legislature of the State of Arizona would be likely to adopt such a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quite sure they would. The State of Arizona had a poll tax in effect for a number of years and decided that it was not in the public interest to continue it, and so did away with it.

Mr. TAFT. Since it is proposed to place a limitation of States' rights upon other States, would there not be a different feeling on the part of the individual States? That is the problem.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is no more so than the constitutional amendment dealing with the right of women to vote. Exactly the same argument could be made with respect to whether women should vote. Prior to the adoption of the constitutional amendment, that was a matter which each State determined for itself. But the Congress decided that women should be allowed to vote in all States, and the amendment was submitted and very promptly adopted. Although, as I said, there were 29 States in which women were not permitted to vote, yet they adopted the constitutional amendment within 15 months.

In this case there are only seven States in which the poll tax prevails.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the constitutional amendment method is the way to go about it, and always the Senator would have in reserve and could come back to, if there was a failure to adopt the constitutional amendment, the method which has been fooled with for many years, a method which to my mind will prove absolutely ineffectual at this session of Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Inasmuch as the Senator is arguing about cloture, does the Senator think it will be any easier to adopt a motion to take up a constitutional amendment than a motion to take up the poll-tax bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly, because in the case of the constitutional amendment, I know that Senators who feel as I do and think that the constitutional amendment method is the one to adopt would vote for a motion to consider a measure proposing a constitutional amendment.

Mr. TAFT. The question is not one of voting after a motion to take up is adopted. The question is whether we can ever reach a vote on the motion to take up. Can the Senator from Arizona give us assurance that we can more easily reach a motion to take up a measure proposing a constitutional amendment than a motion to take up the poll-tax bill itself?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what I have been saying all afternoon.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator give us any assurance on that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. All I know is how I feel about it and how many other Senators feel. I have heard Senators frankly say that they would battle to the last against the Congress invading by law the right of the States to regulate voting within their borders. On the other hand I have heard them say that they had no objection to submitting the question to the States by way of constitutional amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am, of course, not authorized nor would I presume to speak for the Democratic side on this matter. I will say, however, that this phase of the subject has been discussed in conferences which have been held by those who sit on this side of the aisle who are opposing, or proposing to oppose to the limit of our ability this statutory poll-tax measure as well as all bills labeled civil rights which invade the rights of the sovereign States. In my judgment there would be no long-drawn-out discussion in the Senate of the United States on a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to the people and to the States to eliminate a poll tax if those of us who are opposed to the statutory bill can have clear and definite assurance that the Senate would stand fast to its position in proposing this matter to the people and to the States through a constitutional amendment and against any effort to deal with it by statute.

There is a very common error which has been carefully generated in the minds of the people of the Nation with respect to our position on this bill. Through the insidious propaganda that brought this issue into being, started when it was born, and which has been constantly spread since that time, the matter of the poll tax as a tax has been magnified all out of proportion to its real importance. We here are not undertaking to defend the poll tax as such. My own State has no poll tax, and I am glad that it does not. There are those who have said that they think the tax was an onerous burden on the right to vote. I have never been able to endorse that statement.

The poll tax in my State was $1 a year—less than 2 cents a week. In this day of high State taxes and Federal taxes, when people say that a poll tax of a dollar a year is an onerous burden on the rights of a man to vote, such argument is to me sheer political poppycock. But it is an outmoded tax or method of raising revenue. I know of but one Member of the Senate who believes in the poll tax as such, and he believes in it for the purpose of the identification of the voter, and that is a very sound reason.

Mr. President, we do propose to use every parliamentary device available to us to assure us ample time to let the people of the Nation know what is really behind all this agitation for statutory repeal of the poll tax. We propose to use all the time that is necessary and available to us under any rule of the Senate to let the American people know all the implications inherent in the legislation. We will endeavor to bring to every citizen of the United States the knowledge and the awareness of the fact that if the Congress of the United States has a right by a simple statute to in effect repeal sections of the Constitution and wipe out a poll tax within a sovereign State by statute, it has a right to pass a bill to federalize all elections for all Federal officials. We propose to take the time necessary to let every person, even though he be a wayfaring individual, know that if the Congress has the right to pass this anti-poll-tax bill as a statute, it can and is likely to pass legislation that will put a little Federal agent, and a United States marshal, at every voting precinct in this land.

This is a fight to preserve the rights of the several States to handle their own elections without dictation from Washington, and the laws of seven States retaining the poll tax is merely incidental.

In this day of restless change, in this day of subversive activity, in this period when those in the Kremlin seem to have seized upon or created a political party in this country to use for their purposes, let Senators ponder whether or not they wish to have the power over elections concentrated in the central government in Washington. If this Nation were to come under the domination of some unscrupulous and ruthless President, Congress could easily pass a bill to take over the election machinery of the States and control elections from Washington. Let Senators consider how long the liberties of the people would survive under such circumstances.

It is ironical to have this bill brought forward in the guise of civil rights. It is a bill to take the control of elections from the State capitals, from the counties of the States and from the local precincts within the counties and federalize them. Such a course would toss into the laps of the gods every right of every American citizen.

Those who say that we are fighting to retain a tax of $1 are either closing their eyes or deliberately distorting the issue before the American people. We are fighting to retain in the several States the power over elections. This right of the several States was never challenged by anyone anywhere until a few years ago. I think I am correct in saying that the agitation to repeal the poll-tax laws of States by the Federal Congress was started by the Daily Worker. It is not a question of collecting a dollar poll tax even though the poll tax is the oldest of all taxes. Some seem to think that the word "poll" relates to the voting place in the precinct. It is from an old Anglo-Saxon word. It means a head tax. We are not defending the poll tax as such. We are defending the right of the States to govern their own elections and to keep Federal police and the Federal Government away from the voting places in the local precincts now operated under State laws.

If we can be given assurance that this matter will be proposed in the form of a constitutional amendment, I am sure that there will be no great difficulty in submitting such an amendment to the people of the United States. If Congress falls for this political claptrap and tries to enact such a law in the form of a statute, we shall resist it on this floor so long as we have the power and the right to do so. Some of us believe that we know our rights on the floor of the Senate.

I am glad to have the opportunity to make clear to the Senate our position on this question. Usually the attendance in the Senate is not good when one of these misnamed civil-rights bills is

brought up for consideration. The day before a measure of this kind is brought up, the headlines usually say, "Filibuster threatens in the Senate," and Senators betake themselves to the corridors, their offices, or some place other than the Senate Chamber.

Southern Senators have never fought over the $1 tax as such. We are fighting for the right to control our own elections in our own States. It is not merely a fight for Southern States. It is just as important to every American, whether he lives in Oregon, New York, or Michigan, as it is to a citizen of a Southern State. It is important to retain in each State the right to control elections if we are to protect our people and our form of government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand the argument of the Senator from Georgia. The Constitution provides that Congress may regulate the time, place, and manner of holding elections; and it has frequently done so. There may be a constitutional question involved in the meaning of the word "qualification," but so far as the manner of conducting elections is concerned, the Constitution gives Congress the right to regulate it, and it has frequently done so.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Ohio does not appreciate the weight of a precedent in the Congress, it is the only obvious thing I have ever seen that he could not understand.

It is proposed to create a precedent by telling the States what the qualifications of voters shall be. It is easy to follow that precedent with a bill to Federalize elections. We do not propose to submit to any such policy so long as we can resist it.

If we can have assurances that a constitutional amendment will be sustained by the Senate to the end, and that we shall not be compelled in conference to accept a statute, I think we can dispose of the question in short order. There will be some discussion. There will be no unanimous vote, but there will certainly be no prolonged debate, and the discussion will not require an unusual length of time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I made these remarks without consulting any other Member of the Senate as to what I intended to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit I wish to say that I had no idea that he would make any statement on this subject today.

Mr. HAYDEN. Other Senators will confirm my statement. I was simply trying to arrive at a method whereby the same result could be accomplished that is desired by those who sponsored the joint resolution which I have read without the great difficulty which I know would be experienced if we attempted to enact a statute. Inasmuch as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and a group of 25 or more of his associates in the Senate sponsored a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment, if they will stand by what they proposed in 1944 I am sure that they can get enough help from Republican Senators to give the assurance which the Senator from Georgia has asked.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wished to invite the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that article IV, section 4, of the Constitution provides that the United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government. The Constitution even spells "Republican" with a capital R, which is very impressive. So, in addition to what the Senator has said, there are further guarantees as to the form of government and as to the protection of the Federal Constitution. I am sure that the Senator from Arizona, recognizing the respect, if not reverence, in which we hold him, will still wish us to examine this proposal to determine whether or not it may be a Trojan donkey which is being presented for our consideration.

Mr. HAYDEN. It will be brought out that many eminent Republicans, including some of the most able lawyers who have ever served in this body, have said that this kind of bill is unconstitutional. The same view is held by Members of the House. I remember particularly a Member of the House from Maine, when I was a Member of that body, who made a very able argument to the effect that such a bill was unconstitutional, and that he would not support it. Senator Borah and other lawyers took the same position.

There are two sides to the question. It is clear, however, that if the Constitution were amended the question would be settled. It would not be necessary to go to the Supreme Court to have a determination as to whether or not the law which we passed was constitutional. A constitutional amendment would settle that question.

I am satisfied that it would be easier to get the required two-thirds vote—which will be necessary in any event—for a constitutional amendment than for a bill. For that reason, as a practical matter, hoping to see something accomplished, I have made these few remarks.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to make a brief observation. I am one of those who favor the abolition of the poll tax by the States, if possible, and by the Federal Government if we must.

I was the introducer, in 1941, of the original bill on this subject. That bill was amended in the Senate Judiciary Committee, by a subcommittee headed by one of the greatest Senators and one of the best Americans who ever sat in this body, Hon. George Norris, of Nebraska. The bill applied to primary as well as special and general elections.

No one esteems more highly than I do my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I know, of course, that he did not intend to include his colleagues in his reference to the Daily Worker. I introduced that bill because I believed in the principle. The Daily Worker had nothing to do with it. I introduced the bill because of my honest sentiments and conscientious beliefs. I have spoken in this body for it, and I have defended it on the platform. It has been before my constituents in elections ever since 1941.

While I regret that I am the only Senator from any of the 11 Southern States who feels as I do, I have as much right to a conscientious feeling and to my convictions as has anyone else to take the contrary position, which right I do not question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am perfectly well aware that the Senator drafted the bill which passed the House and was considered in the Senate 6 years ago. A similar bill has been before the Senate on four occasions.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this is what I am coming to: I believe in this bill. If this statutory method, which I believe to be legally and constitutionally possible, is the only way of getting the poll tax abolished, and is the only way of enfranchising, as a practical matter, the citizens of this country who are practically disfranchised because of the poll tax, then I am in favor of having this Congress exercise its power to strike down that disfranchisement.

However, I wish to say that it is an unhappy thing to have the valuable and the worth-while legislation recommended in the President's message, which this country wants, delayed because of an unfortunate and sharp schism in the Senate over this particular measure or kindred measures. The other aspects of the civil-rights program I shall pass upon when I see the bills, and I shall vote in accordance with what I think is right at the time when the votes come, after seeing the legislation which I am to vote upon at that time.

But if we could have an agreement here that instead of pressing for the statutory repeal of the poll tax, we could with only short debate submit to the States a constitutional amendment for the abolition of the poll tax, without any litigation in the courts being necessary, the matter could be settled by the people. That would seem to me, taking everything into consideration at the present time, to be the best practical approach to the elimination of the poll tax.

I hope, therefore, the salutary suggestion made by the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] will prevail. I was glad to see the favorable response which was indicated on both sides of the aisle here today. Certainly if that suggestion, so ably and wisely made by the able Senator from Arizona, is not adopted, the majority party, which has control of the Senate Calendar, should not, with all these other recommendations for imperative legislation which were made by the President—for example, the passage of a minimum wage law, and so forth, bring up the anti-poll-tax bill, upon which opinion is so sharply divided, before consideration of high prices, housing, and so forth.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Florida. I

assume that he will be through in a moment, and then of course I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I shall be through in a moment.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to ask a question now of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. Then I shall be glad to respond to a question.

Mr. BALDWIN. My question is this: If the proposed method is such a wonderful and salutary way of dealing with this problem, which has been before the Senate for so many years, I wonder why it was not followed by the Democrats when they had complete control of the situation in this body, as they did for such a long time. Can the Senator answer that question?

Mr. PEPPER. It might be that at that time the Senators on the other side of the aisle were not prepared to acquiesce.

However that may be, the Senator will understand that today we are not trying to read history, but we are trying to make it. So if anyone is at fault, let him receive the condemnation which the Senator would like him to receive.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Florida will agree with me, I am sure, that so far as reaching the final result is concerned, the method of adopting a constitutional amendment will be just as effective as the method of passing a law on the subject.

Mr. PEPPER. I stated a while ago that if, without a bitter, acrimonious fight on this floor, inasmuch as Senators are deeply divided in conscientious sentiment on this subject, we could pass within a few hours, or certainly within a day or two, at the outside, the proposed constitutional amendment, and if the other body would acquiesce—and we would know that it either would or would not in a very short time—then the matter could be submitted at once to the several States. With the legislatures of the States meeting within 2 or 3 years at the outside, I believe the amendment would be soon adopted. So, taking everything into consideration, I believe that would be the wisest and most practical approach to the problem now. As the original introducer of this proposed legislation, I should like to see it favorably disposed of in some way which would avoid holding up all these other measures, such as high prices and the other proposals of the President, which the Congress should be considering at the present time, and at the same time would permit the making of some reasonable progress toward the abolition of the odious as well as obsolete poll tax.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will yield to me, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to give his informal opinion, just as the Senator from Florida gave his informal opinion, in regard to the following question: If such a method were employed—in other words, the constitutional amendment method—and if such a constitutional amendment were adopted, what is his opinion as to the action which might be taken by the State of Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my State has no poll tax. We have eliminated it. But I would not undertake to speak for the general assembly of my State. I have no power to bind it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I realize that.

Mr. RUSSELL. My assembly adopted a new constitution for the State of Georgia, and that constitution eliminated the poll tax, which was an inheritance from colonial days.

Let me say that I was much interested in the observation of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] about the Constitution guaranteeing a republican form of government to the States, inasmuch as the poll tax was in existence when the present Constitution and form of government was adopted and, as a matter of fact, before then. All of the Original Thirteen States had poll taxes or even more rigid property qualifications when they agreed to accept the Constitution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Georgia is very well informed as to the feeling of the people of his State, of course. He has stated that the new constitution of the State of Georgia does not include provision for a poll tax. Let me ask whether it would be his opinion that in line with that precedent there would be a general feeling in Georgia in favor of the adoption of such a constitutional amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I am ever questioned about this statement, I wish this preface to appear: That I have no idea what the general assembly of Georgia would do on this question. If the assembly was not too hard pressed with local legislation I would guess the chances would be good that they would ratify such an amendment abolishing the poll tax.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, to the Senator from Georgia I would say that in my reference to the republican form of government I did not mean to convey any implication that that necessitated a poll tax or the elimination of it. I was, rather, addressing myself to the point that under the Federal Constitution the Federal Government has certain responsibilities in regard to the character of the Government, and might conceivably, under that responsibility, in the future, as it has in the past, exercise the power which the Senator felt was so objectionable, and I am inclined to agree with him as to the unfortunate consequences of the Federal Government intervening in local elections; but I am not of the opinion that the pending legislation on the poll tax will produce any serious violation of the general principle with which we are here concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course if there were a man who undertook to establish what was practically tantamount to a dictatorship within a State, I am sure that in such case the Federal Government owes some obligation to the citizens of such a State, who would be in danger of being oppressed by such a dictatorship; but certainly there is a great deal of difference between such a situation—an attempt by one man to proceed to destroy a republican form of government in a State, to establish a virtual dictatorship in a single State, and action under an alleged power to regulate and control elections generally throughout the 48 States by the Federal Government. Such action would constitute a threat against the republican form of government of all 48 States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is perfectly clear, as a result of this discussion, that Senators on this side of the aisle have been greatly impressed with the statements made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I respectfully suggest that it would appear that the next step in the consideration of this matter involves a formal offer by the leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle, which I assume could come following a discussion or conference among the Democrats, in regard to whether they wish to offer to the Senators on the Republican side of the aisle a proposal for a gentlemen's agreement in the form of a substitute for an anti-poll-tax bill. As acting majority leader I can give assurance that the leadership on the Republican side of the aisle would take under advisement such an offer.

It would also seem clear from the discussion today that in carrying out the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, assurance should be given by the Democratic side of the aisle that no prolonged debate in the form of a filibuster would accompany a proposal to substitute the submission of a proposed constitutional amendment on the poll tax for the pending bill on the same subject.

It seems to me that until such an offer is made and such assurances given by the duly elected officials of the Democratic organization in the Senate, there is no further progress that we can make on the subject at this time. As acting majority leader for the moment, I am privileged to say that the Senators on the Republican side of the aisle will take under advisement any proposal on the matter which Democratic Senators wish to offer.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is very kind of the Senator, but I think that the way to get together is for both sides to go to work. My suggestion is that there be conferences on the Republican side of the aisle to find out how many there are who would favor abolition of the poll tax by constitutional amendment; then perhaps we can talk together. An agreement does not have to be reached by exactly observing all the formalities. I have seen much business transacted in the Senate through understandings, by knowing just where we are and what is going to be done. It can be accomplished in that way. I offer this suggestion on my own initiative. I hope that it will bear some fruit.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator will follow it up with further conferences on his side of the aisle.

DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, at the close of the last session of Congress

last month I indicated to the Senate certain reservations which I held with regard to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which was approved at that time.

I was a member of the conference committee on Senate bill 2242, and I declined to sign the conference report, as a means of protesting against what I considered to be undesirable provisions of the bill.

At that time I announced that at the earliest opportunity I would urge amending legislation so that we might have a better law. Such an opportunity now presents itself in the form of a bill to amend the act of 1948, which bill I join with my colleagues, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. TOBEY], in presenting at this time. The bill will change the cut-off date, in defining the eligibility of displaced persons who are now in camps in the American zones of Germany and Austria, from December 22, 1945, to April 21, 1947.

The purpose of the amendatory legislation is twofold. It removes a discriminatory feature that was unjustified in view of the humanitarian motives which inspired the legislation. It makes the act more workable, because the date of April 21, 1947, corresponds to the date on which complete records were first maintained as to the population of the displaced-persons camps. It therefore removes the possibility of fraudulent applications which would have been possible by reason of the incompleteness of registrations prior to April 21, 1947.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like briefly to discuss the bill which is the unfinished business of the Senate, and which happened to be the unfinished business at the previous session, with the hope that we may dispose of it this afternoon.

Mr. President, at the close of the last session, in the rather hectic hours, there came up for consideration a bill which had been under consideration by the Congress and by the constituted committees of the Congress, and by the presidential board, the measure dealing with our aviation position. The closing hours did not permit final consideration of it, as the unfinished business, before the session terminated; which I trust may commend itself to the Senate as a reason why it may be disposed of this afternoon, without doing violence to any other understandings which may subsequently be reached as to the program for this session.

Since the adjournment of the Senate, additional reasons have multiplied as to the very great desirability of this proposed legislation. The situation in Berlin today, where we are seeking to transport by air all commodities essential to the maintenance of our position, may subsequently be vitally involved in the very measure here proposed, which deals exclusively with the further development of our air transport.

At the present time, undoubtedly American aviation enjoys a supreme position in the world so far as civil air transport is concerned, and, we trust and believe, so far as military aviation is concerned. I think I can say, however, without the possibility of successful contradiction, that that situation cannot continue unless we shall without delay take action of the character here contemplated. Not only is the situation in Berlin today a dramatic illustration of the vital character of civilian air transport, but also, within the past week, a foreign country, entirely through the medium of governmental subsidy, a governmental subsidy indirectly resulting in large measure from the grants of funds from our own Treasury, has completed for trial and test a jet air transport, which, day before yesterday, flew from London to Paris in 30 minutes. That would mean that, in the course of time it could in 5 hours cross the Atlantic, and that would mean that unless America takes action of some character to meet this challenge within the next 2 or 3 years the entire progress of American aviation may find itself stalled by the failure to develop new types of planes.

We have thus far maintained supremacy in air transport by the ingenuity and the organization of our own aircraft industry. It was the unanimous testimony of everyone concerned in aircraft and in air lines, and of every authority in our Government, who are in concurrence, that that situation has now reached an absolute impasse as a result of the cost of development.

To develop today a new type of aircraft, which is urgently needed, requires an expense of from $25,000,000 to $50,000,000. To get back the money from such development, 300 planes must be sold. There is no prospect whatever at the present time that any individual aircraft manufacturer would undertake the hazards which are involved. Therefore, as the result of studies of the past year made by the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, which is in complete and unanimous concurrence, and by the Presidential Aviation Policy Board, which was similarly unanimous, and as the result of the concurrence of every agency of our Government concerned, this measure was evolved in order that there might be a clarification of authority and a concentration of responsibility for the development by our Government of further types of air transport to be of auxiliary military service. This measure is specifically designed to that end, and it will permit the five agencies of our Government which are concerned to concentrate under an Aircraft Evaluation Board here provided, subject to the subsequent appropriation of money, which it is not contemplated could be appropriated at this session. In the meantime, during the next 5 months, preliminary studies would be made, so that, next January or February, the Aircraft Evaluation Board would be able to come before the Congress, no time having been lost meanwhile, and ask for an appropriation to carry on the initial development of a type of aircraft as to the development of which foreign countries are already 2 or 3 years ahead of us. Unless we now take action, we may, 2 or 3 years from now, find ourselves absolutely dependent upon the purchase of foreign aircraft or foreign-designed aircraft, in order to maintain air supremacy so far as the United States is concerned.

These are the reasons why I hope very earnestly, as the result of the intermediate developments, that this authority, which is unanimously recommended by everyone in our Government, by everyone in private industry concerned, and by all the Members of the Congress who have studied the matter in committee, may be given, and that we may get action on the matter this afternoon, after whatever discussion is desired by those who have any questions to ask.

POLITICAL NATURE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States delivered his message to the Congress explaining the reasons why this extraordinary session had been called and recommending to the Congress legislative proposals which he declared to be necessary for the preservation of our domestic economy and the maintenance of the economy and peace of the world.

The President's message was so blatantly political in all of its aspects and so amateurish and sophomoric from an economic standpoint as to insult the intelligence of the Congress and all people who pause to think for themselves.

Since the President has seen fit to attempt to use the Congress in a political campaign for his own political advantage, it seems entirely proper to view the President's message for what it is, namely, a pitiful appeal of a sinking politician for the continuance of political life. Not only does the message offer conflicting and impossible promises to every class, group, and contingent of our society, expressed in the vein of a political speech, but it was carried to millions of people over a national radio network at the expense of the American taxpayers under the guise of a national emergency. I know of no bolder use of the Public Treasury for campaign purposes. The prevailing opinion throughout the United States seems to have been that the President's calling of this extraordinary session was purely political. The message delivered to the Congress yesterday emphasizes the correctness of that opinion.

The President said that he had called the Congress into extraordinary session in order to deal primarily with high prices and with the housing shortage. He also said that production has increased and that we want it to increase still more. He pointed out that we have full employment, and that available materials are being used to the limit, that our full plant capacity is being utilized, thus recognizing that production in a free economy under a competitive enterprise system is today, as it has always been and as it always will be in the future, the basic answer to high prices. Yet, as a political sop to those who believe in a controlled economy, the President recommended every possible pol-

icy, practice, and control that would destroy the productivity of this country, which is the only basic economic answer to inflation.

First, he recommended that an excess-profits tax be reestablished. I doubt if any more devastating blow could be laid upon the productive efforts of the people of this country than the reimposition of an excess-profits tax. I doubt if a more effective method could be devised to increase and maintain high prices than to saddle the productivity of this country with an excess-profits tax. To destroy or take away the profit of producers simply destroys the ability of those producers to expand the production facilities of this country. Yet, the President in opening his political message had observed with amateurish candor and naive misunderstanding that all available materials and all plant capacity of this country were being fully utilized at this time. Frankly, I doubt if the President understood this economic inconsistency of his message.

Second, he recommended that consumer credit controls be imposed upon business. Every businessman who has had the slightest experience with mass production, which has been the magic key to the economic superiority of this country over all the nations of the world in both peace and in war, is keenly aware of the fact that the mass productivity of this country has been built upon and sustained by the extension and use of consumer credit. The regulation of consumer credit must inherently be lodged with the producer who extends that consumer credit in accordance with his business and competitive circumstances. That is a part of the essence of the enterprise system of this country and if allowed to work, it gives balance and stability to the national economy.

Third, the President recommended that the Federal Reserve Board be given greater authority to regulate bank credit. Again, I say that every man with any business experience appreciates the fact that the accumulation of capital assets which can be made available for bank credits is, in most cases, the only method by which plant facilities and raw materials can be increased, which means more production and consequently greater balance against inflationary trends. To impose burdensome controls upon bank credit is to restrict expansion of production, and thus lose the ballast that would bring the inflationary balloon to earth.

Fourth, the President recommended that authority be granted to regulate speculation on the commodity exchanges. I wonder if the President understands that the purchase and sale of so-called "futures" is nothing more nor less than another avenue of credit for the commodity producer. It is the purchase and sale of rights in future production that mark the trend of supply and demand, and in turn, regulate and balance production with demand. The purchase and sale of "futures" is a common and well proved method of spreading market activity over nonproductive periods and is in full accord with the American enterprise system. Of course, it is true that many speculators in the commodity market are financially injured or even financially destroyed by unforeseen circumstances, such as short production or surplus production, but such are the hazards of our competitive system, and the fact that there are financial casualties in this field of enterprise is no more argument for eliminating this field of business enterprise than for prohibiting the operation of automobiles because there are traffic casualties.

Fifth, the President recommended that authority be granted for allocation and inventory controls of scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production, or the cost of living. Now, I ask, does anyone know of any raw material that does not basically affect essential industrial production or does not have a direct bearing upon the cost of living? Under the President's own statement, this recommendation would include all raw materials, because, as I have already mentioned, he pointed out that all materials available were now being utilized in our productive efforts. I am sure we all understand that such controls imposed upon manufacturers and producers of consumer goods would be a devastating blow to the production program of this country and another boost for inflation.

Sixth, the President recommended that rent controls be strengthened and that larger appropriations be provided for enforcement of such controls. This recommendation followed on the heels of the President's previous statement that additional housing was one of the critical emergencies of this Nation and one of the reasons for calling this extraordinary session. Since the removal of rent controls from new houses, this country has witnessed and is today witnessing the greatest building program it has ever seen in its long history of expansion. Reimposing rent controls would, of course, destroy the incentive that is now promoting this tremendous building activity. Every city, town, and hamlet in this great country of ours is today a scene of feverish building activity. Every facility that can contribute to the building of more houses is being used. It should be remembered that the present building boom has developed during the past year and a half, since the removal of rent controls and other restrictions which the President would now reimpose. It should be remembered that for almost 5 years building in this country was at a standstill, and I now venture the prediction that we will balance our housing production with our demand in a shorter period than we were shut down under controls, notwithstanding the rapid increase of population and new families.

Seventh, the President recommended that stand-by authority be granted to ration those products in short supply which vitally affect the health and welfare of our people. He said that on the basis of present facts, and unless further shortages occur, this authority might not have to be used at all. It seems almost impossible that the President of the United States would be so lacking in the fundamentals of business experience and so lacking in an understanding of human nature as not to know that the shadow of statutory authority inherent in any rationing law would impair and seriously damage the productivity of this country, and cause a rush of buying and hoarding that would bring upon us such inflation as we have not yet imagined. The very existence of such a law would create the shortage which the President and his bureaucrats are looking for to impose controls and return to us the iniquitous era of black markets.

Eighth, the President recommended that price controls be authorized for scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production or the cost of living. The same may be said about the enactment of price-control legislation as has been said with respect to stand-by authority for rationing. Both would lead to the same horrible result. The demagoguery of the President in this proposal is emphasized by his statement that noninflationary wage increases can and should continue to be made by free collective bargaining. All wage increases, like all price increases, are inflationary, and both operate with equal force and effect. Merely because a wage increase can be absorbed by existing margins of profit does not mean that it is not inflationary. Simply because it does not result in a direct increase in the price of the related commodity does not mean that it is not inflationary. Even in these cases it means that the ability of the producer to expand production has been curtailed, and thus inflation encouraged.

Having disposed of inflation by these eight recommendations and thereby promised relief to all the people, the President then proposes that the Government launch itself upon a program of public spending for certain groups whose political support he hopes to get in November. He plugs for a housing bill which it is estimated would cost this country more than $150,000,000,000, in addition to some $20,000,000,000 which the Government already has in Government-owned housing and mortgage guaranties. Where is this vast amount of money to come from? The voters, who are the taxpayers, should understand that it is to come out of their pockets and be added to the national debt. What is to become of the Treasury surplus which Mr. Truman said we must build up through an excess-profits tax? It seems so academic that our already large national debt and continued national extravagance and wasteful spending are such important factors in existing inflation, that it is foolish to launch the Government upon a spending program of this magnitude, in direct competition with the greatest private building boom in all the history of the country.

As a further appeal to special groups, the President would have Congress continue public spending for the purpose of increasing Federal assistance to the States for educational purposes. No doubt, the President believes that this is a compelling appeal to the millions of school teachers of this country, but not only the school teacher but every other

citizen and taxpayer of this country will pay the bill through higher taxation, higher prices, and above all, the relinquishment of the right of the States to control their own local educational institutions. We know for a certainty that when the Federal Government takes over the financing of State educational systems and institutions, at the same time the Federal Government takes over control and regulation of those institutions, and thus another right of the people has been given up to the Central Government. As former President Hoover has suggested, those who favor such programs in the name of liberalism become liberals without liberty.

The President would continue his national spending program to increase benefits being paid under the old-age and survivors' insurance system.

Purely as a political gesture, he recommends that the minimum wage be increased to 75 cents an hour. I say this is a political gesture because few, if any, workers in the United States are earning less than the proposed minimum wage. As a practical matter, under present circumstances, there can be no possible necessity for the Federal Government to put a floor under wages.

The President would have the American people double the burden they have already assumed by taking in and caring for 400,000 additional displaced persons outside and above the normal immigration quotas.

He would increase our national spending by underwriting the construction of a permanent home for the United Nations.

He would guarantee, as another political promise for the votes of the American farmers, an export market of 185,000,000 bushels of wheat per year.

He would expand the socialism of Federal power production, and thus add to the already heavy financial burden the people of this country are now carrying for that purpose. This is, of course, another political promise to those who are so situated as to enjoy the results of public power at the expense of all the people; incidentally, another way to distribute the wealth of those who have to those who have not, and a perfect program for destroying competitive incentive and private business enterprise.

As a political enticement to Federal employees, the President recommends a further increase of Federal wages.

Finally, the President urges upon the Congress various and sundry measures to protect and expand what he chooses to term "basic civil rights of citizenship and human liberty." What greater basic civil rights of citizenship and human liberty can be bestowed upon any nation than the right to live in a free economy under a private and competitive system that has made America the envy of all the world? Yet, for low political purposes the President would appeal to race prejudice and incite race against race and class against class. In my own mind, I am thoroughly convinced that the President and his political advisers who hope to retain the New Deal administration in power, are far more interested in the votes of various minority groups of the industrial centers of the North than they are in bettering the condition of the Negro or any other minority group. To me, it is clear that the Constitution of the United States has not delegated to the Federal Government the powers which the President seeks under his so-called civil-rights program. But, in the true Rooseveltian philosophy the President hopes that the Congress will not be deterred by any constitutional doubts.

As political sop to the labor leaders, the President would have Congress repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law. Yet, he has resorted to the use of this law more than a dozen times since its enactment, in order to save his administration from embarrassment by the ruthless and unauthorized activity of labor racketeers who were originally invested with their power and arrogance by the practices and policies of the New Deal Party.

All in all, the President's program is one of continued higher and higher Federal spending on everything in order that the people shall do less and less for themselves, and the Government shall do everything for the people, such as insuring their health, federalizing their education, building their homes, boosting their wages, and raising the prices at which they sell, but at the same time lower the prices at which they buy. It seems to be assumed by the President that we are to forget that the Federal Government can give us nothing unless it first takes it from us. In short, the President's program is all things to all men.

INVESTIGATION OF HIGH MEAT PRICES

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, for more than a year I have tried at every opportunity to encourage effective action to curb dangerously rising living costs. Neither I, nor any American who has to pay food bills, needs a special message from the President to tell him that prices are high and constantly going higher. The price of meat is a good example—and an important example, since meat represents about 30 percent of the total food bill.

It is tragic to make a political football of this problem. We need to get at the facts and deal with them as Americans interested in a common cause.

For an example concerning these facts, last year the Department of Agriculture advised farmers to sell hogs and cattle light. How much effect would that have on the available supply of meat that might be obtained out of those animals? I have heard today that the Department of Agriculture has already proposed, or will propose, that the production of beef cattle be reduced a very substantial figure in this coming year. I do not know how authentic that information may be. I intend to check it. But can we regulate the supply and then expect the much maligned law of supply and demand to operate? During the past few days the prices of wheat, corn, and oats, have fallen very materially—it is said because of the prospects of a bumper crop in the United States and a crop surpassing expectations in Europe. What effect are these facts, if indeed they are facts, going to have on the price of meat?

In the light of these circumstances, what would be the effect of restoring OPA controls as the President proposes? I confess I do not know, and apparently the administration does not, for to date it has offered no specific suggestions.

Last year the Congress passed a bill to combat inflation, which became Public Law 395 on December 30, 1947. Under the provisions of that law it was proposed that the President take certain action when he felt that critical shortages were affecting the health or safety or national security or welfare of our people. That law provided that under such threatening circumstances the President could take the following steps: First, make a statement of the circumstances which he believed required price controls or rationing or any other Government action; second, outline a detailed procedure and program which the administration intended to follow; third, describe the extent to which the administration intends to go and the plans they intended to employ to combat the difficulty; and, fourth, provide—through the many agencies of the Government—a record of the factual evidence upon which the recommendations were based. Under this law, once the President had followed this logical fact-producing procedure, a congressional committee would be required to take action on his recommendations within 15 days.

That law has been in effect nearly 7 months during which time the President presumably has not believed the economic threat was sufficient to take the action suggested though prices have risen steadily. Then suddenly the President called a special political session of Congress and outlined several general proposals which he said should be adopted in view of rising prices. He apparently took advantage of only the first provision of the law, that is, he has made a statement of circumstances but he has not told us, or told the American people, whether or when or how the administration intends to apply price controls or rationing. He has not provided us with the factual evidence and information called for in this law. He has not told us to what extent the administration proposes to go or the specific formula to be employed—as the law outlines. The Congress, unfortunately, does not have the huge agencies or the 2,000,000 employees that are at the administration's command, and that are expected to be able to furnish much of this material.

The President has told us in a very general way that he would like to employ certain procedures and certain tactics in regard to high prices. Those are the same regulations that were employed once before. During the time they were in effect we had black markets, shortages, and constantly rising prices. That would seem to be sufficient evidence to demonstrate that these procedures are in themselves either ineffective or insufficient. It would, therefore, seem that the President should have used his agencies to determine a precise, detailed program so that the American people and the Congress could have some confidence that this serious matter was being approached realistically and effectively.

At the same time that the President issued a call for a special session of Con-

gress he made several comments concerning our economic status. He pointed out that in the last 14 years farm income has been multiplied about six times; that wages and salaries have quadrupled and that the total national income, profits, and wages, are nearly five times as high as they were 14 years ago. The fact that we are now paying nearly four times as many Government employees as we were in 1933 and the fact that the Government is spending nearly 10 times as much money were not mentioned. Nor was the fact mentioned that each of those increases has brought with it an increase in prices of consumer goods.

In other words, Mr. President, the administration would attempt to take political advantage of the good things that may have ensued in the last 14 years, but it does not want to take the responsibility for the things that have happened that are not so good, which are now troubling the American people, and which are in part due to the good things that have happened.

Under these circumstances there would seem to be a question as to whether the very general request to return to methods once before proven ineffective is not primarily a political move.

I may say, Mr. President, that I believe it is solely and completely and entirely a political move. Therefore, it seems that the Congress is unfortunately required to use its own meager facilities to try to find out the facts and determine the best way to deal with this problem, since the administration has failed to take the action the Congress gave it the opportunity to take. I believe we can, right now, begin this program on one phase of high prices—the high price of meat.

Therefore, I shall, before concluding my remarks, submit a resolution requiring the Congress to inquire into the facts causing the deplorably high prices of meat so that the Congress will have immediately available the information which the administration has not provided, as the law requires that it should. It is unfortunate that the cooperation, once promised by the President, cannot be extended in this case so that the agencies of the Government would use their tremendous personnel and power to take effective, rapid action. Under the circumstances, we can only prepare for the time when a new administration will interest itself in high prices instead of politics.

Mr. President, these observations of mine are not highly partisan, although I am bound to admit that they appear to be so. I have tried to make them factual. The things I have stated here are in the books. But in order that I may bring to the support of the position I have taken an impartial point of view I should like to read briefly from an editorial in this morning's New York Times. The New York Times, as all Senators know, is one of the leading newspapers of the world. I believe its observations editorially are highly regarded and long have been and are looked upon in large part as impartial observations of public affairs. The title of the editorial, which I do not intend to read in full, but from which I desire to quote, is "Mr. Truman on Inflation." I read from the editorial as follows:

> The impression that Mr. Truman's anti-inflation program, presented to Congress yesterday, is likely to leave with many persons, we think, is that of a man trying to hit a specific target by standing off and throwing a handful of birdshot at it. Almost anyone who has ever heard the question of high prices discussed, it seems to us, could sit down with pad and pencil and, by jotting down a combination of the suggestions he had heard and remembered, produce about as satisfactory a balanced program as this. And if he was not troubled by considerations of political expediency, he might even score a large percentage of hits.

Mr. President, it will be noticed that many factors enter into the determination of the prices of commodities in this country, and to deal with some of them in a Presidential election year would be perhaps politically dangerous. But anyone who makes an impartial observation of the President's message on inflation, as evidently this editorial writer has, must come to the conclusion that the President has selected those things which might seem politically expedient, and eliminated those things which might have some dangerous political possibilities.

I read further from the editorial:

> The presentation by Mr. Truman of the background of the inflation problem was, it seems to us, almost inexcusably superficial and slipshod, considering the importance of the occasion and the subject.

Those are not my words. Those are the words from the lead editorial of one of the leading newspapers of the world.

I read further from the editorial:

> As to such proposals as the restoration of the excess-profits tax, the tightening of regulations on the commodity exchanges, the strengthening of rent controls, and drawing a line between inflation and non-inflationary wage increases—these suggest that the President, in formulating the program, may have been mildly under the influence of the recent epidemic of political conventions.

Those are not my words. They are the words of the editorial.

I read further from the editorial:

> Like the party platforms that came out of Philadelphia, it can be said that, while it may not have much to do with inflation, there is something in this document for everyone.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. When the editorial suggests that the President may have been "mildly under the influence of the recent epidemic of political conventions," does not the Senator think that probably the editorial writer had in mind that he was under the influence of the Wallace convention more than of his own?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is a pertinent inquiry; but I must confess that I am unable to answer it. It could very well be.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I believe the Senator from Connecticut was reading from a communication on the question of prices, in which communication the question was raised that the President himself, or rather the executive department, had not properly advised the Congress as to the facts and figures on the basic cause of the high cost of living. Is that correct?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Was that a letter?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is a statute of the Congress, signed by the President on the 30th of December 1947.

Mr. KILGORE. No——

Mr. BALDWIN. In the special session of the Congress last November, which was called to deal with inflation, one of the subjects contained in the agenda in the President's message, a specific formula was devised whereby the President could make an ascertainment of the facts, submit them to the Congress, and make specific recommendations. The law further required that the committee to which the recommendation was referred must act upon it within 15 days and make a report to the Congress.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the Senator is begging the question. I am asking the Senator from Connecticut from what he was reading just prior to the reading of the editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. BALDWIN. I was reading from notes which I had prepared for my own speech.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Connecticut is no doubt aware that the principal source of the statistics which the President is criticized for not furnishing the Congress is the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and that the Congress so reduced the appropriations that at the present time it is unable to give the figures with complete accuracy. I know that, because today I called upon the Bureau for certain figures on the cost of meats. I was informed that the Bureau was unable, under the present appropriations granted by the Congress, to keep the necessary men in the field, where the sale of meats was taking place, to furnish the basic figures for a study of the reason of the high cost of meats.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say in answer to that observation that that is a dodge which has been used constantly by this administration to avoid responsibility for doing the things which ought to be done. When we were considering the appropriations last year one department cut down the number of inspectors at the border so as to bring home to the people of the United States the charge that this economy-minded Congress was interfering with its services.

I can think of nothing more important than the consideration of prices of food. If the Bureau of Labor Statistics has not a sufficient number of men to do that particular job, let it take men off some other job which is not so important, and do this job. That is what an industrial corporation or an individual in business would do. The practice of claiming, every time a question is raised, that there is no appropriation to take care of the work, is ridiculous. The appropriations

for this Government are four times what they were in the last peacetime year before the war. Yet it is claimed that there is not sufficient money to operate the Government. The reason is plain, downright inefficiency. The people of the country will have an opportunity next November to correct that situation, and I feel certain that they will do so. So I say to my friend that if in the large appropriations which are made for the Bureau of Labor Statistics there is not sufficient money to do this particular job, the department should come to Congress and ask for it. Why did not the Bureau take employees off work which was not so important and put them temporarily on this work? That is what would have been done in any other business. But in the Federal Government if there is no work to occupy a particular group of employees, what do they do? They sit down and wait until some work comes along. There is no administrative organization whatsoever in the Government to handle the problem in a business-like fashion. As a result the Bureau makes the excuse that its appropriations have been reduced. That is an old argument which has been used over and over again, and will be used constantly throughout the campaign.

Again I ask, if the Federal Government has four times as much in the way of appropriations as it had in the last peacetime year before the war, why can it not do some of these jobs, particularly this job, which is of vital importance and significance?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no desire to contribute anything which might add to the heat which seems to be afflicting the Senator from Connecticut. However, it is true, as I am sure the Senator knows, that not only the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, but other divisions of that Department, presented their needs, as they assessed them, to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress at the session which adjourned in June. If they did not receive sufficient money from the Congress to do the work in which the Senator is interested, does the Senator contend that under the law the Bureau of Labor Statistics could invade some other bureau or division in the Department of Labor and take away from it men assigned to it or money appropriated specifically for some other bureau, in order to do the job about which the Senator is now speaking?

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that Congress has always been very meticulous with respect to the invasion by any other bureau of funds appropriated by Congress for a particular bureau, even though it might have the authority under the law to do so, which is extremely doubtful. When Congress earmarks money for a division, bureau, or department, it is supposed to be expended for the purpose designated. Now and then funds are available to be used in a flexible way; but I do not recall that in the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor, passed before adjournment, there was any such roving fund upon which the Secretary of Labor could call, or from which he could draw additional money for the benefit of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say in answer to the question of my distinguished friend that I do not understand that all the employees of the Bureau of Labor Statistics are concerned with finding out the prices of meats. I do not understand that they are all meat inspectors.

Mr. BARKLEY. Meat inspectors?

Mr. BALDWIN. The point which my friend raised was that there were not sufficient appropriations to take care of funds for meat inspectors. Meat constitutes 30 percent of the cost of living today. It seems to me since that is one of the essential items, if we want to find out the facts, there are other inspectors who might be temporarily assigned to that particular job. Every business organization is operated on that basis.

Mr. BARKLEY. The meat-inspection service is in the Department of Agriculture, and the meat inspectors are supposed to inspect the quality of meat going from one State to another which may affect the health of the people. Certainly the Senator would not contend that the Bureau of Labor Statistics could go to the Department of Agriculture and draw from it meat inspectors, who may be able to pass on the quality of meat or whether it is pure or adulterated or spoiled, but who may not be able to pass on the question of whether the price of meat is too high.

Mr. BALDWIN. The point I make is that if a government, which in the present peacetime year has the largest number of Federal employees it has ever had in any other peacetime year, cannot find somewhere in the Bureau of Labor Statistics sufficient personnel to do this job, then it is an ineffective, inefficient government. That is my sole point.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator will realize that Congress is always rather particular about appropriating money for divisions and departments. It earmarks it for certain purposes and delineates the duty of those who are employed under it. Certainly the Bureau of Labor Statistics has no pool in its own confines from which it may undertake to draw employees to do the work in undertaking to arrive at costs of production and the costs of consumers goods and other matters of that character.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator's experience is much longer and much greater than mine, but I ask him this question: Are all the employees in the Bureau of Labor Statistics concerned with the single matter of finding what is the price of meat?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course not.

Mr. BALDWIN. Or is there a group of investigators there who could be used to investigate the price of meat one day and the price of bread another day and the price of vegetables another day?

I come back to the point that it is very strange indeed that a Government agency with a certain number of employees and an able and intelligent man at the head of it cannot be conducted in such a way that statistics pertaining to such an important matter as the high price of meat cannot be obtained for want of funds sufficient to enable the employment of the necessary number of inspectors. Certainly there must be a sufficient number of inspectors in the Bureau.

Mr. BARKLEY. That raises the very natural question as to whether an employee in the Bureau of Labor Statistics who is an expert in regard to the price of clothing would be appropriately assigned tomorrow to determine how the price of meat is arrived at. I do not know about all the procedures in that Bureau, but I imagine that, as in any other well-organized bureau or division—and I am almost afraid to call it a bureau, for fear that the man who heads it may be called a bureaucrat, but at the same time it is the Bureau of Labor Statistics, created by Congress and called such by the Congress—there are experts qualified to look into and pass upon and report on the cost of various articles and consumers goods. Whether a person who is an expert on the cost of shoes would be properly assigned to the job of determining why the price of meat is high, I do not know. I do not think any of us here in the Senate would know. But I question the wisdom of the suggestion that because meat is a prime element in the cost of living, those who are investigating the cost of other things that go into the cost of living in this country should immediately be taken off their jobs and assigned to the job of determining why the price of meat is high. They may not be the best qualified persons for that purpose.

If the Senator could discover during this session—whether it is a long one or a short one—that there is not sufficient personnel in the Bureau of Labor Statistics to do the quick job of undertaking to find out why the price of meat is high, would the Senator vote for an additional amount necessary to enable the employment of the proper personnel?

Mr. BALDWIN. That would be one thing that the committee to be created under the resolution which I propose to submit could find out. That is another reason why the resolution should be adopted.

But this is the first information I have had and, so far as I know, the Senate has had that the particular agency upon which this particular statute calls—a statute which has been on the books since last December—does not have sufficient personnel to do the job to which I refer. Incidentally, let me say that the other day I heard it stated that employees are being added to the Federal pay roll at the rate of 500 a day. If that be so, there must be personnel somewhere to do this job.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, long ago I found out, as the Senator from Connecticut must have found out, that we cannot rely upon rumors and reports.

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes; and the statement in regard to the addition of 500 employees a day to the Federal pay roll is another thing which could be ascertained under the resolution to which I am addressing myself.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the resolution call for the appointment of a special committee?

Mr. BALDWIN. No; the investigation would be conducted by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that that committee will meet tomorrow to go into the question of holding hearings. It already has authority and facilities.

Mr. BALDWIN. I hope my resolution will be referred to that committee, so that it can consider the matter, along with other matters.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am always very happy to have a suggestion from my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, first I wish to say that when we passed the Reorganization Act and established certain committees, to which we gave all the authority necessary for various investigations, we sought to do away with special committees. I myself have felt for a long time that we have had too many special committees, and that they were taking away from the standing committees jurisdiction which they properly have under the rules of the Senate. So I think the Banking and Currency Committee already has authority to do what the Senator from Connecticut proposes in the resolution. I was a member of that committee for a long time, and it never lacked jurisdiction to look into any question which had any relationship to legislation which it was asked to consider.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am not talking about special committees; but I am asking why it is that, after the Congress has passed a specific law laying down a certain procedure for the President to follow, and after the President has signed that law and it is on the statute books, the President does not avail himself of the procedure outlined in that law? When he has all the Federal administrative agencies at his disposal, and when he is the head of a great many administrative agencies and bureaus and departments of all kinds, why is it that the Congress of the United States then has to go back and look into the matter in detail, although it has only limited resources at its disposal and although its job is not of an administrative character, but of a legislative character, for its job is to act upon the specific recommendations of the President, and not to inquire into all the facts and circumstances. Those are the things I am asking.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator referring to a law which was passed at the special session last fall?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not read that statute lately. What particular provision of it is the Senator criticizing the President for not carrying out?

Mr. BALDWIN. It contains a provision that whenever the President shall find that a particular commodity is in short supply and that the state of affairs is such that the health and welfare of the people are affected, he shall make a statement of fact concerning the matter, shall require the administrative agencies to develop the facts and the situation, and shall make a recommendation to the Committee on the Economic Report, which shall report to the Congress within 15 days. However, although the Congress began its session in January and although, as the President has said, all during that time prices have been going up, nevertheless not once during that time has the President availed himself of the provisions of that law.

Mr. BARKLEY. That raises the question whether any particular commodity has been getting in short supply and whether it is responsible for the increase in price. We know there has been a terrific increase of production in the United States, generally speaking, within the last 2 years and since the end of the war. We have full employment. We have almost complete utilization of our productive capacity. I do not refer particularly to meat. During the last year there has been, of course, a decline in the production of meat in the United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. There was a decline in the supply of meat because of the specific recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. That is in the record.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the Senator referring now to the little pig era?

Mr. BALDWIN. No; I had nothing to do with the little pig era. We went through that. However, the last era we went through was not an era of killing the little pigs, but it was an era of keeping the pigs from getting big, which is a somewhat different matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand there is no particular virtue in the age of a hog.

Mr. BALDWIN. It is the size.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not make much difference, either to the hog or to humanity, as to how old a hog should be when it is butchered.

Mr. BALDWIN. It makes a difference to humanity.

Mr. BARKLEY. But be that as it may, if the President had found there was a shortage of hogs and therefore a shortage of meat, under the law to which the Senator referred, certainly no act of Congress could have increased the supply. No proclamation by the President could have increased it. If the President had made a recommendation based upon a shortage in the supply of hogs, and consequently a shortage in the supply of meat, does the Senator think the Congress, in the situation in which it then found itself, and in the remainder of the session, would have inaugurated legislation to curb or to regulate the price of meat?

Mr. BALDWIN. My recollection of the special session last November is that there was a good deal of sentiment on both sides of the aisle in favor of providing some sort of regulation, of enacting some sort of legal provision to take care of items that might be in short supply. My distinguished friend will remember that, in his message to the Congress at that particular time, the President did not specifically say that he wanted price controls restored. He said he wanted legislation which would give him control over rationing and allocation of items in short supply. Meat is one of the items which is now in short supply and that condition has caused the high price. We do not have in the country enough meat.

Mr. BARKLEY. Congress did not give the President even that stand-by authority.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Congress gave him specific authority in the bill I am talking about.

Mr. BARKLEY. If Congress had given him even the stand-by authority, he could in the present situation do a good job. Nevertheless, Congress certainly could not and did not pass legislation restoring price controls. I do not think there was anybody on either side of either branch of the Congress at that time who recommended or approved the reimposition of price controls as they originally were during the war and for a period following the war.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct. If I may interrupt my friend, that is why I say we passed at that time a bill providing that the President could pick out items he might find in short supply, and with respect to which, for that reason, there was a dangerous possibility of a rapid increase in price. Having picked out such items, he could then make specific recommendations to the committee for action to be taken. That law has been on the books since last December. The President signed it. He has never done anything about it in all that time. That is the method, if my good friend will let me say so, by which the Congress undertook to deal with the specific recommendation or with the particular recommendation made by the President in his message. He wanted some law by which to deal with items in short supply, and that is the provision we made for it. He has never availed himself of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Congress cannot avoid its own responsibility by saying the President did not point out some article of food and recommend a particular piece of legislation in regard to it. Congress has all the facilities the President has for obtaining information. It can obtain information from every department, every bureau, every Federal agency. It can ascertain the facts. The mere fact that the President might point out a shortage with respect to some particular article of food does not in my judgment relieve the Congress of its responsibility.

Mr. BALDWIN. If I may ask my friend a question, Does not the Constitution of the United States provide that the President shall execute the laws enacted by Congress? Is not that his job?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course.

Mr. BALDWIN. The law passed by the Congress provided a specific method of dealing with this particular question. The question I am asking is, Why did not the President use it? The law is upon the statute books.

Mr. BARKLEY. Based upon the information available, he may not have been able to report to Congress that there was a shortage in a particular commodity.

Mr. BALDWIN. He does not necessarily have to report that there is a shortage. He could have reported that the price of a particular article was going up and that therefore some action was required. He did not do that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have as always listened with a great deal of interest to what my friend from Connecticut has to say. There came to my mind several suggestions to make to him as he proceeded with his discussion. In the first place, he said, "What about these reductions of appropriations? Why do we not know something about that? Why can we not stop that?" I suggest to the Senator that the reports by the Appropriations Committees submitted to the Senate only a few months ago—in June, as a matter of fact—show distinctly why the situation is such in the Bureau of Labor Statistics that the Bureau does not now have sufficient money to send statistical gatherers into the field to get the material that is available.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. How large is the President's contingent fund? Does he have one?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The President cannot use the contingent fund for that purpose.

Mr. BALDWIN. How many departments and agencies could be called upon by him for information?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator would only pay attention to what has happened in the Senate, he would know that the Senate cut down or withdrew the President's contingent fund.

Mr. BALDWIN. How large a contingent fund does the President have?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know what it is at the present time, but whatever contingent fund may be given to the President is given to him for a particular purpose.

Mr. BALDWIN. It is given to him for contingent use, is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, indeed.

Mr. BALDWIN. And this is a contingency.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. BALDWIN. If the President needed additional funds for the Bureau of Labor Statistics to enable the Bureau to employ additional personnel in order to furnish information in connection with the present session, he has a contingent fund and why did he not use it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assure the Senator he is quite wrong. That could not be done. If the Senator were a member of the Appropriations Committee, as I am, he would know that the Congress of the United States has specifically forbidden the switching of funds within a department from one agency to another.

Mr. BALDWIN. If I may, as a junior Member of the Congress, I would ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, this question: What is the purpose of the contingent fund? Is it not to meet contingencies?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The contingent fund had to do with national defense, not with domestic affairs. I may say to the Senator that consistently the Congress has been cutting appropriations in the very spots where we could hope to do something about this identical problem. For example, I call to the attention of the Senator the fact that the President in his budget submitted to the Congress last January recommended specifically an appropriation to enable the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a study of the price policies of the corporations controlling the commodities upon which the cost of living depends. The House of Representatives refused that appropriation. I sought to grant the authority, when the bill came to the Senate, and the authority was granted. It was written into the report. But when the bill went to conference the House conferees declined positively to allow an appropriation for that specific purpose. I suggest to the Senator that the reason the President's recommendation to conduct a study of the price policies of the profiteers was denied by this Congress was because this Congress has preferred to serve the profiteers rather than the people.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. BALDWIN. We shall come to that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say another thing to the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BALDWIN. The question we are dealing with here——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest that the Senator suspend until the Chair can enforce the rule of the Senate with respect to the occupants of the galleries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The Chair will indicate to those in the galleries that any further demonstrations, for any reason whatever, will result in a clearing of the galleries. The Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. BALDWIN. My resolution has nothing to do with the profiteering corporations to which my friend from Wyoming refers. I may feel just as strongly about them as he does; but what we are talking about here is why the President of the United States did not carry out a specific law of the Congress which gave him authority to make specific recommendations for action by the Congress with reference to commodities and products in short supply.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to tell the Senator.

First, I should like to suggest to the occupants of the galleries who conducted a little demonstration a moment ago that it might be well for them to withhold their demonstration until they cast their ballots in the ballot boxes next November. That will be the time to show what they want done.

Mr. BALDWIN. It will be a little difficult for them to know what Democrats to vote for.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I do not know, I think they will understand.

Mr. President, last November the President of the United States called Congress into special session, saying that there were two great public service needs which ought to be taken care of by Congress. The first was the control of inflation and the rising cost of living. The other was European recovery. Congress reluctantly took care of the latter subject. With respect to the former, it declined to act. Oh, to be sure, it passed a voluntary allocation bill. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] felt, judging from their expressions upon the floor, that the President was right and that something should be done regarding the high cost of living. They were not satisfied with the bill which was approved by the majority leadership and which was passed by the Senate. The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Connecticut offered an amendment to which the Senator from Connecticut has now referred. I took part in the debate and at that time pointed out to the Senator from Connecticut that the amendment which he and the Senator from Vermont were offering was inadequate, that it could not possibly do the job, and that it would be much more simple, instead of postponing the job, to do it at that time. But it was not done. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report, whose duty it was to pass upon these questions, gave long and careful study to the problems. The Senator from Connecticut rose upon the floor, as the first regular session of the Eightieth Congress was coming to a close, and warned the majority leadership that something should be done. The Senator will recall it. He submitted a resolution which demanded an investigation, and he participated in the investigation.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Studies were made by subcommittees all over the country, from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific coast, and when they were completed there was not a single member of the committee who did not know about the shortage of meat and its increasing cost. There was not a single member of the committee who did not know that inflation had the people of the United States by the throat. There was a difference of opinion as to what should be done. The majority——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator pause there for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say that the very best we were able to get out of the Congress at that time—and my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has volunteered the statement that he himself was then not in favor of rationing—was the legislation to which reference has been made. I claim that a very effective piece of legislation, proposing a very logical way of dealing with the subject, was the amendment which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and I proposed.

I am coming to the question which I have asked many times before. Why has not that particular legislation been carried out? Can the President of the United States say, "This is a law of Congress, but I do not like it. I am not going to observe it; I shall not follow the procedure it provides"? I do not think the Chief Executive can do that. He has never taken one single step under that legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator give me time to reply?

Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reason for it was that the President knew, as did the Congress, when the amendment was offered, that shortages existed. The President never once withdrew his recommendation for positive legislation. The reason nothing was done is that the legislation was utterly inadequate. What we need is more adequate legislation to do the job. The Senator's amendment was merely a polite postponement of the solution of the problem; and I fear, from what he says, that we shall do some more polite postponing——

Mr. BALDWIN. What we must do is to find out the facts which the President ought to have found out and submitted to us, rather than to make a general over-all buck-shot attempt to deal with inflation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that all he has to do is to follow the advice which the President gave the Members of the Congress when he said, "Ask your wife about the cost of living; she will tell you."

Mr. BALDWIN. That is a very familiar phrase; I started my speech with it. It is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator referred to me a moment ago as having said that I did not favor rationing. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that I introduced a bill in the special session last year to carry out the President's recommendations. If those recommendations had been carried out and if the bill which I introduced had passed, we should not now be asked to consider the question. The bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it made the same progress there that the familiar snowball makes in the hot hereafter.

Mr. BALDWIN. It made the same progress that the Republicans made in the 14 years of Democratic administration.

I am sure that my distinguished friend does not mean to imply that since the legislation which was proposed by the Democratic side of the Senate was not adopted and the legislation proposed by the Republican side of the Senate was adopted there was no obligation, therefore, on the President of the United States to carry out its provision. He does not mean to imply that, does he?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not make any such contention as that. Neither do I concede that the President of the United States has failed to carry out the intent or the provisions of the law.

Mr. BALDWIN. I most earnestly contend that he has failed.

Mr. President, a moment ago my distinguished friend from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said we all knew about the shortages and that the President could have made recommendations for——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; that Congress could have acted.

Mr. BALDWIN. I say that the President could have acted, under the law. Let me read to my distinguished friend what the law says:

> Whenever the President shall determine that there is or threatens to be a critical shortage of any raw material, commodity, or product which jeopardizes the health or safety of the people of the United States or its national security or welfare—

Whenever he makes such a determination, then he shall follow out the procedure of the law. If the Congress knew it, certainly the President knew it. The law contains the procedure. Why did he not make his recommendations?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. May I ask the Senator what the procedure is?

Mr. BALDWIN. Under the procedure provided for, the President makes a statement of the circumstances which, in his judgment, require the proposed conservation measures; a detailed method is provided for the administration of the proposed measures, including the additional budget and additional personnel necessary for their enforcement, and the proposed degree of curtailment, in current and prospective use of each such raw material, commodity, or product, by each processor, and/or user thereof, and a complete record of the factual evidence involved.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. I served with the Senator on the committee in the eastern area of the United States. The Senator knows quite well that before we started the hearings we were all convinced that inflation was not only upon us but that prices were spiraling. We held hearings from New Hampshire to Florida. The Secretary of Agriculture appeared before us and told us there would be a meat shortage in the spring and summer of 1948. He told the Senator, and he told me, and he told the other members of the committee, "Prices of meats are going up in the spring and summer of 1948." We did not need to have the President recommend anything. The Senator had that information. Now I understand the Senator is proposing another investigation. We do not need an investigation. We need to do something about inflation. It has been investigated too much, and we already have the information, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. What does the Senator propose to do? What would he propose to do now? What is his recommendation to this Congress?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would accept the President's recommendation.

Mr. BALDWIN. What is the President's recommendation? Is there a bill here with the President's recommendation? What is that specific recommendation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator undoubtedly has a bill. But I am going back to last year. We were told that meats would be scarce, we were told that meats would rise in price. Now Senators come forward and want to blame somebody. Let us forget the past. Let us meet the problem now before us. Let us know that the cost of living is continuing to spiral, and let us do something about it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I agree with my friend wholeheartedly. Let us do something about it. But why is not something done about it by an administration which has 2,000,000 Federal employees, and all the Federal bureaus at its disposal? Where are the recommendations this law provides for? That is what I am complaining about. Until we know the detailed recommendation, I am really at a loss to know how to proceed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will permit me, the majority party does not know how to proceed; it has no program. It cannot act without the President of the United States telling it what to do.

Mr. BALDWIN. Apparently the President could not act without the Congress, because he called us back into session.

Mr. HATCH. The Congress is the legislative branch.

Mr. BALDWIN. Where is the specific recommendation? Where are the specific recommendations? Are they coming from the President?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The recommendations were before the Banking and Currency Committee. They were before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. The majority said, "We do not want to do these things."

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator knows our Government is a government of compromise. We cannot get everything and agree on everything all the time. We have to take the best we can get.

I come back to the point that there is now on the books a specific law, which has been completely ignored by the present administration. There is a statement in the law that whenever the President finds there is a shortage he shall make a recommendation for certain action. There has been no recommendation. There was no proposal of a special session to deal with inflation until the President went to the Democratic National Convention. That is what I am complaining about. Why has not this law been observed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator desires to be accurate. The President did make his recommendation. He made a recommendation in his special message of November 17, 1947. There he spelled out the facts. He told us what the shortages were; he told us that prices were rising. We knew it, and the Senator from Connecticut knew it, and because he knew it he besought his majority colleagues to do something, to take some action. But his majority colleagues would not act. They would not accept the suggestion of the President, and they came forward with this voluntary allocation bill, which is merely a surrender to big business, to ration the public. Then the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Vermont, knowing very well that that was inadequate, offered an amendment, which was merely, as I said a moment ago, a polite postponement.

May I analyze the law for the Senator, the law, with his amendment, the one

he asked the President to carry out? This is what he asks:

Whenever the President shall determine that there is or threatens to be a critical shortage of any raw material—

He had already said so in November. He pointed out the shortage of housing at that time. He pointed out the rising price of meat. He pointed out that there was not enough to go around. So that was already done. But whenever he shall determine that—

he may prepare proposed measures for conserving such raw material—

He had prepared measures. They were here before the Congress. They were in the committee. The Senator from Kentucky, the minority leader, had introduced the administration legislation. There it was, to be considered, but it was thrown into the pigeonhole.

Mr. BALDWIN. Did it not call for rationing; for price control?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It called for standby power.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest that the Senator from Connecticut is privileged, under the rules, in the absence of unanimous consent, to yield for a question and for a question only. We have been exceedingly lenient, it seems to me, in the last hour. Senators who have interrupted the Senator from Connecticut have been carrying on a discussion quite outside the rules of the Senate. In the absence of unanimous consent I shall ask for a strict enforcement of the rules.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Connecticut had yielded the floor to me for this purpose.

Mr. BALDWIN. No; I had yielded to the Senator for a question; an observation. I am perfectly willing for him to make an observation, but I should appreciate it if the observation would pertain to the matter under discussion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I take it now that the acting majority leader and the Senator from Connecticut are resorting to a technicality to end this discussion. I shall not ask unanimous consent, though the Senator from Connecticut may, but when the Senator takes his seat, I shall take the floor and I shall proceed with the analysis of the very inadequate measure of the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to respond very briefly to the query raised by the Senator from Oregon. It is the understanding of the Chair that the rules of the Senate provide that a Senator having the floor can yield for a question and for no other purpose. If he yields for other than a question he will automatically lose the floor if any other Senator raises a point of order. The Chair therefore feels that the rules of the Senate, which govern the conduct of Senators on both sides of the aisle, should, on demand, by any Senator, be literally interpreted and enforced by the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may ask the Senator from Connecticut a question, Is it the desire of the Senator from Connecticut now to appeal to this rigid rule governing Senate debate in order to shut off this discussion? Is it becoming so annoying now to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Connecticut that they desire to have me take my seat? I shall be very happy to do so, and I shall take the floor a little later.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I have sat here many an hour listening to his mellifluous and melodious voice, and I enjoyed it very much, and I am willing to continue the discussion on any terms which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming may suggest. I may say to him, however, that both of us are subject to the rules of the Senate, so if any Senator raises the question, we must abide by the rules.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is nothing the Senator from Wyoming ever has said, and I am sure nothing he ever will say on the floor of the Senate, which has been or can be annoying to the junior Senator from Oregon. However, so long as I am acting in the capacity in which I now am, it is my duty to carry out my instructions as acting majority leader. Therefore I wish to advise the Senator from Connecticut that I shall have to ask for enforcement of the rules. I think he is making a valuable contribution to the RECORD this afternoon, but if he yields I must ask him to yield for a question and a question only. Then when the Senator from Connecticut finishes his remarks, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming may speak in his own time. I have no desire to use any parliamentary tactics to deny the Senator from Wyoming a full opportunity to present his point of view. It is perfectly obvious, however, that we are working under a limitation of time in this special session, and it is the duty of the acting majority leader to call for strict enforcement of the rules of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I understand the Senator from Oregon to be acting under instructions?

Mr. MORSE. I am acting as majority leader in carrying out the policies of the majority party at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What a terrible spot to be in!

Mr. MORSE. One of those policies is, Mr. President, to abide by the rules of the Senate, and I raise the point of order, and shall insist on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to point out that the Senator from Connecticut has the floor. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming if he will put his remarks in the form of a question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Presiding Officer now has the whip hand, and I shall wait until I get the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I merely want to summarize my remarks, which, I think, have already been extended long beyond the patience of most Members of the Senate. In conclusion I want to say that whether we all like the particular bill which was passed by the special session last fall or whether we do not like it, nevertheless it is the law of the land. It does provide a specific method of dealing with shortages, with rationing, with allocations, and with prices. It was adopted in response to a message from the President which asked for limited rationing and limited controls and standby legislation. It does provide a logical, specific method of dealing with the problem, and it is my claim that since its enactment and since its approval by the President on the 30th of December 1947, he has made no recommendation with respect to it, or made no effort, nor has any Government agency made any effort to carry out its particular provisions. I say, Mr. President, that had he done so we would have been equipped now or long since with adequate information and specific recommendations from the administration itself as to how to deal with the problem of the high price of meat.

Mr. President, I should like to call a matter to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who has left the floor. The question was raised that employees were not available in the Bureau of Labor Statistics to secure information for Presidential recommendation in pursuance of the law on the subject of meat. I find from the appropriation bill that in this current year, that is in the year 1948 and 1949, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has an appropriation of $4,073,000. I find, Mr. President, that in the previous fiscal year, for 1947 and 1948, it had an appropriation of $4,073,794. So, cutting the appropriation of the Bureau of Labor Statistics $794 has made it impossible, according to the claim of my distinguished friends, for the Bureau to gather the information which will make it possible for the President to make the recommendations under this law.

Mr. President, I submit the resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 269), submitted by Mr. BALDWIN, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the present high prices of meat.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than February 1, 1949.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ATTITUDE OF GOVERNOR DEWEY TOWARD THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. BUCK obtained the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I have in my hand a clipping from the New York Times reporting an Associated Press dispatch appearing on page 3 of that newspaper, entitled "Tell of Dewey Role. Governor's Secretary, Senators ROBERTSON and TAFT Quoted."

WASHINGTON, JULY 27.—Senator ROBERTSON, Republican, of Wyoming—

For whom, of course, we in this body have a deep regard—

told reporters today that Governor Dewey had advised congressional leaders to stay around a week or so and then go home. He asserted Senator TAFT had carried Mr. Dewey's message to the policy committee.

At Pawling, N. Y., Governor Dewey's press secretary, James C. Hagerty, said:

"The Governor feels that the Congress should stay in Washington and give careful consideration to whatever was proposed in the President's message."

That is version No. 2. But we are not through yet.

Asked about consultations between Governor Dewey and congressional leaders Senator TAFT said:

"There has been more or less consultation with Dewey but not in detail."

He added that Herbert Brownell, Jr., Mr. Dewey's campaign manager, had conferred with congressional leaders.

Governor Dewey made no recommendations at all but was consulted, Senator TAFT stated.

So in one story of four paragraphs we have three different versions of the attitude of the leader of the Republican Party on the reconvening of the Congress. In all fairness, without any bitterness, I think that the leader of the majority party in this Congress would certainly do well to let the American people in on the secret of just which one of these versions is true.

THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I have responded to the call of the President for this special session of the Congress. When we adjourned a few weeks ago I think we all hoped there would be no extraordinary occasion justifying such a call. There has been practically no change in our domestic affairs since we adjourned and the call was not made to meet any foreign situation. The President has evidently concluded that we did not finish our work before we adjourned. He also has evidently decided that it is not a wise thing for us to adjourn when the two Houses agree; that the Executive should make that decision and not the Congress itself.

There will be much argument among the people of the Nation as to whether we were called here with the hope and expectation of accomplishing something really worth while or whether we were called for a purpose which reflects no credit upon the Chief Executive.

I think one suggestion made by the President in his speech accepting a renomination, at which time he announced that an extraordinary occasion had arisen and he was calling a special session of the Congress, was wholly unfair to the Congress. He set forth what he wanted the Congress to do and then stated to the world that it could be done within a period of 15 days if the Congress wanted to do it. This statement was made by a man who had been the Chief Executive for several years and in addition to that had had several years experience in this body. To attempt to make the great body of the American people, inexperienced in Federal legislation, believe that he was stating a fact and that the failure of Congress to do what he said was a practical thing to do, was much more than unbecoming; it was intended to reflect upon the integrity and energy of the Congress and to belittle it in the minds of the people.

In order that the people may better understand the situation, I think it might be well to inquire of the distinguished minority leader, the President's running mate in the next election, whether he agrees that the President's recommendations for civil-rights legislation, for instance, could be passed by this body within 15 days from the day we convene, even if we gave that legislation preference from the very beginning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I call attention to the fact that the distinguished minority leader has now become the acting majority leader, inasmuch as he occupies the majority leader's seat. We welcome him to this side of the aisle.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I will say that I stepped across the aisle to talk to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUCK. I should like to continue.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. BUCK. No, Mr. President; I will not. I shall conclude in a few moments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor and refuses to yield at this time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, what I said was that in order that the people may better understand the situation, I think it might be well to inquire of the distinguished minority leader, the President's running mate in the next election, whether he agrees that the President's recommendations for civil-rights legislation, for instance, could be passed by this body within 15 days from the day Congress reconvened, even if we gave that legislation preference from the very beginning. If the minority leader's answer should be in the affirmative, then I should like an expression from some of his distinguished colleagues on that side of the Chamber, such as the Senators from Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and other Senators who are opposed to the President's civil-rights program. The history of efforts to legislate upon this subject demonstrates, it seems to me, that there could be no hope of getting this legislation through this body in such a short period, and this must have been known by the President at the time he made his statement.

There were other statements made in that speech that were misleading. He was addressing the delegates who had a short time before selected him as their standard bearer for the next election. The delegates in their platform had declared:

The Republican Eightieth Congress is directly responsible for the existing and ever-increasing high cost of living.

The President declared that the Eightieth Congress had demonstrated that special privilege controlled the Republican Party. He undertook then to demonstrate this to his enthusiastic audience and to the country by showing what they had done and what they had failed to do. One of the things that was supposed to prevent the high cost of living was price control, and to the cheering delegates the President declared:

Time and time again I recommended the extension of price control before it expired on June 30, 1946. That price-control legislation didn't come to my desk until June 30, 1946, on the day on which it was supposed to expire, and it was such a rotten bill that I couldn't sign it.

Thirty days after that they sent me one that was just as bad, and I had to sign it, because they quit and went home.

What the cheering delegates and millions of people did not realize at the moment in connection with this "rotten bill" was that the Congress which "quit and went home" was not the terrible Eightieth Republican Congress that was controlled by special privilege, but was the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress, the Congress of the people, the progressive Congress, the Congress which had the opportunity to do all the things the President in his message to Congress yesterday asked us to do in a period of 15 days. Maybe we ought not to feel so bad after all, about being charged by the President with being the worst Congress in the history of the Nation. But before leaving this subject suppose we take a look at the "rotten bill" which the Democratic Congress presented to the President. That bill had in it a provision denying the OPA the right to force anyone to sell a product at a loss. Perhaps that was what made it such a "rotten bill." The President must have been afraid that special privilege had gotten its foot in the door of the Democratic Congress.

Let us pursue the subject a little further and see how consistent the critic of this Congress has been upon this subject. The "bad bill" which the President was forced to sign because the Congress quit and went home restored the OPA to power but gave the President the right to end meat and other price controls at his pleasure. This Democratic Congress placed the matter of control squarely up to the President; and believe it or not, the President, by Executive order just before the election in 1946 took control off meat, and a little later took control off other important items. The so-called special privilege crowd must have gotten its foot into the

White House door as well as the door of the Democratic Congress.

There were some important things which the President and other Democrats left out of their speeches at the convention. They blamed the Republicans for the high cost of living. They gave credit to the Democrats for the recovery from the depression; but not a word was said by any of them about the increase in the Government debt and the increase in the annual budget. The truth is that the Government records show that the cost-of-living index stood at 97.6 at the end of 1932, and at the end of 14 years, when the Eightieth Congress came into control of legislation, that index stood at 153.3. Under the Democrats the cost of living had increased 57 percent. The Federal debt at the end of fiscal year 1932 was $18,200,000,000. By 1941 it had been increased to forty-seven billion eight hundred million, or more than two and one-half times in 9 years. Then came the war years, and by 1945 it stood at two hundred and forty-seven billion. The expenditures for 1932 amounted to a little less than five billion; by 1941 it had increased to nearly thirteen billion; and by 1946 it was a little more than sixty-five billion. These cobwebs which the Republicans have promised to clear away next year have certainly cost the people a great deal of money. The matter is too serious, however, to be treated lightly, too serious to be solved within a period of 15 days in midsummer. The President is in no position to do it. The country, as well as his party, has lost confidence in him as a leader and as an executive. He has succeeded in dividing the Democratic Party into three parts. One part is making a great effort to gild what it believes to be the Russian lily; another part has been forced into a corner where it desperately fights for the principle of States' rights; and the President, as the leader of the other part, calls this Congress, which he in desperation has called the worst Congress in our history, for the purpose of strengthening his own political position. He cannot escape responsibility for the bitterness existing among the political parties and factions, and this comes at a time when the whole world is in a turmoil, when a prayer for peace is on the lips and in the heart of every good American man and woman, and when unity should be the watchword. One thing is certain. The call of this Congress is not likely to be helpful in the progress we have made in eliminating racial and religious discrimination. If anything is done that will be helpful to the Nation it will be done under most difficult circumstances. If there be any extraordinary occasion existing in this country it is not one for this Congress. It is one for the people of the Nation in November, and I trust they will appreciate the opportunity that confronts them and give us a President who will make a new approach to the problems of the Nation.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL-TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil-transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if possible, I should like to dispose of the unfinished business today; but before doing so I think it would be well to ask for a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. BREWSTER. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest to the Senator from Maine that the acting majority leader has been advised that there will be a series of speeches on his proposed legislation. I understand from the Secretary of the Senate that certain Senators interested in this bill have been informed that no action would be taken this afternoon and several of them have left the precincts of the Senate. In view of the lateness of the hour, I suggest that the Senator from Maine make such statements in support of his bill as he cares to make this afternoon, and that the Senate then take a recess and proceed with the discussion of his bill at the opening of the session tomorrow.

Mr. BREWSTER. Am I to understand that I may anticipate an opportunity to discuss the bill tomorrow?

Mr. MORSE. I am advised that it will be the pending business when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, following a recess tonight. It is very doubtful if there is any hope of concluding debate on the Senator's proposal this evening. In view of the lateness of the hour, I suggest that we proceed with the debate until perhaps 5 o'clock, and then take a recess.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, inasmuch as earlier in the session I made a statement regarding the bill, it would be better if we could take a recess at this time and take up the bill tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Maine withdraws his request for a quorum call.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 270) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That during the present special session of the Congress, in the interests of efficiency and conservation of time, no Senator shall speak more than once, on any subject, and no more than 30 minutes thereon.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be suspended for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The resolution constitutes a change in the rule of the Senate which requires a formal notice, and a resolution making such a change would have to lie over. It seems to me it would be unfair to try to adopt such a resolution at this time of day.

Mr. TOBEY. I concur in the Senator's thought. But would not the Senator think it a "blessed event" if we could obtain such a procedure in the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have often expressed my belief that the Senate rules should be modified in behalf of the prompt passage of legislation, but I doubt whether this is the proper way to do it.

Mr. TOBEY. I refer to the special session, particularly.

I wish the Senator would tell me how we could properly do what I have proposed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not like to be required to do that now. I might take more than the 30 minutes as provided by the Senator's resolution.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall come back to the Senator about the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GEORGE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under objection, the resolution will lie over for a day.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there is no other business to come before the Senate at this time, I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday July 29, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou prayer-answering God, we are again invoking Thy blessing, beseeching Thee to make our minds and hearts the sanctuaries of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

Grant that daily we may strive to bring to fulfillment those spiritual ideals and aspirations which Thou hast implanted within our souls.

Enable us to release the hidden splendor of struggling humanity, emancipating it from everything that mars and degrades the image of God in which we have been created.

Fill us with a passion to lead men and nations out of the darkness of night into the radiant light of that new day which will be more blessed than our fondest hopes.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 28, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

DEATH OF JAMES E. WATSON, OF INDIANA

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, former Senator James E. Watson, of Indiana, passed away this morning. His death removes from the field of government and politics a figure that has been outstanding for half a century. From humble birth, James E. Watson rose to a position of influence in the affairs not only of his home State of Indiana and his Nation but of the world. For more than 40 years he was a power in the National House of Representatives and in the United States Senate. He was beloved by all his associates. He possessed a winning personality, a wealth of humor, and a keen mind, and he used these talents to the advantage of his own political party and in the interest of his country. His death leaves a void which will be hard to fill.

At this time, Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and myself, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 271), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and extreme regret the announcement of the death of Hon. James E. Watson, for 17 years a Senator from the State of Indiana.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased, together with a transcript of remarks made in the Senate in praise of his distinguished service to the Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement with regard to the resolution. I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a word by way of tribute to my long-time friend and our former colleague here, Senator Watson, of Indiana.

While, as everybody knows, we differed on many political questions that affected the country, I can say with pride that during my service in the Senate I have had no more devoted or esteemed friend than was Senator Watson.

I recall the first time I ever saw him before I came to the Congress in the first instance. Back in the days of the Chautauqua, when nearly every city or community of any size or importance had an annual series of entertainments and lectures, known as the Chautauqua program, Senator Watson, then a Member of the House of Representatives, came to my home city and delivered an address at what was then known as the Redpath Chautauqua. I have never heard a more eloquent or brilliant address than he delivered. I often referred to it, after I came to the Senate and became personally acquainted with him, as being one of the ablest and most inspiring addresses I had ever heard either on a Chautauqua or any other program. Senator Watson always, with the keen sense of humor and appreciation for which he was noted, thanked me for referring to the earlier address made by him before I ever became acquainted with him.

I cherished him as a personal friend. During his tenure here as leader of the Senate when the Democrats were in the minority, I was the object of many courtesies and many evidences of consideration on his part, and even after he left the Senate he took many occasions to renew and to fortify the friendship which had existed between us during our service here.

He was an able statesman. He was a partisan advocate, of course, for those principles in which he and his party believed. Sometimes the debates on those subjects became very intense, but never bitter, because Senator Watson had too fundamental a sense of humor and of the propriety of things to let his differences with his colleagues interfere with his good nature, his good humor, and his friendly attitude toward them.

I deeply mourn his loss, not only as an outstanding figure over a long period in the public life of the Nation but as a warm-hearted personal friend, and I express through these feeble remarks my profound sympathy for the members of his family. I want them to know that all the remainder of my life I shall cherish deeply the friendship which existed between Senator Watson and me.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to say a word to express the sense of sorrow I have at the news of the death of former Senator Watson. He was an old and close friend of my grandfather when they were Members of the Senate, and I had known Senator Watson since childhood days. I always thought him a wonderful man, because of his wholehearted interest in other people and in causes greater than himself, because of his patriotic love of country, because of his humor, and because of the fact that he never took himself too seriously.

Senator Watson was a fine example of an American public servant. He had friends in every corner of the United States who will be sorry to read the announcement of his death.

I wish to record my sense of grief at the news, and to extend my sympathy to those he left behind.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have learned with personal sorrow of the death of former Senator Watson. He was well and favorably known in the State of Missouri from which I come. My recollection of him brings back to my memory my own distinguished friend and law partner who served for some years as a Member of this body, the late Honorable Selden P. Spencer, of Missouri, who was a friend of Senator Watson.

Since my brief experience began here in Washington, it has been my privilege and pleasure to see Senator Watson on too infrequent occasions, because I always enjoyed being with him and valued highly his friendship.

He served as the majority leader of the Senate from 1929 to 1933. Notwithstanding his age he had an alertness and keenness of mind, and the humor to which reference has already been made today was always present with him.

I am sure, Mr. President, that in speaking today I voice the sentiments of many of my friends and neighbors in the State of Missouri when I express this word of sorrow and regret, and I join with the other Senators who have spoken in expressing to his family and to his other relatives my sympathy and sense of personal loss.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, hardly a thing in this historic Chamber seems the same today.

Back home in Indiana things must be different today, too, because Jim Watson is dead.

Jim was as much a part of this Chamber as are the desks on the floor.

He was as much a part of Indiana as are the willows on the banks of the Wabash.

James Eli Watson was born in Winchester, Ind., on November 2, 1864. It seemed appropriate to Senator Jim Watson's long political career that his eighty-fifth birthday would have fallen on the day when the Nation will next elect a President of the United States.

Senator Watson obtained his education in Winchester and at DePauw University in Greencastle, Ind.

He was admitted to the bar in Indiana in 1886 and practiced law in Winchester.

Jim Watson had been active in Indiana Republican politics from the time he was 17 years old.

It was just 56 years ago, though, that Jim first appeared on a ballot, and he lost that election. It was for Presidential elector on the ticket of Harrison and Reid.

He moved to Rushville, Ind., then and was elected on the Republican ticket to the Fifty-fourth Congress.

Senator Watson began his great public service in the House of Representatives on March 4, 1895.

Jim suffered another defeat 2 years later, but he came back to the Fifty-sixth Congress on March 4, 1899, and was reelected to the four succeeding Congresses.

He was not a candidate in 1908 for Congress, but he did run for Governor of Indiana, but was defeated by Thomas R. Marshall.

In 1916 Jim Watson became Senator Jim for the first time when he was elected to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Benjamin F. Shively.

He served continuously in this august body until March 3, 1933.

I could talk of Jim Watson's interesting life for hours, but most of my colleagues know the story of Uncle Jim.

He was kindly in all his undertakings.

He was keen of mind.

He was a great orator.

He was a leader.

He was a fine public servant who gave to his country the benefit of those great and many qualities which God had bestowed upon this gentleman from Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] for himself and his colleague [Mr. CAPEHART].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ALLOCATION OF PIG IRON FOR CERTAIN INDUSTRIES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of pig iron for certain industries requiring cast iron for the manufacture of products for residential housing, and copies of the requests for compliance therewith issued by the Secretary of Commerce to various pig-iron producers and manufacturers of pig-iron products (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

A letter from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONVEGNO INTERNAZIONALE PARLAMENTARI, GENOVA, ITALY

A letter from A. Tarchiani, Ambassador of Italy, conveying an invitation of the Chamber of Commerce of Genova, Italy, to the Congress of the United States to be represented in the Convegno Internazionale Parlamentari in Genova, Italy, September 14 through 17, 1948 (with an accompanying pamphlet); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Vincent O. Waldeck, National Chief Two-Timer, The Two-Timer Veterans Association, of San Diego, Calif., praying for the enactment of the so-called Mundt-Nixon un-American activities bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the executive committee of the Trades Union Council of the Liberal Party of New York, N. Y., endorsing the recommendations of the President to the special session of the Eightieth Congress; ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. BARKLEY introduced Senate bill 2910, to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 2911. A bill to revive and reenact as amended the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHERRY (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FEAZEL, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2912. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2913. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BARKLEY also introduced Senate bill 2914, to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act by liberalizing benefits, by increasing amounts beneficiaries may earn without loss of benefits, and by lowering the age of eligibility of women beneficiaries, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

CONTROL OF INFLATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce a bill carrying out the President's recommendations with regard to inflation. I understand that the Committee on Banking and Currency had a meeting this morning with a view to holding some hearings on the subject, and I want to introduce this bill and have it referred to that committee for their consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received, and referred as requested.

The bill (S. 2910) to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BARKLEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a summary of the provisions of the anti-inflation bill introduced by me.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF ANTI-INFLATION ACT OF 1948

DECLARATION OF POLICY

The declaration of policy recognizes that existing inflationary conditions and maldistribution of scarce materials threaten to (1) impair the standard of living in the United States, (2) disrupt interstate and foreign commerce, (3) produce future deflation and unemployment, (4) undermine national security, and (5) obstruct the foreign policy of the United States.

It therefore provides that the Federal Government should pursue a comprehensive and coordinated anti-inflation program.

TITLE I. REGULATION OF CONSUMER CREDIT

When credit is created to finance the purchases of consumers, it means additional funds are added to the spending stream. Without an equivalent increase in the output of goods—an impossibility under present full-employment conditions—swelling the spending stream means additional upward pressure on prices. Consumers do not get more goods, but have to pay more for the goods they do get.

Title I calls for revival of regulation W, by which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System exercised control over consumer credit until August of 1947.

The approach involved in this regulation is to restrict the flow of consumer credit by limiting the capacity of consumers to borrow, rather than by curtailing the supply of credit available.

The basic requirements used are: (1) Minimum down payments that consumers have to make in purchasing any of the listed items (automobiles, cooking stoves, ranges, etc.); (2) maximum lengths of time over which installment payments can run. The higher the minimum down payment under (1), the larger the proportion of the purchase price the consumer must provide out of his own resources and the smaller the amount of credit creation inolved in the purchase. The shorter the maximum period under (2), the more rapid will the credit that is injected into the spending stream on behalf of the consumer be withdrawn again as the debt is paid off.

Both requirements mean less credit creation, less inflationary pressure than otherwise. They may work hardship on some consumers, but as part of an over-all attack on inflation, they will contribute to the welfare of consumers.

TITLE II. BANK RESERVES

The volume of credit banks can extend is limited by the fact that banks are required by law to hold a certain proportion of their deposits in the form of a reserve; only the remaining amount of their funds is available for lending and investing. For banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System—which includes those that do the bulk of the banking business in the United States—the proportion of deposits that is required to be covered by reserves is determined by the Federal Reserve Board.

By increasing this proportion the Board can exercise a restraining influence on the volume of credit extended to borrowers by member banks. To meet increases in reserve requirements, banks may be forced to forego using funds for loans they may otherwise make or sell some of their earning assets in order to procure additional reserve funds. Furthermore, a rise in reserve requirements means that a smaller portion of any new funds that are deposited with the member banks—as a result, say, of gold inflow from abroad—will be available for banks to use for loan expansion.

At present the Board has nearly exhausted the possibilities of restraining credit through changing reserve requirements. The reserve requirements for all banks under the Board's jurisdiction, except those in New York and Chicago, have been raised to their legal maximum, while only a 2-percent increase remains for the New York and Chicago banks.

This title would raise the legal maximum to which the Board could increase reserve requirements should conditions warrant it during the next 2 years. The new maximum

would permit the Board to raise the ratio of required reserves to demand deposits by another 10 percentage points, and the ratio of required reserves to time deposits by another 4 percentage points. These percentage-point increases would apply to all member banks.

TITLE III. PRICES AND WAGES

Although fiscal and credit controls will contribute to a reduction in the general inflationary pressure, they will not, unless undesirably severe, eliminate the specific inflationary pressures affecting specific prices. To control those strategic areas where inflationary pressures are exceptionally strong, specific price and wage controls are necessary.

Prices

With respect to prices, the bill provides that maximum prices may be established for specific commodities when certain conditions are fulfilled.

Criteria for Price Control

A maximum price may be established whenever (a) the commodity is important in the cost of living or of production; (b) the price has risen or threatens to rise at least 20 percent above the June 1946 level or nearest representative period; (c) regulation of the price is practicable and enforceable; and (d) the public interest will be secured by such regulation.

Standards for Maximum Prices

(a) Maximum prices to be issued must be generally fair and equitable and will aid in controlling inflation.

(b) So far as practicable, maximum prices, when imposed, would be set at the level of prices prevailing in November 1947, or nearest appropriate period, with consideration given to (i) speculative fluctuations; (ii) changes in costs; (iii) changes in profits and other relevant factors.

(c) Industry consultation before issuing a price order is required except where immediately impracticable, when a temporary 90-day price order may be issued freezing the prices prevailing within 5 days prior to the issuance of such temporary freeze. The temporary freeze is then to be replaced by one based upon consultation.

(d) Orders may be issued providing that sellers of a commodity may not raise prices except after due notice not to exceed 30 days as may be specified. Public hearings may be held. Maximum prices may be issued at any time at levels lower than the increased prices.

(e) Maximum price orders are to be reviewed either on the initiative of the Government or at the request of industry advisory committees to be set up. Such reviews are to consider changes in costs and profits since June 30, 1946.

(f) Individual adjustment for hardship cases is provided to correct gross inequities where it will not impair compliance with the regulation.

(g) Agricultural prices: Maximum prices for agricultural commodities must be high enough to reflect the parity price or a comparable price established by the Secretary of Agriculture. In addition, a disaster clause exists for fresh fruits and vegetables.

Duration of Price Authority

The authority under this table is to terminate on June 30, 1950, or sooner by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress except that liability to prosecution for offenses will continue.

Judicial Review of Maximum Price Regulation

Virtually the same as under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

Penalties for Willful Violation

A fine of not more than $10,000 and/or a prison term of not more than year.

Administration

The administration is vested in the departments specifically designated by the President.

Wages

This section establishes wage controls over employees only when a maximum price has been established affecting the employer and when the employer expects to use the wage (or benefit) adjustment as a basis for seeking price relief. In other words, under this section a covered employer may by voluntary action raise wages without regard to the act, except that he cannot for a period of 6 months use a nonapproved increase as a basis for requesting an adjustment in his price ceiling.

A temporary Wage Board is created, composed of two public representatives, two employee representatives, and two employer representatives. Requests for action by the Wage Board may be made to the Board at any time. In acting upon the request for approval the Board shall determine whether the wage increase or any portion of it is necessary: (1) To compensate for increases in the cost of living or prevent lowering of living standards, or (2) to correct inequities in the wage structure, or (3) to correct substandards of living, or (4) to maintain essential production at levels certified by the department.

TITLE IV. PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

This title reenacts and amends section 2 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended, so as to give the President the powers listed below, to be used when and as needed to fulfill defense requirements, carry out United States foreign policy, or curb inflation. These powers expire June 30, 1950, unless previously terminated by the President or by concurrent resolution.

Priority powers over any material or facility.

Allocation and priority powers over any material or facility basically affecting production or the cost of living, after formal notice, public hearing, and such investigation as the President deems appropriate. The notice and hearing may be waived if the President finds that they would promote hoarding, speculation, or excessive consumption and thus defeat the purposes of allocation.

Inventory control powers, at the President's discretion, over any scarce material basically affecting production or the cost of living.

Existing export controls provided by section 6 (d) of the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, are extended to June 30, 1950.

TITLE V. RENT CONTROL

This title authorizes the Housing Expediter to establish maximum rents or reestablish regulation of rents wherever he thinks this is desirable. The basis for the rents to be established will be the same as the basis previously used except that he is given broad discretion to make adjustments "for such relevant factors as he may determine," including changes in property taxes and other costs.

The title authorizes the Housing Expediter to recontrol units occupied by permanent tenants in hotels, but does not give him authority over quarters in motor courts and similar facilities.

The title also authorizes the Expediter to recontrol units that previously had been decontrolled for any reason and also to bring under control units not previously controlled, such as new units provided by new construction or conversion. For units now brought under control or recontrolled the maximum rent with latitude for discretion, will be the last maximum controlled rent or the prevailing rents for similar controlled accommodations plus allowance for increases in the construction costs since 1939 in the case of new houses.

The title also authorizes suit for treble damages for overcharges and gives the Expediter authority to bring suit in the name of the United States Government. This authority is now vested solely in the tenant. The Expediter also is given authority to refer to the Department of Justice willful violations or evasive practices for appropriate criminal prosecutions.

TITLE VI. REGULATION OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES

Speculation on commodity exchanges has been an important factor in exaggerating inflationary pressures on the prices of essential agricultural commodities, and in causing unwarranted and harmful fluctuations in these prices. Under existing authorities, the Government has been powerless to curb such abuses. Title VI is designed to remedy this defect by giving the Secretary of Agriculture specific authority to regulate margins of trading on the commodity exchanges.

The practice of trading on margin has contributed in important degree to the speculative excesses in commodity trading. Following the extreme fluctuations in prices on the exchange during the past year the President and other officials repeatedly called to the attention of the exchanges the need to raise margin requirements. Only in response to strong pressure of public opinion did the exchanges belatedly and partially accede to the Government's request. Such action as they took was couched in terms that expressed their open resentment at being called upon to take the public interest into account in the regulation of their affairs.

To prevent the recurrence of such situations it is essential that the Government have power for direct preventive action. The authority over margins granted to the Secretary of Agriculture under title VI is limited by the requirement of an official determination that speculative trading is causing or threatens to cause unwarranted price fluctuations. Thus legitimate hedging activities on the exchanges are protected.

Title VI takes the form of an amendment to the present Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (42 Stat. 998; 49 Stat. 1491; 52 Stat. 205; 54 Stat. 1059). It would be administered through the agency already established for carrying out that act, and would use the existing powers and machinery of enforcement.

TITLE VII. MISCELLANEOUS

This title includes three important sections on the coordination of the anti-inflation program.

Section 701 provides that the President may issue any orders and regulations to agencies in the executive branch that he regards as necessary in order to have them exercise their powers in a manner to assist in accomplishing the objectives of the act. It also provides for quarterly Presidential reports to Congress on the progress that has been made in controlling inflation and on further legislative proposals concerning the control of inflation.

Section 702 creates an Anti-Inflation Coordinator in the Executive Office of the President who is to assist the President in the coordination of the anti-inflation activities of the various executive agencies. The Coordinator is to be subject to confirmation by the Senate.

Section 703 establishes an Anti-Inflation Advisory Board to advise the Anti-Inflation Coordinator with respect to the anti-inflation program. It is to include members who have had experience in business management, in agriculture, in matters relating to labor and in consumer problems. It is to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate.

In addition, title VII includes minor sections on separability, the authorization of appropriations, and the inapplicability of the Administrative Procedure Act.

THE SPECIAL SESSION AND PRICES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Special Session and Prices, broadcast by him July 28, 1948, over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. and the Mutual Broadcasting System, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS AT THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator LUCAS at the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia, Pa., on July 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS AT THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Both Ends Against the Middle," delivered by him at the opening session of the Democratic National Convention, Philadelphia Convention Hall, July 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LEGISLATIVE SITUATION AND HIGH PRICES—BROADCAST BY SENATOR WILEY AND GEORGE E. REEDY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast regarding the legislative situation and the problem of high prices by himself and George E. Reedy, of the Arrowhead Network, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO—SECONDING SPEECH BY ROBERT S BEE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech prepared by Robert S. Bee, to be presented in seconding the nomination of Senator JOHNSON for election to the Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH OF CHARLES J. BLOCH AT THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION NOMINATING SENATOR RUSSELL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Charles J. Bloch, of Macon, Ga., vice chairman of the Georgia delegation to the Democratic National Convention at Philadelphia, Pa., nominating Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, as Democratic candidate for President of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

A CALL OF STATESMANSHIP IN THE POLITICAL WELTER—EDITORIAL FROM THE ATLANTA JOURNAL

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Call of Statesmanship in the Political Welter," published in the Atlanta Journal of July 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on civil rights, by George E. Sokolsky, published in the Washington Times-Herald of July 22, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY RALPH McGILL

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on civil rights, written by Mr. Ralph McGill, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD various editorials relative to the poll tax, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPAGANDA FEEDS ON FEUDS—ARTICLE BY DREW PEARSON

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Propaganda Feeds on Feuds in United States," by Drew Pearson, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is my intention to move in a few moments to take up the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

I might state briefly before I make that motion that H. R. 29 passed the House on July 21, 1947, by a vote of 290 in favor to 112 against. The bill came over to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and on April 30, 1948, the bill was reported to the Senate, and it is now on the calendar and ready for consideration.

I may state briefly that because we are pledged to support the bill, not only individually but as a party, I felt the legislation should have been considered in the regular session. Every Senator knows that the problems relating to foreign relations and domestic issued which were brought up then needed the immediate consideration of the Senate. For that reason it was impossible to bring up the poll-tax bill except in possibly the last few hours of the session, and we know what the fate of the measure at that time would probably have been.

Mr. President, regardless of the why or the how or wherefore of Congress coming back into special session, let me say that the President of the United States in Philadelphia and again in his message delivered at the joint session of the two Houses on Tuesday of this week stressed the need for consideration of this particular bill at this special session of the Congress which he has called.

The reason why we are proposing to take up the bill now primarily is this: In the first category of matters the President submitted to the joint meeting of the two Houses he included legislation dealing with inflation, and housing legislation. The Members of the Senate know that we passed a housing bill before we adjourned. The Members of the Senate know that if there is to be anything done with respect to inflation, legislation dealing with that subject must be processed through the committees and then brought to the floor of the two Houses for debate if it comes out of committees. We have already passed legislation to provide Federal aid to education. In the 11-point program presented by the President no measure which he suggested is ready for debate except this particular bill, H. R. 29.

So in view of the fact that this is one of the President's proposals, and one of the prime reasons why he has called the Congress into special session, I see no reason why action should not be taken on the bill; in fact, I believe we are foreclosed in that respect, whether we would like to bring it up or not, whether the attempt to bring it up is going to result in endless debate or is not going to result in endless debate. Any bill brought forward on the floor of the Senate usually involves considerable debate. I have seen bills having no relation whatever to the poll tax which have caused debate of great length on the floor of the Senate. So we cannot refuse to bring up the poll-tax bill for that reason.

Therefore, I think the only logical thing to do, in view of the fact that the President insists on debate being had on this issue and on the passage of the legislation, if possible, is to bring it before the Senate at this time. It should be brought up for the further reason that of all the matters suggested in his 11-point program it is the only bill available and ready for consideration.

So, Mr. President, in that spirit, and most hopefully, I now make the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 29.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Barkley	Holland	Reed
Brewster	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Cooper	Lodge	Taft
Cordon	Lucas	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Tobey
Ecton	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Umstead
Feazel	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Maybank	Wherry
George	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	Young
Hawkes	Myers	
Hayden	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina, if I may have unanimous consent that I shall not be taken from the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from California yielding to the Senator from South Carolina under the circumstances indicated? The Chair hears no objection.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say for the benefit of Senators who are not members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, in keeping with what the distinguished acting majority leader had to say about the anti-inflation program, that we considered the proposed bill this morning. For the benefit of Senators who are present, let me say that last winter the first portion of the bill, title I, was approved by our committee by a vote of 9 to 4 and passed by the Senate.

Title II of the great anti-inflation measure recommended by the President would apply to Federal Reserve banks. In view of the fact that there are approximately 7,000 Federal Reserve banks, and approximately 7,000 State banks, as the testimony showed, the question of States' rights was brought into the banking issue. It is the opinion of Mr. McCabe, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, that this provision of the bill could be made effective only by voluntary cooperation on the part of State banks, unless extended hearings were held and we went into the question fully.

I merely wished to keep the RECORD straight as to the problem of control of inflation, for which purpose Congress has been called back.

I thank the Senator from California.

PROPOSED CONTRACT WITH PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, my remarks will not require more than 5 minutes. I should like to be able to complete them. They involve a subject which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate, because of the public policy involved.

When I was in the State of California recently I heard a report which seemed to me to involve a violation of good public policy. If the proposed action is followed in other instances I believe that both the Congress and the country should be concerned.

On July 26, when I returned to Washington, I wrote a letter to Vice Adm. William W. Smith, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, regarding the subject. I wish to read my letter to Admiral Smith and his reply to me. My letter to Admiral Smith is as follows:

JULY 26, 1948.

Vice Adm. WILLIAM W. SMITH,
Maritime Commission,
Commerce Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMIRAL: I have been informed, from what I believe to be a reliable source, that a proposal has been made, either orally or in writing, that the American President Lines board of directors give to Mr. George Killion, the present president, a 5-year contract at his present salary of $25,000 a year in order that no possible change in the national administration could affect his status.

I would like to inquire of you as to whether or not you know of any such proposal having been made, and whether the United States Maritime Commission has been requested to approve any such contract. It seems to me that a question of public policy is involved in any such proposal which would be subject to severe criticism by both the Congress and the public generally.

Awaiting your early reply, and with best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senator.

Let me say parenthetically that Mr. Killion is a former treasurer of the National Democratic Party. I make no comments at this time as to the job he has done as president of the American President Lines, because I do not believe that is the immediate issue involved. The question is whether, by means of such contracts, whether they be for 3 years, 5 years, or 10 years, certain administration favorites can be protected in their jobs regardless of a change in the national administration.

Under date of July 27 I received a letter from Admiral Smith which I wish to read into the RECORD:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, July 27, 1948.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Replying to your letter of July 26, 1948, relative to the American President Lines and the request of the board of directors that Mr. George Killion, now president, be given a 5-year contract at a salary of $25,000 per year, I assure you that no communication from the board of directors has as yet reached the Commission.

On his last visit in Washington some 2 weeks ago Mr. Killion stated that the board of directors wished to forward a contract for the approval of the Maritime Commission, this contract to bind him as president for a period of 3 years. He stated that his board of directors would not forward such contract unless assured that it would be favorably received by the Maritime Commission. I replied to Mr. Killion that in my opinion he has demonstrated his ability as an efficient president of the company and that I had no objection to the forwarding of the contract by the board of directors. I assured him also that these were my personal observations and opinions and that they did not reflect the attitude of the Commission when the matter comes up for consideration.

Copies of your letter have been distributed to members of the Commission and it is my intention of discussing the matter with them this afternoon. If the proposed contract is received, I shall take it up with the Commission and keep you informed of any action taken by us.

Very sincerely yours,

W. W. SMITH, *Chairman.*

Now, I wish to say, Mr. President, that this is wholly an unsatisfactory answer, so far as I am concerned. The tenor of the letter, as I understand it, may not have been what was intended; the writer of the letter may not have meant to have the letter carry the idea it seems to me to convey, namely, that there is a possibility that the Commission might approve such a contract and might notify the Senate or the individual Senator concerned, who brought it to their attention, after the contract had been approved.

As I pointed out earlier, if such a thing can happen in this one case, then I do not see why the same policy could not be followed in numerous other cases; and then, instead of having a 3-year or a 5-year contract, they might give a 10-year or a 20-year contract; and certainly that would be circumventing the best interests of the country and the possible changes that a new administration would have every right to expect it might deem necessary to be made in the interest of the efficiency of the Federal Government.

I merely wish to serve notice on the Senate that I have called this matter to the attention of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and I have requested that he look into it. If this is to be a precedent for other Government corporations, I think the entire field should be surveyed.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course, I am intensely interested in the presentation which has been made by the distinguished Senator from California. The matter of jurisdiction just flashed through my mind, in view of the reference to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. In the absence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] I am acting chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Therefore, in order to make assurance doubly sure and to see that there is no leak in the dike, I propose to telephone Vice Admiral Smith and see that nothing of that sort is done until we have an opportunity to look into the matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Certainly.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say that I have no pride of jurisdiction. I do not wish to trespass on the rights of my friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that I am familiar with the matter, since it has been called to my attention by the Senator from California. There is no conflict of jurisdiction in this matter. It can very properly come before either or both the committees which have been referred to.

But I should like to add that, if there is to be a general practice of blanketing in favorites for a long period in the future, it does not seem to me that such a practice should be recognized by any incoming Congress as orthodox or legal or binding. Otherwise the will of the people could be completely thwarted by an expiring administration by blanketing in their key employees for a period of years, which in this case would extend over 4 years. As a matter of fact, if they could be blanketed in and given a contract for 4 years, I see no reason why such persons could not be given a contract for 10 years, or 20 years, or even for life.

If this is to be the practice—I am not saying that it is—I do not see why any new Congress or any new administration should consider such a contract as binding upon it.

WAGES AT THE BOSTON NAVAL SHIPYARD

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have recently received a letter from Mr. Edward F. Hines, secretary of the Charlestown Metal Trades Council, which presents in a very graphic and convincing manner what has been happening to the wages being paid the workers at the Boston Naval Shipyard. In this letter are parallel columns showing in one column the wages paid by the State of Massachusetts and in another column the wages paid by the Boston Naval Shipyard for comparable work. It is a sad story.

This is a matter involving the very livelihood of human beings and, in my opinion, it calls for the promptest possible remedial action. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTOWN METAL TRADES COUNCIL,
Hyde Park, Mass., July 26, 1948.

Hon. HENRY C. LODGE, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LODGE: The time has come when, of necessity, we must ask: What are you going to do about the chaotic condition which confronts the craftsmen and production workers of the Boston Naval Shipyard? Is the magnificent fleet of our United States Navy, which was built by our craftsmen in our naval establishments, to be a hollow, meaningless defender of the American way of life? As you are well aware, the cost of living has risen to such proportions that the words "American way of life" begin to take on a new, unfamiliar, unpleasant, and unhealthy aspect. Below is a table of wages which we wish you to examine:

List of wages paid by State of Massachusetts on public-works projects

	Per hour
Bricklayers	$2.50
Cement finisher	2.50
Plasterer	2.50
Carpenter	2.10
Electrician	2.30
Painter	2.00
Sheet-metal worker	2.15
Plumber	2.30
Steamfitter	2.00
Iron worker and rigger	2.15
Boilermaker	2.25
Common laborer	1.55

List of wages paid by Boston Naval Shipyard for comparable work

	Per hour
Bricklayer	$1.45
Cement finisher	1.39
Plasterer	1.45
Carpenter	1.42
Electrician	1.48
Painter	1.42
Sheet-metal worker	1.45
Plumber and steamfitter	1.42
Shipfitter	1.42
Iron worker and rigger	1.39
Boilermaker	1.42
Common laborer	1.06

It should be noted that an unskilled laborer working for the State of Massachusetts receives more than a skilled craftsman working in the Boston Naval Shipyard.

In addition to this, investigation will reveal that the navy yards at Norfolk, Va.; Washington, D. C.; and Charleston, S. C., have all been granted an additional increase in wages since the last inadequate increase of October 1947. This was accomplished by bringing the injustices and methods employed by the Navy Department to the attention of their elected representatives in both Houses of Congress. The Anderson law of 1862, which had worked fairly satisfactorily for a number of years, suddenly, under the present naval administration took on a new and detrimental meaning for civilian employees.

If this injustice can be corrected for other naval shipyards in the country, what is the matter with Massachusetts? With one of the oldest naval shipyards, namely, the Boston Naval Shipyard?

Why should a craftsman, producing identical work for our Navy in Boston, be paid $1.45 per hour as compared with $1.63 per hour on the west coast, all for the same work? In one craft for example, there are seven different rates of pay in the 12 naval establishments of the east and west coasts for the same work ranging from $1.38 per hour to $1.63 per hour.

Figures of the Department of Labor and Industries, Division of the Necessaries of Life, State of Massachusetts, indicate that the cost of living has increased 63.5 percent from January 1941, with an average figure of 37 percent increase in wages in the Boston Naval Shipyard in an 8-year period from 1940 to 1948. It can easily be seen that our employees, working for our Government, cannot maintain their families in the American way of which some of our statisticians boast, with such divergencies as exists between the wages paid and the cost of living. In addition, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics recently disclosed that it took from $3,004 to $3,458 for an average family of four to live modestly without any frills, whatsoever. The wages paid for a skilled man at the Boston Naval Shipyard would net him $3,190.80 for a year.

This puts our skilled men and their families in a pretty poor financial bracket. In order for our men to keep up with the above figures of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, they would have to receive a top rate of at least $1.60 per hour. To add to the plight of our already harassed fellow workers and their families is the additional reduction from their wages of 1 percent for retirement, which accounts for approximately 61 cents less take-home pay. In addition, the inadequate increase that we received in October 1947 places a number of our men in a new income tax bracket, which brought them a decrease in wages rather than an increase. All of these, together, constitutes a reduction in current buying power which in turn reduces the food on a table already depleted.

Again, we say that we do not wish to add fuel to the inflationary spiral; but, what family can survive when the cost of supporting that family exceeds the income about 2 to 1? The Congress has recognized this fact for a portion of its workers and investigation will prove that the surveys conducted for wage board employees would provide a living wage if based on fact and not conducted in secrecy, as it was.

We must, of necessity, inform you that there is tremendous pressure from all of the men in this shipyard to inform you of this chaotic condition. Therefore, we ask you, our elected representative, to join together with the other Members of Congress from Massachusetts to correct this iniquitous condition by granting an immediate 25 cents an hour increase for instant relief and press for an immediate resurvey for the Boston Naval Shipyard.

Respectfully yours,
EDWARD F. HINES,
Secretary.

THE MONTANA PLAN FOR VETERANS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to refer to a letter from Mr. Tom Davis, of Montana, who has received international recognition for his long and distinguished record of public service. Tom Davis has served our veterans and the businessmen of the Nation well and faithfully; and it is with great pride that the people of the United States, as well as those of Montana, give him credit. His letter concerns the Montana plan, which is devised to build business careers for veterans and to benefit all the people of his State of Montana by helping to develop the economy of the individual person in the individual community. The Montana plan interests us in this Eightieth Congress because the plan will be helpful to the interest of the citizens of all 48 States who wish to raise the standard of living of their people.

Mr. President, the Montana plan, which I have helped the veterans' organizations and Tom Davis, of Montana, to devise, is expected to increase the prosperity and security of every individual in the community of that State. Veterans, small-business men, and other members of the communities can increase their incomes and can benefit from the hundreds of thousands of economic opportunities that are waiting to be developed in Montana through private initiative and private enterprise.

To enable our veterans and small-business men to prosper and to attain new leadership for the benefit of all our people, we have sponsored in the United States Congress the bipartisan bill, Senate bill 1652, the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act, popularly called the Little Man's RFC Act. This act, which will implement the Montana plan and other State plans, is designed to enable the small-business men and the veterans in each community to develop gainful careers and businesses under our free-enterprise system—the system that has made us the greatest Nation in all human history.

I ask unanimous consent to have Tom Davis' letter and the Montana plan inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and plan were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUTTE, MONT.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In your plan to develop our great West under such legislation as the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act, I consider it a privilege and an honor to be invited to join you and Senator BRIDGES, chairman of the important Senate Appropriations Committee; Senator BUCK, of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency; Senator CAPEHART, of the Senate Committee on Small Business; Senator DWORSHAK, of Idaho; Senator KNOWLAND, of California; Senator ROBERTSON of Wyoming; Senator CAIN, of Washington; Senator MORSE, of Oregon, the chairman of the Veterans' Subcommittee of the Senate Committee of Labor and Welfare; Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan; House Chairman WOLCOTT, of the Banking and Currency Committee; EDITH ROGERS, the chairman of the House Veterans' Committee; and the other 30 distinguished sponsors of this important legislation.

You have dramatically called attention to the unlimited opportunities for this program in the development of the economic resources of the West. You correctly state that millions of acres of dry land can be brought into production by irrigation. You point out that the development of the vast mineral resources and of hydroelectric power, and the bringing in of new industries,

all under the American system of free enterprise and equality of opportunity, will bring prosperity to the 11 Western States. These States now have a population of 16,000,000.

Not only will the suggested program raise the level of prosperity of those 16,000,000, it will create support for 60,000,000 people at the same high level of prosperity when all of the resources are adequately developed. I favor the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act for all of the Western States; in fact, for the United States. But especially, I propose to make it effective in the State of Montana.

The economic prospects listed above represent some of the hopes I have for the development of Montana through the veterans' RFC. For that reason I am anxious to join in support of this legislation and to give it my wholehearted approval.

Yours very sincerely,

TOM J. DAVIS.

THE MONTANA PLAN TO BOOST STATE INDUSTRY

Montana is a young State, because it was admitted into the Union in 1889, and in its youth it possesses vitality, strength, and ambition. The eyes of the entire country are upon the progressive action we have initiated in our Montana plan. However, Montana's youth is not to be compared with its size. It is the third largest State in the Nation—it is larger than New England, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland combined. Known as the Treasure State, it is a blend of industrial scenes, mining ventures, and wind-swept prairies. There are untold opportunities in Montana, and under the Montana plan I am confident that we now can go forth to greater glory and for the enrichment of our people.

The people in the communities of the United States today have the greatest opportunity to prosper of all time. But simultaneously, they are being challenged by world communism—the most powerful force ever to be utilized by dictators to thwart individual liberty, initiative, and prosperity. The surest way for us to maintain our national strength and to ward off the advance of Communist imperialism and war is to increase the prosperity and economic security of all the people in our communities. It is the best—the only way—to make democracy, based on free enterprise, work.

NEW OPPORTUNITIES IN MONTANA

Agriculture

Livestock

The livestock industry of Montana represents one of the major industries of the State, supporting approximately one-half of the population and utilizing three-fourths of the land.

Further development of Montana's range country would result in a larger and better livestock industry. This will call for the development of a readily available water supply over the entire range country, for intelligent control of range pastures, and for units of land large enough for stock owners to support a herd of sufficient size to afford a satisfactory income. A cooperative cattle-breeding project would help improve herds. Montana could also excel in the production of horses, hogs, and sheep.

In the mountain and foothill farms, the raising of sheep and beef cattle may be combined with the growing of grain on the dry lands. Corn, grain, hay, sweet clover, and alfalfa, and other roughage may be profitably cultivated.

Wheat

Montana is recognized as producing the highest grade of hard spring wheat in the United States. There is a shortage of this type of wheat, and there is definite capacity for the accelerated production of this crop.

Potatoes

The quality of potatoes grown in Montana is exceptionally high, and the yield is satisfactory. On lands serviced by irrigation, soils are suitable for an increased production of potatoes.

Alfalfa and Clover Seed

Demand for alfalfa and clover seed is strong and will increase relative to the expansion of dairy herds. The opportunity exists to enlarge this industry in order to compete with the importation of seed peas from foreign sources.

Fruit

There is room for some further development of cherry orchards, depending mainly upon the water supply.

The production of fruits of high quality can be augmented. The growing of strawberries, cherries, apples, and grapes appears to be well adapted to the climatic conditions of some sections of the State. Expansion in this direction would make possible the construction of small plants for the canning or quick freezing of these fruits.

Agriculture, General Comments

In some counties of Montana farm incomes are comparatively low, due in part to the large number of part-time farmers. In other words, about one-half of the farmers devote about one-half of their available working hours to other occupations. The oportunity for a better livelihood and for increased incomes will present itself if a number of processing, manufacturing, and service activities related to farming can be developed. The following are a few examples: The establishment of sugar-beet refineries is a handsome prospect; the commercial cultivation of potatoes will most likely necessitate the establishment of a washing plant and additional warehouses; an increase in various species of seed production would mean the organization of several small seed-cleaning plants; in conjunction with the industry, there is the possibility of locating butter and cheese factories, a dried-milk plant or even a condensary; canneries and quick-freeze plants will come into existence if and when vegetables are produced in volume; and finally, but not conclusively, other possibilities include the building of warehouses and dehydrating plants to handle vegetables and eggs, a starch and glucose plant to exploit cull potatoes and low-grade wheat, and local stockyards or commission yards if there is a heavy livestock program and an adequate irrigation plan. Several small meat-packing plants could be supported under such a livestock program.

Dairying

The western part of Montana is well suited to dairying. Cheap feed of high quality, good pastures under irrigation, and favorable summer climatic conditions afford vast opportunities for the expansion of the dairy industry and the improvement of herds. Butter and cheese of a superior sort could be profitably manufactured.

An expansion of the dairy industry should stimulate the creation of the necessary processing industries—powdered milk, condensed milk, dried eggs, frozen foods, and other items, as well as cold-storage equipment.

Forestry

Forestry is one of the major industries of Montana. Careful forest management not only means an increase in the production of wood, but also conserves moisture for irrigation and other hydraulic purposes, helps to preserve farm soils, provides a home for wildlife, furnishes a constant and perpetual pasturage for domestic livestock, and aids the development of recreational advantages in Montana. Another important service that forests render is that of a windbreaker. If the velocity of wind is scientifically reduced, soil evaporation will diminish, and this may be a partial solution to Montana's evaporation difficulties.

Pine Manufacture

Most of Montana's ponderosa pine is cut and shipped to Middle Western centers for the construction of sashes and doors. This process could be conducted locally if the required plant were established. Ponderosa pine is becoming depleted too quickly. Other species, particularly larch, which have never been felled as rapidly as growth warrants, should be utilized. This will reduce the pressure on ponderosa pine.

Boxes and Containers

Opportunities exist in box manufacturing for packing fruits and vegetables. Better returns may be had through the manufacture of special types of containers for butter, eggs, cheese, and similar products. There is a suitable supply of timber for this type of manufacture, and several small plants could be readily established.

Safety Matches

Engleman spruce from Flathead County has all the desirable properties for the kind of wood needed in the making of the little "strike-on-box" safety matches. A factory could be located so as to produce this product economically and efficiently with a potential labor force of 450 persons.

As only the first two or three logs from each tree are suitable for match production, the integration of this industry with one requiring the consumption of the residue is both desirable and feasible.

Plywood

Larch and ponderosa pine from Flathead County are fitted for the manufacture of plywood. Larch makes an excellent plywood; however, it is not being produced commercially. Local markets consume 20,000,000 square feet of plywood annually, but there is not a single native producer of plywood. Consequently, a good opportunity exists due to ample raw materials and favorable markets nearby.

Pulp and Paper

Pulp and paper factories, integrated with a number of minor wood-using industries, could be operated successfully. Newsprint consumption in States within a logical radius of supply is approximately 30,000 tons a year. This market also requires wrapping paper, book and writing paper, tissues, and cardboard.

Finished Wood Products

In addition to regular lumbering operations and secondary industries, the making of finished products provides new horizons for economic betterment. Larch and Douglas fir can be used for ties and rough lumber, and larch can be made into plywood, laminated structures, or garden furniture.

Poles and Posts

Production of poles and posts from local forest and farm woodlots offers both full-time and part-time employment opportunities to farmers and other workers. The extension of telephone and electric power lines in rural areas throughout the Nation is creating a large demand for poles. Moreover, treating facilities for the poles or posts could be enlarged, hence bringing new chances for profit.

Christmas Trees

Christmas-tree cutting has become an important occupation in recent years. However, methods for felling should be encouraged that will protect growing forest stands and permit development to maturity.

Other Opportunities Related to Lumber

Fabricating or finishing some of the lumber (which today is shipped in a primary

state) offers new job opportunities. For example, a cabinetmaker is now manufacturing prefabricated houses and farm buildings as well as boxes and crates.

Studies have been made for the establishment of a pulp and paper mill. Other than the main operation of the mill, subsidiary plants could utilize wood waste for by-products.

Substantial openings exists to manufacture a number of minor wood products. A few examples are as follows: Grain doors, which are used for bulkheading in the boxcars in which grain is transported; toys; boats; prefabricated houses; breakfast room, lawn and garden furniture; and laminated wooden trusses.

Recent research indicates the desirability of developing low-cost, cement-bonded building materials from sawmill waste. Such materials are lightweight, weather- and fire-resistant, and should prove a great boon to this region where comparable building materials must be brought in at high freight costs.

Mining

The discovery of placer gold occasioned the first permanent white settlement in the State of Montana, and until 1880, mining was the largest industry of the State and its main support. Montana's outstanding mineral product is copper. There is also silver, gold, zinc, lead, and manganese ore. Also to be found are unlimited amounts of cement material, and building stone, sand and gravel. The future of the mineral industry in Montana appears bright, because of its unusual metal resources. Due to the fact that mining has usually been an individual business, there is ample opportunity for the small operator to develop the mineral deposits and to operate the mining properties. The improvement of transportation facilities and the provision of low-cost electric power are important factors in further development of these minerals.

Irrigation

The irrigated areas of Montana should be extended. These lands are the backbone of the whole agricultural enterprise. Irrigation makes possible a larger and more dependable crop, increases the yield and durability, makes possible a longer season for cultivation, and permits a greater variety of crops. It affords opportunity for greater diversity in all types of agricultural production, both crops and livestock.

Other than actual farming, irrigation enterprises create many new businesses that in turn help maintain villages, towns, and cities that live on the trade which irrigated districts create. Irrigation should, therefore, be developed over the entire State.

Chemicals from wood

In almost all industries utilizing wood there is a great deal of waste. Chemical conversion of this waste into explosives, rayon, cellophane, sugar, yeast, glycerin, and many other products is known to be possible. It is believed that small plants utilizing wood scrap could operate successfully in this region.

Yeast

The use of wood waste for producing Torula yeast, a protein material employed in stock feeding, presents a promising business venture in this State. The process is not expensive and is comparatively simple, and a market for this yeast exists in nearly every cattle-raising community.

Charcoal

There is a large demand for a high grade of industrial charcoal. Some of the advantages of charcoal manufacture would be that it provides off-season employment; creates a demand for a common, yet little-used, timber species; utilizes deformed trees which are unsuitable as sawlogs; and removes large quantities of deadwood, thereby decreasing the danger of forest fires. A simple charring process is now being conducted efficiently on several farms, but there is room for expansion in the manufacture of charcoal for industrial purposes.

Wool

It is easily possible to improve the quality of the wool now produced in Montana, and this finer grade of wool would find a ready market in the United States.

Power resources

Montana possesses enormous natural resources for the production of power. These consist of both hydroelectric power and the production of power from such fuels as coal, gas, and oil. Water power has been developed to a great measure, but greater gains may be attained by the development from other sources and by other means.

Coal

This State has approximately 410,000,000,000 tons of coal and lignite—which constitutes 11½ percent of the total reserves of this Nation. One decided advantage of lignite is that it lies close to the surface in almost horizontal beds with widths running up to 25 feet or more, which makes it easily accessible.

Not only can coal be used as a source of cheap power, but in these days of fastly diminishing petroleum resources, synthetic fuels extracted from coal can help to replenish our depleted stocks. The synthetic fuel industry offers a marvelous opportunity to develop the coal reserves for the benefit of the individual and of the entire country. Other important derivatives of synthetic fuels are the commercially important by-products which can be recovered. These generally constitute important raw materials for other industries.

Recreation

Montana has been graciously favored by nature, and every section of our State is rich in scenic, historic, and recreational attractions. An aggressive program of development and promotion would increase tourist expenditures in Montana. Existing facilities should be enlarged and modernized. Fish and game stocks need to be protected and replenished. Many possibilities exist herein to build small businesses and service enterprises such as hunting lodges, tourist resorts, hotels, sporting goods stores, restaurants, gas stations, garages, and theaters. Individual incomes could also be increased by penetrating scenic, but otherwise inaccessible, areas.

Miscellaneous

Another lucrative enterprise is the raising of poultry and turkeys. There is a ready market for fowl; therefore, hatcheries could be increased in number.

The yield and quality of many products can be effectively increased. Some of these are as follows: Sugar beets, beans, alfalfa and alfalfa seed, peas for canning and seed, and potatoes and seed potatoes. More persons in Montana could become interested in the growing of sugar beets, thus assuring a continuous flow of sugar beets to the refineries.

Montana State plan for economic development (a schematic outline)

The State plan is designed to develop, under the provisions of the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation, the resources of the State to promote the prosperity, welfare, and health of all its people. Career opportunities for veterans as well as continued full employment for others would be fostered through the development of needed new businesses, the modernized productivity of agriculture, the utilization of unused natural resources and the implementation of needed self-liquidating public projects.

The veterans' corporation or "little man's RFC," with authority to extend credit totaling $5,000,000,000, will direct its loans toward supplementing the loans of banks and other existing private lending agencies, and the capital needed will derive from existing public money. No appropriations from Congress will be necessary, as only profitable self-liquidating projects will be considered.

Planning activities would be on a State, county, regional, or community level. The State planning board, with the assistance of a know-how committee composed of technical experts, would plan for the physical development of the State, cooperating with other State agencies in the preparation of programs. It would also assist regional and county committees (which would plan for county and regional projects) and community planning boards, giving technical advice and assisting in the coordination of State, county, and community plans. It would further extend technical assistance to individuals, new businesses, and projects.

Since the Veterans Economic Development program is essentially a grassroots program—designed to serve small business and industry and agriculture in the community—emphasis on planning would be on a community level. Thus, while the State planning board and know-how committee would engage in planning on a State-wide basis, their primary function would be to serve the interests of the communities and to bring to bear the cooperation of the Federal Government on local projects whenever advisable and necessary.

Because of this emphasis on local planning, the following outline on States and community planning will list specific opportunities for development and expansion under the section on community planning.

Foreign Aid

Ambassadors, ministers, and technical experts of friendly nations seeking our help under the Economic Cooperation Administration and other forms of aid have shown great interest in applying this State plan to their own countries. In their opinion, the plan will speed modernization of their economy and enable the people in their communities to become increasingly self-sufficient. This economic development plan will increase two-way trade between the people in the communities of the United States and of other countries for the increasing profit and security of all the people.

It is the belief of American authorities that the application of this plan in the communities of friendly countries will help provide a firmer foundation upon which our financial aid at government level to these countries will rest. Further, the State plan may be put into effect abroad without cost to the American taxpayers as no appropriations of public money are required.

Community Planning

1. Local planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups, agriculture.

2. Planning board sets up a know-how committee.

3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State planning commission or State know-how committee.

(a) Inventory to determine present and future economic needs, including preparation of town and agricultural maps on the following:

(1) Population distribution and trends.
(2) Property tax surveys.
(3) Land use.
(4) Zoning ordinances.
(5) Traffic studies.
(6) Recreational facilities requirements.
(7) Health and welfare survey.
(8) Community center redevelopments.
(9) Highway maintenance.
(10) Fire protection.
(11) Water supply.
(12) Housing.
(13) School system.

(14) Farming, acreages, crop production, livestock.
(15) Utility services.
(16) Transportation service—airport, etc.
(b) Uses facilities of Federal, State and regional agencies for fact-finding and making projective studies.
4. Opportunities for development and expansion.
(a) Local industries:
(1) Needed expansion of existing industries.
(2) Needed new industries: (a) Research for new products; (b) use of captured enemy patents and new processes; (c) use of natural resources; (d) new industrial uses for agricultural products.
(3) Processing plants for local products.
(4) Assembling plants for local markets.
(5) Service industries.
(6) Retail trade.
(b) Land use:
(1) Land conservation: (a) Irrigation, surface and underground water resources; (b) reforestation; (c) erosion control; (d) soil treatment; (e) fertilizers.
(2) Water power development: (a) Utilities; (b) industrial uses; (c) agricultural purposes; (d) home.
(3) Agricultural practices: (a) New methods of farming and livestock improvement; (b) new farm enterprises and better use of land resources.
(c) Commerce:
(1) Sales development—new market centers in growing communities.
(2) Farm cooperatives.
(3) Export development opportunities.
(4) Shipping: (a) Assembly, processing, and warehousing facilities; (b) harbor improvements; feeder lines.
(5) Air transport.
(6) Trucking.
(7) Freight.
(d) Mining:
(1) Geological surveys.
(2) Development of mineral resources.
(3) New uses for mineral products.
(e) Tourist and recreational areas:
(1) Beaches and artificial ponds and lakes.
(2) Wood trails and roads, camping areas.
(3) Sports, fish, and game stocking.
(4) Restoration of historical areas, scenic improvement.
(5) Hotels, cabins, and restaurants.
(6) Stream and pond pollution control.
(7) Handicrafts.
(f) Public service (self-liquidating):
(1) Utilities and power development.
(2) Transportation of passengers: (a) Bus, (b) street car, (c) train, (d) air travel.
(g) Public health and welfare (self-liquidating):
(1) Medical clinics.
(2) Fire prevention.
(3) Sanitation: (a) Stream pollution abatement; (b) sewage disposal, (c) garbage disposal.
(4) Hospitals (improvement and/or expansion).
(h) Public works and public improvements (self-liquidating):
(1) Housing: (a) Multiple low-rental units, (b) prefabricated and industrial housing.
(2) Toll bridges.
(3) Parking areas and buildings.
(4) Municipal projects.
(i) Education (self-liquidating):
(1) Colleges, professional and trade schools (improvement and/or expansion).
(2) Housing to accommodate veteran students.
(3) Community recreation centers.
(4) Vocational and social guidance.
(5) Rural school program, consolidation and transportation.

State and Regional Planning

1. State planning board established, representing industry, finance, business, labor, sciences, the professions, veterans, religious groups.
(a) Supplements and implements work of existing State planning agencies.
(b) Cooperates with and serves community planning boards.
2. Planning board sets up a State know-how committee composed of technical experts in various fields.
(a) Know-how committee gives technical advice to planning board, to community know-how committees, to county or regional committees, to individuals, to new businesses and projects.
3. Planning board outlines program of activity, receiving assistance in organizing and formulating programs from State know-how committee or State planning commission.
(a) Takes inventory to determine present and future economic needs of State and geographical area, preparing State, regional, and county maps and statistical studies.
(1) Uses facilities of Federal, State, and regional departments and agencies for fact finding and making projective studies.
4. Planning board relates county, community, and intrastate regional plans to one another, thereby eliminating overlapping, confusion, and unprofitable enterprises and projects.
5. Planning board cooperates with other States on regional projects in same geographic area, such as power developments, land conservation, etc.

THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate for a few minutes on one item which was mentioned in the special message delivered to the Congress by the President a few days ago. He called upon us to ratify the proposed international wheat agreement during this special session. For that reason I should like to take a few moments to discuss some of the aspects of this proposal.

When this agreement was transmitted to the Senate for ratification, it was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, headed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who in turn referred it to a subcommittee whose chairman is the very able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. That subcommittee, composed of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in addition to the subcommittee chairman, held quite extensive hearings on the proposed agreement. At the conclusion of those hearings, as I understand, the subcommittee decided not to favorably report the proposed agreement.

During the past few weeks we have heard a great deal from some quarters regarding the alleged negligence or obstinacy of the Eightieth Congress. It has been charged that this Congress is dominated by reactionaries or isolationists—or worse. Some of these critics appear to feel that every time the Congress has refused to grant any of the President's demands, that is new proof that dark and mysterious forces control the Republican Party.

I have mentioned these events regarding the International Wheat Agreement to show how absurd such charges are. Surely, the cause of international cooperation has no truer friends than the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the three Senators who are members of the Lodge subcommittee. Surely, the American farmer, particularly the wheat farmer, has no more stalwart champion than the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. If the Senate and its committee and subcommittee on this question have declined to recommend the ratification of the International Wheat Agreement, that action can hardly be attributed to a determination to turn their backs on the rest of the world.

At the present time I do not intend to discuss it in great detail. For the benefit of the public, however, I should like to mention several important reasons why in my judgment the International Wheat Agreement should not be ratified.

Before listing my objections, perhaps I should explain very briefly what is provided in the agreement. Basically, the agreement provides, so far as the United States is concerned, that we shall guarantee to supply not less than 185,000,000 bushels of wheat per annum to certain importing countries if they require it. On the other hand, they presumably guarantee us a market for not less than 185,000,000 bushels of wheat. Australia and Canada likewise guarantee to supply certain quantities of wheat annually to the importing countries which are parties to the agreement, and these same countries among them guarantee a market for the same quantities of Canadian and Australian wheat. Total quantities of 500,000,000 bushels of wheat annually are involved in this movement between 3 of the exporting countries and 33 importing countries. Two other major exporters, however—Argentina and Russia—are not included in the agreement in any way.

The price of the wheat would be permitted to fluctuate between certain limits, but not to rise above the upper limit or fall below the lower limit. The upper limit for the 5 years of the agreement is set at $2 a bushel, basis No. 1 Manitoba Northern Wheat in store Fort William/Port Arthur in Canadian currency. This works out to perhaps from $1.60 to $1.70 on the farm in this country. The lower limit changes from year to year by the terms of the agreement. Apparently it would work out to between $1.10 and $1.20 during the first year, and then go steadily down to between 70 and 80 cents during the fifth year. Presumably our policy makers imagined that wheat prices will tend steadily downward for the next 5 years. Probably any subsequent wheat agreement that might be entered into after the fifth year would be based on this 70- to 80-cent minimum on the American farm.

The immediate effect of ratification would be to knock down the price received for our wheat by about 50 cents a bushel or more. That much is certain. That is a definite loss which must be counted on. Those sponsoring the agreement contend that in the later years of the agreement we will, on the average, gain more from the minimum-price guaranties than we lose. Presumably they mean that on the average we will be able to get a better price for our wheat from our foreign customers with this agreement than without it. All our experience of recent years in international economic relations should tell us that

that hope is false. Frankly, I do not see how we can expect to receive better than a normal competitive price from foreign countries, unless we give our purchasers the money with which to buy.

Mr. President, I have three or four principal objections to this agreement. First of all, it seems perfectly clear from the agreement that the administration has completely abandoned any idea of trying to achieve parity prices for wheat moving in international trade. The wheat agreement might well be called a proposal to guarantee that we will never bring the price of wheat up to parity. Even when wheat prices are at their maximum, under the agreement they will be held below 75 percent of parity. When they are at the minimum provided for the fifth year of the agreement, they will be barely 33 percent of parity. The proponents of the agreement have laid great emphasis on the argument that it will guarantee the farmer a market for his surplus. If there is any such guaranty, it will provide him with that market at a price only one-third of what he is really entitled to receive. Furthermore, that market, even at such a low price, will not by any means take care of the entire surplus if our wheat crops continue at the level we have been experiencing.

My second objection is that in this agreement there is really no guaranteed market on which we can depend. Article V of the agreement provides an easy escape for the importing countries from the commitments of the agreement. This article permits any importing country to be relieved of its obligations if it can show the necessity to safeguard its balance of payments. In other words, any of the importing countries which have shortages of dollars need not import the quantities of wheat provided for in the agreement. Almost every one of the wheat-importing countries included in the agreement appears to suffer from a chronic dollar shortage. Certainly, practically all the principal western European countries have dollar shortages. That is why the Congress passed the ERP. If these countries had not been suffering from such dollar shortages, there would have been no need for the ERP. It is worth noting that most of the principal importing countries listed in this agreement are participants in the Marshall plan and, therefore, presumably, at present, qualify under article V, section 1, of the agreement. In short, if these countries do not desire to live up to their commitments to purchase our wheat, there is no way that we can make them do so under this agreement.

This point might be put in another way. So long as we continue to provide Europe with money, we can expect them to buy our wheat. If we do not continue the present system of foreign assistance, the wheat-importing countries can escape from their purchase commitments by pleading a dollar shortage under article V. The term of 5 years provided by the International Wheat Agreement is approximately the same as the duration of the original Marshall plan. This agreement makes no provision for selling our wheat after the expiration of the Marshall plan.

Thirdly, I should like to remind the Senate that this is not the first New Deal proposal which pretended to guarantee our farmers foreign markets for their products. Ever since 1934 we have had in operation something called the trade-agreements program. Under that program we have made numerous, severe reductions in our own tariff rates, supposedly in return for concessions by foreign countries, to benefit our export trade. Our own tariff structure has been reduced well over 50 percent. We have negotiated agreements with most of the countries participating in this proposed wheat agreement. The State Department and other sponsors of the trade-agreements program have frequently advertised the benefits supposedly gained for our export wheat business through the program.

If this trade agreements program has not given us a dependable export market for our wheat and flour, let me ask how we can rely on a new program—this international wheat agreement—to guarantee those export markets for wheat? We have already made extreme concessions in order to secure an export market for wheat. Why should we make new concessions in order to secure this same export market? At the conclusion of my remarks I should like to have inserted a list of the concessions supposedly obtained for our exports of wheat and flour under the various trade agreements already entered into. I should also like to insert a tabulation indicating which of the wheat-importing countries, parties to this international wheat agreement, have already signed so-called reciprocal agreements with us under the trade-agreements program, and which of the countries are participating in the ERP.

My fourth principal objection lies in the fact that this agreement would absolutely commit us to give preference to certain Communist puppet countries of eastern Europe in a share of our wheat exports. This is a truly astonishing fact.

By the terms of the wheat agreement, such countries as Poland and Czechoslovakia are guaranteed certain quantities of our wheat. By the terms of the agreement, we might easily find that we had to supply these countries with wheat or flour even though it meant we would not have enough left to meet our obligations to maintain the minimum ration in western Germany. It seems to me that this would be a very curious agreement to enter into at the height of a cold war. Right now we are in the midst of a supreme effort to feed the people of Berlin in order to maintain our diplomatic position. I hope and believe that effort will be successful. Fortunately, we do not suffer from a shortage of wheat and flour at present. If we should again have a shortage of wheat, however, we would be morally bound by this agreement to place the Communist regimes in eastern Europe ahead of the people of Berlin. We would have to tell our general in Berlin that we could not supply him because we had already agreed to supply the puppets of his enemies. If this is waging a cold war, I do not understand the meaning of the term.

Mr. President, I very much hope that ratification of this agreement will not be rushed through under the plea that we must accept every measure that has the label "international" on it. To say the least, we should be consistent in our diplomatic outlook. I cannot conceive how we can give preference to two nations behind the iron curtain over our own obligations in western Germany and Berlin. I certainly do not believe that this agreement is in the interest of the wheat farmer, and I have not heard any demand for ratification from the farmers of my State. Its immediate effect would be to cost the wheat farmer or the Federal Government at least 50 cents per bushel on exports of 185,000,000 bushels of wheat this year. In the long run, there is no indication whatever that this agreement will be any more successful than the trade agreements program in insuring us an export market for our wheat. Even if it did so, as I have pointed out, we would receive barely one-third of parity for such exports.

I have here a table showing the nations with which we have already negotiated trade agreements, which have also signed this wheat agreement. Under the terms of this wheat agreement, these trade agreement countries would import annually at least 390,000,000 bushels of wheat. For the last 14 years we have been promised that the trade agreement program would restore our export markets for wheat. If it has been as successful as its sponsors claim, there would not seem to be any need for this wheat agreement.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to include in the RECORD a list of the signatories of the international wheat agreement, and other items, including a table listing all concessions for our export trade in wheat and flour claimed to have been obtained by the State Department in various trade agreements which have been negotiated. These lists are compiled from official announcements of the State Department and the Tariff Commission.

If these concessions are as valuable as the State Department has claimed, there would seem to be no need for this international wheat agreement.

There being no objection, the list and tables referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Signatories of international wheat agreement which already have trade agreements with the United States, July 1948

Country:	*Guaranteed purchases per annum (1,000 bushels)*
Belgium	23,883
Brazil	19,290
China	14,697
Colombia	2,205
Cuba	8,267
Czechoslovakia	1,102
Ecuador	1,102
French Union and Saar	35,824
Guatemala	367
India	27,557
Lebanon	2,756
Mexico	7,349
Netherlands	30,680
New Zealand	5,511
Norway	7,532
Peru	4,042
South Africa	6,430
Sweden	2,756
Switzerland	7,349
United Kingdom	179,930
Venezuela	2,205
Total	390,834

Grains and grain products: United States concessions obtained for principal products

[Value in thousands of dollars]

Country	Effective date of agreement	Further definition of concession	Import treatment accorded United States products	
			Before agreement	After agreement
WHEAT				
Netherlands	Feb. 1, 1936	Milling wheat	Import quotas placed at 5 percent of annual Netherlands imports, at prices not above world prices.	
Switzerland	Feb. 15, 1936		Quota increased from zero to 1,180,000 quintals.	
Guatemala	June 15, 1936		0.2 quetzal per gross kilos	0.2 quetzal per gross kilos (bound).
El Salvador	May 31, 1937	Until and including Dec. 31, 1937	$5 per 100 gross kilos	$5 per 100 gross kilos (bound).
		After Dec. 31, 1937	$5.20 per 100 gross kilos	$5.20 per 100 gross kilos (bound).
United Kingdom	Jan. 1, 1939		2s. 0d. per quarter of 480 pounds (ad valorem equivalent, 4.8 percent).	Free.
Jamaica	do		2s. per 100 pounds, general rate; 6d. per 100 pounds margin of British preference.	Same (margin of British preference bound against increase).
Nigeria (colony and protectorate)	do		15 percent ad valorem	Same (bound against granting of British preference).
Canada [1]			30 cents per bushel	12 cents per bushel.
WHEAT FLOUR				
Cuba	Sept. 3, 1934	Wheat flour made wholly of United States wheat is accorded a preference of 40 percent.	0.91 peso per 100 kilos G. W. 30 percent of United States preference.	Same (margin of United States preference bound).
Netherlands	Feb. 1, 1936		Import quotas placed at 5 percent of annual domestic consumption in Netherlands at prices not above world price.	
Honduras	Mar. 2, 1936		0.12 lempira per gross kilo	0.12 lempira per gross kilo (bound).
Guatemala	June 15, 1936		0.03 quetzal per gross kilo	0.03 quetzal per gross kilo (bound).
Costa Rica	Aug. 2, 1937	Wheat flour, first quality	0.15 colon per gross kilo	0.15 colon per gross kilo (bound).
Ecuador	Oct. 23, 1938		0.15 sucre per gross kilo	0.075 sucre per gross kilo.
Venezuela	Dec. 16, 1939		0.40 or 0.30 bolivar per gross kilo	0.24 bolivar per gross kilo.
Bermuda	Jan. 1, 1939		12½ percent ad valorem; 12½ percent margin of British preference.	12½ percent ad valorem; 50 percent British preference.
Gambia	do		2s. 6d. per 98 pounds; 1s. 6d. per 98 pounds margin of British preference.	2s. 6d. per 98 pounds (British preference removed.)
Gold Coast	do		Free	Bound against granting of British preference.
Northern Rhodesia	do		5s. per 100 pounds; 6d per 100 pounds margin of British preference.	5s. per 100 pounds. (British preference removed.)
Nigeria (colony and protectorate)	do		2s. 3d. per 100 pounds	Bound against granting of British preference.
Sierra Leone	do		1s. per 100 pounds; 1s per 100 pounds margin of British preference.	1s. per 100 pounds. (British preference removed.)
Trinidad and Tobago	do		84 cents per 196 pounds; 48 cents per 196 pounds margin of British preference.	Same. (Margin of British preference bound.)
Newfoundland			Free	Free. (Bound against granting of British preference.)
Canada [1]			$1.35 per barrel	50 cents per barrel.

[1] Reduction accorded under most-favored-nation clause in agreement of Jan 1, 1936.

Source: U. S. Tariff Commission, May 1940.

SUMMARY OF THE CONCESSIONS SUPPOSED TO HAVE BEEN OBTAINED FOR OUR WHEAT AND FLOUR EXPORTS THROUGH THE GENEVA TRADE AGREEMENT

ANALYSIS OF GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE, SIGNED AT GENEVA, OCTOBER 30, 1947, DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Extracts relating to concessions by foreign nations on American exports of wheat and wheat products

Page 5, Concessions obtained by the United States:

Grains and cereal products: The United Kingdom bound wheat duty free and barley at a 10-percent rate. The duties on cornstarch were reduced or bound, depending on type. France reduced the duty on wheat by 66 percent. China bound 15-percent rates on wheat and flour. The duties on oatmeal and prepared breakfast foods were bound. South Africa bound the duty on cereal food products, except oatmeal. Ceylon reduced the duty on prepared cereals.

Norway and Newfoundland bound wheat flour duty free. Benelux bound a 3-percent duty on wheat flour and agreed to a duty-free annual tariff quota of 50,000 metric tons for the Netherlands subject to monopoly fee and mixing regulation assurances. Milled rice and buckwheat were bound free with monopoly fee ceilings.

Cuba reduced the duty on wheat flour and provided that the new lower rate will apply on flour milled from wheat of any origin, and reduced the duty on wheat by 50 percent. Cuba also established a special tariff quota arrangement on hulled and semihulled rice and reduced duties on cornstarch and certain livestock and poultry feeds.

Page 28, Belgium-Luxemburg-Netherlands:

Agricultural products: Wheat flour was bound at 3 percent, with a tariff quota of 50,000 metric tons annually to enter duty free in the Netherlands and with maximum monopoly duty and maximum mixing requirements guaranteed.

Page 29, Other concessions:

Chief among these in trade volume was wheat, which is accorded free customs treatment and a bound maximum monopoly duty.

Page 62, China:

Agricultural products: The present duties of 15 percent ad valorem on wheat and wheat flour, for which China has also been an important market in most years, were likewise bound against increase.

Page 68, Cuba:

Agricultural products: On wheat flour, the United States rate was reduced to $0.63 per 100 kilograms. The new rate will apply to all wheat flour imported from the United States regardless of the origin of the wheat used therein, whereas wheat flour milled entirely from wheat grown in the United States has been dutiable at a rate of $0.78 per 100 kilograms and wheat flour milled in the United States containing imported wheat has been dutiable at the rate of $0.91 per 100 kilograms. Wheat imports were granted a 50-percent reduction in duty.

Page 79, France:

Agricultural products: The principal agricultural products on which concessions were obtained (with value of French imports from the United States in 1939 in parentheses) are: * * * Wheat (13,000,000 francs), * * *. Percentages of duty reduction on agricultural products are: * * * wheat, 66.

Page 98, Norway:

Agricultural products: Raw cotton and wheat flour were assured continued free entry and substantial duty reductions were accorded United States fruits.

Page 112, United Kingdom:

Agricultural products: Wheat and raw cotton were assured of continued duty-free entry.

Page 128, dependent territories of the United Kingdom:

It was agreed that in each of the territories (except Ceylon) named in schedule III of the trade agreement between the United Kingdom and the United States, signed November 17, 1938, the margin of preference, if any, on any product listed in that schedule will not exceed three-fourths of the margin existing on April 10, 1947, or 25 percent ad valorem (or a margin of specific or other duties equivalent to 25 percent ad valorem), whichever margin is the smaller. No margin need be reduced to less than 2 percent ad valorem (or a margin of specific or other duties equivalent to 2 percent ad valorem).

These reductions in preference margins will come into effect at the earliest practicable date and in any event not later than December 31, 1949. They may be made inoperative during the whole of any calendar year which immediately follows a calendar year in which the quantity of general purpose synthetic rubber required to be consumed in the United States under internal quantitative regulations exceeds 25 percent of the total consumption in the United States of natural, synthetic, and reclaimed rubber.

The territories covered in this concession include the British Caribbean colonies of the Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Jamaica, Leeward Islands, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos, Windward Islands, and Cayman Islands; the African and Mediterranean colonies of Cyprus, Gambia, Malta, Mauritius, Northern Rhodesia, Sierra Leone, and British Somaliland; and Fiji Islands, Hong Kong, Malayan Union, and British Solomon Islands. Nigeria and the Gold Coast, which were included in the last agreement, would not be affected since they have no preferential

duties. Ceylon, previously included, has a separate schedule in the present agreement.

The most important commodities concerned are wheat flour, grains, and other grain products.

Page 130, Newfoundland:

Food products: Wheat meal and flour, * * * were assured continued duty-free entry.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the United Kingdom is included in this list of countries which presumably require a total of 390,000,000 bushels a year. Even if we leave out the United Kingdom on the presumption that she will get most of her wheat from Canada and Australia, there remains a market of over 200,000,000 bushels in the countries with which we have negotiated trade agreements. In addition to these trade-agreement countries, five of the nations which have signed the International Wheat Agreement are participating in the European recovery program. They are Austria, Denmark, Greece, Ireland, and Italy, and they would account for an annual market of 89,000,000 bushels of wheat under the terms of this agreement. It would seem that so long as the European recovery program is in operation, we could count on filling their needs for wheat out of our surpluses. Another nation which has signed the wheat agreement is the Philippines, with which we have special trade relations, and which is a regular customer for our wheat. Following is a short tabulation showing the market provided for by these five European recovery program nations, plus the Philippines.

Country:	*Guaranteed purchases per annum (1,000 bushels)*
Austria	18,739
Denmark	1,470
Greece	18,739
Ireland	13,227
Italy	36,743
Philippines	6,246
Total	95,164

When all these nations are added up, we have accounted for about 97 percent of the total export market for wheat provided for in this wheat agreement. We, therefore, should be able to assure ourselves of at least 97 percent of this supposedly guaranteed market for wheat provided in the wheat agreement through the medium of these other programs which we already have in operation; namely, the trade-agreements program, the European relief program, and our special relationship with the Philippines. Under these circumstances, it is hard to see why an additional agreement and new concessions by our wheat farmers are necessary.

THE POLL TAX

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I rise to address the Senate on House bill 29, the so-called anti-poll-tax bill.

It was stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday that the bill affects only seven States, namely, the so-called poll-tax States. I respectfuly submit to the Senate that we shall go far wrong if we consider that this bill affects only those States which have poll taxes in effect. In reality it affects 48 States, because it seeks to control the suffrage clause of the Constitution of the United States.

I respectfully call the attention of the Senate to the fact in the very beginning that this is one of the most important and one of the most touchy subjects to be found in our form of government. It is a subject-matter with relation to which the framers of nearly all our State constitutions and of our own national Constitution have proceeded with great caution. When they came to consider the subject, almost invariably, instead of vesting the legislative bodies of the Government with power to prescribe and control what shall be the qualifications of electors, the people, through their organic law, have themselves prescribed those qualifications.

I desire to make the further point that it is not merely a matter of States' rights. That question is involved, but it cannot be dismissed as merely a question of States' rights as such. I think it affects the political integrity of the Nation and the preservation of constitutional government. It is one of the most serious and far-reaching questions that has ever come to the floor of the Senate; and it is a sad fact that the question has to be considered in a political atmosphere, with various organized groups—pressure groups, and some other groups with fine intentions, but misinformed—knocking on the door, standing on the steps, we might say, of the major political parties of the Nation with their demands that this legislation alone be passed at once. I think it is one of the saddest occasions in American history that the Senate of the United States should be called upon to pass on this matter under such circumstances.

I do not think it can be dismissed as being merely a matter of civil rights as such. I know that a great number of us, and, I think, all of us who are opposed to the bill, stand ready and willing at all times to see that the legal civil rights of all persons are not only recognized but are protected and preserved. I repeat this is not merely a matter of civil rights, as the term is ordinarily understood. The right to vote is a civil right. It is a legal civil right if the person meets the qualifications prescribed by law to become a qualified elector. That is the question. The law respects a person, the law protects him, once he has met the requirements for becoming a qualified elector.

Mr. President, that matter is something which requires specific definition. It requires specific instructions in the law as to just where that right begins. All our State constitutions and our Federal Constitution respect that right and protect it.

The real, true question involved in the bill I am discussing is whether or not a mere majority of the Congress of the United States has the constitutional authority to prescribe what shall be and what shall not be a qualification for voting in Federal elections.

Not in the attitude of seeking controversy, but in all sincerity, I challenge the proponents of this measure to come into court and state the book and page and line of any respectable legal authority they have, from whatever source, to sustain their position. I invite them now and ask them now to bring in the evidence, the legal documentary evidence, from the organic law, or from the courts of our land, which will sustai them on a sound basis. I do not believe they have the power to do that, and I do not believe they will be able to present respectable authority. On the contrary there is an abundance of authority for the other side of the question.

Mr. President, I ask that we always remember that this is not a political campaign matter we are considering. We are dealing with the Constitution of the United States. Let us remember also that we are dealing with one of the most delicate subjects within the Constitution.

Not many days ago I stood in Independence Hall in Philadelphia. I walked around the chamber there, remembering that was where the Constitution of the United States was written. I tried to picture in my mind where it was that Benjamin Franklin sat. I tried to picture where James Madison sat. I thought of the presiding officer, George Washington, and I felt that a political halo hovered around that place. I thought of the great document those men penned there, how, while the world scoffed, they wrote that instrument, and how it has become the object of admiration of all the world, and how we have grown. That towering city of millions was little more than a village then, and I thought how we have grown into a great Nation, the most powerful in the world.

I thought of the city of Washington, where meet the political leaders of the world. We control the commerce, we control the finance, we control the shipping lanes. We are actually the capital of the world, and have become such within a short span, only a few years, relatively speaking.

Soon after being in that atmosphere of reverence and thankfulness, surrounded in my imagination by these towering patriotic intellects, I heard the news of the call of this session of Congress. My thoughts shifted back then to the scene of the Senate floor, and I knew this bill would most likely be brought up for consideration. I picked out in my mind the towering personalities in this Chamber, and compared them in my mind with the patriotic personalities who once sat on the floor of Independence Hall. I can say in all sincerity that they compared favorably in intellect, in intelligence, in attainments, and, more than that, I think they compared well in patriotism.

But, thinking further about the Constitution, it seems to me, Mr. President, with all deference, that instead of trying to respect a sound Constitution and instead of trying to preserve a sound Constitution, this bill will be in effect a butchering of the Constitution.

Someone said that we must be practical, and that we must adopt a method that is expedient. Let me quote from the

words of George Washington himself. In the Constitutional Convention someone suggested that they must propose an expedient form of government, one which would be adopted and which would be sure to meet the popular approval. Trying to do something that will meet popular approval is not a new thing. Let me read what that great man said—and when I say "great" I reflect that of all the magnificent objects in the city of Washington, the most majestic here is that single shaft dedicated to the father of our country, the Washington Monument.

This is what Washington said on the floor of the Constitutional Convention when someone suggested, "We must be expedient and we must write a document that is popular." The reply was:

> It is too probable that no plan that we propose will be adopted. * * * If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and just can repair. The events then will be in the hands of God.

So now, regardless of the expediency of the action, regardless of how popular it may be on some fronts, let us raise a standard here to which the wise and the just can repair; then the event will be in the lap of the gods.

Mr. President, this bill provides, very briefly, that the payment of a poll tax shall not be a prerequisite to voting in elections for President, Vice President, Members of the Senate, and Members of the House of Representatives. This very question has come before other deliberative bodies. We are dealing now with the Constitution, and my whole argument will be based on and centered around the grave constitutional question which arises. This very matter of dealing with the qualifications of electors came before the Constitutional Convention. The men there passed on it—James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and others—and they decided that in our Government we would have a President and Vice President. They decided further that we would have a United States Senate. They then decided that we would have a House of Representatives.

The question then arose as to how the membership of the House was to be chosen, a most vital and most important question. The members of that convention decided that they should be elected by the people.

Then the question arose—and this was one of the most serious of all—who shall be the electors, the qualified electors?

There were three proposals. The first one was that it should be left to the Congress to decide as to who would be qualified electors. That is the very thing the pending bill proposes to do. But that plan was rejected. Incidentally, as I recall, the first plan, providing that the Congress should have this authority, had only one sponsor in the constitutional convention. Think of that.

The second plan proposed was that there should be written into the Constitution itself the definitions of who would be qualified electors to choose the Members of the House of Representatives. That plan was rejected.

The third plan was that definitions should be written into the Constitution, to the extent of saying, "This matter being so important, so highly controversial, we prescribe the rule that in all Federal elections in each particular State those who are qualified to vote in the most numerous branch of that particular State legislature shall be qualified to vote for the Members of the House of Representatives."

That is what they said. That is what they decided on. That is what they wrote into the face of the Constitution itself.

To bring that out more clearly, I shall read the exact words of article I, section 2. Remember these words were carefully chosen after selection had been made among the three proposals I have mentioned:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall—

Note the word "shall"—

> the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. President, I have not heard of anyone who even suggests that the Congress of the United States would have the power to prescribe the qualifications of electors in State elections; that it would have the power to prescribe the qualifications of electors who are to choose the most numerous branch of the individual State legislatures. I emphasize the point that no one, as I understand, claims that there is authority in the Congress to prescribe who shall be qualified electors in the various States in choosing the members of the most numerous branch of their State legislatures, and the Constitution of the United States says that the electors for the United States House of Representatives shall be the same as those provided in each State for the election of members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. President, if we have no power to change the State list how do we have the power to change the Federal list of electors when the Constitution of the United States plainly says that they shall be the same? With all deference, Mr. President, I do not believe that question will be successfully answered at any time during the course of this debate.

To quote further from the Constitution at this point, section 4 of article I does give the Congress a great deal of authority. It reads as follows:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections—

Let us get that clear, please. We are not talking about qualified electors, nor who shall be qualified electors. We are on another subject.

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Mr. President, I anticipate the argument will be made at great length here that under section 4 Congress has the authority, and that it has been established by many precedents, to go into all forms of regulating Federal elections and therefore the argument will be made that that includes the power—listen, we are talking about power, we are talking about authority—to go back to article I and change the qualifications of electors. I submit that this would be a mere argument.

To make the record full, the other provision of the Constitution which applies, article I, section 8, clause 18, is as follows:

> The Congress shall have the power * * * To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers—

"The foregoing powers." In other words, Mr. President, if there is no power in article I, section 2, which provides that the list of electors shall be the same, to change the qualifications of an elector, then there is no power to be gained from subsection 18. It is possible to revert to that provision of the Constitution and say that under it the power of Congress rises higher than it does under section 2. Just like a stream can rise no higher than its source, clause 18 can rise no higher than is the grant of power, if any, in article I, section 2.

Now to make the record more complete——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. DONNELL. I wanted to ask the Senator whether he thinks the further provision of subsection 18 would in any sense alter his argument. Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States reads in its entirety as follows:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

My inquiry is whether the latter part—namely, that which begins with the words "and all other powers"—would in any manner affect the Senator's very interesting argument?

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate very much the Senator's inquiry. I really have all of clause 18 written out before me and I intended to quote it all, the part I did not quote being "and all other powers vested"——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. It is a little difficult to state the matter in the form of a question. I want to assure the Senator that I did not in any sense mean to indicate that the Senator did not intend to discuss the entire clause, but I asked him the simple question that I now repeat, as to whether or not he thinks the latter part of clause 18 would in any sense affect his argument.

Mr. STENNIS. I clearly understand that. I read again the last part of clause 18: "and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the

United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

It is clear to me, especially when the word "powers" is used—whether it is foregoing powers or other powers vested by the Constitution—that there are no such powers that could possibly reach the matter of changing the qualifications of electors in Federal elections. That is very clear to me. I made thorough search in an effort to find something of substance which would make this clause have some bearing. It is my humble opinion that there are no such powers, be they "foregoing" or found elsewhere, which would permit the Congress to go back to article I, section 2, and prescribe what is or what is not a qualification for a voter to vote in Federal elections.

We come back again and again to the proposition that the Constitution of the United States provides that the qualifications shall be the same for electing members of the State legislature as for electing Members of Congress. Congress cannot possibly have any kind of power to prescribe what shall be the qualifications of electors to elect members of the lower branch of the Missouri Legislature. If that be true—and it is undenied, as I understand—how can Congress, under any clause, have the power to say that the Constitution is all wrong and that we shall establish a list of qualifications for voters for Members of Congress, and that the Missouri Legislature can do what it pleases under the Constitution with respect to the qualifications of electors of the lower branch of the Missouri Legislature? It is proposed that we shall not follow the Constitution with respect to the question of qualifications. Mr. President, I do not see how we can pursue such a course. That is why I say that it is not a question of expediency. It is not a matter of what might be proper under certain circumstances. It is a matter of doing something "to which the wise and the just can repair." Those are George Washington's words, not mine. Then, as he says, affairs will be in the hands of God.

Another provision which has a bearing on this question is amendment X to the Constitution. We are still talking about powers:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Certainly that means something, particularly when we try to squeeze out an imaginary power from some of the other clauses of the Constitution, especially when we are pressed because of the expediency of the occasion. We might be inclined to lean over the line a little; but amendment X calls us back:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

With all deference to the author of this bill, whoever he may be, and to whoever might have helped draft the bill, I invite the attention of the Senate to the language of the bill itself, which I think admits on its face that it has no proper constitutional base. I refer to the language beginning in line 3 on page 1:

> That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors—

That is what I call a legislative fiat. I raise the point now that the Congress of the United States has no power to interpret a word in the Constitution. That is a judicial function. We must take those words as we find them and give them their ordinary, commonly accepted meaning, with such additional meaning as has been given to them authoritatively by the judicial branch of the Government. This bill is a clever way of trying to get around article I, section 2, which I have been discussing, and transfer this question over into article I, section 4. The proponents of the bill are trying to escape from the point raised, that voters for Members of Congress and for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature must have the same qualifications. They propose to say, by legislative fiat, that a poll tax shall not be deemed a qualification. We shall come later to the historical meaning of that word. I am raising the point now that the proponents of the bill must resort to legislative fiat to try to give the run-around to article I, section 2.

Mr. President, I believe that we would have the same authority to say that the freezing point of water shall be 28° F. instead of 32°. That would be legislative fiat. We are trying, by force of language, to say that the requirement that a poll tax be paid shall not be deemed a qualification—

> but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections.

The word "manner" is used in the Constitution. When a State prescribes that certain qualifications shall be met before one can become a qualified elector, does such a requirement pertain only to the manner of holding an election? Let me make it clear that once a person becomes a qualified elector he is clothed with certain high rights and prerogatives. I want him to be protected as a qualified elector. He has met the requirements, and he is entitled to all kinds of protection. He is entitled to as much protection as the State government and the Federal Government can give him.

This is simply a legal question, based upon the Constitution of the United States. The bill flirts with words, and admits on its face, I believe, that the Congress does not have the authority to proceed on the merits, but must resort to a juggling of words, a mesmerization of words, in order to get some semblance of a legal basis on which to stand.

I shall shortly return to a discussion of the historical and legal meaning of the word "qualifications." With reference to the word "qualifications" it is said that the poll tax itself is unconstitutional. It is not said that the poll tax is a bad thing and ought not to exist. It is not said that the poll tax is obsolete. The proponents of the bill do not say that they believe that the poll tax should be abandoned as a matter of policy. They actually argue that the poll tax itself is contrary to the Constitution, and that therefore we have authority to enact the proposed law.

Let us look into the historical significance of that question. Is a land tax with reference to voting unconstitutional? Is the payment of a property tax of any kind as a prerequisite to voting, contrary to the Constitution of the United States? Or is the requirement that a voter own property of some kind contrary to the Constitution of the United States? Were not such requirements included in the word "qualifications" when it was used in the Constitution?

Let us see what the picture was when the word "qualifications" was written into the Constitution of the United States, in article I, section 2. Let us see what those men, the framers of the Constitution, were considering and what was in their legal minds and what was in their minds as the leading political thinkers of that day. Let us not convict them of ignorance. We know that those men had before them the constitutions of the various States. We know they were highly familiar with those laws, and that they were the most competent men of their times to pass on such a subject.

I shall turn now to page 101 of section 14 of volume 716 of the Senate committee hearings of 1943, which can be found in the Senate Library. I shall take up with the indulgence of the Senate, the requirements of the various States which were represented at the Constitutional Convention at the time when the Constitution was adopted. We are addressing ourselves now, Mr. President, to what the word "qualification" meant, as there used.

The State of New Hampshire, by its constitution of 1784, required that before its citizens could become qualified electors, they must pay a poll tax. That was required by the constitution of 1784. That is bound to have been within the knowledge of the framers of the Federal Constitution when they wrote that clause.

The State of Vermont required that before one could vote, he must be a freeholder, which, of course, as everyone knows, meant that he must own land.

At that time the State of Massachusetts, according to the Massachusetts Constitution, required that before one could vote—and let us remember, Mr. President, that these provisions were written in their organic law—he must have a freehold of an annual income of £3 or an estate of £60.

The great State of New York in its constitution of 1777 provided that one must have a freehold of £20 or be paying rent of 40 shillings or have a freehold of £100 in order to qualify to vote for State senator, or he must be a taxpayer or a freeman of Albany or of New York City. This was a part of the picture which was before the members of the Constitutional Convention. They had before them the words of the constitu-

tions of the States I have named requiring what must be done in order to qualify one as a voter.

New Jersey required an estate of £50.

Pennsylvania required that in order to vote a man must be a taxpayer.

Delaware provided that in order to qualify, one must pay to the State and the county some tax.

Maryland required that he have a freehold of 50 acres of property or £30.

I find here a memorandum as to the situation at that time in Virginia. It states "qualifications as fixed by law." The Virginia Constitution did not require anything on the subject, but Virginia law required that in order to qualify as an elector, a person must be a freeman having 500 acres of land unsettled or 25 acres of settled land.

The Constitution of North Carolina required a freehold of 50 acres in a county for 6 months before the election, and also required that in order to qualify as a voter, one must have paid public taxes. In such case he might vote for the members of the State legislature.

In South Carolina in 1778 the requirement was a freehold of 50 acres as a qualification for electors.

In Georgia the requirement was property of £10 or that one be in a mechanical trade or be a taxpayer.

The other original States—those that did not have constitutional requirements on this subject—had various statutory requirements regarding it, all of which were along the line of requiring that one be a freeholder or have paid a tax on some kind of property.

Mr. President, inasmuch as this question was one of the most delicate and one of the most controverted questions which came before the Constitutional Convention, and inasmuch as those men of intelligence and information and learning were passing on that matter and were passing in a most serious vein on this vital question of who shall be a qualified elector to vote for Members of the Congress, when they finally settled on these words, "and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature," are we not sure in our minds that they knew what they were doing and that they knew what they were saying? They were not trying to write a new language. They were not trying to give an imaginary meaning to the word "qualification." I shall be able to show, later, that the word "qualification" runs all the way through the law. They were not trying to write a new language. They were creating a new government. They were prescribing one of the most serious tests that was to be laid down. They were prescribing who should be the ones qualified to choose Members of the House of Representatives. We know they used that word advisedly, with all this mass of information before them, and we know they gave that word a practical meaning and legal meaning. The law was full of it.

Now, later, on some kind of a theory, and merely because we do not believe that a poll tax should be required, can we in good conscience say that we do not believe that the payment of taxes—poll taxes or any other kind of taxes—was intended to be included in the word "qualifications"? As I see it, that is the only point of argument that the proponents of this measure could possibly have; and the door is absolutely closed in their face by the words of the Constitution, by its prior history, and by its subsequent legal development.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question only.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. North of Mason and Dixon's line there are seven States which still carry in their election laws the property requirements the Senator has just recounted as being the test of qualification originally adopted by all the States. All of them had some kind of property requirement. But there are seven States which now prohibit a pauper from voting. If a man or woman has, through misfortune, become so very poor that he or she has become a public charge and is declared to be a pauper, those seven States will not let such a person vote. That is a disqualification. Has any Member of the House or the Senate from those States come forward in the Congress and said, "We have tried to correct that injustice in our State; we do not think there should be any property test"? Such persons may be intelligent, they may be honest, they may be very much interested in government and anxious to vote, but they are poor, they are paupers, and are disqualified. Has any Member of Congress said, "We made that fight in our own State, and we come to the Congress now to wipe that restriction from the laws of our own States, so that in those seven States paupers may vote"? Has anyone ever heard that claim made in the Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. I really have not, no. I thank the Senator from Virginia for his illuminating question. I continue on with the idea as to what was in the minds of the framers of the Constitution of the United States when they used the word "qualifications." I turn back and read, merely for the benefit of the Senate, the actual words of the New York statute. It provides:

> Every male inhabitant of full age who shall have personally resided within one of the counties of the State for 6 months immediately preceding the day of election * * * if during the time aforesaid he shall have been a freeholder, possessing a freehold to the value of 20 pounds within the county, or have rented a tenement therein of yearly value of 40 shillings, and been rated and actually paid taxes to the State.

Paying taxes, rated for taxes, owning a freehold. The books are simply full of requirements of that kind, which were staring these men in the face when they solemnly declared:

> Whatever qualifications the State prescribes for voting in the most numerous branch of its legislature, those shall be the qualifications provided for voting for Members of Congress.

Listen now to Rhode Island. Rhode Island says:

> Every male citizen * * * of the age of 21 years, who has had his residence and home in this State for 1 year, and in the town or city in which he may claim a right to vote, 6 months next preceding * * * and who is really and truly possessed in his own right of real estate in such town or city in the value of $134 over and above all encumbrances, or which shall rent for $7 per annum over and above any rent reserved or the interest of any encumbrances therein being an estate in fee simple, fee tail, for the life of any person, or an estate in reversion, or remainder, which qualifies no other person to vote—

Notice the word "qualifies." They were talking about qualifying, and they said a person could not use an estate, if the same estate were used to qualify someone else to vote—

> which qualifies no other person to vote, the conveyance of which estate, if by deed, shall have been recorded at least 90 days, shall hereafter have a right to vote in the election of civil officers and on all questions in legal town or ward meetings as long as he continues so qualified.

Notice the word "qualified." What were they talking about? They were talking about persons who meet the requirements to enable them to vote for members of the State legislature in Rhode Island. What were the framers of the Constitution talking about? They were talking about those who were to be qualified to vote for Members of the House of Representatives. What did they say? They said that those who were qualified in the States to vote for members of the legislature should be qualified to vote for the Members of Congress. My point is that the Congress can do nothing about that. The State could not pass a law and say, "To vote in Federal elections this shall be the requirement, but in State elections this other measure shall be the requirement." The State could not do that. The Constitution would not let them do it, because it says the same qualifications shall be required.

By the same token, the Congress cannot do that, because it does not have the authority to depart from the standards set up by the State for their own legislature. I agree that is a Federal right. Surely, it is a Federal right, and it is by force of the Federal Constitution. I do not argue that the States as such have the right to fix the qualifications of electors for the United States Congress. The States do not have that right. They have the right to say who shall be qualified in their respective States to vote for the most numerous branch of the legislature. Then, when they have said that, the gavel has fallen, all time for debate has expired. The Constitution of the United States then, in these solmn words, comes along and says the Federal Government, the Congress or anyone else, "shall adopt in each State" the qualifications and the requisites as prescribed in such State for voting for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. When those electors vote for a Member of the House of Representatives, they are exercising a Federal right, they are voting in a Federal

election. That is a legal civil right, and I want them to have all the protection of the law. Section 4 of article I gives the Congress plenty of authority to afford them such protection. I raise the point here, though, that the Congress has no authority and no power to fall back upon section 2 of article I, where they have been plainly excluded. They have no power or authority to go back to anything contained in that section, and begin shuffling or trying to shuffle words, and saying that they do not mean this, or they do not mean that. What they mean is plain and unmistakable. I submit the framers of the Constitution meant exactly what they said, and said exactly what they meant.

Going back now a little further into the historical background with respect to the meaning of the word "qualifications" and with respect to the power of the Congress, I desire to call certain witnesses to testify on the subject. Perhaps we may waive the oath by reason of their prestige and reputation over the years for intelligence and patriotism which will supply the necessary requirements. I first call for the benefit of the Senate a witness whose name is George Mason. I shall ask him a few questions very briefly on this point. I want to ask him if he is the George Mason who wrote the Bill of Rights. His answer is, "I am." I ask: "Now, Mr. Mason, what do you say about the Congress regulating or altering the qualifications of electors?" In reply, reading from Madison's reports of the Convention, at page 386, George Mason says:

> A power to alter the qualifications would be a dangerous power in the hands of the Legislature.

Since the context shows that the subject under discussion was the National Government, when he speaks of the "Legislature" the reference of course is to the Congress. He says it would be "a dangerous power in the hands of the Legislature."

I next present as a witness James Madison, called the Father of the Constitution. I do not know that he altogether deserves the title, but, at any rate, he was present and knew what was said and what occurred. Taking now James Madison's statement from the Federalist, article 57, he raises this point:

> Who are to be the electors of these Federal representatives? Not the rich more than the poor; not the learned more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of distinguished name more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune; the electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States.
>
> They are to be the same to exercise the right in every State of electing the corresponding branch of the legislature of the State.

May I be permitted to repeat that language? It is not mine. It is the language of Mr. James Madison. He said they are to be the same. Note that word "same." It is used in the Constitution, article I, section 2, which says that they shall have the same qualifications.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall yield only for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. I note the Senator's use of the word "same" as occurring in section 2 of article I of the Constitution. I have before me a copy of that section, and I do not observe in it the word "same." Does it appear in the copy which the Senator has?

Mr. STENNIS. The word "same" does not appear in the text.

Mr. DONNELL. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator. Did I misunderstand him when I thought he said the Constitution used the word "same"?

Mr. STENNIS. I might have said that, thinking that the word "same" was there. The plain meaning is that the electors of Federal representatives shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the corresponding branch of the State legislatures. That certainly means "same," as I interpret it.

Mr. DONNELL. I simply inquired of the Senator in order to be sure that I correctly understood him.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, continuing in the course of bringing in witnesses on the question of what the word "qualifications" meant as used and the power of the Congress to go into the question, I now call forth one of the truly great men who graced the Supreme Court of the United States for almost 30 years, as I recall, the great Justice Story. He was overshadowed, in a way, during many of those years by the illustrious John Marshall. But in my humble opinion, no man ever made a greater contribution, so far as soundness is concerned, to American constitutional law than did Justice Story. I have here a quotation from him while he was discussing section 4 of article I of the Constitution, which refers to the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives. He said this:

> There is no pretense to say that the power in the National Government can be used so as to exclude any State from its share of the representation in Congress.

Of course, those words were used prior to the amendments following the War Between the States. Here is the sentence in which I am particularly interested:

> Nor can it be said with correctness that Congress can in any way alter the right or qualification of voters.

Of course, those words were all written after the Constitution was written, with the exception of the amendments following the War Between the States.

That brings to my mind this question: Suppose some State requires electors to have qualifications of various kinds which the Congress might think should not be required because of being too liberal or too extreme. Congress could not change the rule. That is what Justice Story said, and that is what the Constitution says. Congress cannot alter the right or qualification of voters in any way.

I shall now proceed further with the same thought. It is not my idea to speak too long. I am merely trying to cover a high point of the main constitutional argument which applies, as I see it. I want to say, before going into other cases, that all the way through, in all the literature in reference to the Constitutional Convention, in reference to the plans, the methods, and the efforts in connection with securing its adoption, one of the main themes of the argument was that on this highly important and delicate subject of who should be qualified electors the States would still have the right to say who should be qualified electors in their elections, and then the National Government, by the Constitution, adopted the test prescribed by the States as the test in Federal elections in the States.

They did not say the Congress would adopt it; they did promise that the Congress would always be reasonable about it. They said to the people of the States—and I am talking about the people, now—and to the men who were chosen for the specific purpose of adopting or rejecting that Constitution: "This is a matter about which you are not running any hazard, you are not taking any chance. It is forever sealed, unless it is changed by a constitutional amendment." I do not think anyone will find that statement controverted in any way, and to that extent, Mr. President, it was a solemn and serious compact.

Mr. President, I am sure those things meant something then. I believe they mean something today. I believe that is a serious thought that will find lodgment in the minds of the conscientious Members of this body when they come to reach a final decision as to how they shall vote.

Now I wish to call the Senate's special attention to one of the early cases on this subject.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has spoken about this compact. Is it not also a fact that the only way the compact can be changed is by and with the consent of three-fourths of the States of the Union?

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, the Senator is correct about that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The question I wish to ask the Senator is this: Can the integrity of the Constitution be maintained with respect to the qualified electors for Federal officers, for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and for President and Vice President, if a statute is passed providing that the payment of a poll tax is not a qualification, when the State constitution says it is? Would the integrity of the present language of the Constitution be maintained if such a Federal statute attempted to repeal that provision of the Constitution?

Mr. STENNIS. I think not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, it would completely abrogate and nullify that provision of the Constitution which now provides that the qualifications of electors shall be the same, would it not?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I have before me a case decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, *Ex parte Yarbrough*, decided in 1884, reported in One Hundred and Tenth United States Supreme Court Reports, page 651. I invite the attention of the Senate to a

reading of this case, and the other cases I shall cite.

Under section 4 of article I of the Constitution the Congress had passed a law with reference to the regulation of elections, and the petitioners in this case were convicted for intimidating a voter in a congressional election. The conviction was under a Federal law against interference and intimidation. The law was upheld by the Court as being valid under section 4 of article I of the Constitution, and the Court used the language I shall read from page 663:

> If this were conceded, the importance to the General Government of having the actual election—the voting for those members—free from force and fraud is not diminished by the circumstance that the qualification of the voter is determined by the law of the State where he votes.

That is merely a recognition of the law. No one disputed that. That is what the Court took to be the law. That was the plain understanding.

This is the main portion of the case I wish to quote:

> The States in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualification for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States—

This is the Supreme Court speaking—

> and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

That is where the word "same" to which I referred comes in. It was in this Supreme Court decision, rather than in the Constitution itself. But the meaning is logically inescapable that it is the same qualification, and the Court in this case upheld the Federal power; the decision was not adverse to the Federal Government, and in upholding the Federal power, it still laid down the qualification just as clearly as before. I shall read the last sentence again:

> They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

It will be noticed further how the Court uses over and over again the word "qualifications." All the way through the law, in the constitutions of the States, in the Constitution of the United States, and in the Supreme Court decisions, the word "qualifications" is used.

I have another case I wish to cite. I am skipping over a great number of cases in order to get down to the more modern ones. I am trying to keep from consuming too much time.

The next case was decided in 1937. It was the case of Breedlove against Suttles, found in Three Hundred and Second United States Reports, page 277. The facts were that a Georgia law imposed a poll tax on all inhabitants between the ages of 21 and 60, excepting the blind and females who do not register and vote. The State constitution provided that one could not register and vote unless he had paid the poll tax required. The petitioner sought to require the registrar of elections to permit registration for voting in the State and Federal elections without the petitioner having paid the tax.

Now let us understand the facts. The petitioner sought to have the registrar of elections register him to vote in both Federal and State elections without having first paid the tax. That case went to the Supreme Court of the United States. It was decided in 1937. The late Justice Butler rendered the opinion in that case. It was a unanimous opinion. Getting down to the gist of his actual holdings, he had this to say, speaking for the Court:

> To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment.

We are coming now to the question of the fourteenth amendment. It has been claimed by some that the adoption of the fourteenth amendment changed the picture.

> Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

Now getting down to specific words. What I have heretofore read are rather broad statements. We now get down to specific words. Mr. Justice Butler said for the Court:

> The payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting is a familiar and reasonable regulation long in force in many States.

That is direct and specific language by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1937.

> The payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting—

And that was the question involved; this is not a dictum—

> is a familiar and reasonable regulation long in force in many States.

Mr. President, while I am on that subject I want to bring up next the case that follows, the Pirtle case.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. Is the Senator from Mississippi taking the position that in the Breedlove case the Court in any way passed on the power of Congress to enact a law such as is proposed in the bill now before us dealing with the requirement that the poll tax be paid?

Mr. STENNIS. I think the main holding in the Breedlove case is that the poll tax is valid, that it can be required, that it is an accepted part of the qualifications, and has been down through the years. I think it is a direct holding to that effect.

Mr. DONNELL. But the Court was not holding, was it, that the Congress is without power to pass a statute to the effect that the requirement that a poll tax be paid shall not be deemed a qualification of voters? That question was not before the Court?

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, that question was not before the Court in that specific case.

Mr. DONNELL. Of course, that is the question, is it not, which is now before the Congress in this bill?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. And is it not true that the question which is now before the Congress in this bill was not before the Court in the Breedlove case? Is that not correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Of course, this bill, or no bill like it, was before the Court in that case. In that case there was an attempt to have the Court outlaw the poll tax, and the Court said that it was an accepted part of the qualifications of voters.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator this question: Am I not correct in my understanding that the Court, although it used the language which the Senator has read, was not passing on the question as to whether Congress has the legal power to pass an act of a general nature similar to that which is before us for consideration? Am I not correct in that statement?

Mr. STENNIS. My interpretation is that the Court did close the door again on that question, but there was no such bill, of course, before the Court as we have here today.

Mr. DONNELL. And is it not true that the Court was not passing on whether the Congress had a right to pass such a bill? Am I not correct in that matter?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. The Court was not passing specifically on that point.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the Court did in that case hold that the payment of a poll tax was a qualification for voting?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And if it is a qualification for voting, then the Constitution says that the States shall determine, and not the Federal Government, and therefore until there is constitutional power delegated to the Congress to pass such a statute, such a statute would be void.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is correct. I call attention also to the fact that the Court expressly excluded the operation of the fourteenth amendment with reference to the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, and expressly said that the requirement of such a tax did not deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment.

Mr. President, the next case I have is the case of Pirtle against Brown. The decision in that case was rendered by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth District. The case involved a special election in the State of Tennessee where the only office to be filled was that of a Member of the United States Congress—the House of Representatives. There was no State election involved. In that case the

appellant, Henry Pirtle, possessed all the qualifications required by the laws of Tennessee to entitle him to vote in this election, except that he had not paid his poll tax. For this reason the judges of the election declined to allow him to vote. That case went before the Circuit Court of Appeals on the single question. No other election was involved. No other question was involved except whether or not he would be qualified to vote in this Federal election, not having met the requirements of the State of Tennessee with reference to poll tax.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. I did not get the citation of the case.

Mr. STENNIS. Pirtle versus Brown, decided in 1941 by the Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, 118 Federal (2d), page 218.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. To make it brief, I will say that the Circuit Court of Appeals followed the Breedlove case and held that the man was not entitled to vote because he was not a qualified elector under the laws of the State of Tennessee, and therefore had no standing as a qualified elector to vote in a Federal election. It was expressly challenged there, as it had been in the Breedlove case, that the fourteenth amendment intervened, and that the poll tax was unconstitutional, unreasonable, and invalid, but the court handed down a decision in conformity to that in the previous case I cited.

That case was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. It went up on a writ of certiorari. I do not have the citation before me, although I can supply it. The Supreme Court of the United States, without rendering an opinion, dismissed the writ. In other words, it affirmed and upheld the lower court. I believe that the Supreme Court knew what it was doing. It was suggested by one of the witnesses who testified before a Senate committee that the Supreme Court of the United States was afraid to pass upon the question. The witness passed upon the question and gave his version of the Supreme Court decision. He stated that the case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, and that the Supreme Court of the United States was afraid to pass upon the question, as were Members of the United States Senate.

I do not believe that to be true. I believe that the Supreme Court of the United States knew exactly what it was doing; and I believe that Members of the Senate—I am not engaging in flattery—are wrestling with their consciences and using their intelligence and patriotism, not to decide what may be expedient, but honestly and conscientiously to decide what is right, and what they should do under the Constitution of the United States. I have no doubt in my mind that when this question is finally settled a majority will vote against the bill, for the reason that it has no proper foundation under the Constitution of the United States as now written.

I wish to return briefly to something which I should have presented immediately following the statement by Justice Story. I wish to read briefly from references to senatorial debates when certain amendments to the Constitution were adopted following the War Between the States, and when the suffrage amendment to the Constitution was adopted. The record has been compiled by an esteemed gentleman from Washington by the name of Charles Warren, who testified before the Senate committee in 1943.

I wish to read briefly from page 87 of Division 14 of Senate Hearings, volume 716. This testimony was taken before the Senate committee in 1943. Mr. Warren gives a history of a part of the debate with reference to the fifteenth amendment. I have made research upon the idea which was in the minds of the Congress with reference to the adoption of the nineteenth amendment, which permitted women to vote. That is further evidence of the fact that the Congress did not consider that it had the power to say what should or should not be a qualification of an elector. Certainly if we have the authority to say what tax shall be a qualification, we have the authority to say that sex shall not disqualify a person.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. May I inquire whether this is the same Mr. Warren who is the author of the book entitled "The History of the Supreme Court of the United States"?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

A reprint of Mr. Warren's testimony was placed before the committee during the most recent hearings on the poll tax. I read from page 87, in the 1943 hearings:

> Then arose that very heated condition growing out of the situation at the end of the war—

He is speaking of the War Between the States—

> and if there was ever a time in our whole history, and especially in our whole legislative history, if there was ever a time that a claim should have been made that the United States Congress had any power to regulate the question of suffrage in the States, that claim would have been made during the debates over the civil-rights bill of 1866 and the debates on the fourteenth amendment in 1866. I want to read to you, at the risk of trespassing a little on your patience and your time, the very emphatic statements made by the Senators at that time, not only the Senators of the North and East but the Senators of the West—of course, there were no Senators from the South. With the exception of one Senator, there was not a single Senator on the floor of the Senate who claimed or contended for 1 minute that the States did not have the full control of the suffrage.

That is what an examination of the debates in 1866 showed. Only one man claimed that Congress had any control, or that the States did not have full control of suffrage.

> The only exception to that statement was Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, and even he admitted that the State of Massachusetts had complete power to regulate suffrage with one exception; he did not think they had the power to deny suffrage to the Negro, but, with that exception—and how he worked out that exception is rather a mystery—but with that exception there was not a Senator who denied the full power of the State to regulate suffrage.
>
> Let me recall to you who were the authors of that fourteenth amendment. When I said every Senator, North, West, and East, I meant to include every Senator, Republican and Democratic. Who were the authors of that fourteenth amendment?
>
> First, it was constructed by a joint committee of 15 of the Senate and House, the Senate chairman of which was William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, later President Lincoln's Secretary of the Treasury. The senior member and the man who took Senator Fessenden's place on the floor of the Senate when Fessenden was later ill, was Jacob M. Howard, of Michigan, and then followed John Harris, of New York; James W. Grimes, of Iowa; Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland; and George H. Williams, of Oregon.

I shall omit some of the historical references and skip to this paragraph:

> This amendment was considered twice. The first two sections were considered separately and then as separate resolutions for separate amendments, and then they were later joined together and made articles of one amendment, the fourteenth amendment, as it now appears.

Mr. Warren cites what Senator Bingham said:

> The second section excludes the conclusion that by the first section suffrage is subjected to congressional law.

That was the point. They had excluded suffrage as being subject to congressional law.

Mr. Warren continues:

> In the Senate, this first section was discussed by Senator Howard, who was heading the committee in the absence of Senator Fessenden; and he states:
>
> "The first section of the proposed amendment does not give to either of these classes the privilege of voting. The right of suffrage is not, in law, one of the privileges or immunities thus secured by the Constitution. It is merely the creature of law. It has always been regarded in this country as a result of positive local law."

Mr. Warren quotes Senator Howard:

> "This section does not recognize the authority of the United States over the question of suffrage in the several States at all. Nor does it recognize, much less secure, the right of suffrage to the colored race. It leaves the right to regulate the elective franchise still with the States and does not meddle with that right."

I am not bringing out any point with respect to races. These words were spoken on the floor of the Senate before the adoption of the fifteenth amendment. That amendment, of course, covers the question fully. My point is that there was general recognition throughout the debate, with the exception of Senator Sumner, that there was no power in the Congress to specify what should be or what should not be the qualifications of electors, and that the fourteenth amendment did not attempt to give any such power.

I have before me quotations from a great number of Senators. They are to be found on pages 91, 92, and 93 of that portion of the volume to which I have referred. Mr. Warren has collected the

statements of those who were Members of the Senate at that time.

I have one other case which I wish to discuss. It was passed on by the Supreme Court of the United States. I think it will be used as an argumentative proposition, wherein it will be contended that it is a basis for the passage of this bill. I am sorry, but I think this is a rather technical case. I do not mean to be technical in an argument, but the subject matter requires one to do so.

This is the case of the United States against Classic, which was decided by the Supreme Court in 1941. It is to be found in Three Hundred and Thirteenth United States Reports, at page 299. The opinion is written by Mr. Justice Stone, who later became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. It is a criminal case, based on two counts of an indictment found in a Federal district court, which originated, incidentally, in Louisiana, wherein it was charged that the commissioners of elections in conducting a primary election under Louisiana law to nominate a candidate of the Democratic Party for Representative in Congress, willfully altered and falsely counted and certified the ballots which the voters cast in the primary election. The case went up to the Supreme Court on that criminal charge, and the statute under which that prosecution was based was upheld by the Supreme Court. It extends the protection—and rightfully so—of the law to anyone who is a qualified elector in any State, who offers to vote or seeks to vote for the election of a Federal officer. I am entirely in harmony and in agreement with that law and with the Supreme Court's upholding of it, but we most emphatically deny that this language can in any way be construed as a basis for the authority of the Congress by mere majority to tamper with section 2 of article I of the Constitution in prescribing the qualifications of electors.

I wish to call attention to what Mr. Justice Stone said at page 309 of that case:

> Section 19 of the Criminal Code condemns as a criminal offense any conspiracy to injure a citizen in the exercise "of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States." Section 20 makes it a penal offense for anyone who, acting "under the color of any law, willfully subjects, or causes to be subjected, any inhabitant of any State * * * to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States."

He goes on to state that those are founded under article I, sections 2 and 6.

On page 310 he further says:

> Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters to choose Members of the House of Repesentatives is thus to be exercised in conformity to the requirements of State law subject to the restrictions prescribed by section 2 and to the authority conferred on Congress by section 4, to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Representatives.

Mr. President, my point is that Mr. Justice Stone there is extending the protection of the Constitution to such persons as are qualified electors. In other words, before one can come within the protection of this case—and it is rightful protection—one must come clothed in the garments of a qualified elector. It goes back to the same proposition, as the Court has so many times held, that in order to become a qualified elector one must meet the requirements of the law of the particular State. When one has done that, the Federal Constitution adopts him and clothes him with all the powers, privileges, and immunities of a qualified elector in a Federal election, and will protect him to the last limit of the law. That is what Mr. Justice Stone said. He uses the words "authority of the Congress" only when he is referring to section 4, and does so in referring to the regulation of the times, places, and manner of holding elections. That is exactly what this case holds.

In referring to section 2, he says:

> Pursuant to the authority given by section 2 of article I of the Constitution, and subject to the legislative power of Congress under section 4 of article I, and other pertinent provisions of the Constitution, the States are given, and in fact exercise, a wide discretion in the formation of a system—

He is referring to the manner of holding an election. The States have been given wide powers. It is only in a few cases that their powers in that respect are limited. This case all the way through refers to the manner of holding elections, and it bottoms its authority on section 4. Whenever Mr. Justice Stone uses the word "authority" in this case, in referring to the authority that is being upheld, he is referring to the authority granted by section 4 of the Constitution, with reference to the manner of holding elections.

On page 314 we find the following:

> We come then to the question whether that right is one secured by the Constitution. Section 2 of article I commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes.

Let me read that again, please. A part of this case will be used as a dictum, as the main basis for the asserted authority of the Congress to pass this bill. Here is what Mr. Justice Stone said:

> We come then to the question whether that right is one secured by the Constitution. Section 2 of article I commands that——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, is the Senator now reading the dictum?

Mr. STENNIS. No.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator be kind enough to state what he anticipates will be the dictum which will be used as a basis for attempting to sustain the validity of this bill, if passed?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall indicate that.

My point is that this case all the way through recognizes the various standards which I have been maintaining throughout this argument. Here is what Mr. Justice Stone says on that point:

> Section 2 of article I commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes.

He is there talking about the States, and he cites *Ex parte Yarbrough*, among other cases. That was the first one I cited.

Here is the dictum which will be used, as I understand. I do not mean to anticipate too much the argument which will be made, but this point has been argued to me. I understand this is to be used as the basis for authority in this case. Mr. Justice Stone said:

> While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States, see *Minor* v. *Happersett*—

And he cites three other cases—

> this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution, to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

In other words, the most favorable light in which this dictum could be considered Mr. Justice Stone still confines us to such authority and power as is to be found in section 4 and in clause 18 of section 8. Section 4 pertains all the way through to the "times, places, and manner of holding elections." I emphasize "manner." We cannot get away from the fact that historically and legally the word "qualifications," at the very time it was used and ever since that time, until this very day, has been considered by the best minds and by the courts as having the same meaning as the word "qualifications" found in section 2 of article I. So, by the most liberal interpretation of this dictum, as I understand, the learned Justice clearly limits the power of the Congress to section 4, relating to "times, manner, and places" and to clause 18, which refers to the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, or any other powers that are to be found within the Constitution.

Where are such powers to be found? Are they to be found in the fourteenth amendment? The Supreme Court of the United States says no. They have already looked there and they did not find them. Does a poll tax violate the privileges and immunities clause of the fourteenth amendment? The Supreme Court says no; they have already looked there and passed on that matter. Is a poll tax, within itself, merely the bare fact that it is a tax used as a prerequisite, therefore condemned? Does such a tax afford Congress any power to act? The Supreme Court of the United States in the Breedlove case says no, and more than that, the Court said it in the Pirtle case.

I now come to this point: The Pirtle case which I cited a while ago, which was passed on by the Supreme Court of the United States merely by closing the book and not rendering an opinion, was decided, it will be remembered, 6 months after the Classic case from which I have been quoting. In other words, whatever the law of the land was under the Classic case it was already the law for 6 months before the Pirtle case was decided; and in that case again, the Court said in effect that States do have authority to impose a poll tax; that it is a qualification. The Court falls back upon section 2 of article I. The Classic case sends us

back to section 2 of article I. I return to my statement, then, that the only possible way I can see by which the pending bill could be bottomed upon sound authority is to baldly state that qualifications and the poll tax have no relation one to the other. One may branch off into philosophy or into theory and say that, but when we come to the law of the land, when we go back to the Constitutional Convention, when we go back to the Constitution and the statutes of the various Colonies prior to the formation of the Union, when we go back to the wording of the Constitution based upon the facts as the framers of the Constitution found them, with all deference, I cannot see how it is possible so to play on language as to say that the legitimacy of the poll tax as a qualification is not written boldly into the Constitution.

But that is not all, Mr. President. The most distinguished constitutional lawyers who had responsibilities as high as ours, including Justice Story, Members of the United States Senate who were here following the War Between the States, and the members of the Supreme Court of some 10 or 12 years ago, indeed as it was constituted as late as 1941, all held the same view. The matter of qualifications is something Congress cannot touch; it is something that is written into the Constitution of the United States, and it has serious meaning. I respectfully submit that we are standing on holy ground upon which no one else has ever dared tread, and certainly this question should be most seriously considered by us.

That brings to my mind this point, Mr. President: If we pass this bill, it will be the first instance in the history of our Nation of the United States Government invading the field of Federal suffrage. If the Congress goes into that, and if the Supreme Court should uphold it, then the Congress will be in that field, unfettered, unbound, unregulated, and unrestricted, without any limitation, without any guide, and there will be no semblance of control over the present Congress or the membership of future Congresses. Do we want to do that? Do we want to take the responsibility of doing it? If we do, it should be done only after the greatest consideration and deliberation.

In colonial days, nearly all the Colonies had constitutions providing what the qualifications of electors should be. If we are willing to enter and tread on ground that few framers of State constitutions since that time have been willing to tread upon, if we are willing to enter upon it unrestrained—and we are not only involving ourselves, we are bringing our successors in—if we are willing to do more than the framers of the Constitution were willing to do, and if we are willing to enter upon this holy ground without a direct authorization of the people, we are doing something that every Supreme Court that has ever passed on the matter has carefully avoided intimating that we have the slightest suggestion of power to do.

I respectfully call the attention of the Senate to a state of facts that existed here only twelve short years ago. Along the line of treading on dangerous ground and of going into the sacred domain of suffrage, which no other Congress has ever before entered, I call the attention of Senators to the conditions that existed in 1936.

The Democratic Party swept this Nation like a forest fire and carried 46 of the 48 States. The membership of the fine group on my right was reduced, as I understand, to a scant 19 Members. There was a crushing and overwhelming Democratic majority at the other end of the Capitol. The leader of the Democratic Party sat in the White House. Certainly the party had as much authority as ever was vested in any political party. Suppose that such a law as is now proposed had been passed. Suppose they had not stopped with that, but had gone to extremes, under section 4, and passed all manner of measures with reference to the holding of elections, had established the machinery, and by law, by force, by intimidation, and otherwise, had dominated the elections in all of the States. That would have been legal if this poll-tax bill is legal. It shows the dangerous ground involved. Suppose those things had happened. Is it to be supposed that these gentlemen would be here today as Members of the United States Senate, elected to membership in this body under laws as they are today, under elections controlled by their own State laws, guided and protected by their own State police powers? In a short span of 12 years, which is a very short time, under our system, the Republicans have come back to power. They now have a very respectable majority in the Senate, having 51 Members. They control the other House. They dominate every committee in the Senate and the House of Representatives, having not only the chairmen of the committees, but the chairmen of all subcommittees. They are making a serious bid to elect a President of the United States. Could that have been done if an oppressive party had passed extraordinary laws of all kinds, which would have been legal if this poll-tax bill is legal? Do the Republican Senators think they could have made a come-back such as they have made under those circumstances? I do not think so.

Mr. President, I believe that in the calm reflections of a man's own private room, where he is his better self, if he thoroughly goes into the matter, strictly on a constitutional and legal basis, forgetting all the expediency of the occasion, his calm, deliberate conclusion would be that it is sound for Congress to stay out of this delicate and dangerous field of suffrage. More than that, we are bound by the organic law of the land. Rightly or wrongly, the Constitution says that this is one matter which the Congress itself, through legislation, shall not touch. If there be any serious doubt about it in any man's mind, would it not be an act of statesmanship—I do not say, "Would it not be expedient"—if there were a serious doubt about such a grave constitutional question, to say "I shall resolve this doubt against the bill." I submit it is a man's duty, if he reaches that conclusion, that he follow that course.

May I again remind the Senate of the admonition which came from George Washington when it was proposed that there be adopted some expedient that would meet the popular will. He said:

> No. Let us prepare a standard—

Referring to the Constitution of the United States—

> to which the wise and just may repair. The events then will be in the hands of God.

I conclude, Mr. President, by making some reference to another course which is open to the Congress. I mention it not as one who would personally favor it on a vote on the merits, but it is a course which is entirely constitutional. It is a course which is entirely safe. I do not plead today for the poll tax as such; I plead for constitutional government. It is the course which was mentioned yesterday by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who has filed individual views with reference to the bill. He filed in his report quotations from men who were distinguished in ability and honorable in their approach to all public questions. I want to reflect their sentiments and what they have said with reference to a constitutional amendment and to an anti-poll-tax bill.

I now quote from the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] in a statement which he made on the floor of the Senate on November 23, 1942:

> I am opposed to Senate bill 1280. To me the Constitution clearly provides that the qualifications necessary to vote for a Representative in Congress are the qualifications by the State to make one eligible to vote for a member of the most numerous house of the State legislature. I think that as it presently stands the Constitution clearly leaves this question to the States. If the National Government desires to exercise authority to declare different qualifications it should be done by an amendment to the Constitution and not attempted to be done by a statute which, in my opinion, is in contravention of the rule laid down in the Constitution.

I have here another quotation from the late Senator Shipstead, of Minnesota. He stated on May 15, 1944:

> I desire to state in a few words my view on House bill 7. I voted against cloture, and if the bill should come to a vote I would vote against the bill.

Then he quoted section 2 of article I, and said:

> The power to impose qualifications on voters is vested by the Constitution in the State itself. If the Congress has the right, under the Constitution, to remove one qualification, it has the right to remove all qualifications or to impose others. We are sailing on rough seas, with foggy weather, these days, and our compass is the Constitution.

He went on to say that if the bill should become law it would open the door to a mass of legislation now prohibited by the present construction of the Constitution. He further said it would place the welfare of the country and its population within the complete power of whatever faction happened to be in the majority.

> There is the pitiful part, the sad part—whatever faction may happen to be in the majority.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, have we forgotten that it is the majority from which we must protect ourselves, even when we are temporarily a part of that majority ourselves?

I ask that question again: Have we forgotten that it is majorities from which we must protect ourselves? If we have forgotten that, then we have forgotten almost every line, every paragraph, and every page of American history, because somewhere on almost every page of the constitutional law of this Nation is the thought that we have constitutional guaranties which protect us from majorities. That is a deliberate part of our plan and, I submit, the soundest part. I verily believe that this bill would take the very foundation out of that protection, insofar as suffrage is concerned. I am no calamity howler, but somewhere down the years when oppressive majorities undertake to shake down other great foundation stones of this Government I believe that if this bill shall pass men can point back to the day it was passed and say, "Here is where the first crack started in the great wall of American constitutional liberty."

I say, Mr. President, that we stand on holy ground when we consider this bill. Let us tread carefully. Let us look to our own intelligence for a guide. Let us look to the Constitution as a guide, to those who wrote it, and to those who have passed on it since, and ask for the guidance of an even Higher Power, because it is the Constitution with which we are dealing, and one of the most delicate subjects of that entire instrument.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. In stating my question I wish to say to the Senator that I have listened very carefully to what I consider to be the very able argument the Senator from Mississippi has presented in support of his position on the constitutional question involved in the measure now being discussed.

The Senator has referred to the possibility of considering the disposition of the matter by way of submitting a constitutional amendment, if I understood him correctly, along the lines of the suggestion made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Assuming for the moment that that course of procedure were followed in the Senate on this issue, my question is, Does the Senator from Mississippi take the position that the other matters included in the President's civil-rights platform, such as the antilynching bill and the Fair Employment Practice Act, also involve, in his opinion, constitutional questions which would warrant their being handled by way of the submission of constitutional amendments, rather than by way of legislation?

Mr. STENNIS. That is a rather broad question. I am not now discussing the President's message as such, pro or con. I am defending, as I see them, the principles of our organic law, the Constitution of the United States. I am interested in the proposed constitutional amendment as being a way of solving the problem, what I have thought to be the only sound way of solving any problem in connection with this subject.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator's position, but if he will permit me to say so, without jeopardizing his right to the floor in any way whatsoever, I am trying to think ahead to what our total procedure in the special session may be on the whole question of civil rights.

Tentatively, I am inclined to share the Senator's view that careful consideration should be given to the suggestion that this particular issue might be determined procedurally by way of submitting a constitutional amendment, although my judgment on that is reserved. I am also aware of the fact that we have other civil-rights issues to face, and I was wondering whether or not the Senator from Mississippi had reached a conclusion as to whether he thought constitutional objection similar to those he is raising in connection with the anti-poll-tax legislation would be applicable to those pieces of legislation.

Mr. STENNIS. I feel that we should rise above the President's message and rise above party platforms and everything else, and decide this matter as a most serious constitutional question affecting the organic law of our land. I think the destruction of the protection afforded by article I, section 2, would be the beginning of the destruction of other parts of the Constitution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield the floor?

Mr. STENNIS. I feel that we should

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point a telegram which I have received from Mr. Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and one from Mr. Jennings Perry, chairman of the National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax, both protesting the proposal for a constitutional amendment.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 28, 1948.*

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge every Member of the Senate genuinely interested in abolishing the poll tax not to fall into the trap of supporting the proposal offered by Senator HAYDEN on the floor today to strike out all except the enacting clause of H. R. 29, the antipoll-tax bill, and substitute resolution to outlaw the poll tax by the device of constitutional amendment. It is our considered opinion that Congress has the constitutional authority and responsibility to eliminate poll-tax requirement by a statute such as that proposed in H. R. 29, which has already passed the House and has been approved by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. The abolition of the poll tax by constitutional amendment would require ratification by 36 State legislatures. We have grave doubt whether ratification can be obtained since the specious States' rights arguments will be made against the constitutional amendment in State legislatures just as they have been made in Congress year after year against H. R. 29 and its predecessors. Undoubtedly a poll-tax amendment would suffer the same fate as did the child-labor amendment passed by the Congress many years ago.

Strongly urge Senate not to succumb to threat of a filibuster by compromising on this vital legislation.

WALTER WHITE,
Secretary, NAACP.

NASHVILLE, TENN., *July 28, 1948.*

Senator ROBERT TAFT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please stand by Bender bill. Amendment alternative meaningless to millions down here who never have voted in their lives. Resolution would foreclose the solemn pledge of both parties and mock the right to vote. We have not had a free election for 50 years. Kindly pass Bender bill to give these voiceless millions now living a voice in their own land.

JENNINGS PERRY,
Chairman, National Committee To Abolish Poll Tax.

THE NEW DEAL AND HIGH PRICES

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, our country today does not need this session of the Congress. What it needs is a real President.

Let me cite a damning indictment of the entire New Deal and its relationship to the outrageously high prices which the American housewife is forced to pay for a basic food commodity.

Skyrocketing meat prices today lead the parade as the cost of living moves higher and higher. This is a matter of direct concern to every American family. Attempts have been made to fix responsibility for this situation upon several different groups. By some, the farmers are charged with profiting unduly. Others accuse the packers, and still others say it is the retailers who are profiteering. So far as I know, no one has yet pointed a finger at the real villain in the piece, Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture.

The official records of this agency reveal unmistakably that short-sighted planning and even downright stupidity by the Department have brought about such a situation that meat supplies are precariously low at a time when demand is at unprecedentedly high levels.

I have before me a tabulation prepared by Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture which reveals the livestock-production goals set by this agency during the last 10 years. It shows that since 1944 the numbers of cattle, hogs, and poultry on American farms have declined alarmingly, sacrificed to Department recommendations for decreased production, at a time when our human population was growing rapidly and the per capita demand for meat was the greatest in our history.

The current meat shortage and the resulting high prices were inevitable under the production programs which have been laid down by Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture in recent years, and even this year.

In 1944, for example, we had 85,573,000 head of cattle and calves on our farms. By the end of 1946, just 2 years later, this total had been reduced to 81,207,000 head.

Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture officially recommended that this total be further reduced to 78,500,000 by the end of 1947, and this goal was achieved. In 3 years' time the number of cattle in this country went from 85,573,000 head down to 78,500,000 head, though the population was increasing,

and the per capita demand was increasing every day. Farmers reported 78,564,000 head at the beginning of this year.

Now observe, Senators, that after we had had the political speech at Philadelphia and the political call of Congress into session, and after hearing all the talk about high prices as one of the major reasons for the call of the special session, only last week Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture set a further reduction in the number of cattle to 78,047,000 head for its 1948 goal. The Department has reduced it again this year by almost another half a million head of cattle. Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture last week recommended that virtually all the reduction—listen to this—of one-half a million head, be made in beef cattle breeding herds.

This recommendation has come from an administration which now seeks further control over the production and the marketing of farm commodities as a means of solving the twin problems of shortages and high prices. Every farm boy knows what apparently Mr. Truman's professional planners in the Department of Agriculture will not concede, that slaughtering breeding cows does not produce calves. The inevitable result of the Department's latest folly will be fewer cattle next year, an even more critical beef shortage, and almost certainly still higher prices.

Our cattle herds, destroyed by unbelievably stupid edicts, cannot be rebuilt overnight. The job will require years. But we should not delay for even one moment in making a start in that direction.

With a bumper corn crop in prospect—and a bumper crop of corn in my State alone is estimated to be almost 400,000,000 bushels—and with bumper crops and ample supplies of other feeds in sight, American farmers should be asked by their Government to increase cattle production rather than decrease it. They should be asked specifically not to market their breeding cows this year. And they should be asked to feed the cattle they do market to much heavier weights in order to alleviate the current meat shortage as much as possible.

Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture bungling has had a similar effect upon pork production. The Department did not stop simply with beef. It has run the gantlet of all the meat products.

In 1943, for example, spring-pig production totaled 74,223,000, while the fall-pig output was 47,584,000.

Three years later, by 1946, the Department's official goal was 51,651,000 spring pigs—that is a reduction of 23,000,000 head of pigs in 3 years—and 31,551,000 fall pigs. That is another reduction in 3 years' time of about 16,000,000 head of pigs.

Actual production was 52,392,000 spring pigs and 30,548,000 head of fall pigs.

Although production goals were increased in 1947, the number of pigs farrowed was approximately the same as in 1946.

By the fall of 1947 the meat shortage was becoming acute, and even Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture spokesmen were predicting that it would be still more critical in 1948.

How did they propose to meet this situation? The record shows that they asked the farmers to produce fewer spring pigs in 1948—a total of 50,000,000 as against 52,786,000 the previous spring.

The Department's fall pig production goal has been raised above last year's figure, to 34,400,000, but even this total is more than 3,000,000 below the 1942–46 average.

Are Senators concerned over the high prices of lamb chops and mutton? Those from the Western States know that in 1942 there were in this great Nation 55,150,000 sheep and lambs on our farms and ranges. Through careful planning this number had been reduced to 35,332,000 head by the end of 1947, a reduction at a time when demand was greatest, with population growing. By the planning of the great brain trusters in Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture they have succeeded in reducing sheep and mutton production from 55,000,000 in 1942 to 35,000,000 this year, and the downward trend continues.

The housewife who hopes to trim high living costs through the substitution of poultry and eggs for the beef and pork on the family dinner table will find little consolation in Mr. Truman's Department of Agriculture 1948 production goals for eggs and chickens.

During the 1942–46 period, we had an average of 477,714,000 hens and pullets on the farms. During 1947 the Department set as its official goal a reduction in this number to 435,000,000, a reduction of almost 42,000,000.

Farmers complied, the Department's statisticians report, with the result that there were actually 435,665,000 hens and pullets on the farms by the end of the year. The Department's goal for 1948—unbelievable though it may seem in the light of the meat shortage—is a further reduction to 400,000,000 pullets and hens, making a total reduction in the last year of almost 50,000,000 head.

Egg production, which totaled 4,608,000,000 dozens in 1947, will be only 4,200,000,000 dozens in 1948 under Mr. Truman's Department's curtailed production program. In other words, the people of America will have an opportunity to buy 400,000,000 dozen fewer eggs because of the reduced production program.

These are not my figures. They are taken from the official records of the Department of Agriculture. They reveal that our own Government has engaged in a deliberate program of restricting poultry and livestock production at a time when the demand for these products is the heaviest on record.

Could it be that the real reason and purpose of these professional planners was to create shortages that they might seek, as they are doing in this special session, additional powers to deal with a crisis of their own making?

The theory of creating prosperity through scarcity is not new in the Department of Agriculture. "Bubblehead" Wallace's contributions to this philosophy were firmly embedded there during his days and the early days of the New Deal. They have been nurtured to full flower by his successors, including Mr. Truman.

We remember all too well the slaughter of millions of little pigs while the Nation went hungry, the plowing under of every third row of cotton while administration leaders shed crocodile tears over the "ill clad," and the curtailment of wheat and corn acreages while many of our people went without bread.

Some administration apologists may contend that the present meat shortage was brought about as the result of a short corn crop last year.

While it is true that this was a contributing factor, the RECORD will reveal that the deliberate program of reduced livestock production was set in motion long before 1947 and is being continued this year in the face of a record corn crop, as well as a record crop of wheat and oats, particularly corn and oats. I am not sure as to the wheat crop.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. We have one of the largest wheat crops ever produced in America. There is so much wheat going to market in my State today that the price of wheat, which was $3.18 a bushel in January, has dropped on the Chicago market below $2.22, which is below parity. Today in our State embargoes have been placed against certain places, and the price of wheat has gone 2 cents below parity.

Mr. JENNER. That much more shame must be heaped upon the little politician for calling a special session and trying to play politics with such a sacred thing.

Other administration spokesmen may say that our heavy grain exports to relieve other nations during the last 2 years made it impossible to feed a normal number of cattle, hogs, and poultry in this country. There is some truth in this argument, too; but the American people should have been told that the meat shortage would be aggravated, with resultant higher prices, if we undertook to ship more than a billion bushels of grain from this country in a 2-year period. Instead, they were told that we could safely export this amount without any visible effect upon our domestic economy.

Mr. Truman himself has repeatedly said that our relief program has not been a cause of high prices at home.

Only a few months ago, Mr. Charles Luckman's Citizens' Food Committee, the Department of Agriculture, the President's Cabinet Food Committee, and, indeed, the President himself, were beating the drums for increased grain exports to Europe.

The poultry industry was very nearly dealt a death blow through ill-advised recommendations for reducing poultry numbers and curtailing consumption of poultry in order to provide more grain for export.

Farmers were told to market their cattle and hogs at lighter weights as a further grain-conservation measure, with absolutely no regard for what this would do to an already critical domestic meat situation. We are reaping the whirlwind today in the form of shortages and higher

prices. We cannot cure the price situation with respect to meat in a special session. We cannot cure it in a week. They have been working 10 years to destroy the food of the Nation.

Now Mr. Truman asks that he be given further authority over the production and distribution of American farm commodities. Gentlemen, are you "nuts"? The record reveals unmistakably that he and his Department of Agriculture aides for too long have had too much control over farm production.

It is already too late to solve the meat shortage in 1948. Unless action is taken immediately, it will be too late to make the situation much better in 1949.

First. The Government should urge farmers to increase the numbers of cattle, hogs, and poultry as rapidly as good management will permit.

Second. They should be asked to feed the livestock which they do market to much heavier weights as a means of alleviating to some degree at least the current meat shortage.

It would perhaps be too much to expect this administration to replace the Department of Agriculture's exponents of planned scarcity with men who have at least a rudimentary knowledge of farm economics.

I am confident, however, that this will be done next January when Governor Dewey is President of the United States.

Meanwhile, this Congress can best protect what remains of our livestock and poultry industry by refusing the President's requests for stand-by powers to control the marketing and distribution of meat and other foods.

Mr. President, I respectfully urge that the Senate Committee on Agriculture conduct a rigid, searching investigation into the facts I have just presented and determine once and for all the responsibility for the tragic economic condition in which our agricultural economy finds itself. Such investigation would reveal to the American housewife and to the fathers and the heads of the families who are paying these exorbitant prices, how the President is playing cheap politics with the prices our people have to pay for meat.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to discuss rather briefly House bill 29 and the motion that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator whether he will permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum. He has a most excellent speech which he has prepared to deliver to the Senate, and I should like to inquire whether he will permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum at this time.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the Senator, but I prefer not to yield for that purpose.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss the motion to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 29, the so-called anti-poll-tax bill, which makes unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Section 2 of the bill provides that—

> It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any person from voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax—

And so forth. Mr. President, I do not undertake to enter into a legal discussion of this question on the same basis as that used by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] who preceded me, for he prepared and delivered to the Senate a very fine statement on the legal phases of this matter. So I shall not enter into a discussion of this subject with the idea of improving upon the speech delivered to the Senate by the Senator from Mississippi or with the idea of enlightening the Senate regarding the legal phases of the subject or the constitutional questions involved, because I think the Senator from Mississippi made a most excellent presentation of those matters.

However, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate what I believe to be the controlling constitutional provisions, because this bill raises very definitely a serious constitutional question.

In May 1944, as I recall the date, we debated, in connection with a bill then pending, substantially the same questions which are involved in House bill 29.

The provision of the Constitution which I think is definitely controlling, so far as the election of Members of the House of Representatives are concerned, is found in article I, section 2, which provides that—

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

So far as the qualification of electors is concerned, the same provision is found in the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, which provides for the election of Senators by popular vote. The words are identical. So, those who vote for Members of the United States Senate and Members of the House of Representatives in each State must have the same qualifications as those who, under the laws of the State, vote for members "of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

In my State of Tennessee that would be the house of representatives, because it is the most numerous branch of our State legislature.

Inasmuch as Tennessee is one of the remaining seven States which have poll-tax requirements, I wish to speak briefly regarding the Tennessee qualifications and requirements. I shall confine myself to a discussion of the laws of Tennessee on this subject, and not the laws of other States, because I have some familiarity with the laws of my State, but very little with the laws of other States.

Mr. President, in Tennessee, by law all persons who vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the Tennessee General Assembly or State legislature, as expressed in the constitution, must pay a poll tax if they are over 21 years of age and under 50. The poll tax must be paid for the year preceding the election. The payment of the poll tax is not pyramided. It is not cumulative as is provided in some of the other States. In Tennessee the elector may vote by merely paying, in the year preceding the election, a poll tax of $1 or $2, according to the requirement in his county.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield, if I may do so without yielding the floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. EASTLAND. The poll tax applies to persons within what age limits?

Mr. STEWART. Our test tax date each year is January 10. For example, a person becoming of age before January 10, 1947, may vote in 1948 on payment of a poll tax. If he becomes of age after January 10, which is the test tax date, he may vote the following year without payment of a poll tax. Likewise, if a man becomes 50 years of age prior to the test tax date, the 10th of January of the year preceding any election, he is not required to pay a poll tax.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then a person over 50 years of age is not assessed a poll tax?

Mr. STEWART. No.

Mr. EASTLAND. Persons over 50 years of age vote in Tennessee, do they not?

Mr. STEWART. They do.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then how is the argument valid that the poll tax disfranchises people, when it does not apply to anyone over 50 years of age?

Mr. STEWART. The poll tax, as I have described, applies to all persons between the ages of 21 and 50, but it applies to no one over 50.

Mr. EASTLAND. The principal argument advanced here in support of the pending bill is that the poll tax disfranchises people. How could that be true, since it does not apply to those over 50 years of age?

Mr. STEWART. It applies only to those within the age limits I have stated. Certainly no poll tax is required of any person over 50 years of age. The Senator from Mississippi is entirely accurate in what he says. Nobody is disfranchised by reason of the poll tax.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. How much is the poll tax in the Senator's State?

Mr. STEWART. The various counties have different requirements, the maximum being $2. I think the constitution fixes it at $1, and provides that no county may require more than an equal amount.

That is, if the State requires $1, the amount fixed by the county may not exceed that amount.

Mr. EASTLAND. For what purpose is the tax levied? Is it not for the maintenance of schools?

Mr. STEWART. It is for the maintenance of schools. The money is paid into the school fund and is used to support the common or public schools of the State.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a fact that Negro schools are the principal beneficiaries of the tax?

Mr. STEWART. They are, indeed, but all schools benefit by it. We have both Negro and white schools. The money is paid into the county school fund.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. In the event the tax were invalidated, Negro education would suffer, would it not?

Mr. STEWART. It would suffer to that extent, just as all other education would.

Mr. EASTLAND. As a matter of fact, are those who urge the enactment of the pending bill and who appeal for its passage really friends of the Negro race and of Negro education?

Mr. STEWART. I have never thought so.

Referring now to the two provisions, the seventeenth amendment and article I, section 2, of the Constitution, the one relating to the election of Senators, the other to Members of the House of Representatives, these provisions were placed in the Constitution of the United States by the States themselves. Under our law and our Constitution, no rights are given to the Federal Government which are reserved by the States themselves. No rights are given to the Federal Government except those expressly granted to the Federal Government by the States. The Constitution, as adopted, included the first 10 amendments, comprising the Bill of Rights. The tenth amendment was, therefore, included as a part of the Constitution. It was all passed upon at the same convention. The tenth amendment provides:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Commenting upon that provision, the Supreme Court has said that the reservation of powers to the States, respectively, can only mean the reservation of the rights of sovereignty which they respectively possessed before the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, which rights they had not relinquished as a result of the adoption of the Constitution, and that any congressional legislation beyond the limits of the delegated power would constitute a trespass upon the rights of the States, or of the people, and would not constitute the supreme law of the land.

In this case, legislation is sought which would make it unnecessary for a voter to pay a poll tax in order to vote for Members of the Congress or for Presidential electors, contrary to the express provisions of law in my State of Tennessee and in other States of the Union, requiring that in order to vote a man must pay a poll tax. The proposal flies directly in the face of the tenth amendment. It is an effort by the Congress of the United States to pass a law prohibited by the Constitution itself, not only under the express provisions of article I and the seventeenth amendment, but also under the provisions expressly defining the qualifications of those who may vote for Representatives. It is also contrary to the tenth amendment to the Constitution, an additional safeguard, providing that powers not delegated by the States are reserved to the States, or to the people.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the bill provides that the payment of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in primaries and other elections is not and shall not be deemed a qualification for voters or electors.

Mr. STEWART. That expressly flies in the face of the constitutional provision which I have just read.

Mr. EASTLAND. I was getting ready to ask the Senator a question. In other words, it is an attempt, is it not, to have the Congress, under the Constitution, define what shall and what shall not be the qualifications of voters? Is not the attempt to pass the pending bill an effort to usurp a function of the Supreme Court? Is the question not a judicial one for determination by the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. STEWART. It is, of course, a judicial question.

Mr. EASTLAND. As a matter of fact, has not the Supreme Court of the United States held that the State is empowered to levy a poll tax, and to require it as a qualification for voters?

Mr. STEWART. That has been repeatedly held in years gone by.

Mr. EASTLAND. When the State determines the qualifications of an elector for the most numerous branch of the State legislature, such qualifications automatically apply to voters for Representative or Senator, or for Presidential electors, do they not?

Mr. STEWART. That is true. The Senator is correct in what he has said about the bill presenting a legal question. There is no question about its being properly a question for determination by the courts. It will probably go to the courts in the event the bill is passed. At the same time, even though we are a legislative body, we should not undertake to pass legislation which we think is unconstitutional. Without invading the province of the judicial department of the Government, we can, I think, following the law and its proper interpretation, enact statutes which we believe are not within the province of the judicial branch.

Mr. EASTLAND. How may the Congress determine what shall be a qualification? How can it say what a State cannot do in the exercise of its sovereignty?

Mr. STEWART. I think we may find the answer to that very clearly stated in the section of the Constitution which I just read, prescribing the qualifications of voters for Members of the House of Representatives, namely, that they "shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

We go, then, to the State, which elects the Members of Congress, to find out what are the qualifications of the electors.

Is not that a fair statement?

Mr. EASTLAND. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and I should like to ask him another question. This bill would make unlawful the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, Senators, or Members of the House of Representatives. The Constitution plainly says that Presidential electors shall be chosen by the States as the legislatures thereof may direct. In other words, the legislature of a State has supreme and exclusive authority to say how Presidential electors shall be chosen. That is provided by the Constitution of the United States. How can this bill say that a State legislature must meet certain conditions set down by the Congress in choosing Presidential electors? How can the Congress say who shall participate in elections for Presidential electors for the President and the Vice President of the United States?

Mr. STEWART. Congress certainly cannot go beyond the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not exclusively within the hands of the State legislature to say how Presidential electors shall be chosen?

Mr. STEWART. I so interpret the Constitution. I think the Senator is correct about it. I have been confining my remarks chiefly to the provisions which I have mentioned, although I think the Senator is correct in what he says regarding the subject of the right of the State legislature to determine the method of selecting electors.

Mr. EASTLAND. The only exception which is grafted on is the provision that a man shall not be discriminated against. That is the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution, regarding race, creed, or color. The poll tax is levied on all alike, both white and black, is it not?

Mr. STEWART. There is no discrimination. It definitely applies to all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color. There is no discrimination at all. It applies to everyone.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. STEWART. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is not the main controversy not the payment of a poll tax, but to uphold the American system of government which, after all, is the primary duty, the first responsibility, of a Senator or of a Representative? If one will read the notes on the Constitutional Convention he will see that it is the very genius of the American system. It was considered essential to the preservation of our liberties that local control of local affairs remain in the States and in the hands of the people. This controversy

involves the control of elections, the fixing of qualifications now in the hands of the people and of the States, and the centralization of authority in the Congress to regulate the affairs of all the American people.

Mr. STEWART. This bill, as certainly as time goes by each day, is an invasion of States' rights. It is an unwarranted invasion of States' rights. It is an invasion of the rights which the States retain to themselves, and it is an invasion of the rights expressly reserved in the Constitution from which I have just read.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator realize that under the new administration of the present distinguished Governor of South Carolina, who will be inaugurated in January, we shall have no more legislation such as this, but that in his hands the future of this country and the preservation of our system of Government is secure?

Mr. STEWART. That is purely a political question, but I certainly hope he will adhere to the principles of government as we understand them and have understood them for many years.

Mr. President, since the Senator from Mississippi has mentioned the discussions which took place at the time our Constitution was being debated and faith and confidence were being expressed therein by the members of the Constitutional Convention, I should like to read a little bit of the discussion that took place in 1787. I am reading from Formation of the Union, which is a book arranged and indexed by Mr. Charles C. Tansill, prepared under the general supervision of H. H. B. Meyer, Director, Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. It is a collection of documents relating to our constitutional history. These discussions are taken, I believe, from the transactions of the Constitutional Convention when they discussed this very question of voting and the control of elections. It is stated here as follows:

Madison proposed to strike the clause out, which was done. He also proposed to omit the provision fixing the time when the legislature should meet.

Morris—in favor of leaving the time of meeting to the legislature, and observed that if the time be fixed in the Constitution, it would not be observed, as the legislature would not be punctual in assembling.

That is a very interesting discussion. I read further:

Gorham—in favor of the legislature's meeting once a year and of fixing the time. They should meet, if for no other business, to superintend the conduct of the Executive.

Mason—in favor of an annual meeting. The legislatures are also inquisitorial and should meet frequently to inspect the conduct of the public officers.

Article 4, Section 1: Electors to be the same as those of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Morris proposed to strike out the clause, and to leave it to the State legislatures to establish the qualification of the electors and elected, or to add a clause giving to the national legislature powers to alter the qualifications.

Ellsworth—if the legislature can alter the qualifications, they may disqualify three-fourths or a greater portion of the electors—this would go far to create aristocracy. The clause is safe as it stands—the States have staked their liberties on the qualifications which we have proposed to confirm.

Dickinson—It is urged that to confine the right of suffrage to the freeholders is a step toward the creation of an aristocracy. This cannot be true.

They were debating the question that Federal electors must have the same qualifications as electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. Dickinson continued:

We are all safe by trusting the owners of the soil; and it will not be unpopular to do so, for the freeholders there are the more numerous class. Not from freeholders, but from those who are not freeholders, free governments have been endangered. Freeholds are by our laws of inheritance divided among the children of the deceased, and will be parceled out among all the worthy men of the State; the merchants and mechanics may become freeholders and without being so, they are electors of the State legislatures, who appoint the Senators of the United States.

Mr. Ellsworth then said:

Why confine the right of suffrage to freeholders? The rule should be that he who pays and is governed, should be an elector. Virtue and talents are not confined to the freeholders, and we ought not to exclude them.

Then Mr. Morris said:

I disregard sounds and am not alarmed with the word aristocracy, but I dread the thing and will oppose it, and for this reason I think that I shall oppose this Constitution because it will establish an aristocracy. There cannot be an aristocracy of freeholders if they are all electors. But they will be, when a great and rich man can bring his poor dependents to vote in our elections—unless you establish a qualification of property, we shall have an aristocracy. Limit the right of suffrage to freeholders, and it will not be unpopular, because nine-tenths of the inhabitants are freeholders.

Then Mr. Mason said:

Everyone who is of full age and can give evidence of his common interest in the community should be an elector. By this rule, freeholders alone have not this common interest. The father of a family, who has no freehold, has this interest. When he is dead his children will remain. This is a natural interest or bond which binds men to their country—lands are but an artificial tie. The idea of ccunting freeholders as the true and only persons to whom the right of suffrage should be confided is an English prejudice.

They proceeded to discuss this question, and a reading of the discussion is very interesting. I refer to the debate and quote from it because of the questions asked by the Senator from Mississippi, to point out that this problem of voting, this problem of placing qualifications upon the electors, has been one which has had serious consideration from the time those interested began to build this Government. It has always in the days gone by in all governments been a question of vital and extren.e importance. We are not dealing with anything new, and as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] said in his able argument, it is a touchy kind of question. It is not one upon which we agree readily. It seems that at the times when it was debated those who engaged in discussing it seemed to spar with it and to touch one another lightly so far as the idea of tampering with this matter, which is certainly fundamental, was concerned.

We have adopted a Constitution which provides, and has provided throughout the years it has stood, that Members of the National Congress shall be elected from the States they represent, and that they shall be elected by those persons in the States who are qualified voters within the meaning of the statutes of the States. All the Federal Constitution provides is that they shall be those voters who elect the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

To repeat, in Tennessee—and that is the only State of which I have any intimate knowledge, so far as the laws governing electors are concerned—a voter must be 21 years of age, he must have resided within the State for 12 months, and if he moves from one county to another within the State, he must have resided in the new county for a period of 6 months. Those are the only qualifications, if the electors are of sound mind, except that they have to pay a poll tax, and our courts have held that that is a condition precedent to casting a ballot in Tennessee. That applies to the electors who select those who serve in the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

I do not see any exception to that. I do not see any way around that provision of the Constitution. I do not see how it can be circumvented or avoided. It looks to me as if it would require a construction of the Constitution, if I may say so, which would lack a great deal when it comes to the definition of the word "honesty." I do not believe this provision of the Constitution can honestly be evaded.

I now wish to read and comment briefly on some of the selections I have made from Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, eighth edition, volume 2:

THE RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE IN ELECTIONS

In another place we have said that, though the sovereignty is in the people, as a practical fact it resides in those persons who by the Constitution of the States are permitted to exercise the elective franchise. The whole subject of the regulation of elections, including the prescribing of qualifications for suffrage, is left by the National Constitution to the several States, except as it is provided by that instrument that the electors for representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and as the fifteenth amendment forbids denying to citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. (This amendment had the effect to abrogate all provisions in State laws and constitutions restricting the suffrage to white persons) (*Neal* v. *Delaware* (103 U. S. 370; 26 L. ed. 567)). See article by Dr. Spear, in 16 Albany Law Journal 272, in which, among other things, the force and scope of the new amendments to the Federal Constitution in their relation to suffrage are considered. Until recently the regulation and control of all elections, including elections for Members of Congress, and the punishment of offenses against election laws, has been left to the States exclusively. Congress, however, had undoubted authority to make such regulations as shall seem needful to insure a full and fair expression of opinion in the election of Members of Congress, and also to guard and protect all rights conferred by the recent amendments to the Federal Constitution (*Ex parte Siebold* (100 U. S.

371, 25 L. ed. 717); *Ex parte Clarke* (100 U. S. 399, 25 L. ed. 715); *In re Coy* (127 U. S. 731, 32 L. ed. 274, 8 Sup. Ct. Rep. 1263); *United States* v. *Goldman* (3 Woods 187); *United States* v. *Gradwell* (243 U. S. 476, 61 L. ed. 857, 37 Sup. Ct. Rep. 407)). But Congress has no power to regulate primary elections at which candidates for the offices Senator and Representatives are nominated (*Newberry* v. *United States* (256 U. S. 232, 65 L. ed. 913, 41 Sup. Ct. Rep. 469); see also *United States* v. *Gradwell* (243 U. S. 476, 61 L. ed. 857, 37 Sup. Ct. Rep. 407)). A statute excluding Negroes from participation in primary elections has been held not to violate the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, it being held that the amendment only protects the right to vote at general and not at primary elections (*Chandler* v. *Neff* (298 Fed. 515); see also *State* v. *Carrington* (194 Iowa, 785, 190 N. W. 390); *Hodge* v. *Bryan* (149 Ky. 110, 148 S. W. 21); but see *Britton* v. *Board of Election Comm'rs* (129 Cal. 337, 61 Pac. 1115); *People* v. *Strassheim* (240 Ill. 279, 88 N. E. 821)).

In other words, the Constitution of the United States leaves the regulation of elections of all persons who hold public office in the State and in the municipalities under the laws of the State. The Federal Constitution does not touch that question. It does not undertake to interfere with the laws pertaining to the election of a governor of a State or members of the supreme court of the State or members of the judiciary in any capacity. It does not undertake to say what qualifications the electors shall have who vote for the mayor of a city or for county officers or for any other officers. The Constitution is completely silent upon that subject. But it does say, with respect to the Representatives in Congress—and it applies to both branches, since the seventeenth amendment—that they shall have the qualifications requisite to electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. That is the only qualification placed upon all those who vote to elect national officers, and that is the specific qualification which governs and controls.

The fifteenth amendment proceeds to say that no citizen shall be denied the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. That is not interfered with at all by the States. Under the laws of my State of Tennessee there is no provision governing the qualification of electors, except such law as applies to every citizen of the State regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

To continue reading from Cooley's constitutional limitations:

> Participation in the elective franchise is a privilege rather than a right, and it is granted or denied on grounds of general policy; the prevailing view being that it should be as general as possible consistent with the public safety. Aliens are generally excluded (an unnaturalized Indian, who has surrendered his tribal relations, is not a citizen nor entitled to vote, though born in the United States and a resident of a State. *Elk* v. *Wilkins* (112 U. S. 94, 28 L. ed. 643, 5 Supp. Ct. Rep. 41)), though in some States they are allowed to vote after residence for a specified period, provided they have declared their intention to become citizens in the manner prescribed by law.

The States may do that. The States may have special provisions as to an alien who has lived in the country a certain length of time, and who has expressed an intention to become a citizen. The Federal Government has nothing to do with that. The Federal Constitution has no provision that would interfere with such State law.

The fifteenth amendment, it will be seen, does not forbid denying the franchise to citizens except upon certain specified grounds, and it is matter of public history that its purpose was to prevent discriminations in this regard as against persons of African descent. Minors, who equally with adult persons are citizens, are still excluded, as were also women before the adoption of the nineteenth amendment (see Opinions of Justices (62 Me. 596); *Rohrbacher* v. *Mayor of Jackson* (51 Miss. 735); *Spencer* v. *Board of Registration* (1 MacArthur, 169); *Van Valkenburg* v. *Brown* (43 Cal. 43); *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall, 162, 22 L. ed. 627); *Bloomer* v. *Todd* (3 Wash. Terr. 599, 19 Pac. 135); *Gougar* v. *Timberlake* (148 Ind. 38, 46 N. E. 339, 37 L. R. A. 644); *Coffin* v. *Thompson* (97 Mich. 188, 56 N. W. 567, 21 L. R. A. 662, and note); *Van Valkenburg* v. *Brown* (43 Cal. 43); *Spencer* v. *Board of Registration* (1 MacArthur (D. C.) 169)); and sometimes persons who have been convicted of infamous crimes are excluded (Story on Constitution (4th ed.) par. 1972).

The nineteenth amendment provides that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." This provision is within the power of amendment conferred by the Constitution and was validly adopted. (*Leser* v. *Garnett*, 258 U. S. 130, 66 L. ed. 505; 42 Sup. Ct. Rep. 217. Mr. Justice Brandeis, who delivered the opinion of the Court in this case, said: "The first contention is that the power of amendment conferred by the Federal Constitution and sought to be exercised does not extend to this amendment, because of its character. The argument is that so great an addition to the electorate, if made without the State's consent, destroys its autonomy as a political body. This amendment is in character and phraseology precisely similar to the fifteenth. For each the same method of adoption is pursued. One cannot be valid and the other invalid. That the fifteenth is valid, although rejected by six States including Maryland, has been recognized and acted on for half a century. * * * The suggestion that the fifteenth was incorporated in the Constitution, not in accordance with law, but practically as a war measure which has been validated by acquiescence, cannot be entertained.") Its adoption, by its inherent force, struck from the constitutions and statutes of the several States the word "male" wherever it occurred as a limitation upon the right of the citizen to vote. (*Groves* v. *Eubank*, 205 Ala. 174, 87 So. 587; *Brown* v. *Atlanta*, 152 Ga. 283, 109 S. E. 666; *State* v. *Walker*, 192 Iowa, 823, 185 N. W. 619; Opinion of the Justices, 237 Mass. 591, 130 N. E. 685. See also State ex rel. *Polk County* v. *Marsh* (106 Neb. 760, 194 N. W. 901. "The adoption of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States conferred upon women no greater or different right with respect to the exercise of the elective franchise than had heretofore been possessed and enjoyed by men under the constitutions and laws of the States." State ex rel. *Klein* v. *Hillenbrand*, 101 Ohio St. 370, 130 N. E. 29.)

In some States laws will be found in existence which, either generally or in particular cases, deny the right to vote to those persons who lack a specified property qualification, or who do not pay taxes. (See *Frieszleben* v. *Shallcross* (9 Houst. (Del.) 1, 19 Atl. 576, 8 L. R. A. 337 and note).) In some States idiots and lunatics are also expressly excluded, and it has been supposed that these unfortunate classes, by the common political law of England and of this country, were excluded with women, minors, and aliens from exercising the right of suffrage, even though not prohibited therefrom by any express constitutional or statutory provision. (See Cushing's Legislative Assemblies, sec. 24; also sec. 27, and notes referring to legislative cases; McCrary, Law of Elections, secs. 50, 73; *Clark* v. *Robinson* (88 Ill. 498). Drunkenness is regarded as temporary insanity. Idiots and insane persons are excluded in Alabama, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland (provided they are under guardianship as such), Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Convicted felons are excluded in Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. Persons under guardianship are excluded in Florida, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin. Paupers are excluded in Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts (see Justices' Opinions, 124 Mass. 596), New Jersey, Rhode Island, and West Virginia. Persons kept in any poorhouse or other asylum at public expense are excluded in California, Colorado, Missouri, and South Carolina. Persons confined in public prisons are excluded in California, Colorado, Missouri, and South Carolina. Persons under interdiction are excluded in Louisiana, and persons excused from paying taxes at their own request, in New Hampshire. Capacity to read is required in Connecticut, and capacity to read and write, in Massachusetts. In Nevada every male citizen, except convicts and paupers, have the franchise; Mormons cannot be excluded by registration laws. *State* v. *Findley* (20 Nev. 198, 19 Pac. 241). It is otherwise in the Territories. *Murphy* v. *Ramsey* (114 U. S. 43, 29 L. ed. 61, 5 Sup. Ct. Rep. 747); *Innis* v. *Bolton* (2 Idaho, 407, 17 Pac. 264).

Wherever the Constitution has prescribed the qualifications of electors, they cannot be changed or added to by the legislature, or otherwise than by an amendment of the Constitution.

See *Green* v. *Shumway* (39 N. Y. 418); *Brown* v. *Grover* (6 Bush. 1); *Quinn* v. *State* (35 Ind., 485); *Huber* v. *Reiley* (53 Pa. St. 112); *People* v. *Canaday* (73 N. C. 198); *State* v. *Tuttle* (53 Wis. 45, 9 N. W. 791); *Tolbert* v. *Long* (134 Ga. 292, 67 S. E. 826, 137 Am. St. Rep. 222); *Coggeshall* v. *Des Moines* (138 Iowa, 730, 117 N. W. 309, 128 Am. St. Rep. 221); *State* v. *Monahan* (72 Kan. 492, 84 Pac. 130, 115 Am. St. Rep. 224, 7 Ann. Cas. 661); *Johnson* v. *Grand Forks County* (16 N. D. 363, 113 N. W. 1071, 125 Am. St. Rep. 662); *Livesley* v. *Litchfield* (47 Oreg. 248, 83 Pac. 142, 114 Am. St. Rep. 920. Ante p. 99, note). Compare *State* v. *Neal* (42 Mo. 119). Where a disqualification to vote is made to depend upon the commission of crime, the election officers cannot be made the triers of the offense. *Huber* v. *Reiley* (53 Pa. St. 112); *State* v. *Symonds* (59 Me. 151); *Burkett* v. *McCarty* (10 Bush, 758). It is not competent for the legislature to discriminate between voters and require that one class of them shall be taxpayers, while not making the same requirement as to the others. *Lyman* v. *Martin* (2 Utah, 136). But voters at municipal elections may be required to pay taxes before voting. *Buckner* v. *Gordon* (81 Ky. 665); *State* v. *Dillon* (32 Fla. 545, 14 So. 383, 22 L. R. A. 124).

Mr. President, on that point that the qualification of electors cannot be changed or added to by the National Legislature, or otherwise than by an amendment to the Constitution; we are controlled by the provisions of the Fed-

eral Constitution which say that persons who vote for Members of Congress in the different States must have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. We are bound to follow that provision and to be controlled by it. House bill 29 is not in accord with the provisions of the Constitution, and it is not only not in accord but it absolutely flies into the face of the constitutional provisions which say that electors for Members of Congress must have the same qualifications as electors who vote in the States under the provisions of State law for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. If we pass a law of the kind now proposed we are defying our own Constitution; we are violating our own Constitution.

Mr. President, I see no reason why such a law as here proposed should be passed simply for the purpose of satisfying or appeasing someone who is opposed to the poll tax which exists in a few States of the Union. So far as I am concerned personally, living in a poll-tax State, Tennessee, I should like to see the poll-tax law in my State repealed. I should be perfectly willing, and have so publicly expressed myself several times, to go along with those who want that law repealed. It is a provision of our State constitution, and the Supreme Court has upheld it, so that in Tennessee one of the prerequisites to voting for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature is the payment of the poll tax. I should be glad to see the tax repealed in my State, I repeat, but I do not think the Federal Government, the National Government, call it what you will, acting through the Congress has a legal and constitutional right to invade a State and undertake to change its laws, which for perhaps 150 years have stood the test of time and are the laws which were passed under the Federal Constitution shortly after it was adopted.

The Constitution of the United States is the same document now as it was when it was drafted. It is a flexible document. It is one under which we can all live. It is so flexible that sometimes I think it has been stretched a little bit too much. It seems that many want to take hold of it and test its flexibility just a little more. But I think we should confine ourselves seriously and earnestly to nothing more and nothing less than an honest construction of the greatest document that has ever been penned by the hand of man. It is a document under which our country has lived and grown great. It is the same document, with the amendments which have been added to it, that was drafted so many years ago.

When that document was drafted it provided that the Members of Congress should be elected by those who were qualified in each State to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The same words that were used when that document was drafted are now controlling. They have been in the document ever since it was drafted. They have been construed time and again. They have been looked upon to mean exactly what they say. It has been believed by those who are students of the Constitution that it means simply that no one can vote for a Member of the Congress who is not qualified to vote for a member of the most numerous branch of the legislature in his State. There is no other provision in the Constitution that overrides that language or repeals it or sets it aside. It is an express provision, and was placed in the Constitution, as I said at the outset of my argument, by the States, and is something which has been preserved to the States and never seriously questioned.

A moment ago I referred to a paragraph which I wish to repeat:

> In some States laws will be found in existence which, either generally or in particular cases, deny the right to vote to those persons who lack specified property qualifications or who do not pay taxes.

There is cited a case reported from the State of Delaware, found in 337 L. R. A., with footnotes:

> One of the most common requirements is that the party offering to vote shall reside within the district which is to be affected by the exercise of the right.

I believe that if the Congress has a right to abolish the poll-tax requirement in the States which still have the poll-tax law, it would also have a right to provide that it is not necessary to reside in the district, as might be required by the State as one of the qualifications for voters or electors before they could vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. If the National Congress has the authority to abolish the poll-tax requirement, it certainly has authority, by the same process of reasoning, it seems to me, to provide that it shall not be necessary for a person to reside in the district which is affected by the exercise of the suffrage.

> If a State officer is to be chosen, the voter should be a resident of the State; and if a county, city, or township officer, he should reside within such county, city, or township. This is the general rule; and for the more convenient determination of the right to vote, and to prevent fraud, it is now generally required that the elector shall only exercise within the municipality where he has his residence his right to participate in either local or general elections. (The mere fact that one lives upon a steamer does not give him a voting residence at her home port, even though he has no voting residence elsewhere, and is unmarried. *Howard* v. *Skinner* (87 Md. 556, 40 Atl. 379, 40 L. R. A. 753); *Jones* v. *Skinner* (87 Md. 560, 40 Atl. 331, 40 L. R. A. 752). Residence is not changed by presence in and support at and by a State soldiers' home. *Wolcott* v. *Holcomb* (97 Mich. 361, 56 N. W. 837, 23 L. R. A. 215) and note on residence and attendance or presence at public institutions; see also to same effect *Powell* v. *Spackman* (7 Idaho 692, 65 Pac. 503.)

If we have the right, in the face of the constitutional provisions, which I have read and to which I have referred several times, to say that voters do not have to pay a poll tax when the State requirement is that they must pay a poll tax before they can vote for members of the legislature, then certainly we have the right to say that they do not have to reside in the State for 12 months, which is another provision of law in Tennessee, or that they do not have to be 21 years of age.

To take the converse of this proposition, we could just as well provide that voters must continue to pay a poll tax after they pass the age of 50 years. In other words, if we can break down this provision of law for one purpose, we can do it for practically any other kindred purpose.

Requiring him to vote among his neighbors, by whom he will be likely to be generally known, the opportunities for illegal or fraudulent voting will be less than if the voting were allowed to take place at a distance and among strangers.

That is one of the reasons why the right of a man to vote is confined to a particular locality. He must live in a certain precinct, so that those who conduct elections in most cases will know him. They will know who he is, and there will be less chance for fraud. If we have the right to override the provisions of the Consitution and enact a poll-tax statute, we have the right to provide that a man who resides in one portion of the State may vote in another portion of the State.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, without losing the floor, so that I may introduce a bill?

Mr. STEWART. I shall be glad to yield with that understanding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill amending certain provisions of the Social Security Act, in compliance with the recommendations of the President in his message on Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2914) to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act by liberalizing benefits, by increasing amounts beneficiaries may earn without loss of benefits, and by lowering the age of eligibility of women beneficiaries, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BARKLEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, may I interrogate the Senator from Kentucky concerning his bill, without losing the floor? I ask unanimous consent to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEWART. As I understand, the Senator is introducing a bill providing, perhaps, among other things, that the old-age security benefits may be given to women who can qualify when they become 60 years of age, instead of 65?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a bill carrying out the recommendations of the President with respect to increasing the benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance system and reducing the retirement age for women from 65 to 60.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator is a little late. I introduced such a bill a day or two ago.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for his prescience, and also his cooperation.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. STEWART. Reading further from the text which I have been quoting:

And wherever this is the requirement of the Constitution, any statute permitting voters to deposit their ballots elsewhere must necessarily be void. (Opinions of Judges (30 Conn. 591); *Hulseman* v. *Rems* (41 Pa. St. 396); *Chase* v. *Miller* (41 Pa. St. 403); Opinions of Judges (44 N. H. 633); *Bourland* v. *Hildreth* (26 Cal. 161); *People* v. *Blodgett* (13 Mich. 127); Opinions of Judges (37 Vt. 665); *Day* v. *Jones* (31 Ca. 261); in re Opinion of Justices (80 N. H. 596, 113 Atl. 293); In re Contested Election (281 Pa. St. 131, 126 Atl. 199, 35 A. L. R. 815); In re Right of Electors (41 R. I. 118, 102 Atl. 913).) The case of *Morrison* v. *Springer* (15 Iowa, 304) is not in harmony with those above cited. In North Carolina where the constitution provides that a voter at an election shall have resided in the State for 2 years, in the county 6 months, and in the election district, in which he offers to vote, 4 months next preceding the election, and that every person offering to vote shall be at the time a legally registered voter, and that the election shall be by ballot, a statute providing that absent voters who are duly registered may mail their ballots to be deposited in boxes in the district of their residence, was held to be constitutional. *Jenkins* v. *State Board of Elections* (180 N. C. 169, 104 S. E. 346, 14 A. L. R. 1247). See also *Jones* v. *Smith* (165 Ark. 425, 264 S. W. 950); *Straughan* v. *Meyers* (268 Mo. 580, 187 S. W. 1159); *Goodell* v. *Judith Basin County* (70 Mont. 222, 224 Pac. 1110); *Adams* v. *Flanagan* (201 App. Div. 735, 195 N. Y. Supp. 182, affirmed without opinion, 234 N. Y. 540, 138 N. E. 438). Under the constitution of Kentucky which provides that "all elections by the people shall be by secret official ballot, furnished by public authority to the voters at the polls, and marked by each voter in private at the polls, and then and there deposited," a statute authorizing voting by absentees is void. *Clark* v. *Nash* (192 Ky. 594, 234 S. W., 1, 19 A. L. R. 304). So far as the election of Representatives in Congress and electors of President and Vice President is concerned, the State constitutions cannot preclude the legislature from prescribing the "times, places, and manner of holding" the same, as allowed by the National Constitution—article I, section 4, and article II, section 1—and a statute permitting such election to be held out of the State would consequently not be invalid. Opinions of Justices (45 N. H. 595); Opinions of Judges (37 Vt. 665). But in Opinion of the Justices (80 N. H. 595, 113 Atl. 293), the court held that the validity of an election of a Senator or a Representative in Congress which depends upon votes given by proxy is so doubtful that it could not advise that legislation so providing would be valid. The court, after reciting the provisions of the Federal Constitution requiring that in elections for Representatives and Senators the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, said:

"The advice given in 1864 (45 N. H. 595) that voting for Representatives in Congress could be authorized in places other than those in which the voter was by the State constitution qualified to vote was based upon the proposition that the place where a voter was qualified to vote was no part of his qualifications as an elector. Giving a narrow construction to the term 'qualification,' it might be concluded that the requirement of the State constitution that the voter should present his vote in person related merely to the manner of voting and not to the qualifications of a voter. But the elector is not capable of voting for members of the most numerous branch of our legislature unless he is physically capable of attending the meeting and is there present in person. The requirements of the Federal Constitution that the electors of Senators and Representatives should possess the qualifications of electors of a class of legislators in the State would seem to imply that only those who by State law were permitted to vote for such legislators should have the right to vote for candidates for the Federal officers."

There are now constitutional provisions in New York, Michigan, Missouri, Connecticut, Maryland, Kansas, Mississippi, Nevada, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania which permits soldiers in actual service to cast their votes where they may happen to be stationed at the time of voting. It may also be allowed in Ohio. (*Lehman* v. *McBride* (15 Ohio (N. S.) 573).)

In Massachusetts provision is made by statute for voting by mail at biennial State elections of voters absent from the city or town where they are registered. (General laws, ch. 54, secs. 86–103.)

I read an excerpt from a footnote under the text from which I have read, which refers to the Constitution of Kentucky:

Under the Constitution of Kentucky, which provides that all elections by the people shall be held by secret official ballot furnished by public authority to the voters at the polls and marked by each voter in private at the polls and then and there deposited, a statute authorizing voting by absentees is void.

If we have the right to change the poll tax law of Tennessee, we have the right to provide that in the State of Kentucky voters in an election shall not be required to mark their ballots in private. We would have that right by the same process of reasoning by which we would have the right to fly in the face of the express provision of the Constitution on the proposition of the qualification of electors. We would have a right to do practically anything we wanted to do, however absurd it might appear to be.

There is a case from which I should like to read, reported in 45 New Hampshire, 595, commenting upon the same text from which I read with respect to fraudulent voting:

The advice given that voting for Representatives in Congress could be authorized in places other than those in which the voter was by the State constitution qualified to vote was based upon the proposition that the place where a voter was qualified to vote was no part of his qualifications as an elector. Giving a narrow construction to the term "qualification," it might be concluded that the requirement of the State constitution that the voter should present his vote in person related merely to the manner of voting and not to the qualifications of a voter.

There is another provision of the Constitution which affects the manner of voting.

But the elector is not capable of voting for members of the most numerous branch of our legislature unless he is physically capable of attending the meeting and is there present in person.

This is the Supreme Court of New Hampshire speaking.

The requirements of the Federal Constitution that the electors of Senators and Representatives should possess the qualifications of electors of a class of legislators in the State would seem to imply that only those who by State law were permitted to vote for such legislators should have the right to vote for candidates for the Federal officers.

Continuing to read from the text:

A person's residence is the place of his domicile, or the place where his habitation is fixed without any present intention of removing therefrom. (*Putnam* v. *Johnson* (10 Mass. 488); *Rue High's case* (2 Doug. (Mich.) 515); *Fry's Election case* (71 Pa. St. 302, 10 Am. Rep. 698); *Church* v. *Rowell* (49 Maine 367); *Littlefield* v. *Brooks* (50 Maine 475); *Parsons* v. *Bangor* (61 Main 457); *Arnold* v. *Davis* (8 R. I. 342); *Hannon* v. *Grizzard* (89 N. C. 115); *Dale* v. *Irwin* (78 Ill. 498); *Strugeon* v. *Korte* (34 Ohio St. 525); *State* v. *Savre* (129 Iowa 122, 105 N. W. 387, 113 Am. St. Rep. 452, 3 L. R. A. (N. S.) 455); *Erwin* v. *Benton* (120 Ky. 536, 87 S. W. 291, 9 Ann. Cas. 264); Story, Conflicting Laws, Sec. 43. As to what residence is sufficient, see *Kellogg* v. *Hickman* (12 Col. 256, 21 Pac. 325); *Kreitz* v. *Behrensmeyer* (125 Ill. 141, 17 N. E. 232); *Langhammer* v. *Munter* (80 Md. 518, 31 Atl. 300, 27 L. R. A. 330). That one should vote where he eats, not where he lodges, if at different places, see *Warren* v. *Board of Registration* (72 Mich. 398, 40 N. W. 653).) The words "inhabitant," "citizen," and "resident," as employed in different constitutions to define the qualifications of electors, mean substantially the same thing; and one is an inhabitant, resident, or citizen at the place where he has his domicile or home. (Cushing's Law and Practice of Legislative Assemblies, sec. 36; *State* v. *Aldrich* (14 R. I. 171). See also *Anderson* v. *Pifer* (315 Ill. 164, 146 N. E. 171, 37 A. L. R. 134). But in Louisiana it has been held that the term "residence" used by the Constitution in fixing the qualification of voters, does not mean domicile; that in the absence of proof that a person otherwise qualified has acquired a residence elsewhere, he must be considered to be a resident of the parish where his work requires him to stay, where he was born, and where he has always lived and voted; and that it makes no difference that he has never had in said parish any other home than a boarding house, while he has had in another parish a home where he has kept his wife and children, whom he has visited as often as he could. *Estopinal* v. *Michel* (121 La. 879, 46 So. 907, 19 L. R. A. (N. S.) 759). Where territory in which a voter has continuously resided up to the time of annexation to a municipality is annexed to or incorporated with it, his period of such residence is to be counted in determining his residential qualification for eligibility to office. *Gibson* v. *Wood* (105 Ky 740, 49 S. W. 768, 43 L. R. A. 699).)

Every person at all times must be considered as having a domicile somewhere and that which he has acquired at one place is considered as continuing until another is acquired at a different place. (*People* v. *Turpin* (49 Colo. 234, 112 Pac. 539, 33 L. R. A. (N. S.) 766, Ann. Cas. 1912 C. 724); *Welsh* v. *Shumway* (323 Ill. 54, 83 N. E. 549); *Elam* v. *Maggard* (165 Ky. 733, 178 S. W. 1065); *Carwile* v. *Jones* (38 Mont. 590, 101 Pac. 153); *In re Rooney* (172 App. Div. 274, 159 N. Y. Supp. 132); *Finn* v. *Board of Canvassers* (24 R. I. 482, 53 Atl. 633); *Clarke* v. *McCowan* (107 S. C. 209, 92 S. E. 479); *Seibold* v. *Wahl* (164 Wis. 82, 159 N. W. 546, Ann. Cas. 1917 C, 400).) That it is not a necessary consequence of this doctrine that one must always be entitled to vote somewhere, see *Kreitz* v. *Behrensmeyer* (125 Ill. 141, 17 N. E. 232). In North Dakota it has been held that "a domicile once gained does not continue until a new one is acquired for voting purposes, nor does a right to vote at a particular poll or district continue until the right to vote elsewhere is shown; but the shortest absence coincident with an intention to

change the residence, defeats the right to vote at the former domicile." *Nelson* v. *Gass* (27 N. D. 357, 146 N. W. 537, Ann. Cas. 1915 C, 796).) As has been said by the Supreme Court of Nebraska: "One's residence is where he has established home; the place where he habitually is present, and to which, when he departs, he intends to return. The fact that he may at a future time intend to remove will not necessarily defeat his residence before he actually does remove." (*Berry* v. *Wilcox* (44 Neb. 82, 62 N. W. 249, 48 Am. St. Rep. 706); *White* v. *Siams* (89 Neb. 65, 130 N. W. 978, Ann. Cas. 1912 C, 518).) It has been held that a student in an institution of learning, who has residence there for purposes of instruction, may vote at such place, provided he is emancipated from his father's family, and for the time has no home elsewhere.

Putnam v. *Johnson* (10 Mass. 488); *Lincoln* v. *Hapgood* (11 Mass. 350); *Wilbraham* v. *Ludlow* (99 Mass. 587); *Perry* v. *Reynolds* (53 Conn. 527, 3 Atl. 555); *Berry* v. *Wilcox* (44 Nebr. 82, 62 N. W. 249, 48 Am. St. Rep. 706). Compare *In re Blankford* (241 N. Y. 180, 149 N. E. 415); *Seibold* v. *Wahl* (164 Wis. 82, 159 N. W. 546, Ann. Cas. 1917 C, 400); *Dale* v. *Irwin* (78 Ill. 170).

A different conclusion is arrived at in Pennsylvania. *Fry's Election case* (71 Pa. St. 302, 10 Am. Rep. 698). And in Iowa, *Vanderpoel* v. *O'Hanlon* (53 Iowa 246, 5 N. W. 119, 36 Am. Rep. 216).

In *Anderson* v. *Pifer* (315 Ill. 164, 146 N. E. 171, 37 A. L. R. 134), Justice Farmer, who delivered the opinion of the court said: "Whether a college student is entitled to vote because his permanent abode is at the place of the college is one of fact. One cannot have a residence in two places at the same time. *Dale* v. *Irwin* (78 Ill. 170). The mere presence of the student at the place of the college is not sufficient to entitle him to vote. His residence must be bona fide with no intention of returning to the parental home. College students entirely free from parental control, who regard the college town as their home, and who have no other home to return to in case of sickness or other affliction, are legal voters." (See also *Welsh* v. *Shumway* (232 Ill. 54, 83 N. E. 549).)

"If a man takes up his permanent abode at the place of an institution of learning, the fact of his entering it as a student will not preclude his acquiring a legal residence there; *Sanders* v. *Getchell* (76 Maine 158); *Pedigo* v. *Grimes* (113 Ind. 148, 13 N. E. 700); but if he is domiciled at the place for the purposes of instruction only, it is deemed proper and right that he should neither lose his former residence nor gain a new one in consequence theerof. *Vanderpoel* v. *O'Hanlon* (53 Iowa 246, 5 N. W. 119, 36 Am. Rep. 216).

"The question of residence, inhabitancy, or domicile—for although not in all respects precisely the same, they are nearly so, and depend much upon the same evidence—are attended with more difficulty than almost any other which are presented for adjudication. No exact definition can be given of domicile; it depends upon no one fact or combination of circumstances; but, from the whole taken together, it must be determined in each particular case. It is a maxim that every man must have a domicile somewhere, and also that he can have but one. Of course it follows that his existing domicile continues until he acquires another; and vice versa, by acquiring a new domicile he relinquishes his former one. From this view it is manifest that very slight circumstances must often decide the question. It depends upon the preponderance of the evidence in favor of two or more places; and it may often occur that the evidence of facts tending to establish the domicile in one place would be entirely conclusive, were it not for the existence of facts and circumstances of a still more conclusive and decisive character, which fix it beyond question in another. So, on the contrary, very slight circumstances may fix one's domicile, if not controlled by more conclusive facts fixing it in another place. If a seaman, without family or property, sails from the place of his nativity, which may be considered his domicile of origin, although he may return only at long intervals, or even be absent many years, yet if he does not by some actual residence or other means acquire a domicile elsewhere, he retains his domicile of origin." Shaw, chief justice, *Thorndike* v. *City of Boston* (1 Met. 242, 245). And see *Alston* v. *Newcomer* (42 Miss. 186); *Johnson* v. *People* (94 Ill. 505).

In *Inhabitants of Abington* v. *Inhabitants of North Bridgewater* (23 Pick 170), it appeared that a town line ran through the house occupied by a party, leaving a portion on one side sufficient to form a habitation, and a portion on the other not sufficient for that purpose. Held, that the domicile must be deemed to be on the side first mentioned. It was intimated also that where a house was thus divided, and the party slept habitually on one side, that circumstance should be regarded as a preponderating one to fix his residence there, in the absence of other proof. And see *Rex.* v. *St. Olave's* (1 Strange 51).

That persons residing upon lands within a State, but set apart for some national purpose, and subjected to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, are not voters. (See Opinions of Judges (1 Met. 580); *Sinks* v. *Reese* (10 Ohio St. 306); McCrary, Law of Elections, sec. 29.)

Mr. President, if Congress has a constitutional right to pass an anti-poll tax law, such as contained in House bill 29, concerning which a motion for consideration is pending, then Congress has a right to tamper with the laws of residence of voters and of citizens of various States. It would have the same right to provide, as I said a moment ago, that a man might live in one county and might vote in another. If Congress has the right to interfere with the poll-tax laws, it also has the right to do those other things.

I read further:

By the constitutions of several of the States it is provided, in substance, that no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence, while employed in the service of the United States; nor while a student in any seminary or place of learning; nor while kept at any almshouse or asylum at public expense; nor while confined in any public prison. (See Constitutions of New York, Illinois, Indiana, California, Michigan, Rhode Island, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, and Wisconsin. A pauper inmate of a soldiers' home comes within such provision. *Silvey* v. *Lindsay* (107 N. Y. 55, 13 N. E. 444). In several of the other States there are provisions covering some of these cases, but not all. A provision that no person shall be deemed to have gained or lost a residence by reason of his presence or absence in the service of the United States, does not preclude one from acquiring a residence in the place where, and in the time while, he is present in such service. *People* v. *Holden* (28 Cal. 123); *Mooar* v. *Harvey* (128 Mass. 219). Temporary absence from one's home with continuous intention to return will not deprive one of his residence even though it extend through a series of years. (*Harbaugh* v. *Cicott* (33 Mich. 241); Fry's Election Case (71 Pa. St. 302, 10 Am. Rep. 698); *Dennis* v. *State* (17 Fla. 389); *Wheat* v. *Smith* (50 Ark. 266, 7 S. W. 161); *State* v. *Sayre* (129 Iowa, 122, 105 N. W. 387, 113 Am. St. Rep. 452, 3 L. R. A (N. S.) 455); *Erwin* v. *Benton* (120 Ky. 536, 87 S. W. 291, 9 Ann. Cas. 264); *Nelson* v. *Gass* (27 N. D. 357, 146 N. W. 537, Ann. Cas. 1915 C, 796); *State* v. *Lally* (134 Wis. 253, 114 N. W. 447, 15 Ann. Cas. 242).)

Mr. President, if we could change the law which pertains to the qualification of voters for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, we could change the poll-tax requirement. The argument is just as plausible when applied to one as it is when applied to the other. If we could invade a State and deprive it of the rights, which it has from the powerful and explicit words of the United States Constitution, words which were placed there by patriotic Americans many years ago, words which speak so strongly and so eloquently, and which were intended to preserve to the States the right to define the qualifications of voters, then we could make the other changes to which I have referred. Certainly if we could make changes in the one case, we could do so in the other.

Mr. President, the step here proposed would be an invasion of States' rights, an invasion of rights which, as I have stated, the States have undertaken to preserve. I do not see how the framers of the Constitution could have stated their intention any more clearly or strongly. I believe they thought they were expressing themselves, by the use of that language, as strongly as it was possible for human beings to express themselves, and I believe they used words which they thought everyone in the future who spoke the English language would understand. I believe the framers of the Constitution thought those words would preserve to the several States the right to declare the qualifications of electors of the Members of the United States Congress and other United States officers. I do not believe there is any escape from that conclusion; and certainly there is no provision of the Constitution which interferes with that interpretation, as I see it and as I honestly believe it and understand it.

CONDITIONS TO THE EXERCISE OF THE ELECTIVE FRANCHISE

While it is true that the legislature cannot add to the constitutional qualification of electors, it must nevertheless devolve upon that body to establish such regulations as will enable all persons entitled to the privilege to exercise it freely and securely, and exclude all who are not entitled from improper participation therein. For this purpose the times of holding elections, the manner of conducting them, and of ascertaining the result are prescribed, and heavy penalties are imposed upon those who shall vote illegally, or instigate others to do so, or who shall attempt to preclude a fair election or to falsify the result. The propriety, and, indeed, the necessity, of such regulations are undisputed. In some of the States it has also been regarded as important that lists of voters should be prepared before the day of election, in which should be registered the name of every person qualified to vote. Under such a regulation the officers whose duty it is to administer the election laws are enabled to proceed with more deliberation in the discharge of their duties, and to avoid the haste and confusion that must attend the determination upon election day of the various and sometimes difficult questions concerning the right of individuals to exercise this important franchise. Electors also, by means of this registry, are notified in

advance what persons claim the right to vote, and are enabled to make the necessary examination to determine whether the claim is well founded, and to exercise the right of challenge if satisfied any person registered is unqualified.

Mr. President, if this bill should pass and should be upheld, it would be necessary in the State of Tennessee, I believe, to hold two separate elections. In the coming November when we shall elect a governor and 10 Members of the United States House of Representatives and 1 Member of the United States Senate, as well as numerous State officers, we would be compelled to have separate ballot boxes, because persons who then would vote for Governor of Tennessee would first have to pay a poll tax, and persons who would vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature who will be elected in November would first have to pay a poll tax, under the Tennessee law. On the same election grounds there would also have to be a ballot box in which persons could place their votes for United States Senator and Members of the United States House of Representatives. Many of those persons would not be qualified as electors for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, because they would not have paid their poll tax. Mr. President, how could such a situation be handled? Persons who had not paid their poll tax could not put their ballots in the box in which the ballots for Governor of Tennessee would go; but those who had not paid their poll tax would nevertheless insist that they had a right to vote for United States Senator and Members of the United States House of Representatives. So a separate ballot would have to be printed.

The confusion which would be caused and the chances for fraud which would be presented would be tremendous. I do not know how the matter would be worked out in a practical way; but certainly, as I was saying, those who had paid their poll tax could vote for governor and for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, because they would qualify under the State law to do so; but a group of persons who had not paid their poll tax might present themselves and might say, "House bill 29 is a law now, and we want to vote. Although we are not qualified to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, nevertheless, we want to vote for Members of the United States Congress."

Certainly the election officials would be confronted with a serious problem. It is something that would have to be worked out in advance, time permitting. There would have to be a separate set of election officers. I do not know whether there is any machinery provided in the State of Tennessee to take care of such a situation. It might be that one set of election officials would conduct two elections and supply two separate sets of ballot boxes as would be necessary if persons not be qualified under the provisions of the Constitution, to which I have referred, could vote to elect Representatives and Senators. They could not vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. They could not do that because the State of Tennessee would not permit it, they not having paid the poll tax. In that case it might be that a candidate for Senator or Representative would receive the necessary votes but would not be lawfully declared elected under the Constitution, he having been elected by persons not qualified to vote for the State legislature. That flies in the face of both the Federal Constitution and the State constitution.

When the constitution has established no such rule, and is entirely silent on the subject, it has sometimes been claimed that the statute requiring voters to be registered before the day of election, and excluding from the right all whose names do not appear upon the list, was unconstitutional and void, as adding another test to the qualifications of electors which the Constitution has prescribed, and as having the effect, where electors are not registered, to exclude from voting persons who have an absolute right to that franchise by the fundamental law. See *Page* v. *Allen* (58 Pa. St. 338). And compare *Clark* v. *Robinson* (88 Ill. 498); *Dells* v. *Kennedy* (49 Wis. 555, 6 N. W. 246, 381, 35 Am. Rep. 786); *White* v. *Multnomah Co.* (13 Oreg. 317, 10 Pac. 484). In *State* v. *Corner* (22 Neb. 265, 34 N. W. 499), it is said the voter has the right to prove himself an elector, register, and vote at any time before the polls close. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania laid down a rule in conflict with these cases, in *Patterson* v. *Barlow* (60 Pa. St. 54), which case is in harmony with those cited in the next paragraph.

This position, however, has not been generally accepted as sound by the courts. The provision for a registry deprives no one of his right, but is only a reasonable regulation under which the right may be exercised. *Capen* v. *Foster* (12 Pick. 485, 23 Am. Dec. 632); *People* v. *Kopplekom* (16 Mich. 342); *State* v. *Bond* (38 Mo. 425); *State* v. *Hilmantel* (21 Wis. 566); *State* v. *Baker* (38 Wis. 71); *Byler* v. *Asher* (47 Ill. 101); *Monroe* v. *Collins* (17 Ohio St. 665); *Edmonds* v. *Banbury* (28 Iowa, 267, 4 Am. Rep. 177); *Ensworth* v. *Albin* (46 Mo. 450); *Auld* v. *Walton* (12 La. Ann. 129); *In re Polling Lists* (13 R. I. 729); *State* v. *Butts* (31 Kan. 537, 2 Pac. 618). As to the conclusiveness of the registry, see *Hyde* v. *Brush* (34 Conn. 454); *Keenan* v. *Cook* (12 R. I. 52).

A law closing registration 3 weeks before the election has been upheld. *People* v. *Hoffman* (116 Ill. 587, 5 N. E. 596, 8 N. E. 788). Otherwise as to one closing it 5 days before: *Daggett* v *Hudson* (43 Ohio St. 548, 3 N. E. 538); and 10 days before; *State* v. *Corner* (22 Neb. 265, 34 N. W. 499).

Registration may be required at a city election where it is not required by State law. *McMahon* v. *Savannah* (66 Ga. 217). See *Com.* v. *McClelland* (83 Ky. 686).

Voter may be required to exhibit his poll-tax receipt, or make affidavit that he has paid the tax and lost or misplaced the receipt. *State* v. *Old* (95 Tenn. 723, 34 S. W. 690, 31 L. R. A. 837).

But a law attempting to invalidate ballots upon which the inspectors have neglected to mark their initials is void where the constitution provides that all persons having certain qualifications "shall be entitled to vote at all elections." *Moyer* v. *Van De Vanter* (12 Wash. 377, 41 Pac. 60, 29 L. R. A. 670).

Where statute provides that upon voter's taking a specified oath "his vote shall be received, such provision is mandatory. *Wolcott* v. *Holcomb* (97 Mich. 361, 56 N. W. 837, 23 L. R. A. 215).

An unregistered voter may be required to make affidavit as to his qualifications, stating them in full. *Cusick's Appeal* (136 Pa. 459, 20 Atl. 574, 10 L. R. A. 228).

Requirements in registration law must be reasonable. *Owensboro* v. *Hickman* (90 Ky. 629, 14 S. W. 688, 10 L. R. A. 224, and note).

Such regulations must always have been within the power of the legislature, unless forbidden. Many resting upon the same principle are always prescribed, and have never been supposed to be open to objection. Although the Constitution provides that all male citizens 21 years of age and upward shall be entitled to vote, it would not be seriously contended that a statute which should require all such citizens to go to the established place for holding the polls, and there deposit their ballots, and not elsewhere, was a violation of the Constitution, because prescribing an additional qualification, namely, the presence of the elector at the polls. All such reasonable regulations of the constitutional right which seem to the legislature important to the preservation of order in elections, to guard against fraud, undue influence, and oppression, and to preserve the purity of the ballot box, are not only within the constitutional power of the legislature, but are commendable, and at least some of them absolutely essential. And where the law requires such a registry, and forbids the reception of votes from any persons not registered, an election in a township where no such registry has ever been made will be void, and cannot be sustained by making proof that none in fact but duly qualified electors have voted. It is no answer that such a rule may enable the registry officers, by neglecting their duty, to disfranchise the electors altogether; the remedy of the electors is by proceedings to compel the performance of the duty; and the statute, being imperative and mandatory, cannot be disregarded. The danger, however, of any such misconduct on the part of officers is comparatively small, when the duty is intrusted to those who are chosen in the locality where the registry is to be made, and who are consequently immediately responsible to those who are interested in being registered.

All regulations of the elective franchise, however, must be reasonable, uniform, and impartial; they must not have for their purpose directly or indirectly to deny or abridge the constitutional right of citizens to vote, or unnecessarily to impede its exercise; if they do, they must be declared void.

In some other cases preliminary action by the public authorities may be requisite before any legal election can be held. If an election is one which a municipality may hold or not at its option, and the proper municipal authority decides against holding it, it is evident that individual citizens must acquiesce, and that any votes which may be cast by them on the assumption of right must be altogether nugatory. The same would be true of an election to be held after proclamation for that purpose, and which must fail if no such proclamation has been made. Where, however, both the time and the place of an election are prescribed by law, every voter has a right to take notice of the law, and to deposit his ballot at the time and place appointed, notwithstanding the officer, whose duty it is to give notice of the election, has failed in that duty. The notice to be thus given is only additional to that which the statute itself gives, and is prescribed for the purpose of greater publicity; but the right to hold the election comes from the statute, and not from the official notice. It has therefore been frequently held that when a vacancy exists in an office, which the law requires shall be filled at the next general election, the time and place of which are fixed, and that notice of the general election shall also specify the vacancy to be filled, an election at that time and place to fill the vacancy will be valid, notwithstanding the notice is not given; and such election cannot be defeated by showing that a small portion only of the electors

were actually aware of the vacancy, or cast their votes to fill it. But this would not be the case if either the time or the place were not fixed by law, so that notice became essential for that purpose.

On the subject of implications, I wish to read also from Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, volume I, page 138, as follows:

The implications from the provisions of a constitution are sometimes exceedingly important, and have large influence upon its construction. In regard to the Constitution of the United States the rule has been laid down that, where a general power is conferred or duty enjoined, every particular power necessary for the exercise of the one or the performance of the other is also conferred. The same rule has been applied to the State constitution, with an important modification, by the Supreme Court of Illinois.

It has been said that certain other provisions of the Constitution, namely, article I, section 4, particularly, the fourteenth amendment, and perhaps the fifteenth amendment, by inference or implication, would convey the right to Congress to pass anti-poll-tax legislation. That is the reason I wish to refer to the decision by the Supreme Court of Illinois, reading as follows:

That other powers than those expressly granted may be, and often are, conferred by implication is too well settled to be doubted. Under every constitution the doctrine of implication is too well settled to be doubted. Under every constitution the doctrine of implication must be resorted to, in order to carry out the general grants of power. A constitution cannot from its very nature enter into a minute specification of all the minor powers naturally and obviously included in it and flowing from the great and important ones which are expressly granted. It is therefore established as a general rule that when a constitution gives a general power, or enjoins a duty, it also gives, by implication, every particular power necessary for the exercise of the one or the performance of the other. Story on Constitution, page 430. See also *United States* v. *Fisher* (2 Cranch, 358, 2 L. ed. 304); *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 4 L. ed. 579); *Northwestern Fertilizing Co.* v. *Hyde Park* (70 Ill. 634). In *First National Bank* v. *Union Trust Co.* (244 U. S. 416, 61 L. ed. 1233, 37 Sup. Ct. Rep. 734), the court after reviewing *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 4 L. ed. 579), and *Osborn* v. *Bank of United States* (9 Wheat. 738, 6 L. ed. 204), and considering the power given to Congress to pass laws to make the specific powers granted effectual, said: "In terms it was pointed out that this broad authority was not stereotyped as of any particular time, but endured, thus furnishing a perpetual and living sanction to the legislative authority within the limits of a just discretion, enabling it to take into consideration the changing wants and demands of society and to adopt provisions appropriate to meet every situation which it was deemed required to be provided for." See also *Smith* v. *Kansas City Title & Trust Co.* (255 U. S. 180, 65 L. ed. 577, 41 Sup. Ct. Rep. 243). Congress may establish banks for national purposes. *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 4 L. ed. 579); *Osborn* v. *Bank of United States* (9 Wheat. 738, 6 L. ed. 204); *Farmers & Mechanics National Bank* v. *Dearing* (91 U. S. 29, 23 L. ed. 114); *Smith* v. *Kansas City Title & Trust Co.* (255 U. S. 180, 65 L. ed. 577, 41 Sup. Ct. Rep. 243).

Continuing reading from the text:

"The implication under this rule, however, must be a necessary, not a conjectural or argumentative one. And it is further modified by another rule, that where the means for the exercise of a granted power are given, no other or different means can be implied, as being more effectual or convenient." (*Field* v. *People* (3 Ill. 79, 83). See *Fletcher* v. *Oliver* (25 Ark. 289).) In Nevada it has been held that a constitutional provision that the counties shall provide for their paupers will preclude a State asylum for the poor. *State* v. *Hallock* (14 Nev. 202, 33 Am. Rep. 559). The rule applies to the exercise of power by all departments and all officers, and will be touched upon incidentally hereafter.

Akin to this is the rule that "Where the power is granted in general terms, the power is to be construed as coextensive with the terms, unless some clear restriction upon it is deducible (expressly or by implication) from the context." (Story on Constitution, pp. 424–426. See *Du Page County* v. *Jenks* (65 Ill. 275).) This rule has been so frequently applied as a restraint upon legislative encroachment upon the grant of power to the judiciary, that we shall content ourselves in this place with a reference to the cases collected upon this subject and given in another chapter. (See post, pp. 173, 221.)

Another rule of construction is, that when the Constitution defines the circumstances under which a right may be exercised or a penalty imposed, the specification is an implied prohibition against legislative interference to add to the condition, or to extend the penalty to other cases. On this ground it has been held by the Supreme Court of Maryland, that where the constitution defines the qualifications of an officer, it is not in the power of the legislature to change or superadd to them, unless the power to do so is expressly or by necessary implication conferred by the constitution itself. (*Thomas* v. *Owens* (4 Md. 189). And see *Barker* v. *People* (3 Cow. 686); Matter of Dorsey (7 Port. 293); *Dickson* v. *Strickland* (114 Tex. 176, 265 S. W. 1012).)

Other cases recognizing the same principle are referred to in the following paragraphs:

The legislature cannot add to the constitutional qualifications of voters: *Rison* v. *Farr* (24 Ark. 161); *St. Joseph, &c. R. R. Co.* v. *Buchanan County Court* (39 Mo. 485); *State* v. *Williams* (5 Wis. 308); *State* v. *Baker* (38 Wis. 71); *Monroe* v. *Collins* (17 Ohio St. 665); *State* v. *Symonds* (57 Me. 1480); *State* v. *Staten* (6 Colo. 233); *Davies* v. *McKeeby* (5 Nev. 369); *McCafferty* v. *Guyer* (59 Pa. St. 109); *Quinn* v. *State* (35 Ind. 483); *Clayton* v. *Harris* (7 Nev. 64); *Randolph* v. *Good* (3 W. Va. 551); *Morris* v. *Powell* (125 Ind. 281, 25 N. E. 221, 9 L. R. A. 326); *Ferbrach* v. *Drainage Dist.* (23 Idaho, 85, 128 Pac. 553, 44 L. R. A. (n. s.) 538, Ann. Cas. 1915 C, 43; *Coggeshall* v. *Des Moines* (138 Iowa, 730, 117 N. W. 309, 123 Am. St. Rep. 221); *State ex rel. Gilson* v. *Monahan* (72 Kan. 492, 84 Pac. 130, 115 Am. St. Rep. 224, 7 Ann. Cas. 661); *Johnson* v. *Grand Forks County* (16 N. D. 363, 113 N. W. 1071, 125 Am. St. Rep. 662); *Livesley* v. *Litchfield* (47 Oreg. 248, 83 Pac. 142, 114 Am. St. Rep. 920). Nor diminish them: *Allison* v. *Blake* (57 N. J. L. 6, 29 Atl. 417, 25 L. R. A. 480, and note); *Talbert* v. *Long* (134 Ga. 292, 67 S. E. 826, 137 Am. St. Rep. 222); *Coggeshall* v. *Des Moines* (138 Iowa, 730, 117 N. W. 309, 128 Am. St. Rep. 221); *State ex rel. Gilson* v. *Monahan* (72 Kan. 492, 84 Pac. 130, 115 Am. St. Rep. 224, 7 Ann. Cas. 661). But where the Constitution is silent upon the subject the legislature may prescribe the qualifications of voters. *State v. Dillon* (32 Fla. 545, 14 So. 383, 22 L. R. A. 124); *Plummer* v. *Yost* (144 Ill. 68, 33 N. E. 191, 19 L. R. A. 110); *State ex rel. Gilson* v. *Monahan* (72 Kan. 492, 84 Pac. 130, 115 Am. St. Rep. 224, 7 Ann. Cas. 661); *Hanna U. Young* (84 Md. 179, 35 Atl. 674, 34 L. R. A. 55); *Bonham* v. *Fuchs* (Tex. Civ. App.) (228 S. W. 1112); *Willis* v. *Kalmbach* (109 Va. 475, 64 S. E. 342, 21 L. R. A. (n. s.) 1009).

The legislature may regulate the exercise of the constitutional right to vote leaving the right itself untouched. They may, for example, make reasonable provisions for determining the age, length of residence, etc., of persons who offer to vote. Such regulations are valid, provided they do not amount to a denial or invasion of the right conferred by the Constitution. *Edmonds* v. *Banbury* (28 Iowa, 267, 4 Am. Rep. 177); *Southerland* v. *Norris* (74 Md. 326, 22 Atl. 137, 28 Am. St. Rep. 255); *Pope* v. *Williams* (98 Md. 59, 56 Atl. 543, 103 Am. St. Rep. 379, 66 L. R. A. 398, affirmed 193 U. S. 621, 48 L. ed. 817, 24 Sup. Ct. Rep. 573); *Capen* v. *Foster* (12 Pick. 485, 23 Am. Dec. 632); *State ex rel. Klein* v. *Hillenbrand* (101 Ohio St. 370, 130 N. E. 29, 14 A. L. R. 255); *State ex rel. Cothren* v. *Leon* (9 Wis. 279); *State ex rel. Wood* v. *Baker* (38 Wis. 71). Thus a statute requiring an applicant for registration as a qualified elector of a municipality to state his or her age has been held valid. *State ex rel. Klein* v. *Hillenbrand* (101 Ohio St. 370, 130 N. E. 29, 14 A. L. R. 255).

The legislature cannot add to the constitutional qualifications of an officer: *People* v. *McCormick* (261 Ill. 413, 103 N. E. 1053, Ann. Cas. 1915 A, 338); *Feibeleman* v. *State* (98 Ind. 516); *State* v. *Craig* (132 Ind. 54, 31 N. E. 352, 32 Am. St. Rep. 237, 16 L. R. A. 688); *State* v. *Goldthwait* (172 Ind. 210, 87 N. E. 133, 19 Ann. Cas. 737); *Barker* v. *People* (3 Cow. 686, 15 Am. Dec. 322). But see *State* v. *McAllister* (38 W. Va. 485, 18 S. E. 770, 24 L. R. A. 343); nor shorten the constitutional term of an office: *Howard* v. *State* (10 Ind. 99); *Cotton* v. *Ellis* (7 Jones, N. C. 545); *State* v. *Askew* (48 Ark. 82, 2 S. W. 349. But see *State* v. *Plasters* (74 Neb. 652, 105 N. W. 1092, 3 L. R. A. (n. s.) 887, 13 Ann. Cas. 154); *Botten* v. *Pinson* (77 W. Va. 412, 89 S. E. 985, L. R. A. 1917 A, 1244); nor practically abolish the office by repealing provision for salary: *Reid* v. *Smoulter* (128 Pa. 324, 5 L. R. A. 517, 18 Atl. Rep. 445); *People* v. *Howland* (155 N. Y. 270, 49 N. E. 775, 41 L. R. A. 838); nor extend the constitutional term: *People* v. *Bull* (46 N. Y. 57); *Goodin* v. *Thoman* (10 Kans. 191); *State* v. *Brewster* (44 Ohio St. 589, 6 N. E. 653); *Kahn* v. *Sutro* (114 Cal. 316, 46 Pac. 87, 33 L. R. A. 620); *Gemmer* v. *State* (163 Ind. 150, 71 N. E. 478, 66 L. R. A. 82). But see *State* v. *Plasters* (74 Neb. 652, 105, N. W. 1092, 3 L. R. A. (n. s.) 887, 13 Ann. Cas. 154). See also *Hill* v. *Slade* (41 Md. 640, 48 Atl. 64); but see *Jordan* v. *Bailey* (37 Minn. 174, 33 N. W. 778; nor add to the constitutional grounds for removing an officer: *Lowe* v. *Commonwealth* (3 Met. (Ky.) 257); *Brown* v. *Grover* (6 Bush, 1); *People* v. *Howland* (155 N. Y. 270, 49 N. E. 775, 41 L. R. A. 838); as by enacting that intoxication while discharging his duties shall be deemed misfeasance in office, *Com.* v. *Williams* (79 Ky. 42); but see *McComas* v. *Krug* (81 Ind. 327); nor change the compensation prescribed by the constitution: *King* v. *Hunter* (65 N. C. 603); see also, on these questions, post, page 388, note; nor provide for the choice of officers a different mode from that prescribed by the constitution: *People* v. *Raymond* (37 N. Y. 428); *Devoy* v. *New York* (35 Barb. 264, 22 How. Pr. 226); *People* v. *Blake* (49 Barb. 9); *People* v. *Albertson* (55 N. Y. 50); *Opinions of Justices* (117 Mass. 603); *State* v. *Goldstucker* (40 Wis. 124); see post, page 561, note.

A legislative extension of an elective office is void as applied to incumbents. *People* v. *McKinney* (52 N. Y. 374). Where the constitution limits the term, appointee under statute providing for holding during good behavior cannot hold beyond constitutional term. *Neumeyer* v. *Krakel* (110 Ky. 624, 62 S. W. 518).

It is not unconstitutional to allow the Governor to supply temporary vacancies in offices which under the constitution are elective. *Sprague* v. *Brown* (40 Wis. 612). But such vacancy does not arise by mere failure to hold the election. *Ijams* v. *Duvall* (85 Md. 252, 36 Atl. 819, 36 L. R. A. 127). Enumeration in constitution of certain modes in which vacancies arise does not prevent legislative creation of other modes. *State* v.

Lansing (46 Neb. 514, 64 N. W. 1104, 35 L. R. A. 124). Illness of Governor which disables him to perform his duties is such vacancy as authorizes the officer designated by the constitution to assume the powers and discharge the duties of the Governor until the disability is removed. *Barnard* v. *Taggart* (66 N. H. 362, 29 Atl. 1027, 25 L. R. A. 613). Where the term fixed by statute is unconstitutional, the tenure is at the will of the appointing power. *Lewis* v. *Lewelling* (53 Kan. 201, 36 Pac. 351, 23 L. R. A. 510).

Mr. President, I have some citations from one or two more authorities; for instance, from Story on the Constitution. First, I want to read an excerpt from the case of *Anderson* v. *Baker*, 32, 33, 34, 23 Maryland 531:

Among the absolute, unqualified rights of the States is that of regulating the elective franchise; it is the foundation of State authority; the most important political function exercised by the people in their sovereign capacity. Whilst "the right of the people to participate in the legislature is the best security of liberty and foundation of all free government," yet it is subordinate to the higher power of regulating the qualifications of the electors and the elected. The original power of the people in their aggregate political capacity, is delegated in the form of suffrage to such persons as they deem proper for the safety of the commonwealth; Brightly Election Cases (*Anderson* v. *Baker*, 32, 33, 34, 23 Maryland 531).

Quoting from Justice Story, treating of the same subject:

Every constitution of government in these United States has assumed, as a fundamental principle, the right of the people of the State to alter, abolish, and modify the form of its own government according to the sovereign pleasure of the people. In fact, the people of each State have gone much further and settled a far more critical question by deciding who shall be the voters entitled to approve and reject the constitution framed by a delegated body under their direction. (1 Story Constitution, ch. 9, sec. 581.)

From this it will be seen how little, even in the most free of republican governments, any abstract right of suffrage, or any original and indefeasible privilege, has been recognized in practice (ibid.). In no two of these State constitutions will it be found that the qualifications of the voters are settled upon the same uniform basis, so that we have the most abundant proofs that among a free and enlightened people convened for the purpose of establishing their own forms of government and the rights of their own voters the question as to the due regulation of the qualifications has been deemed a matter of mere State policy, and varied to meet the wants, to suit the prejudices, and to foster the interests of the majority.

The exclusive right of the several States to regulate the exercise of the elective franchise and to prescribe the qualifications of voters was never questioned, nor attempted to be interfered with, until the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was forced upon unwilling communities (the States then lately in rebellion) by the military power of the General Government, and thus made a part of our organic law; a necessary sequence, perhaps, of the Civil War, but nonetheless a radical change in the established theory of our Government. (Brightly Election Cases, author's note, pp. 42, 43.)

The right to vote is not of necessity connected with citizenship. The rights of the citizen are civil rights, such as liberty of person and of conscience, the right to acquire and possess property, all of which are distinguishable from the political privilege of suffrage.

The history of the country shows that there is no foundation in fact for the view that the right of suffrage is one of the "privileges or immunities of citizens." (McCrary Elections, p. 3.)

"The right to vote is not vested; it is purely conventional, and may be enlarged or restricted, granted or withheld, at pleasure, and without fault."

In *Blair* v. *Ridgely* (41 Mo. 161) the question at issue arose out of the provision of article II, section 3, of the Constitution of 1865 of the State of Missouri. By this section it was provided that no person should be deemed a qualified voter who had ever been in armed hostility to the United States, or to the government of the State of Missouri; that every person should, at the time of offering to vote, take an oath that he was not within the inhibition of this section, and that any person declining to take such oath should not be allowed to vote. The plaintiff, at an election held in the city of St. Louis on November 7, 1865, offered to vote, but refused to take the oath prescribed by the constitution. His vote being rejected, he brought his action against the judges of the election for damages. The case was taken to the supreme court of Missouri, where it was argued exhaustively, and with much learning, by eminent counsel, and the argument is to be found in full in the Reports of the Supreme Court of Missouri, volume 41. It was contended by the plaintiff that the section of the constitution in question was in violation of the Constitution of the United States, being a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law within the meaning of that instrument, and, in consequence, null and void. But the court held against this contention, drawing the distinction between laws passed to punish for offenses in order to prevent their repetition and laws passed to protect the public franchises and privileges from abuse by falling into unworthy hands. It is said by the court that—

"The State may not pass laws in the form or with the effect of bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts. It may and has full power to pass laws, restrictive and exclusive, for the preservation or promotion of the common interests as political or social emergencies may from time to time require, though in certain instances disabilities may directly flow in consequence. It should never be forgotten that the State is organized for the public weal as well as for individual purposes, and while it may not disregard the safeguards that are thrown around the citizen for his protection by the constitution, it cannot neglect to perform and do what is for the public good."

It was argued in *Blair* v. *Ridgely* that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277), where it was held that this section of the Missouri Constitution, so far as it provided an oath to be taken by preachers, was in the nature of pains and penalties, and consequently void, was decisive of the Blair case. But the distinction between the right to practice a profession or follow a calling and the right to vote is clearly stated in the opinion of Judge Wagner, as follows:

"The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Cummings case proceeds on the idea that the right to pursue a calling or profession, is a natural and inalienable right and that a law precluding a person from practicing his calling or profession on account of past conduct is inflicting a penalty, and therefore void. There are certain rights which inhere in and attach to the person, and of which he cannot be deprived except by forfeiture for crime, whereof he must be first tried and convicted according to due process of law. These are termed natural or absolute rights. * * *

But is the right to vote or to exercise the privilege of the elective franchise a right either natural, absolute, or vested? It is certain that in a state of nature, disconnected with government, no person has or can enjoy it. That the privilege of participating in the elective franchise in this free and enlightened country is an important and interesting one is most true. But we are not aware that it has ever been held or adjudged to be a vested interest in any individual.

"Suffrage in the United States not being a vested right, it results that persons who have enjoyed and exercised the privilege, and who have been qualified electors, may be entirely disfranchised and deprived of the privilege by constitutional provision, and such persons are entirely without a remedy at law." (McCrary, Elections, p. 9.)

Such is the situation, may I observe, Mr. President, in this particular case, with respect to those who vote for Members of the Congress. They must be qualified to vote for members of the most numerous branch of their State legislatures. If they do not have such qualifications, then they cannot vote for Members of the Congress. Among the requirements and among the qualifications in a poll-tax State, at least in Tennessee, is the provision that the poll tax must be paid in the year preceding the election.

I continue reading from Cooley on Constitutional Limitations, eighth edition:

"The whole subject of the regulation of elections, including the prescribing of qualifications for suffrage, is left by the National Constitution to the several States, except as it is provided by that instrument that the electors for Representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and as the fifteenth amendment forbids denying to citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Participation in the elective franchise is a privilege rather than a right, and it is granted or denied on grounds of general policy, the prevailing view being that it should be as general as possible consistent with the public safety." (Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 8th ed., Carrington, vol. 2.)

Mr. President, the fifteenth amendment is not involved at all in the consideration of House bill 29 because no one is being denied the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, which is right. But I point out that again an authority on constitutional law refers to the fact that the whole subject of the regulation of elections, including prescribing the qualifications for suffrage, is left by the Federal Constitution to the several States, and there is only one exception, which is the exception I have read forty-odd times, which applies to the election of Members of Congress, and they must be elected by those who are qualified to vote for members of the legislature.

If a man should be elected by electors who were not qualified to vote for members of the legislature in any State, he would certainly be in a very strange position. He would be the first man ever to be elected either to the Senate or the House of Representatives of the National Congress by persons who could not vote for members of the State legislature.

Another very ridiculous, ludicrous situation would obtain, as I described a moment ago, as I was drawing a verbal picture of what might occur on the election grounds. Suppose it should be necessary to have two boxes, one in which national officers might be voted for and one in which the State officers might be voted for. I am sure that most of the poll-tax States do not have any law which provides for two sets of election officers, and they would not have time to call the legislatures into session before the November election. Therefore, in addition to the legal objections, which are so persuasive, it seems to me, that nothing else need be argued; as a practical matter we would be in extreme difficulty with two elections being held for two sets of officers, which is certainly not provided for by any provision of law in my State, as I recall. We would have persons who were not qualified to vote for the members of the State legislature wanting to vote for Members of Congress in defiance of the Constitution; and we cannot repeal the Constitution by the passage of a bill which repudiates it. When people presented themselves at the polling places those who had not paid their poll taxes could not vote for members of the legislature or for governor, and those who could vote for governor and cast a ballot in one box would probably violate the law by undertaking to vote for a Federal officer in another box. I can see nothing but confusion to be brought about. Nothing of this sort was ever expected or intended, and throughout the years it has not been considered. I am sure that in the States which do not have any poll taxes only those are allowed to vote for the Members of Congress who are otherwise qualified to vote. If a non-poll-tax State has a provision, as some of them do, I understand, that certain things must be done to qualify electors to vote for Federal officers, they must be the things which qualify them to vote for candidates for the most numerous branch of the legislature. Non-poll-tax States have requirements for electors. In such States the poll-tax problem would not arise. In some States persons not qualified to vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the legislature would not be allowed to vote for Members of the Congress, while in other States, where the poll tax obtains, persons would be allowed to vote for Members of Congress who could not qualify under the same provisions of the State constitution to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. In other words, those States which do not have poll-tax requirements have other requirements which apply to electors in order that they may be qualified to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. By reason of the fact that they are qualified to vote for members of their legislature they can vote for Members of the Congress. So in such case there is no conflict. But in other States where the poll tax exists Members of Congress could be elected by persons who are not qualified to vote for members of the legislature.

Mr. President, may I inquire of the majority leader at what time he would like to adjourn or recess? I have perhaps a little more data to present which I should like to look over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should be very glad to accommodate the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. My understanding was that the Senator would speak until about 5 o'clock today.

Mr. STEWART. I thought I could be able to finish by that time. My difficulty is that I have additional data at my office, but do not have it before me now. I do not want to take the floor for the second time on the same subject. If I might have the floor on the convening of the Senate tomorrow, for about 30 minutes——

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator concludes his speech tonight he can speak a second time on the same subject tomorrow. I do not want to be placed in the position of carrying the Senator over until tomorrow with the idea of giving him an opportunity to speak more than twice on any one subject. If the Senator can conclude tonight I shall be glad to stay until he can do so.

Mr. STEWART. Would the Senator agree that I may resume the floor tomorrow if I do not consume more than 30 minutes?

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator wish to ask unanimous consent to that effect?

Mr. STEWART. I do not want to be placed in the position of speaking for the second time on the subject tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not see how that can be avoided unless the Senator should ask and receive unanimous consent to be recognized to speak when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow I may be allowed to speak for not to exceed 30 minutes, my speech at that time to be considered as being part of my first speech on the subject, and not to be charged as a second speech on the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted by the Senate this afternoon, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 30, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 29 (legislative day of July 28), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, a Foreign Service Officer of the Class of Career Minister, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Good Offices Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations on Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, the United States Special Representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the Representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

John J. Macdonald, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of class three, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Truce Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations April 23, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons to be Representatives of the United States of America to the Third Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held from October 18 to November 10, 1948, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

George V. Allen, of North Carolina.
Milton S. Eisenhower, of Kansas.
Luther H. Evans, of Texas.
Waldo G. Leland, of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick, of New York.

The following-named persons to be Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the Third Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held from October 18 to November 10, 1948, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Frank Capra, of California.
William H. Hastie, of the District of Columbia.
Mrs. Kathleen N. Lardie, of Michigan.
W. Albert Noyes, Jr., of New York.
George F. Zook, of Virginia.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

B. Harvie Branscomb, of Tennessee, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1951, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Karl T. Compton, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Harold W. Dodds, of New Jersey, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Martin P. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1949, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Mark Starr, of New York, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1949, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD

The following-named persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, established under title I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

James Barron Carey, of the District of Columbia.
George Meany, of New York.
Allan Blair Kline, of Iowa.
Albert S. Goss, of Washington.
James George Patton, of Colorado.
Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.
Jonathan W. Daniels, of North Carolina.
Robert Henry Hinckley, of Utah.
Sarah Blanding, of New York.
George Houk Mead, of Ohio.
Eric A. Johnston, of Washington.
Arion Everett Lyon, of Illinois.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Waldemar J. Gallman, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Myron Melvin Cowen, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Stanton Griffis, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

James Grover McDonald, of New York, to be Special Representative of the United States of America to the Provisional Government of Israel, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

George Wadsworth, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iraq, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

Edward R. Dudley, of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Robert Alexander, of the District of Columbia.

Charles R. Enlow, of Kansas.

William Kling, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Edward H. Foley, Jr., of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, in place of A. Lee M. Wiggins, resigned. (Mr. Foley is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.)

John S. Graham, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Edward H. Foley, Jr.

A. Miles Pratt, of Louisiana, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La. (Reappointment.)

John J. Fitzpatrick, of Connecticut, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut, to fill an existing vacancy.

BUREAU OF THE MINT

George B. Gillin, of California, to be superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., to fill an existing vacancy.

Gilroy Roberts, of Pennsylvania, to be engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa., to fill an existing vacancy.

These officers are now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Thomas Chalmers Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1952, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

David J. Coddaire, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term expiring April 15, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

William E. Willett, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term expiring June 30, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, United States Army, to be Director of Selective Service, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Ernest Gruening, of New York, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska. Reappointment.

Llewellyn M. Williams, of Alaska, to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska. Reappointment.

BUREAU OF MINES

James Boyd, of Colorado, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, terminating recess appointment, vice Royd R. Sayers.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Hon. Paul P. Rao, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. Roy W. Harper, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Hon. Samuel Hamilton Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Edward Allen Tamm, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

George L. Grobe, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York. (Mr. Grobe is now serving under an appointment which expired October 1, 1947.)

Cleon A. Summers, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma. (Mr. Summers is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 5, 1948.)

John B. Tansil, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana. (Mr. Tansil is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.)

Joseph F. Deeb, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan. (Mr. Deeb is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 5, 1948.)

Harry O. Arend, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska. (Mr. Arend is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.)

Timothy T. Cronin, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin. (Mr. Cronin is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.)

Lester Luther, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

William Marvel, of Delaware, to be Unitad States attorney for the district of Delaware. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

William M. Lindsay, of Kansas, to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas. (Mr. Lindsay is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.)

Paul B. Messick, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware. (Mr. Messick is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.)

Harold K. Claypool, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio. (Mr. Claypool is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.)

Jack R. Caufield, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon. (Mr. Caufield is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 28, 1947.)

Frank C. Blackford, of New York, to be United States marshal for the western district of New York. (Mr. Blackford is now serving under an appointment which expired June 29, 1948.)

Thomas N. Curran, of Maine, to be United States marshal for the district of Maine. (Mr. Curran is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 29, 1948.)

Edwin D. Bolger, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan. (Mr. Bolger is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 31, 1948.)

John J. Barc, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Michigan. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired November 4, 1947.)

Bernard Fitch, of Connecticut, to be United States marshal for the district of Connecticut. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 29, 1948.)

Kehoe C. Shannon, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Carl H. Fleckenstine, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Swan Burrus, Jr.
Lewis McLaurine Williams
Bernard E. O'Malley
Paul Francke, Jr.

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

John B. Baldi
Arthur P. Burdon
John F. Laws

To be sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance:

M. Allen Pond

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948:

Erwin W. Blatter
Calvin B. Spencer
Bert R. Boone
Victor H. Haas
Paul A. Neal
Donald W. Patrick
George G. Van Dyke
Waldemar J. A. Wickman

Dental surgeon to be senior dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948:

Oscar Mikkelsen

Scientist to be senior scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective July 1, 1948:

Howard L. Andrews

Assistant dietitians to be senior assistant dietitians (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective July 1, 1948:

Engla J. Anderson
E. Grace Gibson
Myrtle M. Morris

The above-named officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Harold Heller, June 30, 1948.
Frederick G. Gillick, July 16, 1948.

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Robert W. Mowry, July 8, 1948.
Andrew G. Morrow, July 15, 1948.
Calvin W. Applewhite, June 29, 1948.
James B. Gilbert, June 29, 1948.
Eldis M. Christensen, July 1, 1948.
Donald J. Ottenberg, July 2, 1948.
Robert O. Scow, July 22, 1948.
Ted E. Becker, July 1, 1948.
J. Carter Wright, June 29, 1948.
Harold H. Davidson, July 2, 1948.
Allen N. Koplin, July 1, 1948.
Frederick E. Phillips, June 30, 1948.
J. D. Leggett, June 30, 1948.
Richard A. Reiss, July 6, 1948.
Roland H. Corbet, July 1, 1948.
John H. Tuohy, July 1, 1948.
Frederick A. Thompson, Jr., July 5, 1948.
Councilman Morgan, July 1, 1948.
Eugene V. Nininger, July 3, 1948.
Edwin B. Thomas, July 1, 1948.
Jules Glenn, July 2, 1948.
Reed M. Broadbent, July 14, 1948.
Gerald Giges, July 6, 1948.
David M. Dumville, July 1, 1948.
William H. Gutstein, July 3, 1948.
Paul W. Rogers, July 15, 1948.
John J. Johnson, July 2, 1948.
John F. Montroy, July 24, 1948.
R. Raymond Green, July 1, 1948.

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Victor A. McKusick, July 1, 1948.
Gordon L. Farrell, July 8, 1948.
Richard A. Saavedra, July 2, 1948.
John M. Vogel, July 1, 1948
R. Guy Lewis, July 1, 1948.
David S. Wilder, July 1, 1948.
Glenn M. Gordon, July 1, 1948.
Arnold W. Pratt, July 2, 1948.
Robert L. Price, July 1, 1948.
John F. Lowney, July 23, 1948.
Albert L. Patrick, July 9, 1948.
Stewart M. Williams, July 1, 1948.
Edward A. Rogers, Jr., July 3, 1948.
McClain Johnston, July 1, 1948.
Milton Sheinbein, July 16, 1948.

To be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective June 26, 1948:

Harry G. Trautman

To be scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective June 29, 1948:

Clarence M. Tarzwell

To be veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective July 1, 1948:

William T. S. Thorp

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Frederick J. Brady, August 20, 1948.
W. Palmer Dearing, July 10, 1948.
Leonard A. Scheele, July 10, 1948.
Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr., August 22, 1948.
Alexander G. Gilliam, July 10, 1948.

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

David M. Gould, July 7, 1948.
Samuel C. Ingraham II, July 7, 1948.
Robert E. Miller, July 11, 1948.
Donald J. Birmingham, July 14, 1948.

Dental surgeons to be senior dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Bruce D. Forsyth, July 2, 1948.
John W. Knutson, July 2, 1948.
William P. Kroschel, July 2, 1948.
Ralph S. Lloyd, July 2, 1948.
George E. Jones, July 2, 1948.

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Malcolm C. Hope, September 19, 1948.
Russell W. Hart, August 1, 1948.

Senior assistant scientist to be scientist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date indicated:

Lewis J. Cralley, December 6, 1948.

Junior assistant nurse officers to be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Joan M. Norkunas, July 13, 1948.
Margaret M. Sweeney, October 20, 1948.

The above-named officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.):

To be lieutenant colonels

Lyman C. Duryea, MC, O283287.
Franklin H. Grauer, MC, O261176.
Alphonsus M. McCarthy, MC, O254260.

To be majors

Robert D. Anderson, MC, 0419558.
John F. Breslin, MC, O294499.
Parker B. Hollingsworth, MC, O317630.
Thomas W. Howell, MC, O374247.
James B. Neil, DC, O400175.
Allen D. Smith, MC, O355613.

To be captains

Thorwald R. Anderson, MC, O1765038.
James N. Brien, Jr., MC, O1735080.
Robert E. Broaddus, MC, O470773.
Roy E. Campbell, MC, O468727.
Edwin S. Grantham, MC, O474346.
Richard A. Hayden, MC, O460743.
Howard W. McCall, DC, O1735409.
Thomas F. Puckett, Jr., MC, O1785726.
Wallace K. Reese, Jr., DC, O401456.
Robert P. Reynolds, DC, O397674.
Van R. Richmond, MC, O368203.

To be first lieutenants

Richard P. Ariagno, MC, O945337.
Sherman L. Armstrong, Ch., O932956.
Stewart L. Baker, Jr., MC, O1725275.
Raymond W. Blohm, Jr., MC O945334.
Edward S. Brezina, MC, O945339.
Robert L. Chancey, MC, O1735731.
Charles A. De Kovessey, MC, O1718814.
James F. Donovan, MC, O1764805.
Warren D. Eddy, Jr., MC, O935825.
Robert J. Fanning, DC, O937340.
Roland L. Fowler, DC, O937728.
Frederic S. Glazener, MC, O945036.
Fay B. Graves, MC, O945338.
Richard L. Howard, DC, O1786105.
Thomas W. Jones, DC, O1735657.
Allen F. Kingman, Jr., MC, O945443.
Richard J. Maloney, DC, O945444.
Oliver A. Mays, MC, O473791.
Georges F. McCormick, MC, O1705957.
John C. Mebane, MC, O943979.
Frank L. Miller, MC, O1725000.
Venedict M. Osetinsky, MC, O479890.
Ellis Oster, MC, O1767351.
James F. Parker, DC, O1786021.
Thomas R. Plowright, MC, O1705360.
Thomas L. Robbins, MC, O945341.
Norman M. Scott, Jr., MC, O1705500.
John J. Sheridan, MC, O1736002.
James F. Stagg, MC, O945335.
Glenn E. Talboy, MC, O1785912.
Ross W. Warren, DC.
Daniel C. Wilkerson, Jr., MC, O945342.
David H. Wilson, MC, O945344.
Norris A. Wimberley, Jr., MC, O945345.
Samuel P. Wise III, MC, O936529.
John B. Zaontz, MC, O945346.
Branko K. Zec, MC, O932777.

REGULAR ARMY AND REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force of the United States in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

REGULAR ARMY

To be first lieutenants

Daniel J. Costello
Leonard Petkoff

To be second lieutenants

Paul L. Applin
John D. Caldwell
Henry D. Doiron
Ralph H. Girton
Ernest A. Hinojosa, Jr.
Lee G. Knox
Jere J. Lewis
Dale E. Nielsen
Manuel Olivera-Barroso
Richard O. Palmer
Duane E. Raph
John E. Reed
Howard T. Sagehorn
John J. Sarazen
John E. Stringer, Jr.
Norman E. Sudnick
Gus A. Wolman, Jr.

REGULAR AIR FORCE

To be second lieutenants

George L. Ahrens
Thomas I. Allison
Hunter W. Anderson
Robert E. Anderson
Wilson K. Baker, Jr.
James G. Barney
Bertram D. Becker
Robert W. Bieber
Buford C. Blount
Randolph Blumberg
Warren W. Boone
Marion L. Boswell
William F. Boyle
Joseph X. Brennan
Robert E. Brumm
Robert B. Burns
John M. Chapman
Ben H. Clements, Jr.
John I. Daniel III
Walter B. Duff
Frederick C. Eckmann
Walter H. Escue
James E. Geary
Richard L. Haggard
Philip O. Hertsgaard
Harry D. Hink
Robert P. Horn
Richard W. Kane
Ernest M. Kelly
Joseph F. Kent, Jr.
Hugh W. McBride
George C. McCleary
Jim T. Meredith
Bill A. Montgomery
Winston E. Moore
Richard J. Moran
Alfred W. Mullan, Jr.
Harry W. Neville
Herman L. Peace
Edward M. Potter, Jr.
Thomas S. Rea
Eldon S. Riley
Dean R. Rindy
Robert Rotstan
Charles D. Schwalier
Charles F. Schwaner
Orville O. Scroggin III
Clark B. Smith
Mart G. Smith, Jr.
Hermon F. Son
Paul R. Springer
Alan B. Thomas
George W. Thompson
Frank A. Titus
Bobby J. Tooley
Andrew J. Trammell
George A. Voris
Marvin M. Watkins
Donald C. Winner
Edwin N. York

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lt. Thomas Alonzo Webb, AO50407, United States Air Force, with rank from June 1, 1948.

First Lt. Elwood Dean Storrs, Jr., AO56563, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 2, 1948.

First Lt. William George Morley, AO50408, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 4, 1948.

First Lt. Ward Ellsworth Protsman, AO27060, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Rean Lochry, AO27064, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Francis Hegenberger, AO27067, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Handford Lindsley Cummings, Jr., AO27081, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hal Lloyd FitzPatrick, AO27097, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Wallace Gourley Hynds, Jr., AO27099, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arnold Horowitz, AO27103, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Frederick Bond, Jr., AO27109, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Paul Baker, Jr., AO27113, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Estes Farrar, Jr., AO27116, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Gifford Merrill Holden, Jr., AO27120, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Edward Reuler, AO27123, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. David James Crawford, 3d, AO27127, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hugh Campbell Parker, Jr., AO27129, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arthur Summer, AO27134, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Henry Lee Warren, AO27137, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Standish Stoer, AO27144, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Kellogg Stebbins, 3d, AO27149, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Edward Richards, AO27152, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Arthur James Steele, AO27153, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Maxwell Oscar Johnson, Jr., AO27155, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Byron Franklin Knolle, Jr., AO27166, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Kendall Russell, AO27167, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Russell Marks, AO27173, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Francis Lish, AO27175, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Ross Karr, AO27182, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Arthur Willis Walton, AO27186, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Warren Marshall Briggs, AO27187, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Offa Swann Nichols, Jr., AO27189, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Tuinenburg Preston, AO27192, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arnold Reints, AO27195, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roland Daniel Foley, Jr., AO27199, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Frank Freeman Marvin, AO27202, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harry Lee Maynard, AO27205, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Robert Jarrell, Jr., AO27206, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles William Clark, AO27208, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, United States Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Bobby Lee Marlow, AO27208, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Vergil Calvin Givens, AO27214, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederic William Hartwig, AO27215, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Eugene Duvall, AO27217, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Martin Harvey Brewer, Jr., AO27218, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kelton Merrill Farris, AO27220, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Daniel Doremus Whitcraft, Jr., AO27221, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Will Coffey, Jr., AO27222, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Brierton Townsend, Jr., AO27223, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Derrick Raymond, AO27225, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Harlie Bacon, AO27243, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roger Lundeen Johnson, AO27246, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Baird MacWherter, AO27250, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Winthrop Draper, AO27262, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Malcolm Nebeker Stewart, Jr., AO27266, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Wiliam Atkinson Jones, 3d, AO27268, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Alfred Gardner Thompson, AO27269, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Graham Crouch, AO27270, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Patrick Conniff, AO27271, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Robert Manlove, AO27274, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Alexander Williams, Jr., AO27275, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Vernon Monroe Smith, AO27276, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Roland Neville, Jr., AO27278, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Scott Basham, AO27280, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert McChesney Smith, AO27281, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William King Moran, Jr., AO27283, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Wauchope Crockett, AO27284, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Dow Swain, Jr., AO27286, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Chester Arthur Skelton, Jr., AO27287, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jeptha Hughes Evans, AO27299, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Bernard Moran James, AO27886, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Edward Barnett, AO27305, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), wth rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Franklin Case Davies, AO27306, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Henry Hull Stick, AO27307, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Graham Valpey, AO27311, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Marshall Glenn Coulter, Jr., AO27313, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Anthony Roberts Parrish, AO27314, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Sylvester Attinger, Jr., AO27315, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Earl Milton Thompson, AO27316, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with ranke from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Samuel Holtze, AO27317, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Orlando Holway 3d, AO27322, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Frank Gilbert, AO27325, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ralph Joseph Ford, Jr., AO27328, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. J. F. Allen, Jr., AO27330, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Lewis Gandy, Jr., AO27334, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Samuel Brown Adams, Jr., AO27335, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wendell Jackson Long, AO27337, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Bradley Chickering, AO27338, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert George Lindsay, AO27339, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Shelton Gillespie Spear, AO27340, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Byrd Minor, AO27341, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Richard Golden, AO27351, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harry Randolph Patrick, AO27352, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Broomhall Swartz, AO27353, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Jack Chase Pettee, AO27354, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Jerome Avery, AO27358, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John William Storb, AO27360, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harrison Larkin, AO27366, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kingdon Alva Davidson, AO27368, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Goodman Lake, AO27372, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edgar Marvin Munyon, AO27377, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948

×First Lt. Billy Neel Hollis, AO27385, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Cecil Leland Rutledge, Jr., AO27386, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Sterling Wood, AO27387, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Paulle Eckert, AO27391, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Blount Craig, AO27392, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edmund Anthony Rafalko, AO27393, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Basil A. Brockles, Jr., AO27887, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Roy Leon Marston, AO27402, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Grant Harrison Fenn, AO27408, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Samuel Kenric Lessey, AO27409, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Duncan Gault, AO27414, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Thomas Bess, Jr., AO27417, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. Harold Howard Buth, AO27418, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Brown Rupert, AO27420, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John William Pauly, AO27424, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Adolphus Giles, AO27425, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Murray Field, AO27428, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clifford Edward Myers, Jr., AO27430, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Paul Clement Whelan, AO27439, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Edgar Walker Nichols, AO27443, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Calvert Lewis Estill, Jr., AO27444, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Wilson Patrick Hurley, AO27449, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948

×First Lt. John William Campbell, Jr., AO27450, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Henry Lee Cobb, Jr., AO27451, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Ernest James Davis, Jr., AO27456, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Jack Norman Hoffman, AO27459, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jesse Bethea Hearin, Jr., AO27460, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Denton Ledford, AO27465, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Edward McGlynn, AO27470, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Archie Rice Patterson, Jr., AO27472, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Harding Romney, AO27482, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jesse Cecil Gatlin, Jr., AO27483, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Russell Eugene Taliaferro, AO27500, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Irvin Daubert, AO27502, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Richard Wale Williver, AO27505, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Ewing Lawrence, AO27506, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Duer Ludlow, AO27510, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Malcolm Fitzpatrick, AO27512, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederick Clifton Thayer, Jr., AO27513, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Clark Wayne, AO27517, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Walter Turbush Galligan, AO27518, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Lee Treester, AO27526, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Ray Bissell, AO27528, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Spearman Simpson, AO27532, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Francis Deacon, Jr., AO27533, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Allen Perez, AO27534, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Rowland Charles William Blessley, Jr., AO27536, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Ralph Alan Ellis, Jr., AO27537, Air Force of the United States (Second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edwin Harry Bailey, AO27538, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James John Rouch, AO27539, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clair Gene Whitney, AO27541, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Ballard Wohlford, AO27548, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Kenneth Lee Jackson, AO27549, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Jones Mason, AO27552, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Edward Pine, AO27557, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Wesley Sherwood, Jr., AO27559, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Charles William Cross, AO27561, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Stanley Jones, Jr., AO27572, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harry Richard Middleton, AO27573, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Kenneth Homer Werner, AO27574, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Finley Trimble, AO27586, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Edwin Godwin Kellum, AO27590, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Jacob Knight, AO27591, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Clarence Virgil Slack, Jr., AO27592, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Gale Breene, Jr., AO27596, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Scott Anthony Kuntz, AO27598, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Lewis Babin, AO27599, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Charles Edward Moran, AO27606, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Dirck deRyee Westervelt, AO27615, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Ralph Granik, AO27617, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Augustine Stephen Puchrik, AO27620, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Aloysius Lee, AO27621, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James Gordon Mason, AO27625, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Morgan Seeger, Jr., AO27626, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Clarence Leslie Linton, AO27630, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Simpson Barton, AO27631, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Glen Chadwick Childs, AO27632, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Yale Francis Trustin, AO27633, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Roff Horner, AO27637, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Frederick Wadsworth Robinson, AO27638, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. James David Morrison Morris, AO27644, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Chauncey Brooks Vandevanter, AO27647, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Rumley Wallace, Jr., AO27650, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Winthrop William Wildman, AO27654, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Branham Dillard 3d, AO27657, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Junior Godwin, AO27658, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Daniel Jack Nelson, AO27659, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Barrett English, AO27660, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Alfred Lewis Bailey, AO27662, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Peter Van Matre, AO27663, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lorrin Carlton Peterson, AO27665, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Homer Robert Minckler, AO27671, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Thomas Farr, AO27676, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Joseph Rice Byron, AO27686, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Joseph Schibilsky, AO27687, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Ash Callahan, AO27688, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Theodore Mayer Fite, AO27690, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Cole Dempster Bacon, AO27691, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Edward Coulahan, Jr., AO27692, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Nat Dulaney King, AO27694, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Earl Dudley Bruton, Jr., AO27705, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Warren Hurdis, AO27706, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Ralph Francis Croal, Jr., AO27707, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Cannon Hanes, AO27709, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Louis Lyon Martin, AO27710, Air Force of the United States (second lieu-

tenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ivan Leon Foster, Jr., AO27716, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Claudius daSilva Fingar, AO27717, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Rogers Eugene Miller, AO27718, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Max Findell, AO27720, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jacques George Beezley, AO27730, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Leon Alexander Dombrowski, Jr., AO27731, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles William Pratt, AO27742, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Earl Vane Wilkinson, Jr., AO27754, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Randolph Carrington Heard, AO27755, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Allen Evans, AO27757, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Valen Crowe, AO27758, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Marshall Pulliam, AO27762, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Pagenstecher Liebel, AO27763, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Devol Brett, AO27767, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Chester Val Braun, AO27768, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Price Smith, AO27769, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Benton Catron 4th, AO27770, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Elmer Resides Haslett, AO27890, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Norman Gardiner Sauer, AO27773, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Donald Einer Huseby, AO27776, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Walter Aaron Carter, Jr., AO27778, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Morton Spiegel, AO27780, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harry Grady Walker, Jr., AO27781, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederick Corbin Blesse, AO27784, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alexander Otto Froede, Jr., AO27788, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Leonard William Lilley, AO27792, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Daniel Crawford Perry, AO27793, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Stewart Sylvester Stabley, Jr., AO27795, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Nathan Brown Chase, AO27799, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Francis McCaddon, AO27801, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Paul Kenneth Bullard AO27804, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. George Elden Shaffner, AO27808, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harold Frederick Brenneman, AO27811, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. William Philip Brown, AO27817, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alfred Dixon Blue, AO27819, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. Harry Drake, AO27824, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wilbur Raymond Pugh, AO27826, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Elias Spragins, AO27827, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Slade Nash, AO27828, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Emmet Rochfort, AO27832, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Thomas O'Neal, AO27835, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Leslie Gerald, Jr., AO27841, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Paul Walker Field, AO27850, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lyman Screven Willcox, AO27851, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Hanley Curtis, AO27854, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donovan Low McCance, AO27855, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hally Delmar Chesney, Jr., AO27865, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Robert Stickman, Jr., AO27867, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Jacksel Markham Broughton, AO27870, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Daniel Ely Farr, 2d, AO27878, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Thompson Blood, Jr., AO27881, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Josiah Snow, 2d, AO27882, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Rodney Hugh Newbold, AO50409, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Dias Hippert, AO27884, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 6, 1948.

×First Lt. Jesse Henry Johnson, AO27885, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 7, 1948.

First Lt. Theodore Mark Jablonski, AO4133[illegible], Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 9, 1948.

Capt. Anthony Joseph Rose, AO50412, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 10, 1948.

First Lt. Lloyd Gerald Miller, AO56567, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 12, 1948.

×First Lt. Lawrence Eugene Killion, AO56566, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 12, 1948.

Capt. Alvin Mathew Welbes, AO50413, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 13, 1948.

First Lt. Carl Edwin Fales, AO56569, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 13, 1948.

First Lt. George Drexel LeMay, AO38505, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 14, 1948.

First Lt. Herbert Richard Dahl, AO56570, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 16, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Rodney Thomis, AO56573, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 16, 1948.

×Second Lt. Lawrence Thomas Lawler, AO50414, United States Air Force, with rank from June 16, 1948.

Second Lt. Walter Eugene Julin, AO56575, United States Air Force, with rank from June 18, 1948.

First Lt. Harris Ong Poy, AO56576, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 19, 1948.

Second Lt. Alfonso Christopher Toler, AO56577, United States Air Force, with rank from June 21, 1948.

Second Lt. Don William King, AO50416, United States Air Force, with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Lewis Eugene Williams, AO50417, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Alphons Edward Kosciuszko, AO56578, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Eugene Sterling, AO50418, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Francis Nee, AO38481, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Richard Van Sant, AO50420, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 24, 1948.

First Lt. Glendor D. McAdams, AO56986, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 27, 1948.

Second Lt. John Tilla Parish, Jr., AO50421, United States Air Force, with rank from June 27, 1948.

×First Lt. William David Small, Jr., AO38483, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 27, 1948.

Second Lt. William George Metsopoulos, AO56581, United States Air Force, with rank from June 27, 1948.

Second Lt. James Holte Hegg, AO56580, United States Air Force, with rank from June 27, 1948.

Capt. Gail Eugene Jacobson, AO56583, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 28, 1948.

First Lt. Harley LeRoy Grimm, AO56584, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 29, 1948.

First Lt. Delphin Randolph Hasty, AO56585, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 30, 1948.

First Lt. James Joseph Connolly, AO38484, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 30, 1948.

NOTE.—All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, we preface the deliberations of this day with ascriptions of praise unto Thee. Still true is Thy ancient promise, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength."

Strengthen our wills until we shall have power to deliver ourselves from all hidden despotisms. May we wait upon Thee, O Lord, until we shall be no longer content to accept the world as it is but as Thou hast said it should be. Make it clear to us through the renewal of our vision that we cannot substitute our own conceptions of righteousness for those of God nor practice error persistently enough to make it truth.

This day may Thy presence go before these Thy servants. May they be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might. This prayer we offer in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 27, 1948, was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and in one to include an editorial from the Minneapolis Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER EXTENDED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time I have for today be extended to 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the other special orders of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I know the House agrees with me that our maritime transportation should be carried in American bottoms.

I am including as part of my remarks an editorial from the Boston Record which is very illuminating. It shows that much of our relief commodities are being sent to foreign lands in foreign ships under foreign flags.

[From Boston Daily Record of July 26, 1948]

FOREIGN SHIPS GIVEN UNFAIR BREAK

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 20, 1948.*

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST,
Los Angeles Examiner:

There seems to be no limit to the ineptitude and folly of those who are managing our national affairs.

Congress is confronted by a problem affecting the American merchant marine which it will be its bounden duty to solve quickly and effectively.

According to advices from Washington, Capt. Granville Conway, personal representative of President Truman in arranging transportation of supplies to Europe under the Marshall plan, has stated that the only way in which American shipping firms can be assured of receiving their statutory minimum of the cargoes under that plan is for foreign transport companies to operate on an honor system.

Where those rapacious shipping interests are to find the honor to operate on, we have not been told.

Under the legislation enacted by Congress in connection with the Marshall plan, at least 50 percent of the recovery goods shipped to foreign lands shall be carried in United States vessels.

The fact that our Nation, the dispenser of billions of dollars of American wealth to other countries in effectuating the Marshall plan, has sufficient shipping of its own to transport all those supplies abroad did not carry with our legislators the weight which statesmanship and patriotism dictated.

On March 31, 1948, 933 ships were under charter by the Maritime Commission to various American companies. On June 30 of this year only 660 were being operated under charter. In other words, during the second quarter of 1948, ship operators returned 273 vessels to the Maritime Commission to be laid up, because of lack of cargoes.

And now Captain Conway, according to information from Washington, wants to submit our merchant fleet's minimum allotment rights under the Marshall plan to the tender mercies of the honor of our foreign shipping competitors.

Captain Conway is a native of Maryland. He first became connected with the American merchant marine in 1916. During the Second World War he rose to considerable prominence therein.

When Admiral Land resigned a few years ago as head of the Maritime Commission, Captain Conway was appointed to succeed him as War Shipping Administrator. On several occasions the captain was called upon to act as the direct representative of President Truman.

Recently the Cosmopolitan outfit took on a little American color when it bought a single American ship.

Some months ago, before the Marshall plan became law, President Truman called in Captain Conway and named him to direct the shipment of Marshall-plan supplies to Europe.

The question was then raised as to why Mr. Truman gave this post to the head of a shipping combine operating foreign vessels almost exclusively, instead of assigning it to a man connected with an American shipping organization.

Later on Captain Conway was made Mr. Truman's personal representative in connection with the shipment to Europe of Marshall-plan goods, in which capacity he has come forward, according to advices from Washington, with his fantastic honor system of guaranteeing to our merchant ships their 50-percent minimum of the Marshall-plan cargoes.

American shipping companies have maintained that the Marshall plan Administrator, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, should set up a bureau of transportation in his organization to be composed of operators of American ships, so that it will be certain that a minimum of 50 percent of the Marshall-plan cargoes shall be transported in American vessels, as the law provides.

Let it always be borne in mind that the law does not limit to 50 percent the participation of American shipping in the Marshall-plan traffic.

That participation can run as high as 100 percent, but the law stipulates that it cannot run under 50 percent. Our foreign competitors, however, are not respecting our 50-percent minimum allotment.

Mr. Hoffman has taken cognizance of our shipping men's efforts on behalf of a bureau of transportation in his organization, to the extent of designating Col. Arthur G. Syran as director of transportation of the Marshall plan.

Colonel Syran is a retired Army officer and evidently a thoroughgoing American, as indicated by his services to General MacArthur in Japan, where he exposed (to the general's

amazement) a carefully laid plot of the Japanese to resume their prewar shipping operations in unfair competition with our own merchant marine, and by the firmness with which he has laid down the law to foreign shipping interests as to the observance of the Marshall-plan legislation giving our American merchant fleet a 50-percent minimum of the Marshall-plan cargoes.

His words and attitude clearly show the absurdity of Captain Conway's honor system of dealing with our foreign-shipping competitors, who are determined to reap the maximum profit from our largesse under the Marshall plan, and are equally determined that the American merchant marine shall be denied every dollar under that plan which it is possible for them to grasp.

It will be recalled the British newspapers demanded that all Marshall-plan supplies be carried by British ships. They even wanted us to give Britain American vessels to enable her to monopolize this traffic.

Moreover, we were denounced in British newspapers for even thinking of using American ships in the Marshall-plan traffic, since our doing so would reduce the amount of American cash which British shipping would receive.

And as if to emphasize their contempt for American intelligence, our British friends put forth even more fantastic proposals with regard to our role of long-eared Santa Claus under the Marshall plan.

Naturally, there is a great deal of resentment among American shipping concerns against Captain Conway's honor system for dealing with America's insatiable competitors.

Our legislators in Washington must give this shipping situation the instant consideration it calls for, and take all the steps necessary to protect the interests of the Republic by assuring that the American merchant marine shall not be victimized for the benefit of foreign lands under the Marshall plan.

WILLIAM GRIFFIN,
Editor and Publisher,
New York Enquirer.

THE LATE HON. JAMES E. WATSON

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, James E. Watson or Jim as he was most frequently called has passed beyond and in his passing, Indiana and the Nation has lost one of its most distinguished and honored citizens. He was first elected to fill an unexpired term after being nominated as a compromise candidate, in a nominating convention. Upon coming to the House of Representatives, from the District it is my honor to serve, he was selected by the Speaker at that time, Joe Cannon, as a promising young party member. He lived with Joe Cannon and received from him all the benefit of his storehouse of information and administrative ability. Jim was an apt student and his popularity within his district later sent him to the United States Senate. Here he served three terms from 1915 to 1933 and was majority leader of that body when he retired.

His service and influence within this period were widespread as he was truly a National figure. The problems of our Nation during World War I and the postwar period presented a challenge to our Congress which he ably assisted in meeting. When the history of this period is written, the name of Jim Watson will loom large as an outstanding American, who contributed much to our rise as a Nation.

As a citizen, and I did have that privilege of knowing him intimately as a fellow citizen, his affable personality and almost unbelievable capacity of remembering names made him one of the most loved citizens in Indiana. He was held in esteem and affection by all who knew him and his popularity transcended all party lines. He had, however, served his party with unfailing loyalty and had not missed a National Convention of the Republican Party in 60 years. The entire State of Indiana will mourn his passing and extend its heartfelt sympathy to his widow and children.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and profound regret that I learn of the death of James E. Watson, a former Member of this body and of the Senate.

The passing of Senator Watson recalls many memories to those of us who knew him and loved him through the years. To know Jim Watson, as he was affectionately called by his many, many friends, was to know a statesman.

Like other legislators who served their country for many years, whom we can recall in a few moments, Senator Watson contributed very much to the building of our United States.

In Indiana, where Senator Watson was born November 2, 1863, his name was and long will remain a household word. In the Nation he was and is known far and wide.

This is a day of mourning for Jim Watson among his beloved Hoosiers. It seems superfluous to cite instances in which he left his contribution to the progress of Indiana and to the Nation, so active was he in working for the welfare of his fellow Americans.

As a young lawyer from Rushville, Ind., Jim Watson came to Washington as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Fifty-fourth Congress, from 1895 to 1897. He served in this body continuously from 1899 to 1909. In 1916, before the First World War, he became a United States Senator and served continuously in that body until 1933, rising to the high and responsible position of Republican floor leader.

Thus, for 17 years he was a lawmaker, servant of the people and counselor to his colleagues and Presidents as a Senator, preceded by 12 years of like service in the House of Representatives—altogether 29 years.

So long, for so many years, was Senator Watson identified with Government and the Republican Party, that well it can be said he was born to Government and service of the people. Republican National Conventions through the years from 1912 saw him as a delegate from Indiana. He was chairman of the committee on resolutions in the 1920 convention, and back in 1912 floor leader for the supporters of William Howard Taft.

With the passing of Senator Watson, Indiana had lost a favorite son and America a great man. His contributions for good government are imperishable. They are an inspiration for us who carry on and for generations without number.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am shocked and grieved to learn of the death of my friend Senator James E. Watson. I join my colleagues in paying final tribute to an eminent son of Indiana, a great American, an illustrious public servant, who gave so generously of his extraordinary talents and energy through the many years he was a member of the United States Congress.

Jim Watson served the people of Indiana and the Nation in the National Congress for more than 40 years. His party loyalty and unusual ability were recognized by his colleagues by his elevation to majority leader, first in the House, and later in the Senate. His rugged Americanism inspired the members of his party and won the everlasting admiration of people everywhere. He was a statesman of the old school and his unselfish service helped build this country into the great Nation that it is today.

Volumes could be written extolling Jim Watson, for his talents were as unusual as his amazing physical energy and stamina. But above everything else, I shall fondly remember him for his generosity, his sincere and unfailing friendliness, his ready willingness to help and to serve.

Jim was equally at home with Presidents and with the common people of Indiana, whom he served so faithfully and well. People of all walks of life loved him, because he honestly loved his fellowmen and demonstrated it day by day. I believe Jim Watson could have said, as Will Rogers did, that he never met a person he did not like.

Jim Watson lived a longer and more fruitful life than most of us are given to enjoy. We who knew him intimately realize that his final years were fraught with failing health and the infirmities of advanced age. We know that only courage and a fighting heart sustained him in the closing years.

Even so, his passing seems untimely, and leaves me with a deep sense of personal loss. Indiana, the Nation as a whole, and the thousands of individuals whose lives he touched are the richer for his contributions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We on the Democratic side join with the Indiana delegation and our colleagues on the Republican side in expressing our deep regret at the passing of former United States Senator James Watson. It was my pleasure to know Jim Watson personally. He was a great and powerful figure for many years in the Congress of the United States. He wielded a powerful influence of a constructive nature.

I thoroughly agree with everything that has been said by the previous speakers about his unusual contributions. From our side we can also pay tribute to

him as a loyal party man. The two-party system in America under our constitutional form of government is, from a practical operation, for the best interests of such constitutional government or democratic government because it places responsibility upon whichever party the people, in their wisdom, desire to have control of our government, whether Federal or State. No matter what party we belong to we must respect the other major party from that deep, fundamental angle, as well as all members who are strong and loyal members of their party.

Jim Watson always commanded my attention and respect because of his loyalty to his party. He commanded my attention and respect as a great legislator. He commanded my attention and respect also as a great American. I had the pleasure of enjoying his friendship, which feelings I completely reciprocated. I am very sorry, I repeat, to hear of his passing and join, particularly with the Indiana delegation, in expressing keen regret.

I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement to the loved ones he leaves behind.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Someone has described the friendships that grow up between Members of the different parties here as the flowers that overhang the walls of party politics.

In all my service here I never knew a man with whom I enjoyed a more profound and unreserved friendship than I did with Senator Jim Watson, of Indiana. I remember when we were going through the same fiasco that is now taking place at the other end of the Capitol in 1922, when similar attacks were being made on the white people of the South, and the disgust expressed by him at that fiasco.

After he went out of the Senate our friendship continued, and even the last day he was in the House just before the recent adjournment we had a good, long, friendly talk.

I want to join in paying my tribute to Jim Watson, not as a party man, because he made you forget party. I do not remember that he and I ever discussed party politics. But I want to pay my tribute to him as a real American. I wish we had more such real Americans, with his determination, his stamina, his integrity, his love and devotion to America, in key positions all over this country today.

I am glad to pay my humble tribute and come, as it were, to lay a wild flower upon his bier.

His life was gentle and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world, "This was a man."

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I find myself called upon to speak in memory of a friend I have known and loved beyond most men of my acquaintance. Today on the floor of the House I learned of the death of my good friend, Senator James Eli Watson, of Indiana, who served in the House and Senate for more than a third of a century. I am deeply saddened. We pause here today to pay tribute to a grand and noble character and to pay a just and loving tribute to the memory of a distinguished Hoosier and a great American.

Jim Watson was a constant inspiration to me at our political gatherings and conventions. A towering symbol of unswerving principle and justice and kindness, fostered in a Hoosierland where people love such virtues. Brilliant in debate, fearless in a fight for a cause he thought was right, his loyal friendship and unselfish interest was a never failing source of strength and comfort over the years of our acquaintance.

In a wider less personal sense, Senator Watson's life was rich in contributions to the welfare of his fellowmen, was loved and honored by people all over the world. No man in our party or in our time has been more devoted to the cause of freedom and justice and the molding of our great country. His accomplishments will be an eternal shrine to his memory. I shall always remember Senator James Eli Watson as the embodiment of those stalwart characteristics that have gone into the building of a great nation.

Homeward, serenely he walked
With God's benediction upon him.

To his faithful and devoted wife, may the precious memories you cherish of your life together sustain and comfort you and your family now and in the days to come.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of James E. Watson, Indiana has lost a great son, the Nation has lost a great statesman, the Republican Party has lost a great leader, and I have lost a great friend.

My first acquaintanceship and friendship with Jim Watson began in 1912, when I had the distinct honor and pleasure of serving as his page in the Republican National Convention of that year, when he was the floor leader of the President William Howard Taft forces. That friendship has lasted throughout the years.

I have been thrilled by Jim Watson's great statesmanship, not only in this House but in the Senate of the United States, and then, finally, as an elder statesman who gave sound advice and valuable help to his party and his Nation. In his death, America has lost a gentleman of the old school, a political leader who believed in party responsibility, and, in turn, personal responsibility to his country. America is the better for Jim Watson's having lived.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I never served in the House of Representatives with the Honorable Jim Watson; he left here before I arrived in Washington. I met him however on numerous occasions. He was friendly, kind, and gave me good sound advice as a new Member of Congress; for this I shall always be grateful to him. Jim Watson was a great American. Jim Watson was a good legislator. He was interested in good sound government as our forefathers carried on under our Constitution. A personal word of commendation he was near and dear to all members of his college fraternity, and I refer to the Phi Kappa Psi; he regularly attended their alumni association meetings here in the District of Columbia, and our fraternity will greatly miss him for there we respected him and we honored him as we felt he was a great honor to us as a member of the Phi Kappa Psi fraternity. He was also blessed by sons who were Phi Psis. Our country will miss him and our country needs more men like Jim Watson.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and I ask that they appear in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SMITH of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 8 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include the remarks of Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING when he placed a wreath on the grave of Miss Susan B. Anthony, as the representative of the seven women in the Congress, and further to include two articles from the Rochester Times-Union describing the ceremonies.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include an article by him appearing in Planes, an official publication of the Aircraft Industries Association of America.

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution of the American Legion at Manchester.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of disability re-

tirements of officers in the armed services.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on flood control and include a newspaper article.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, over the Columbia Broadcasting System on Wednesday evening, July 28, at 10:45 p. m.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE STEEL SCRAP SITUATION

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months, I have frequently brought to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, and to the public, the extreme importance of replenishing our national reservoir of steel scrap. We recognize the necessity of stock piling of strategic and vital materials essential to our national security. One of the most strategic materials is steel scrap, since our production of steel is virtually dependent upon this ingredient.

Our present supply of scrap is at an all-time low because during World War II we shipped overseas 123,000,000 tons of steel and steel products. If we can recapture in steel scrap even a small fractional part of such tonnage, our steel production could be increased immediately by three to four million tons annually. It is toward this end that my committee has been working, since increased production is the only real answer to inflation.

It is estimated that approximately 10,000,000 tons of excess steel scrap is located in the bizonal area of Germany. I have been informed that General Clay has authorized the sale of 1,200,000 tons of this material, 440,000 tons of which has been earmarked for United States buyers. While this is a step in the right direction, I feel that additional allocations to this country should be set up without delay to assure us as speedily as possible a minimum of 2,000,000 tons. I also urge that all scrap obtained from Germany by any country be charged against that country's total allotment. I say this because I understand that contrary to the policy of the United States other countries have taken hundreds of thousands of tons of scrap out of Germany under the guise of booty or captured enemy material.

Some sound decision should also be reached in Germany so that the nations participating in the ECA program are not permitted to use money furnished by the United States to outbid American purchasers for scrap.

The Federal agencies charged with protecting our interests in this matter have apparently coordinated their activities under the Secretary of Commerce who is intensely aware of our scrap needs. Therefore, with the cooperation of General Clay, a satisfactory scrap-recovery program should be set up without further delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

GOOSEBERRY PROJECT, UTAH

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Secretary of the Interior on Gooseberry project, Utah, dated June 23, 1948—Executive Communication No. 1700—referred to the Committee on Public Works, July 26, 1948, be re-referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and the Committee on Public Works be discharged from further responsibility thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a column by George Sokolsky from the Harrisburg Evening News.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MUHLENBERG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

MEAT RATIONING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today renewing the proposal made by Senator FLANDERS and myself last January to ration meat. The impending shortages of meat are even greater than were anticipated earlier this year. The facts indicate that against a normal demand, based on present consumer income levels, estimated at 160 pounds a year, the supply will be about 145 pounds in 1948. We may be looking forward to $2 per pound for meat, instead of the present $1 per pound.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, I cannot yield, as my time is too short.

Mr. SHAFER. Does the gentleman know that the Army is now stock piling meat?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, I cannot yield further now.

Mr. Speaker, two points of difference between the previous bill and this bill is that, first, this bill gives the President stand-by powers, not only for rationing, but for the allocation of meat at all levels of supply with the idea of distributing meat around the country fairly.

Secondly, this bill gives the power of rationing at wholesale levels and locally so that all income levels may have equal advantage of such supply of meat as is available, and so that the available meat may not be confined just to those with large incomes who can buy at these high prices.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman include hog meat?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, I cannot yield to the gentleman at this time.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman include hog meat?

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, I cannot yield to the gentleman at this time.

Mr. Speaker, meat represents about 25 percent of the family's normal food budget. Food prices have gone up 60 percent to 100 percent depending on the item, since the war ended. If we really want to strike at inflationary food prices with respect to the high cost of living, we must strike at meat as the key sector of the whole problem.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] must have a very short memory about the rationing and price controlling of meat. The gentleman must know that rationing must go along with price control. The gentleman should remember that the Bureau of Labor Statistics in May 1946 issued a report that 85 percent of the meat markets, retail stores, had no veal; 80 percent had no pork or beef, and that after meat rationing and price control had been in effect for many months.

The meat cutters union of Chicago issued a report that Government rationing drove meat out of the market; that it made a meat bootleg industry. It is ridiculous to talk about rationing and price control of meat. It does not produce one more pound of meat.

I hope this silly argument about rationing and price control of meat will not continue, because it just does not produce meat. It makes for shortages.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. The record also shows that the per capita consumption of meat in America today is not only greater than it was before the war, but also greater than at any time in our history due to controls having been removed. And this

regardless of the exorbitant price of meat.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want a return of the OPA.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address given by the distinguished Speaker of the House at the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

REQUEST FOR FACTS ON RUSSIA AND GERMANY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include the text of a resolution at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today the question of deepest concern to the American people is the deterioration of our relations with Russia and the prospect of war over the situation in Berlin. The President has called Congress into extraordinary session but his message on the state of the Union said nothing on this subject.

Believing that a factual statement on the situation will help the people of the United States to understand the issues involved and contribute to their solution, I am today introducing the following resolution of inquiry:

Resolved, That the President be requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable moment full information in response to the following questions:

1. What is the historical and legal basis for the United States to administer a sector of Berlin and to maintain ground communications therewith?

2. What is the substance of the argument of the Russians that we do not have such rights? Is it that we never had such rights, or that we have exceeded such rights, or that we have forfeited them? If either of the latter, in what respects do they allege that we have exceeded or forfeited them?

3. What is the historical and legal basis for Russia to maintain troops in, and to administer the affairs of that portion of Germany west of the Elbe River which was taken and occupied by troops of the United States, France or England prior to VE-day? What is the approximate area, and the approximate population of such territory?

4. What percentage of the industrial potential of prewar Germany is represented by: (a) East Prussia and that portion of eastern prewar Germany now under Polish administration, (b) the Russian zone in occupied Germany, and (c) the dismantling of plants in the three western zones (British, French, and United States) which have been allocated to Soviet Russia?

5. What is the status of the so-called Ruhr area with respect to the agreements of the four powers (United States, United Kingdom, France, and the U. S. S. R.) as to its administration by one or more of them?

6. What efforts have been made to clarify the status of that portion of prewar Germany now under Polish administration?

7. Do any covenants by the four powers (above cited) with respect to the occupation of Germany require further implementing agreements to make them effective? If so, what are they?

8. Have any actions taken by any one of the four powers been charged by any of the other powers (a) to be in violation of specific agreements entered into with respect to the occupation of Germany, or (b) to be beyond the scope of such agreements? If so, in what respects?

9. What efforts have been made to negotiate agreements for the economic and political unification of the four zones of occupied Germany? What obstacles or disagreements have prevented such an accomplishment and what have been the positions of the several powers thereon?

10. Would the trusteeship provisions of the United Nations Charter be applicable to Germany? Are there any agreements between the occupying powers which would bar such a course?

11. Is the present problem of administration in and supply for the sectors of Berlin one which may be brought before the United Nations or any of its constituent parts? If so, how?

12. What is the cost of administration and relief in Berlin to the United States, sector by sector, and what portion of the cost is due to the current supply by air? Out of what appropriations are these costs paid? Are other expenditures thereby reduced? What is the effect of such shift in costs?

INDUCTION OF MEN INTO THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, whatever may be the division in thought in this House on some of the important questions of the day, I think each and every Member of this House is of a single mind on one issue; that is, the welfare of the young men who are going to be called into the draft on August 30.

The time has arrived for us to express the hope, and to see that it is carried out, that we have the best trained, the best cared for, and the best equipped men to make up the finest armed force that the world has ever seen.

Three years ago, when the armies came back from World War II and disbanded, we immediately reverted to the ways of peace, and dropped many of our military and strategic positions. In my opinion, we let down our guard too abruptly and too often. The time has come to build up that strength again, to see that this great defensive force, which the Congress has approved and which the country so desires, is made indefatigable and invulnerable. We can do so by taking an interest in the young men, in the youth of America, who are to leave in the draft on August 30, and who are volunteering as recruits all over the country today, to make up this splendid patriotic force in the defense of our beloved country.

We voted to draft these boys and it is our duty to treat them fairly. I regret I have not heard as much concern expressed for their well-being as I did in 1940 when we passed the Selective Service Act.

What I would like to see is a committee appointed or a subcommittee designated to scrutinize the general military set-up when the training program really gets going.

That group would report back to Congress on the progress our trainees are making. It would examine how conditions are in the camps, and determine if our young men are receiving the moral guidance and spiritual uplifting they deserve along with their physical needs.

Yes, this Congress is the one responsible for the general welfare of the new American defensive force, and we should lose no time in adopting a vigilant attitude to assure its success.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

DISPLACED-PERSONS LEGISLATION

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, President Truman in accepting the Presidential nomination at the Democratic National Convention, referred to the displaced-persons legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress as anti-Catholic.

Mr. President, you have been misinformed.

I talked with the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward E. Swanstrom, of New York City, chairman of the National Catholic Resettlement Council, and as a result of our conversation he wrote me a letter, which I now hold in my hand, and from which I quote for the record:

WAR RELIEF SERVICES,
NATIONAL CATHOLIC
WELFARE CONFERENCE,
New York, N. Y., July 27, 1948.

Hon. FRANK FELLOWS,
Old House Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR MR. FELLOWS: Pursuant to our telephone conversation of this afternoon, may I tell you again that no Catholic authority in the United States, to my knowledge, has made a public statement that the so-called Fellows-Wiley displaced persons bill, which has become Public Law No. 774, is discriminatory as far as Catholics are concerned.

On the other hand, at the most recent meeting of the National Catholic Resettlement Council in Buffalo, I made a public statement to the press that we did not consider it discriminatory. More than 90 percent of the Lithuanians, about 40 percent of the Latvians and a very minor percent of the Estonians are Catholics. A very large percent of the Poles from east of the Curzon line are Catholics. These are the two groups—the Balts and the Poles—to whom your bill of necessity gave priority. If an opportunity is given to make this bill operative, a very fair proportion of Catholics will have an opportunity to resettle in the United States.

Of course, all of us would have preferred to see a date of April 21, 1947, before which the displaced persons would have had to be in the camps to be eligible, included in the bill rather than the present eligible date of December 22, 1945. The later date would have been fairer to all groups and elements within the camps.

For your information, I am enclosing a few press clippings on the statement that I made at our Buffalo meeting.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

(Rt. Rev. Msgr.) EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Executive Director.

Enclosed in this letter from Monsignor Swanstrom were several newspaper clippings. I hold them in my hand.

No. 1 has this heading: "Charges that new DP law is Anti-Catholic denied" is from the Boston Pilot of July 24, 1948.

No. 2 has this heading: "Monsignor Swanstrom denies discrimination in DP law." This clipping is from the Denver Register of July 24, 1948.

No. 3 has this heading: "DP law called fair by Catholic group." It is from the New York Times for July 15, 1948.

The charge made by the President has no foundation in fact. He needs a new adviser on DP legislation, and I suggest that great care should be used that the successor be an honest man.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter dated July 9, 1948, from Robert P. Scott, secretary-treasurer, and copies of the resolutions passed by the Michigan Federation of Labor at its recent convention.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter dated July 1, 1948, from Barney Hopkins, secretary-treasurer, and copies of resolutions adopted by the tenth annual convention of the Michigan State CIO Council held in Grand Rapids, Mich., on June 21, 22, 23, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by herself at the recent Democratic convention.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next following the other special orders of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE DISPLACED PERSONS BILL

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in taking the floor at this time I wish to corroborate the statement made by the gentleman from Maine, chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration. Many misstatements have been made about the displaced persons bill. I happen to know that bill from A to Z. The act does not discriminate against any religious group; and I am making this statement, mindful that it is contrary to all the newspaper reports.

At the time the House bill was discussed on the floor I stated that the original Senate bill was and is a lot better than the House bill, as there were no religious groups mentioned in it.

My only objection to the act is that the House conferees forced upon the Senate the acceptance of the House version of mortgaging all future quotas. In other words, closing the doors to future migrants from the particular countries for years to come.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE, THE MARSHALL PLAN, AND HIGH PRICES

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the United States News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the purely political antics of President Truman in calling Congress back into session to consider his weak program to fight inflation, it is well for us to consider some of the basic causes of the high prices we suffer. If the people will consider these basic causes, they will see that Harry S. Truman and his predecessor in the White House have caused most of the inflation.

Take the price of food. If a man has to buy groceries for his own family and for the family next door, of course his food bill goes up. A lot of Americans do not know it, but they are paying the grocery bill of housewives overseas, as well as their own, through the policies followed by Roosevelt and Truman.

The American housewife, sorely beset with high prices, should realize that the housewives of Great Britain are paying only half as much for the necessities of life, due to the American subsidies poured out by Truman and Roosevelt.

I predicted years ago and as recently as 3 months ago that if we went along to any extent with the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan, prices would go up here. Now we can see the inevitable results of such a huge unconscionable waste of American money and resources.

Just take a look at how Great Britain is using Marshall plan funds and other funds borrowed or begged from America. The British Labor Government is using American money and materials in order to subsidize the groceries of the average British housewife. In other words, we Americans are not just paying our own grocery bill, high as it is, but we are paying, through taxes, the grocery bills of millions of housewives in Britain and likely in France, Italy, and elsewhere in the world.

The United States News and World Report, in its issue of July 30, has an authoritative report on the prices of food items in Great Britain. The statement is made that "food prices in Britain are only about half as high as in the United States."

In this article we learn that bread is 4 cents a pound in Britain, 14 cents a pound in the United States. Rib roast is 40 cents a pound in England and 77 cents a pound here. Butter is 30 cents a pound there and 91 cents a pound here.

This article proves, in a graphic way, what a cheap political stunt it was for Harry Truman to call Congress back into special session in a vain attempt to saddle Congress with the blame for higher prices. He knew and he knows that policies followed by him and his predecessor have run the cost of living up at home, while making them heroes abroad, temporarily. Incidentally, the special session, called for political reasons, added a couple of million dollars to the already high cost of government.

The American housewife can blame Harry S. Truman when she considers the high prices here. He it was who originated the so-called Truman doctrine. He it was who O. K.'d and pressured through Congress the so-called Marshall plan. The Truman administration has given away or lent some $22,000,000,000 since VJ-day. No wonder prices are low in England and high here.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the entire article from the July 30, 1948, issue of the United States News and World Report.

WHY FOOD IS CHEAPER IN BRITAIN

(Reported from London)

Food prices in Britain are only about half as high as in the United States.

British housewives pay 30 cents a pound for butter, 40 cents for rib roast, 48 cents for bacon, 4 cents for bread.

Big subsidies, United States help, and special deals with foreign suppliers are the secret of Britain's low prices.

At a time when food prices in the United States are reaching for the sky, it is startling to realize what the British, by comparison, are paying for their food.

The accompanying chart shows some of the price contrasts, but it does not show the reasons behind these contrasts. Gifts, subsidies, and special deals with suppliers help to explain.

Bread, for example, is bought by the British housewife at the equivalent of 4 cents a pound. The average American housewife pays about 14 cents for a pound loaf. Bread sells in Britain for less than a third of the United States price partly because the British Government is paying half the cost. It is able to do this by taxing the well-to-do to provide cheap bread for the masses of the people. It gets most of the grain from Canada under contract at $2 a bushel, with the United States helping to pay the bill. Bread has just been taken off the ration list.

Meat, a good grade of beef rib roast, costs the British housewife 40 cents a pound. That is about half the United States price. The British Government, by subsidy, pays about 16 cents of the cost of a pound of rib roast. The meat ration is 20 cents' worth each week. That means half a pound of rib roast or a pound of cheap grades of beef.

Britain is getting most of her beef from Argentina, at a price below United States costs. In payment, Britain uses sterling received in the sale of British-owned railways in Argentina.

Bacon, rationed at 2 ounces a week, sells in Britain at 48 cents a pound, as compared with more than 75 cents in the United States. A subsidy of about 18 cents helps to keep the price down and the first cost is low.

Canada is selling bacon to Britain at 36 cents. The United States gives Britain dollars with which to pay the bill. The United States taxpayer, thus, indirectly helps to make cheap bacon available to the British people.

Butter sells in Britain for 30 cents a pound, compared with around 90 cents in United States. The subsidy is about 20 cents. Bulk of the butter comes from Denmark and the Dominions and is paid for with sterling. The butter ration is 3 ounces a week.

Oleomargarine sells at 15 cents a pound and is subsidized at about 5 cents. Most of the fats used in making it are bought with sterling from Dominion and Empire sources. The ration is the same as that of butter. Thus, the British resident gets a total of 6 ounces of butter and substitutes weekly.

Potatoes, most of which are grown locally or bought abroad with sterling, were selling in the spring at about 3¼ cents a pound, but the price is falling. The subsidy is a little over half a cent a pound. In the United States potatoes are selling at about 6½ cents. Potatoes have been unrationed in Britain since last spring.

Eggs are bringing 60 cents a dozen in Britain, with a subsidy of about 20 cents. British prices are a little under United States prices. The ration is one egg a week for an adult. More for a child.

Milk of the best quality sells generally for around 20 cents a quart, about the same as the United States average. The subsidy is about 3 cents. Britain's milk is produced locally or bought with sterling in nearby countries. The supply for most adults is restricted, but the Government provides free milk for three-fourths of the children in elementary schools, and makes a pint available daily for about 3 cents to each child under 5 years of age and to every expectant mother.

On other essential foods the story is similar. Cheese, for example, sells for 18 or 20 cents a pound, tea for 68 cents. On these and other items, the Government is maintaining low prices by means of subsidies, United States gifts, and favorable purchase contracts. The average Briton gets about 17 percent less food than the average American, but the prices he pays are a lot lower.

The subsidies that keep down prices amount to around $1,500,000,000 a year, or about a seventh of the national budget. The Government, however, considers the money well spent. And United States gifts of about $1,000,000,000 a year to finance British buying abroad are a big help.

Food price spread

	United States	Britain
	Cents	*Cents*
Bread, pound	14	4
Rib roast, do	77	40
Milk, quart	20	20
Eggs, dozen	67	60
Butter, pound	91	30
Margarine, do	44	15
Bacon, do	76	48
Sugar, do	9	8

FEDERAL MINE INSPECTION

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 27, 13 miners lost their lives and 3 were injured in an explosion at King's mine, Princeton, Ind. There were 176 men in the mine at the time, but other crews were not endangered. It was the second serious explosion in 8 months at King's. The previous blast, last November, caused no deaths, but was followed by extensive fires, which closed the mine for more than 2 months.

Last year 111 coal miners were killed in an explosion at Centralia, Ill. Let me give you some of the statistics of death and injury in the coal-mining industry. In 1942 there were 1,471 fatal accidents and 69,564 nonfatal. In 1943 there were 1,451 fatal accidents and 66,594 nonfatal. In 1944 there were 1,294 fatal accidents and 65,900 nonfatal. In 1945 there were 1,079 fatal accidents and 59,350 nonfatal.

During the 5 years, 1942 to 1946, inclusive, there were total accidents of 322,637, of which 6,229 were fatal, leaving thousands of widows and dependent children. This record clearly demonstrates that every man who goes to work in a coal mine will be, statistically, killed or injured every 6 years.

Despite this terrible record, we cannot get mining laws enforced in some States, and we have been unable to get a Federal mine-inspection law passed in Congress with teeth in it.

I contend we face a national emergency. At this special session of Congress it is our duty to take up legislation which will prevent these explosions. I hope the Members of Congress will get an opportunity to vote on H. R. 3702, which I introduced in 1947. This bill will give Federal mine inspectors the power to close down unsafe mines for 30 days or until the mine is made safe by management, whichever may be the shorter period. After management has been notified by an inspector it will have 10 days to make the mine safe before orders are given to close the mine.

SAVE THE SCHOOLS

Mr. Speaker, we have in our country approximately 10,000,000 people who are practically illiterate, and nearly 5,000,000 of our school-age children are not attending any school. This is the direct result of our failure to provide sufficient opportunity to attend school. Our school problem has reached a crisis due to the tremendously increased birth rate of 13,000,000 babies born in the past 5 years. By 1951 there will be 6,000,000 more children under 5 years of age than there were in 1940. This increased number of children entering school each year constitutes an ever-increasing strain on school facilities.

The national public elementary and secondary educational plant needs will total about $6,600,000,000. The additional school enrollment will increase the number of school rooms to 240,000 which will cost $3,600,000,000. This will require at least 240,000 more school teachers. Old buildings will have to be replaced or repaired.

The costs of such a school building program cannot be met from current taxation without imposing too great a load. In order to expand and improve education plants, I am today introducing a bill which will give Federal aid to start this building program. This bill authorizes the appropriation of $248,000,000 to assist the States to construct, remodel, or repair public elementary and secondary schools.

There shall be allocated to each State under this title, first, $2,000,000 to each State and the District of Columbia, $98,000,000; second, $128,000,000 to be divided among the several States and the District of Columbia according to the number of persons 5 to 17 years of age; third, $22,000,000, an equalization fund which will go to States to produce $45 per person 5 to 17 years of age.

To be eligible for the benefits of this act, a State must give notice prior to January 1, 1950, of its intention to make application for such benefits. If no notice is given in the time specified the sums allocated to such State shall be available for proportionately increasing grants to other States.

Mr. Speaker I contend this is emergency legislation and should be brought up in this special session of Congress. This legislation is free from Federal control and will aid materially to strengthen at a most strategic time one of our first lines of defense—education.

A nation cannot be strong enough to lead the way in peace and democracy if it disregards the educational needs of its people.

Number of children 6 years of age as estimated by Bureau of Census

1940	2,054,000
1947	2,483,000
1948	2,672,000
1949	3,063,000
1950	2,875,000
1951	2,819,000
1952	2,757,000
1953	3,834,000
1954	3,501,000
1955	3,235,000

There were 429,000 more children 6 years of age in 1947 than there were in 1940.

This year, 1948, there are 628,000 more children eligible to enter school than there were in 1940.

Next year, 1949, there will be 1,000,000 more children of the age to enter school than there were in 1940 and 391,000 more than last year.

Number of children under 5 years of age as estimated by Census Bureau

1940	12,684,000
1947	17,275,000
1948	18,105,000
1949	18,278,000
1950	18,435,000
1951	18,466,000
1952	18,405,000
1953	17,103,000
1954	16,007,000
1955	15,076,000

There are now, in 1948, 5,421,000 more children under 5 years of age than there were in 1940. There will be an increase of 170,000 next year over this year.

This increase continues up to 1951 when it reaches a peak of almost 6,000,000 more children under 5 years of age than there were in 1940.

This increased number of children entering school each year constitutes an ever-increasing strain on school facilities.

Number of children of school age as estimated by Bureau of Census

Year	Number of children ages 6 through 10	Number of children ages 11 through 16	Number of children ages 6 through 16
1940	10,850,000	14,349,000	25,199,000
1947	11,628,000	12,841,000	24,469,000
1948	12,096,000	12,804,000	24,900,000
1949	12,865,000	12,930,000	25,795,000
1950	13,407,000	13,170,000	26,577,000
1951	13,891,000	13,439,000	27,330,000
1952	14,164,000	13,765,000	27,929,000
1953	15,326,000	14,237,000	29,563,000
1954	15,759,000	15,096,000	30,855,000
1955	16,113,000	15,674,000	31,787,000

In 1940 there were 10,850,000 children from 6 through 10 years old.

In 1948 this number had grown to over 12,000,000, an increase of 1,246,000.

By 1950 it will be 2,400,000 more than in 1940 and 1,300,000 more than 1948.

By 1955 there will be 16,113,000 in this age group, or 5,500,000 more than in 1940 and 4,000,000 more than at present.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING AND ITS CAUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are assembled here at the call of the President, made at a Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia on July 15, 1948, in the heat of Democratic differences soon after the Democratic delegates of Mississippi and Alabama walked out of the convention because of the President's civil-rights program. This happened at 2 o'clock in the morning, when most of our people were sound asleep. The President said he would call us back in that early morning fracas of Democrats, but you and I only received our notice from over the radio and the newspapers. No Member of Congress received any official notice, yet we are here to learn what it is all about.

The high cost of living—we all know it is too high. Just ask your wife, who does the marketing, if you do not think so. Everything is too high. And the first direct cause is the cost of government. It is the highest on peacetime record, and going higher, higher, and higher. Who is responsible? No one more so than President Truman. No President asks for more money for government than President Truman. Who is responsible for that? President Truman and his predecessor. The greatest squandering administration ever known. A shame and disgrace to American frugality. A travesty to sound thinking. A burden to all our people. The President's budget last year of $39,600,000,000 was a disgrace: only a squanderer would submit it. Why do we have high prices and high cost of living? The greatest reason is high cost of government. Who is most responsible? President Truman and his predecessor. High government cost means high taxes. High taxes means less net earnings, less to spend, and higher prices. Keep up this high cost of government and we will go bankrupt; go bankrupt through inflation. The higher the cost of government the higher the cost of everything. The Treasury statement of July 26 says our national debt is $253,341,947,621.08.

Our greatest enemy is inflation, and the President is the greatest offender. Why? For his own personal pride, to gain votes, and to sit in the White House. Why do I say that? My reason is just this, read his message to Congress that he delivered on Tuesday, July 27, at 12:30 p. m. See what bait he throws out to the voters. Now read and think what the estimated cost is to the people of America:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM URGED BY PRESIDENT IN MESSAGE

President Truman yesterday asked Congress to pass legislation that would:

1. Control inflation	$100,000,000
2. Provide low-cost housing	5,000,000,000
3. Give Federal assistance to education	750,000,000
4. Increase social security benefits	200,000,000
5. Amend the Displaced Persons Act	5,000,000
6. Furnish funds to build permanent United Nations headquarters	65,000,000
7. Approve the international wheat agreement	250,000
8. Appropriate for a TVA steam plant	84,000,000
9. Raise Federal pay	15,000,000
10. Carry out the civil-rights program	50,000,000
11. Increase minimum-wage levels	5,000,000

He urged action on other measures if the Congress finds time. This secondary list includes:

1. A health program	$300,000,000
2. An amended Labor-Management Act	1,000,000
3. A long-range farm program	250,000,000
4. Stronger reciprocal trade agreements	5,000,000
5. A universal training program	$2,000,000,000
6. A National Science Foundation	30,000,000
7. The St. Lawrence waterway treaty	700,000,000
Total	9,660,250,000

Just think, he wants a program that will cost the country over $9,000,000,000 additional to what he is spending now. Is it not just ridiculous? To me it is suicide for our form of government. It is inflation of the worst sort, it spells higher prices. Higher, higher, higher the prices of everything. Higher taxes. Bust, bust, bankruptcy, ruination.

Our American people must realize, and do it soon, that they cannot look to the Federal Government for everything they want. They must send Congressmen here to Washington to help work this problem out, or we all loose when the Government goes broke. We must cut down cost of government, not increase it. You must elect a President this fall who will economize in government or we go broke, and lose all the fine things in life that the American people have and do enjoy—liberty, freedom, and independence. We must stop assuming the guardianship of all nations of the world. Let the United Nations Organization do that. I say to America, look after our own people before it is too late. This is sound advice, if I can give it to you, and it is imperative that you heed it.

THE USE OF FOREIGN SHIPS FOR THE SENDING OF RELIEF COMMODITIES TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 26, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] stated that it had been brought to her attention "that the administration is using foreign ships to send relief commodities to foreign countries and that our own ships are put into disuse." She then rightly reminded the House that looking after our own shipping is particularly vital. Today she again brought this matter to our attention.

Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, provided that at least 50 percent of commodities purchased in the United States for export to participating nations under the provisions of this act be carried by American-flag ships. Inquiry into the present working of this provision reveals the following:

At the initiation of the program it was not possible to comply strictly with the 50-percent requirement, but every effort was made to attain compliance within a reasonable time. At present, bulk shipments comply approximately with the law in the over-all picture.

It is difficult to determine exact figures for berth shipments, since the whole program is not yet under way. However, complete April statistics indicate approximate berth compliance with the law.

The Administrator of ECA, Mr. Hoffman, has assigned the handling of waterborne shipments to Col. Arthur G. Syran, Traffic Division, ECA. Colonel Syran is an experienced shipping man—highly recommended by the industry, and one who can be depended upon to see that the will of Congress is carried out with neither undue restrictions nor petty evasions. In this instance I am sure we can anticipate the administration of the law in accordance with the intent of Congress, and those of us specifically interested in American shipping will keep a close lookout to see that our ships do get every consideration to which they are entitled by law.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's message to Congress last Tuesday was the sequence of the call for a special session from the rostrum of a political convention. He said in effect that its purpose was to put Congress on the spot. His message was in the same vein. It was purely a maneuver of political demagoguery. After a tirade against high prices and housing scarcity, he proposed to perform miracles. He said if only Congress would give him the dictator powers of price control, rationing, and bureaucratic building of public housing the problems were as good as solved.

The President gave the impression that if given a public-housing bill the Government could perform the miracle of building the two and one-half million homes we are still short in a short time, shall we say, 6 months or a year. Now, everybody who thinks for a moment knows this is a physical impossibility for either Government or private industry. Moreover, we know from experience that with the Government in house building the bureaucrats would claim priorities and tie up 50 to 60 percent of the raw materials to do 10 percent of the construction, thereby wrecking the whole program—reducing it to less than one-half of our present production.

In 1946 we were short 5,000,000 homes. This was because the New Deal in the 10 years of the thirties built 500,000 homes a year less than we built in the 1920's. We were told in the thirties that we had reached the limit of our frontiers. We should build no more factories or homes but use and divide up what we had.

In 1946, with "Wyatt" Government controls, we were promised 1,200,000 homes. We got only 435,000. Then the Government building program bogged down completely. In 1947, when Congress lifted controls, we built 835,000 homes. This year we will build a million. At this rate we will be nearly out of the woods and breathing easier within a year. We are making far more progress than we have made, or would make, under Government controls. The President should have encouraged this phenomenal progress instead of beguiling the American people with his proposed miracles.

The President's remedy for high prices was in the same category. When he called the special session last November he asked for the same powers of standby rationing and price controls to prevent inflation—this, notwithstanding the fact that a short time before he had said that he would not want to go back to the police-state methods of controls in peacetime. At the same time he deliberately deceived the American people when he said that foreign aid and foreign shipments were not responsible for high prices. His Under Secretary of State, Mr. Lovett, refuted this in a simple but forcible manner a few days later. At the hearings on the interim-aid bill for the Marshall plan in November, when I asked him if he agreed with his Chief, he said, "You and I both know that we would not have $3 wheat in this country if we were not shipping 500,000,000 bushels abroad this year." If there should be any doubt about this, it was amply confirmed a few months later, in the spring of this year, when the forecast of the biggest European wheat crop in years immediately caused wheat to tumble to nearly $2 a bushel. The American housewife can be assured that our foreign aid is only one, but a substantial, element in our high-price situation.

Do not think for a moment that I say this because I am against the Marshall plan. I am for it and have been all the time. All I have been against was the waste, mismanagement, and misrepresentation under which it was handled until we set up the present independent agency. The American people are entitled to honest facts. Given these, they can be depended upon for full cooperation as a matter of enlightened self-interest.

How much better it would have been if, instead of asking for police-state powers and promising miracles, President Truman had said "Sure, the Marshall plan is partially to blame for high prices, but it is well worth the sacrifices you must make and the burden you must bear in this cold war against communism, if by them we can avert the devastating catastrophe of another world-wide shooting war. It will take us a little longer to get back to normalcy, but your patience will be well rewarded." Can there be any question that under such statement and leadership the American people would cooperate with each other and the Government to lick this inflation?

Of course, there are other causes of inflation. Among them are irredeemable currency, excessive Government spending, the wage-and-hour law, the spiral of wage increases, and so forth. Just take the last, the spiral of wage increases. These began in 1945 when President Truman and Henry Wallace—who was dominating both our foreign and domestic policy at that time—both came out with the new doctrine that wages could be increased without increasing prices. Any sane person knew that this would require a miracle. When every dollar that a consumer spends for the merchandise he buys represents 80 cents in labor bestowed upon it from the time the raw material leaves the field or the mine to the time of his purchase, it surely took a miracle to raise wages without raising prices. But the Government raised wages then, beginning with General Motors, which the great Wallace said should raise wages 25 percent. However, the miracle never materialized and, of course, prices had to rise. Henry admitted he had overlooked some things. Now President Truman takes the not only tenuous but ridiculous position that President Truman is entitled to the credit for high wages, but Congress must take the responsibiilty for high prices. This is, indeed, a new low in political demagoguery.

The truth of the matter is that Congress has done an outstanding job against inflation caused by President Truman's ineptitude. Right in his message against inflation the President asked for new legislation which, if it were all enacted, would add $20,000,000,000 to the national budget, causing inflation which would stagger the imagination.

President Truman grudgingly admits that Congress increased production by taking off controls, but he says nothing of the unlooked for and added demands on this production as being responsible for high prices. Even the much maligned Taft-Hartley Labor Act, which he would repeal, cut strikes down to one-third, saving American labor $1,000,000,000 and giving the consumer that much more goods, thereby cutting down inflation.

The President's message might get votes from the unwary, but it was destructive rather than constructive. It was a political speech. Ours is still a government by the people, and instead of a request for police-state powers we need a leadership that will be honest with our people, but will give them the facts and ask for their cooperation with each other and with the Government to solve our common problems patiently. We must get away from engendering class hatred by blaming nonexisting scapegoats and promising miracles in the pursuit of them. What we need is honest American realism in Presidential messages.

A CHANGE IS NEEDED

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this session of Congress has been called for political reasons, I deem it my duty to make a report of my findings in connection with a jaunt through 15 counties in Pennsylvania since the Republican National Convention at Philadelphia. I talked to all kinds of people, in all kinds of places, under all kinds of circumstances; steel workers, miners, farmers' wives, truck drivers, storekeepers, and so forth. This is the picture that presents itself: The Republicans want to, at long last, elect a Republican President. They are proud of their ticket and opportunity and they are going to vote in mighty numbers. The Democrats want a change. They do not want a Republican, but they want a change, and openly say everywhere, "We do not want Truman." So, with Henry Wallace in their party, and they wanting a change, you do not need to have much concern as to what is going to come out of it.

Out of all of it I get this: I have a great and abiding faith that the country is going to be saved by what happens after November. It seems people everywhere want to save what is left.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a letter from Omar B. Ketchum, director of national legislative service. Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in the other correspondence from the national legislative commission, the American Legion.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each newspaper articles.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include several letters.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, James C. Haggerty, press secretary for Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York, announced yesterday:

> The Governor feels that the Congress should stay in Washington and give careful consideration to whatever was proposed in the President's message.

Governor Dewey's position not only as the executive of the Empire State, but as the leader of the Republican Party, commands respect. I know that the American people are happy to have some indication from the Republican standard bearer that he, too, is aware of the distressed circumstances in which the average American family now finds itself.

If Governor Dewey and the Members on the Republican side of the aisle think that the question of the high cost of living is not paramount in the minds of the American people today, they are in for a rude awakening. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] a few moments ago brought up the subject of rationing. However, I notice that he failed to mention the fact that during 1944, 1945, and 1946 the packing industry deliberately and willfully held back the supply of meats. Also he neglected to mention that today when the supply of meats is plentiful, the prices due to manipulations, are 40 to 50 percent higher than even the peak prices reached by the black market.

A previous speaker this morning was telling how he had gone around his district and spoken to people of all occupations and classes. If he did this, the first thing he was confronted with was their eagerness to bring prices down. Our people are being pushed into poverty and actual want due to excessive costs. The situation is intolerable, and a solution must be found quickly.

If Governor Dewey is sincere, if Governor Dewey has the interests of these millions of his fellow Americans at heart, he should do more than just request "careful consideration" by Members of Congress of the program as suggested by the Chief Executive. Governor Dewey should make haste to come to Washington and avail himself of the opportunity to talk with all the Members of Congress. I know the American people would be very reassured if the Governor would use his considerable influence and would testify before the various committees that are handling the problems presented in the President's message. Such appearances would carry much weight during this special session.

I hope that the Governor will see fit to grant us the opportunity of learning what proposals he may have to offer in this crisis. We shall all be grateful for his suggestions and for his help.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES SHOULD SHUT UP AND APOLOGIZE TO DR. CONDON

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Members of this House should be told again about the irresponsible behavior of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in continuing its ridiculous attack by press releases on Dr. E. U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. This conduct is reacting unfavorably on the reputation of the Congress throughout the Nation, as evidenced by many recent editorial comments.

On Monday of this week the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL], the acting chairman of the committee, held a press conference in which he again monotonously repeated those same unsubstantiated and now thoroughly discredited attacks on this distinguished scientist which were made public 6 months ago in a sensational press release of a subcommittee report. That report, you will recall, was dramatically released from the hospital bedside of Chairman J. PARNELL THOMAS as a matter of such importance that it demands immediate attention. On May 12, Mr. McDOWELL told the Members of this body that hearings would be held before Congress adjourned, but just at adjournment time—the committee having done nothing as usual—he announced they would begin August 1. Now this week he announces again that there will be hearings but omits naming a date.

The excuse for delay that they give is the illness of the committee chairman. If the committee really sincerely believes it has anything against Dr. Condon, is it not trifling with the national security to have delayed in this way? It has been some 15 months since attacks first began, over a year since Mr. THOMAS personally attacked Dr. Condon in popular magazines, and 5 months since the sensational March 1 publicity release. My answer is that the committee has no evidence to support its nasty insinuations. Then why in all fairness, does not the committee drop its publicity business and manfully apologize to Dr. Condon, instead of continuing to subject him to what the New York Times months ago aptly called punishment by publicity?

On July 15, while the Congress was in recess, the Atomic Energy Commission announced its findings on Dr. Condon after what was probably the most thorough study in a case of this kind ever made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I ask leave also to insert the Commission's statement on Dr. Condon in the RECORD. There never was any real reason for such an extensive investigation other than the publicity and atmosphere of the accusations of the House Committee on Un-American Activities—and it has resulted in an absolutely clean bill of health for Dr. Condon.

On July 22, 1947, on the floor of this House, over a year ago, discussing an early attack originating with this committee, I said:

> Rumormongering character assassins should put up or shut up.

I most emphatically repeat that challenge today. I suggest that since this committee has not been able to put up, in more than a year of publicity efforts to smear Dr. Condon, it should now shut up, in the most graceful way possible considering the disgraceful position in which it finds itself.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

JULY 15, 1948.

The question before the Commission is the security clearance of Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. In view of Dr. Condon's past association with the atomic-energy project, this question arises under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act for reinvestigations of persons who were permitted access to restricted data by the Manhattan District. The question presented is whether Dr. Condon's clearance should be continued to permit him to have access to the restricted data pertinent to his duties as Director of the Bureau of Standards and related activities.

After examining the extensive files in this case the Commission has no question whatever concerning Dr. Condon's loyalty to the United States. What we have for consideration, therefore, is whether the continued clearance of this distinguished American scientist, whose loyalty is unquestionable, would constitute a security hazard to the atomic-energy program. Such a decision calls for a common-sense evaluation of the factors involved.

In considering the case the Commission has taken note of the prior association of Dr. Condon with the atomic-energy program, during which he was given access to information of a high degree of secrecy:

1. In 1940 Dr. Condon was appointed a member of the eight-man Uranium Subcommittee of the Uranium Section, National Defense Research Committee, which carried out the first over-all survey of problems related to developing nuclear energy from atomic fission for the defense program.

2. In 1941 and 1942 Dr. Condon served as associate director of research of the Westinghouse Corp., during the period when Westinghouse took a prominent part in the production of the first substantial quantities of pure uranium metal.

3. Also in 1942, Dr. Condon was appointed a consultant to the S–1 Executive Committee of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. This committee was charged with the responsibility for reviewing the basic program of the entire uranium project.

4. For a short period in 1943 Dr. Condon served as associate director of the Los Alamos Laboratory, at that time in the early stages of its organization as the unit of the Manhattan project which would finally turn out atomic bombs. While at Los Alamos he prepared a document known as the Los Alamos Primer, which was used as an introduction to the subject of the explosive use of fissionable material, to introduce to scientific and technical personnel coming to the laboratory the fundamental ideas under investigation.

5. In 1944–45 Dr. Condon worked at the Radiation Laboratory of the University of California at Berkeley, which was under contract with the Manhattan District.

6. In November 1945 Dr. Condon, having been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, took office in the position which he now occupies as Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

7. In December 1945 Dr. Condon was designated and thereafter served as Scientific Adviser to the Senate's Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

8. In 1946 Dr. Condon was named by the President as a member of the Evaluation Commission for Operations Crossroads, and in this capacity attended the Bikini tests.

During the war the Bureau of Standards conducted for the atomic-energy program of the Manhattan District certain work of types which the Bureau was particularly suited to perform. The Bureau has continued to perform for the Atomic Energy Commission similar work which can be best carried out by the Bureau. Thus in his position as Director of the Bureau of Standards, and in other related atomic-energy activities in which he would participate, Dr. Condon has need for access to certain types of restricted data. This meant that under the Atomic Energy Act Dr. Condon's security clearance required "reinvestigation"; that is, it was necessary for the FBI to investigate and report to the Commission on his character, associations, and loyalty, and for the Commission then to determine whether permitting him to have access to restricted data will endanger the common defense and security. In defining the question before the Commission it is recognized that, as is the case with thousands of other persons whose security clearances must be passed on by the Commission, Dr. Condon's clearance does not involve access to information on weapons, or production or stock-pile data, for the reason that his duties do not require that such access be given.

The five members of the Atomic Energy Commission have personally examined with care the entire record. Although its Personnel Security Review Board expressed the opinion on June 7, 1948, that action by the Commission on the case might appropriately be deferred, pending reasonably prompt action by the House Committee on Un-American Activities with respect to that committee's own investigation and hearing as to Dr. Condon, the Commission considers that in view of its statutory obligations this is a case which the members of the Commission should themselves decide, and that it is our duty to proceed at this time to such a decision.

The record before the Commission includes reports compiled in two FBI investigations. In a most detailed and exhaustive manner, these present a very full picture of Dr. Condon's character, associations, and loyalty, since the FBI interviewed over 300 persons to obtain information and its investigations were conducted by a large number of agents on a country-wide basis. In addition, the FBI supplied the Commission the pertinent information relating to Dr. Condon which it had obtained from the files of other Government agencies. The thorough and painstaking investigations by the FBI, and other relevant information available to the Commission, provide the basis on which it is the Commission's responsibility to determine the question of Dr. Condon's security clearance.

In considering the record, the Commission has found that, in the opinion of some persons, Dr. Condon's tact, judgment, and discretion appear to be subject to some degree of criticism. On the other hand there are statements by persons who have been closely associated with Dr. Condon during his long work on classified information, which indicate proper care on his part in assuring that unauthorized persons should not obtain access to classified information. The file contains unfavorable information of a relevant character concerning certain persons with whom Dr. Condon and Mrs. Condon have from time to time had contacts. The file also shows that Dr. Condon is a man of wide associations, and that his associates include many highly reputable members of the scientific community who have great confidence in him.

In deciding such matters, the Commission has a statutory responsibility to place in perspective the evidence, both favorable and unfavorable, and to decide whether the common defense and security of the United States would be adversely affected if the individual concerned continued to have that access to restricted data which is required by the nature of his duties.

On the basis of the voluminous record before it, the members of the Commission are fully satisfied that, in the terms of the statute, Dr. Condon's continued clearance for the purposes stated above "will not adversely affect the common defense and security" of the United States. The Commission considers that his continued clearance is in the best interests of the atomic energy program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in two instances to include editorials on civil rights and in the third an article on the United States merchant marine.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

VETERANS' HOMESTEAD ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if this special session of Congress is to be of benefit to America, it should devote itself, I think, to those questions of primary importance to our people. I believe it is generally conceded that the question of housing is one of the most, if not the most, pressing problems facing us.

On Monday I urged the House to take immediate action to pass the Veterans' Homestead Act.

There are a number of other housing bills pending in the House and Senate. Most of them are extremely controversial, and apparently have no chance of passing at this special session. The Veterans' Homestead Act is not a controversial bill. It has been endorsed by the authors and proponents of other housing legislation, as well as by many veterans' organizations, and by Members of Congress of both the Democratic and Republican Parties. It can be enacted at this session. If and when the Veterans' Homestead Act is passed, it will provide housing for veterans, not 2 years from now, or 4 years from now, but will provide housing for veterans now. It will also provide veterans' housing, both rental and purchase housing at prices they can afford to pay.

On July 27, 1948, Gen. John Thomas Taylor, the director of the American Legion's National Legislative Commission wrote a letter to Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House, and sent a copy to me, in which he urges the enactment of the Veterans' Homestead Act, which is now on the House Calendar. I insert this letter herewith as a part of my remarks, and call attention to that portion in paragraph two which refers to the Veterans' Homestead Act.

Again I earnestly urge the Members of the House to take quick action on this bill while there still remains ample time for its passage, and while the membership of Congress is still in a frame of mind to render constructive service during this session.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: When Congress adjourned on June 19, several bills in which the American Legion is particularly interested were either pending before congressional committees, had been favorably reported and were on the House or Senate Calendar, or had been passed by one branch of the Congress.

I enclose herewith a list of some of these items which are in accordance with official mandates of our two governing bodies, our national conventions and national executive committee, all of which had been given some consideration at the time of adjournment. Some of these bills are of vital importance to disabled veterans and their dependents, in view of the serious condition in which they have been placed by virtue of the fact that the cost of living has reached an all-time high. The American Legion bill, H. R. 4488, to create the Veterans' Homestead Act, is on the House Calendar, and, if enacted into law, would greatly improve living conditions of many veterans who have been seriously handicapped in their readjustment to civilian life by chaotic housing conditions. Present threats to the security of our country make it absolutely necessary that universal military training and the Mundt-Nixon bill to combat communism be promptly enacted into law.

On behalf of the American Legion, composed of 3,250,000 veterans who honorably served their country, and the American Legion Auxiliary, with a membership of approximately 1,000,000 wives, daughters,

mothers, and sisters of war veterans, I strongly urge that the bills enumerated on the attached list be favorably acted on during the present session of the Eightieth Congress.

It will be greatly appreciated if you will call this letter, with its enclosure, to the attention of the House of Representatives, including their insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION ON HOUSING AND HIGH PRICES

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, President Truman has spoken from the heart the anxiety of the American people over soaring prices and the shortage of decent homes. The day before yesterday the majority pretended to listen politely, but with a deaf ear. Candidate Dewey did not even bother to turn on his radio.

But the housewife who buys the groceries knows that her budget has reached the breaking point. The patience of the veteran living with relatives and seeking a roof of his own for the wife and kids is at the boiling point. They now know that the President has exercised his full constitutional powers in their behalf. He has called back the Congress into special session; he has clearly stated the urgency of these problems; he has suggested legislation to meet them.

The prompt answer of the Republican majority in Congress was a political attack upon the President. They now propose to hold committee hearings, but the prospect for sincere cooperation in the housing-inflation fight is not bright.

Republican Members of this Eightieth Congress say that they are not bound to enact now the sections of the 1948 Republican platform on these critical issues. They say that job should be left for the Eighty-first Congress next year. But the people are not interested in technicalities or promises. They need help now. Moreover, they doubt whether the Republican Members of Congress seeking reelection will be any more inclined after the election to act in their behalf than they are today.

This Congress may reject the earnest plea of the President for immediate legislation on housing and high prices. The Republican Party may continue to place political subservience to the real-estate lobby and to the NAM above the crying needs of the people. If this happens, the only hope is to remember in November—and to assure President Truman of the cooperation next January of a Democratic Congress.

GEN. OMAR BRADLEY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, a great soldier, statesman, administrator, and leader has spoken with courage.

Long before Gen. Omar Bradley became Chief of Staff, I heard his distinguished predecessor, General Eisenhower state: "When true history has been written, among the names of the great will appear that of Gen. Omar Bradley." It is interesting to note that these two great generals concur in their views about the inadvisability of mixing the races in military units.

How anyone who has served in the Army can contend for abolishing segregation in military service is beyond my conception. The mixing of the races would place both whites and blacks, especially the Negro, at a great disadvantage. In retaining the segregation rule, colored troops vie with each other in attaining ranks. Were the units mixed it would be most difficult, if not impossible, for a Negro to receive even noncommissioned appointments to say nothing of officer ranks. We are shocked at the extent to which some individuals will go for political expediency. Since equal treatment is accorded all racial representatives in military service, there is no justification for the intermingling of the races.

At this, the first meeting of the House since the issuance of General Bradley's statement retaining segregration, in spite of the President's Executive order, I arise to commend General Bradley for his courage in continuing the policy of General Eisenhower on segregation in the interest of maximum military efficiency.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of discussion about emergencies. But there is one emergency that we do not have to talk about—we have known about it for years. That is the emergency existing in the public-school system today. The high cost of living has not improved this situation.

The stand taken by Governor Dewey at the governors' conference in New Hampshire last June has shocked the people of this country almost beyond belief. We cannot believe that any person who might be eligible to seek the Presidency of the United States could come out against the teaching profession, when they are only asking for small increases in salary and adequate funds for other expenses.

Salaries and operational expenses are small as compared with the expenses and allowances made in other departments of public service.

I feel rather pleased and encouraged however, to know that one more great organization in this country has taken a stand publicly for public education through their national commander, the Honorable James F. O'Neil of the American Legion.

Commander O'Neil, in his address before the National Education Association meeting in annual convention in Cleveland on July 6, came out strong for a special session of Congress to consider Federal aid to education. For that reason I am asking permission to extend at this point in the RECORD the complete address of Commander O'Neil, because I believe it warrants the attention of every Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADDRESS BY NATIONAL COMMANDER JAMES F. O'NEIL, OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, BEFORE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, CLEVELAND, OHIO, JULY 6, 1948

I am delighted to be with you today, and bring you the greetings of the 3,000,000 members of the American Legion.

You of the National Education Association and we of the American Legion have many interests in common. We have formed a working alliance on many programs.

We join with you in promoting National Education Week, in order to acquaint the general public with the aims, needs, and achievements of our schools, and to stimulate popular interest in the Nation's educational system.

The American Legion, with its auxiliary, sponsors Boys State and Girls State, and a progression of the programs to the Federal level through the Boys Forum of National Government and Girls Nation. In these activities student leaders are encouraged to assume the duties, privileges, rights, and responsibilities of American citizenship. Twenty-four thousand outstanding youngsters will engage in these programs this year.

In cooperation with the schools of the land American Legion posts award medals and citations to students in recognition of the high qualities of character and scholarship at an age when youth is most impressionable. Our posts are guided by school faculties in making these awards.

With the approval of the Association of Secondary School Principals, the American Legion has developed the national high-school oratorical contest to inspire among students a keener understanding of the Constitution of the United States. As an incentive for participation in this program the American Legion awards scholarships worth $8,000 each year.

In addition, the American Legion contributes 20 college scholarships annually to orphan sons of veterans of World Wars I and II. Each scholarship is valued at $1,200.

NEA and the American Legion jointly promote flag education and the observance of patriotic holidays.

These are programs we mutually undertake as a public service. As one partner to another, the American Legion extends warmest thanks to you for your help and for your participation. We solicit your support and offer our own in widening these programs so that together we can build a better citizenship for tomorrow.

June 22 of this year marked the fourth anniversary of the signing of the GI bill of rights. The educational dividends from this measure already have exceeded the fondest hopes of Legionnaires who conceived and won its adoption as the primary instrument of veterans' readjustment.

Since June of 1944 1,122,000 veterans have attended colleges and universities under the GI bill. Another 694,000 are enrolled in trade and technical schools. More than 450,000 are taking on-the-job training and 242,000 are in institutional on-the-farm training.

I am sure you appreciate the tremendous advantages accruing from this program not only in terms of a better informed and better trained citizenry but—equally important—in the way of awakening the public to the importance of education and extending the reach of our educational system.

Certainly the superior performance of GI students indicates that the cost of the program will not begin to measure its value. This is one investment Uncle Sam will profit from for years to come.

Affording every inducement and opportunity for the development of intellect and talent has evolved as the primary goal of the American system of free education. Within the scope of this mission another and equally pressing job confronts our teachers of today. I refer to the job of instructing and impressing our boys and girls in the meaning and value of the American way of life.

The most important occurrence of our generation, and perhaps of the twentieth century, is the war of ideals now being waged by the forces of democracy and communism. The burden of resolving this conflict on freedom's side will fall largely upon the generation of Americans now attending schools. In the interest of their own survival and the survival of the moral and physical liberties we believe indispensable for right living, we must provide our young men and women with the knowledge and zeal they will need to meet the challenge of their time.

The American Legion sincerely hopes you will, as an organization and individually, prosecute without pause the campaign already begun to expand the role of teacher and school as agents of democracy. The vacuum of indifferent patriotism is too easily filled with subversive philosophies. It must be the task of all of us—schools, parents, churches, and civic organizations working together—to arm our children with certain knowledge about democratic doctrines.

Under our concepts, equality of opportunity is the fundamental basis of democracy. This cannot exist without equality of educational opportunities. We do not have equality of educational opportunity in America today, despite the fact we are the richest people on earth.

World War II gives us an example. Selective-service records show that 600,000 men were rejected for reasons of illiteracy. This is the equivalent of 40 divisions with supporting troops.

Another example is the wide range between States in their ability to finance an educational program. An eastern State, by expending 1.74 percent of its peoples' income, can provide $198 for each child in school. A southern State, by using 1.64 percent of its income, can yield only $44 per child in school. The poorer States can never hope to support broad curricula or health education which will adequately take care of the needs of their children or pay adequate salaries to their teachers on a basis comparable to that of wealthier States.

There is an old saying that "crime does not pay." There is no analogy between the pursuit of crime and pursuit of a teaching profession, but circumstances have placed the two occupations in about the same catagory in terms of revenue. Thousands of teachers are struggling along on salaries far out of step with the spiraling cost of living.

This country is guilty of a shameful neglect of those who are devoting their lives to the education of American youth.

For the aforementioned reasons the American Legion stands four-square behind proposed legislation to extend Federal financial support for schools.

It is our studied opinion that the school districts of the Nation should support themselves so far as they are able to do so, but that impoverished districts, wherever located, should have additional aid in the form of Federal grants. These grants should be conveyed without Federal domination of, or interference with, the existence of local control of schools.

We urged the Eightieth Congress to enact this Federal-aid program. So did the NEA and other organizations. We did not succeed.

Though the legislation failed of enactment in the last session of Congress, I see no reason to lose heart. NEA has suffered defeats before. So has the American Legion. We battled all out for universal military training legislation. We didn't get it. But we are not relinquishing efforts to have the draft superseded by UMT as soon as possible, as the most democratic and economical means of attaining peacetime training and preparedness.

That the school-aid legislation progressed as far as it did in Congress is a cause for hope. Let us rally to it. I pledge you the full support of the American Legion in endeavoring to put it over.

More specifically, I favor that Congress be recalled into session this summer to take up and pass legislation for Federal aid to schools, and resolve other major issues which Congress neglected to perform during the regular session.

The need for this is immediate and imperative. Precious time will be lost if Congress waits until next year to act.

Our educational standards must go forward. They must not be permitted to stand still or retreat.

The men and women who will be called upon to speak for America in meeting the crisis of tomorrow, are the boys and girls attending our schools today. The Nation will be directly accountable should it fail to assure the maintenance of education processes which would enable them to cope with their future responsibilities.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LUSK. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The statement just referred to, which Governor Dewey made at New Hampshire, has since been corrected in the press. I think the RECORD ought to be clear here that the governor denied the press statement as quoted, and that he did not say what the gentlewoman referred to.

Mrs. LUSK. May I reply to the gentleman that I will submit for the RECORD here a statement from the Governor of New Mexico, who took the side of the teachers in this discussion with Governor Dewey. Governor Mabry, of New Mexico, and Governor Warren, of California, took issue with Governor Dewey in that discussion. I can furnish you, I think, with a fairly accurate record of the statement.

Mr. McDONOUGH. However, that statement was incorrect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New Mexico has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED PROGRAM OF ACTION FOR CONGRESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members on both sides of the aisle are in agreement that prices are entirely too high and that runaway inflation is about to engulf us and wipe out the middle and lower classes of our society economically.

I do not see that anything is to be gained by recriminations of one party charging the other with the blame. The main thing is that the people of the Nation want something done to stop skyrocketing prices. This bickering is not lowering prices.

In talking with the leaders of both sides, it seems to me that there are certain areas of agreement. There are five or six things at least that can be done, which would tend to check inflation. About these there does not seem to be much controversy. So it seems to me that since we are convened in special session something might be done at least to give authority to require greater bank reserves, to control the commodity market, to put some check on consumer credit, to allocate steel, also, perhaps, to take some action against the monopolistic corporations which are setting a high-price pace. We should try to stop the monopoly fixing of prices.

These things can be done. Nobody wants to put on price controls and rationing unless and until everything else is tried. Even selective price control and rationing should be used as a last resort only.

So let us try to do something about these things which we agree on substantially while we are here in special session.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Alabama asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. S. R. Young, executive assistant to the Postmaster General.

SEX CRIMES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, since the adjournment of Congress, another brutal crime has been committed here in the District. A little 11-year-old girl was brutally attacked. This is one of a long series of such attacks here in the District. This once fair Capital City of the Nation has become the haven of sexual perverts and criminals. They are converging upon Washington in ever-increasing numbers.

If there is one place in this Nation where a little child can walk alone it should be here in the District of Columbia. It is dangerous for one to walk alone here at any hour of the day or night. These criminals have become so bold that they no longer wait for the cover of darkness to commit their atrocious crimes but carry them out in the broad open daylight.

In order to give better protection to the inhabitants of the District, I have just introduced a bill which will consolidate the Park and the Metropolitan Police. If this special session of Congress does only one thing it should enact this bill and have a reorganization of the police force of this District.

The conditions that exist here are a shame and disgrace to a civilized community. This Congress must demand that this condition be cleaned up and that it be done now. The adoption of only this bill will not do it but it will make a good start. Do not tell me that we must coddle these rapists and murderers; do not tell me that they do not know what they are doing; do not tell me that they must be sympathetically handled. There are three things that will stop it and these are: First, prompt capture; second, prompt trial; and third, prompt execution. These brutes will then think before they commit these acts if they know what is coming to them.

Nothing that I have said here is a censor or condemnation of the Metropolitan and Park Police. They have worked hard, under great handicaps, but there is divided authority. They have done well under great odds. Both the Park Police and the Metropolitan Police are undermanned. All of these men should be given good salaries and shorter hours. Law enforcement should be under one command. By the adoption of this bill, we will make a good start in this direction.

Let us protect the precious lives of the little girls of this community by the strong arm of law enforcement. Rape and murder of women and little children in the District of Columbia must stop. I trust that every Member will read a most striking editorial from the Washington Times-Herald, headed "Our Deadly Parks." I commend it to your most serious consideration:

OUR DEADLY PARKS

What kind of a town is this, that a little girl can't ride her bike in the park on a bright, sunshiny Sunday without having her throat cut by a sex maniac?

Washington's parks are world famous for their size, beauty, and variety. We have more parkland here than any comparable city in the world.

But what pleasure can we have in all this when parents have to warn their children never to go out into our parks alone? When a woman can't walk in them by day free of the fear of rape and murder? When man never knows but what he will be held up for his money and lose his life as well?

The thing that happened to 11-year-old Carol Bardwell, Sunday, can happen to anybody, anytime.

Just to remind you, consider the case of Frances Erickson, who went walking in Rock Creek Park on Sunday, August 6, 1944. Surely, she had a right to think that it was safe as she strolled along the footpath near Massachusetts Avenue Bridge with hundreds of people riding and walking within the sound of her voice. Yet she was robbed and stabbed to death.

The very week before the Erickson murder a sailor pulled a 15-year-old girl into the shrubbery in that same part of the park and brutally beat her in an attempt to rape.

When next you go riding in Rock Creek Park have a look at Pierce Mill, a landmark preserved for historic color and interest. Look at it a second time and remember that in its shadow one Sunday not so long ago a 16-year-old girl was seized and raped as she was walking home from a horseback ride.

HAUNT OF MURDERERS

Remember, too, that 50 yards from Pierce Mill, on August 29, 1943, the raped and mangled body of Mrs. Grace Grubbs was found. Next time you cross the K Street Bridge over Rock Creek, remember that a sniper in the bushes there shot and killed Hylan G. McClaine.

When you go down in East Potomac Park to the golf course, again, look up the spot out in the open field where Dorothy Berrum was strangled to death one night by Earl McFarland.

Look at the lagoon in front of the Pentagon where another dead woman was found a short time before that.

The record can be run on and on, back through the years. The sum of it all is plain: Our parks are the haunts of murderers and rapists, sex maniacs and perverts of all varieties, robbers and thieves. Our parks are far more dangerous than the city's streets.

The record being what it is you might think, therefore, that the most powerful and effective of all our police would be concentrated in them. The fact is exactly the opposite, thanks to Harold L. Ickes, ex-Secretary of the Interior.

TWO FORCES, NO SAFETY

The fact is that our 30,000 acres of parks in and around Washington are not protected at all by the Metropolitan Police. Our parks are not even in the District of Columbia, lawfully speaking. They are Federal territory claimed by the Department of the Interior, and their regulation and protection are the assignment of some 118 men called park police, who have no plain-clothes detectives watching the park crowds. They have only about 50 men on foot to beat the bushes and only two men on horseback for the whole system, whose job is primarily to chase runaways on the bridle path. The others are on motorcycles or in autos mainly for traffic control.

Police cannot watch out for murderers in the shrubbery, when they are in cars hunting speeders.

As it works out, allowing for clerks and men on leave and out sick, the park police on duty at any given time average about 1 man per 1,000 acres.

HOW TO MAKE THEM SAFER

The solution is obvious. It is, of course, to put the 30,000 acres of Washington parks under the Metropolitan Police, send skilled detectives and foot patrolmen and most important of all, plenty of men on horseback with orders to go up all the little foot paths and back trails.

When this was last attempted, Ickes blocked it.

He loved the pomp and circumstance of commanding a traffic force to chase down people driving faster than Ickes thought they should.

How much murder and rape do we have to take before common sense can override that old fool's vanity?

Washington's parks today are deadly. The metropolitan force, with special horseback squads, are the only police who can begin to make them safe.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks and to include a letter.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include certain extraneous matter.

LONG-RANGE HOUSING BILL

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, only 63 more names are needed on discharge petition No. 6 to give the Members of the House the opportunity to vote for the long-range housing bill. I placed this petition on the Speaker's desk over a year ago. Today it is the one chance we have of passing legislation that is desperately needed.

I believe the Republican leadership is deliberately setting the date for adjournment in the fear that we will complete the housing discharge petition. Those who want to register their support for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill must sign the petition today.

As a Democrat, I know the Republicans are not going to pass any legislation they do not want to pass, and it is obvious from their statements that the Republican leadership is not going to pass any legislation in this special session. The only thing the Democrats can possibly get for the people of the country is the passage of the long-range housing bill. Everything else is "pie in the sky."

I especially appeal to the Members from the South. There are still two-thirds of the southerners who have not signed the housing discharge petition. With but one exception, every non-southern Democrat has signed discharge petition No. 6. The southerners alone can come to the rescue of the millions of men and women who live in slums.

The South can force this great piece of legislation to a vote.

We are today building houses that cost between fifteen and twenty thousand dollars. They are not within the reach of those 3,000,000 families who today find themselves homeless, most of whom are veterans.

The 5,000,000 families living in slums will never get out of them unless the TEW bill is passed.

I beseech you to sign this petition today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include a statement by Mr. Paul A. Porter before the Ways and Means Committee.

THE HOUSING SITUATION

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that some people and a few Members of Congress have very short memories. It is only a very few years ago that we had a housing bill in America, the Wyatt housing bill. It was supposed to produce homes for veterans.

What did it do? All it did was to raise the price of homes, raise the price of almost everything that went into the homes. Hence the veterans got fewer houses.

The only thing that a public-housing bill might do today would be to make more Federal money easy and cheap and to raise the price of everything that goes into a home just as the Wyatt housing law did Therefore we will have fewer homes and they will cost more money if the T-E-W bill is made law.

It would be a criminal offense on the part of this Congress to pass the socialistic housing bill such as the President and his socialistic advisers are recommending. Certainly the veterans of America and the American people today cannot afford higher cost of homes.

Let private industry take care of this business. They are doing a wonderful job. They built 830,000 homes in 1947. They will build a million homes in 1948 or three times more than was built in the years of planned public building of homes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by W. G. Palmer, president of the Texas & Pacific Railway, delivered before the Dallas, Tex., Traffic Club.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill introduced by himself.

THE ANTITRUST DIVISION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the happenings of the last 24 hours and the statement by the Attorney General I wish to call attention to a paragraph in my remarks of March 3 during the presentation of the Department of Justice appropriation bill. At that time I said:

I now comment on another rapidly growing division, that of the Antitrust Division that has been enlarged remarkably over 1940, the outlay being in that year $1,309,000. We have allowed $3,411,000 for 1949, an increase of $161,700 over the budget.

The Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Sonnett, testified that the present law provides all the needed authority to proceed against offenders, pleading only a lack of funds to enable him to act forcefully and effectively against trusts, cartels, and monopolies in restraint of trade in domestic commerce. The committee has provided funds in excess of those recommended by the President, and expects the Department to proceed to bring to book those charged with offense by the President in his recent messages, and thus justify our faith in them and their plea for funds.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman who is now addressing the House is a member of the committee which makes appropriations for the Department of Justice. The gentleman realizes, because he has already mentioned it, that this committee which makes appropriations for the Department of Justice in spite of the fact that the President did not recommend an increase in the budget figure for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, the gentleman's committee, the committee of which I am chairman, increased the amount for the Department of Justice, that is, that part which has to do with the Antitrust Division. Is not that a fact?

Mr. CLEVENGER. An increase of $161,700 over the budget.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. CLEVENGER. The President cut the budget for that item. We increased it.

Mr. STEFAN. And the committee in its report made it plain, and also during the hearings made it plain that we intended some action. It not that true?

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is exactly true.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following excerpt from the report of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the Justice Department bill:

Antitrust Division: For this Division the bill includes the amount of $3,411,700—an increase of $1,011,700 over the current appropriation and an increase of $161,700 in the budget estimates. The appropriation of $2,400,000 available in the current fiscal year includes the amount of $250,000 for railroad-reparations cases, whereas the amount recommended for 1949 includes only $125,000 for this work, the net result being that the Division is allowed an increase for its regular activities of $1,136,700 rather than the apparent increase of $1,011,700 shown. The committee heard with some concern during the hearings for this Division a statement to the effect that concentration of economic power in American industry is at the highest point since the passage of the Sherman Act. Appropriations made by the Congress for this activity have in the past very closely followed the estimates presented by the Department and, at least during one recent preceding year, exceeded the estimates presented, which would seem to indicate that the committee has been rather consistent in its position of giving support to the Department in its effort to protect the free economy of this Nation through proper enforcement of the antitrust laws.

In overruling the Bureau of the Budget and including in the bill the full amount originally requested by the Department, the committee took full cognizance not only of the testimony hereinbefore referred to but also of the recommendation of the President in his state of the Union message to a joint session of the Congress on January 7 last, wherein he stated that "the appropriation of sufficient funds to permit the proper enforcement of antitrust laws is essential." The committee also feels that the Antitrust Division should do everything within its power to strengthen its position in antitrust litigation and to decrease the great number of consent decrees. If additional legislation is needed, it should be suggested to the Congress, although in answer to a query along this line during the hearings it was stated by Mr. John F. Sonnett, Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust activities, that he did not think that the problem—the broad problem—was one of additional legislation at this time. Whatever the problem may be, it should be solved. This Nation must free itself of monopolies, and it is up to the responsible department of Government to see to it that interests of the majority are protected. In granting the original request of the Department, the committee expects a more-than-normal expansion and acceleration of antitrust activities, particularly as they refer to food, clothing, and shelter.

The recently enacted Public Law 395 provides, among other things, for the priority allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production and authorizes a plan of voluntary agreements on the part of industry and business to carry out the purpose of the act. It is believed that some additional responsibility will be placed on this Division in the form of passing on the legality of these agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I want to extend the exact words of my chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska, Congressman STEFAN, before the House on presenting this bill March 3, 1948:

I do want to call your attention to the action of the committee with respect to the Antitrust Division. We did something which we rarely do and something which is generally not too popular with the House Appropriations Committee, that is, to increase an amount over the budget estimate. It was felt that in view of the seriousness of the antitrust work during this present time the Department should have its original request of $3,411,700 rather than the amount of $3,250,000 approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Sonnet, Assistant Attorney General, heading this Division, told us that the concentration of economic power in American industry is at the highest point since the passage of the Sherman Act. To me, this is a rather serious statement. The President, in his state of the Union message on January 7 last, stated that the appropriation of sufficient funds to permit the proper enforcement of antitrust laws is essential. A similar statement was made by the President in his state of the Union message in 1947. I want to point out, however, that from the fiscal year 1933 to and including the appropriations recommended for the fiscal year 1949, this Division requested of the Bureau of the Budget a total of $27,890,000. The budget reduced these annual requests to a total of $22,530,000, or a reduction of $5,360,000. On the other hand, during the same period the Congress on an average not only approved the amount requested through the Bureau of the Budget but increased these requests by $130,000. I can see no consistency in, on the one hand, advocating greater appropriations for this activity, and then, on the other hand, having the requests of this Division reduced by the Bureau of the Budget. It can be seen that, regardless of the party in power, Congress has generally supported the requests of the Antitrust Division. Furthermore, the President in his last state of the Union message stated

that additional legislation should be considered to implement our present antitrust activities. When queried as to this point, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust work, told the committee, and I quote:

"I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that the problem as I see it, the broad problem, is one of additional legislation at this time. I think rather it is one of additional enforcement."

The Congress has in general approved the Bureau of the Budget amounts requested for this activity and is willing to go along with additional legislation, if needed, but it seems to me that what is now needed is a determined effort on the part of the administration to ferret out these monopolies and prosecute them to the limits of existing law. I feel that it is the responsibility of the administration to apprise the Nation of the threat of monopolies through vigorous prosecution and continuous publicity, rather than through the coming up to the Congress once a year and informing them that the antitrust situation is serious. Small business is the lifeblood of the economy of this Nation and the Congress must demand that it be protected.

MR. CLARK'S WAR ON HIGH PRICES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a news story from the New York Times of this morning, based on a handout from the Department of Justice. The headline is "Drive set to stop price-fixing plots." With such vague charges of plots the Attorney General is trying to shift responsibility for inflation from the disastrous policies of the Truman administration to unnamed criminals and malefactors.

Mr. Clark's shadowy charges have a very familiar ring. Just about a year ago he made these same vague charges and the same vague promises to prosecute with vigor. Let me read to you the headline of a news story from the Cleveland (Ohio) News of August 12, 1947. The headline is: "Clark hunts plots to keep prices up on food, housing." What has Mr. Clark found in his hunt during the last year, and what has Mr. Clark done about it? After a whole year of hunting his sleuths in the Department of Justice have discovered that prices are going up—a fact which any American housewife could have told them.

What steps does the Attorney General propose to take to meet this crisis situation? He announces that he will open new offices in Philadelphia, Jacksonville, and Kansas City and that he will increase the staffs in his field offices in New York, Boston, Cleveland, Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle. Does the Attorney General feel that all he has to do is to open a new office and he will scare prices down?

Here is the Associated Press dispatch as it appeared in the Cleveland News on August 12, 1947, almost 1 year ago:

CLARK HUNTS PLOTS TO KEEP PRICES UP ON FOOD, HOUSING

WASHINGTON.—Attorney General Tom Clark today ordered an investigation of food, clothing, and housing prices.

He instructed the Justice Department's Antitrust Division to determine whether conspiracies exist to maintain or to increase present prices in the food, clothing, and housing fields.

Jail sentences, rather than merely fines, will be sought for any violators, it was announced.

A Justice Department statement announcing Clark's action, said:

"Such conspiracies will be prosecuted criminally and in those cases the Justice Department will oppose acceptance by the courts of pleas of nolo contendere (no contest), and upon conviction of the defendants the Department will recommend jail sentences for the individual defendants and maximum fines against the corporations."

ACTION FOLLOWS PRICE STUDY

The statement said the investigation follows a 3 months' study of the present price situation by Assistant Attorney General John F. Sonnett, who took charge of the Antitrust Division in May.

Clark feels, it was added, that "the soaring high prices now continuing in the food, clothing, and housing fields, require that a new and more vigorous approach be undertaken in these fields."

Hence, it was stated, the decision to press for jail sentences for individuals violating the antitrust laws.

CIO ASKS NEW PRICE CURBS

Shortly before Clark's announcement, the CIO full-employment committee had issued a call for a special session of Congress to restore price controls.

The CIO pronouncement said there would be another round of wage demands if living costs continued to rise.

Clark recalled in his announcement that President Truman has repeatedly warned of dangers from rising prices.

Clark's statement said:

"In his state of the Union message in January, President Truman pointed out to the Congress that, despite half a century of antitrust law enforcement, one of the gravest threats to our welfare lay in the increasing concentration of power in the hands of a small number of giant organizations, and that today we find that to a greater extent than ever before whole industries are dominated by one or a few large organizations which can restrict production in the interest of higher profits and thus reduce employment and purchasing power."

In today's New York Times we have this latest contribution from Mr. Clark:

DRIVE SET TO STOP PRICE-FIXING PLOTS—CLARK EXPANDS HIS ANTITRUST FIELD SERVICE TO SCAN FOOD, CLOTHING, AND HOUSING

WASHINGTON, July 28.—As part of a drive against conspiracies to maintain or raise prices of food, clothing, and housing, the field service of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice will be materially expanded, Attorney General Tom C. Clark announced today.

New offices will be opened in Philadelphia, Jacksonville, and Kansas City, while the staffs of the field offices at New York, Boston, Cleveland, Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle are being enlarged.

Although the expansion is primarily intended to cope with conspiracies affecting the cost of living, the enlargement will also allow the division to deal with what Mr. Clark terms "the increasing concentration" of economic power in other areas.

Under the new program, the whole country will be covered, each field office attacking monopolies within the States it covers.

Expert attorneys from divisional offices will intermittently visit industrial regions to uncover any illegal price fixing and other violations of the antimonopoly laws. Specially designed lawyers and investigators will help small-business men to see that they have full opportunity and free competition.

"Continuing high prices and the growth of private economic power compel an antitrust survey throughout the country," said Mr. Clark. "The expanded field-office program will facilitate that survey and afford prompt action to meet these problems. Adoption of the program follows a study by Assistant Attorney General Herbert A. Bergson.

Mr. Bergson said that the Antitrust Division, which he heads, desired support and cooperation from everyone in the battle to smash monopolies, price-fixing conspiracies, and other restraints of trade.

"Some of the best leads" have come to the Division through letters from individuals, he explained. He promised an investigation of all complaints.

Rodolfo A. Correa will be the field-office coordinator, working under Mr. Bergson.

THE MEAT AND FEED SITUATION

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard comments here today relative to the meat situation. In the travels of those of us who have gone through the great Midwest during the past 5 weeks we have noted the greatest feed crop in history in the making, and a good part of it already harvested. If we will simply allow the law of supply and demand to take care of this meat production we will have a great improvement in the quantity of the meat supply and that in turn will operate to the benefit of the consuming public.

We have seen the price of oats, for example, go down 30 cents per bushel in the past month in my home town simply because of the great crop that is being produced today. We have also seen corn go down about one-fourth in price. If we institute again in any way price controls as far as meat is concerned, we will discourage the farmers from going ahead and producing more livestock toward taking care of the feed that today is in abundance throughout America. If left alone this problem will adjust itself. Just as houses today are being built in great numbers, by private enterprise throughout America and the housing problem is being licked, so will the meat shortage go out of the picture. Controls will destroy production, and production is the No. 1 answer to inflation.

ECONOMICS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, I think about 1935, we raised the price of gold to $35 an ounce. The price index on commodities today, as published by the Government departments, shows about 166 of the 1925–29 price level. It should move up about 3 or 4 points more, or to about 169, in order to bring everything in line with the gold price of $35 an ounce.

The gold price was established in order to have a long-term effect on price levels. It is now having that effect on price levels. If you cut the agricultural income $1 you can figure your national income is going to drop $7. In other words, if you cut the agricultural income $10,000,000,000 next year you better figure on your national income dropping $70,000,000,000. If the national income drops $70,000,000,000 next year, you can bet that the next President will have plenty of trouble.

As a buyer I want a cheap price. As a seller I want a high price. So does every other person in the United States. Just sit in your labor conferences today as I have since I left here a few weeks ago. We find that the labor negotiator constantly argues for an increase in wages. The other fellow says, "I will have to increase my price if wages rise." The labor man says, "That is all right. We are not discussing prices. We are discussing wages. Let the prices go where they may; I want my increase in wages." He gets his increase in wages because the manufacturer has a market where he can sell his goods at the stepped-up price. He has a market to sell those goods because we have a pipe line running from the United States to other countries on a gift basis which moves goods out of this country if they do not sell here. We have substantially removed the forces of competition from the American private enterprise system, and unless that force of competition is reestablished, more and more people will move in the direction of collectivism and the substitution of something else for the private enterprise system which, as Republicans and Democrats, means that we have a tough job on our hands whether it is settled this year, next year, or 10 years from now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include certain extracts appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION IN NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I missed the opening roll call of this special session on Monday in order to remain in New York to accept the designation of the Republican Party in my district. It saved my ears from the ——— unfair attack upon the decent, progressive, and thoroughly American people of this country made that day by the Representative from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MULTER. It saved my ears from the ——— unfair attack upon the decent, progressive, and thoroughly American people of this country made that day by the Representative from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this is one of those border-line cases which would be as well left unsaid.

The Chair wants to say that of late personalities have been more or less indulged in in the House, which he regrets very much, because this does not make for the dignity of this great body. In the few days ahead there is a possibility there may be a great deal of political recrimination, and we must be unusually careful in our language.

In this particular instance, the Chair thinks the use of the word "offense" is a reflection upon the gentleman from Mississippi, and he requests that the gentleman from New York ask unanimous consent that the word be stricken from his remarks.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the word "offense" be stricken.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FEPC IN NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, twice before in this Congress, on March 11, 1948, and on March 15, 1948, I directed the attention of this House to the true facts with reference to FEPC in New York State. Nevertheless, the attacks upon its supporters continue to come from the Representative who some time ago on the floor of this House referred to some of his colleagues as mis-Representatives.

Who the mis-Representatives are will be determined by the people at the next election.

His statements to the contrary notwithstanding, the people of New York have not been punished by FEPC, and its supporters are not the blackguards he would have the world believe them to be.

The FEPC law in New York is better known as the Ives-Quinn law, bearing the name of that fine Republican gentleman IRVIN IVES, who was since elected junior United States Senator from the State of New York, and the name of that distinguished Democrat, Elmer Quinn, who is still serving as minority leader of the New York Senate. The bill was approved into law by the Governor of New York, Thomas E. Dewey, who has since been unanimously nominated by the Republican Party for the high office of President.

I know of no objection in New York State to the workings of that law, either as to the personnel administering it or as to its enforcement.

For the benefit of the "whiners," who label as "whining" the furtherance of the American principles of democracy, I say I speak for every shade of American thinking in my district. The only party that will not support me for reelection is the Communist-dominated and affiliated, Wallace-adopted American Labor Party, whose support I do not want.

Just as FEPC passed in New York with only 6 votes against it in the senate, and none against it in the assembly, I am sure that the vote in my State would be almost unanimous in support of approving FEPC on a national scale.

Those people are Americans, they are not racial minorities. They are the people who "fought our Nation's battles in times of war" and "sustained its institutions in times of peace." At least 75 percent of the people of my State are white Christians and I know that they would resent as much as I do the utterances which would attribute to them sentiments which are contrary to everything which we deem to be American.

The World War II dead and permanently disabled in my county alone exceed the total number of voters in 1946 in Mississippi. My county alone gave to the armed services in World War II almost eight times the total number of voters in Mississippi in 1946. They fought to preserve, among other things, this very congressional system in which we are participating.

No one will object to reasonable and sound, or even unsound, arguments being urged against any type of legislation offered to this House. Every opinion with reference thereto should be respected, if made with the sincere belief in the pertinence and truth of the facts relied upon.

It is time we stopped all belittling talk in this House about racial minorities and imaginary majorities, as well as all talk about white supremacy.

We have no room in this country for Aryans or totalitarians by whatever name.

Let us all be Americans, even in our differences, in the true sense of our founding fathers under the divine guidance of the one eternal God.

EUROPEAN CROPS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was in Europe. I returned late last evening. I listened with a great deal of interest to the words of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], who referred to crops.

I want to take this minute merely to report to the membership of the House that I traveled over hundreds of farms in Czechoslovakia, Austria, Germany, and France. On the day before yesterday, with Mr. Paul Hoffman, Adminis-

trator of the ECA; Mr. Averell Harriman, our roving Ambassador; and Mr. Foster, Mr. Harriman's assistant, as well as others, we visited very large and important farms in France, where wheat will yield at least 60 bushels to the acre.

I personally visited many farms in Brittany and Normandy, where, believe it or not, wheat will yield 90 bushels to the acre.

An agricultural expert in France told me, when we were in one field, that that particular field of wheat will yield 100 bushels to the acre.

For over 3 weeks while I was traveling in these foreign countries it rained incessantly. There was rain and cold weather. The grain was lodging in many places. But, during the past few days, we have had sunshine in Czechoslovakia and Germany, France, and many other places—and the harvest is on in full blast. The potato crop is excellent.

I was told by Mr. Ben Thibodeaux, our agricultural expert, and a very efficient one, that the yield of small grains and potatoes there will be perhaps the largest that Europe has enjoyed in many years.

I thought the membership of the House would be interested in this. Later I will have some other reports to make to the membership.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER and Mr. BEALL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

CORPORATE PRICES AND PRICE CONTROL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, since the removal of price controls, corporate profits have increased tremendously. The last half of 1946 shows a tremendous increase over the first half of 1946. Corporate profits in 1947, after taxes paid, were $17,000,000,000 plus, the largest in the history of our country and about $6,000,000,000 more net profit than in 1946.

It is predicted that the corporate profits this year will exceed those of last year, making another all-time high. One of the lines of activities that has made and is making tremendous profits is steel. Yet, we read of a $9-plus increase in the price of steel only a few days ago.

That is going to have a tremendous effect upon the cost of living. That is going to have a tremendous effect upon all business activities that depend upon steel, directly or indirectly, in their manufacturing or in their business processes.

Another line of activity is the newsprint or wood-pulp industry. Companies in that particular field have been and are now making tremendous profits. That is having a very serious effect upon all companies who have to buy wood pulp or newsprint or any other kind of paper in connection with the conduct of their business. Particularly, it is having a serious effect upon the newspapers of the country.

I was amazed only recently when a representative of one of the biggest newspaper chains in the country called to see me and asked me to introduce a bill, which I have done, providing for a 7-cent coin, because they fear they will have to increase the price of their daily papers to 7 cents. That, in turn, has an effect upon circulation. That, in turn, has an effect upon the freedom of the press. We see how this vicious circle of upward prices not only has a serious impact upon the consumer but upon business and, in turn, temporarily, can have a serious impact upon the complete expression and full exercise of their constitutional right.

It seems to me that the steel industry of America is subject to severe criticism in putting through this increase of over $9 per ton, with the tremendous profits that they are making. It also seems to me that the large companies which manufacture wood pulp and newsprint are subject to justifiable criticism for having put through the recent increase only a week or 10 days ago.

My remarks are mainly to call the attention of the country to the fact of how the recent increases, particularly in those two lines, not only seriously affect the consumer, the purchaser, but have a serious effect upon tens of thousands of small independent businesses, and is having a serious impact upon the great newspapers of our country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I want to discuss with you an idea which I ask you to consider, not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans. These are days when we must put country above party; national interest above self interest. We have acquired unity in foreign policy. To support our long-range foreign plans, we desperately need unity on domestic policy.

Over Berlin hang the clouds of world war III. In meeting that crisis we do not ask whether our foreign policy follows the Republican line or the Democratic line. We ask only that it follow the American line.

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICY IDENTICAL

To sustain our foreign policy we must stay strong at home. If we allow the bubble of inflation to swell until it breaks, our foreign policy also collapses.

When the cost in dollars of a family's requirements, food, clothing, and rent, reach the highest point in our history, as the Department of Agriculture reported last week, the danger signals are flying. When the housewife has to pay $16.32 for the same items that cost $10 in 1946, the danger signals are flying. I submit that the time has come to form a bipartisan policy on inflation. We can do it. We can do it with a committee appointed by the President of the United States, a committee of men clearly without political motivation; men like Bernard Baruch, Cordell Hull, and the new president of Columbia University. He would, I believe, respond to a draft of this kind.

THE BREADBASKET COMMITTEE

We could call it the Breadbasket Committee; the committee to make it possible for the housewives of America to fill their breadbaskets and stay within their budgets.

Many of you disagreed with many of the things which the President of the United States said on Tuesday. I did not agree with many of them. But we all agree with one statement. Let me read it:

THE COMMUNIST HOPE

The Communists—

He said—

both here and abroad, are counting on our present prosperity turning into a depression. They are counting on economic collapse in this country.

We know those are true words. We know that unbridled inflation leads to collapse—boom and bust. We agree that if the Government can act, it must act.

I opposed the sudden lifting of price controls. I believed our wartime controls should have been lifted more gradually. But that is water over the dam. Prices have been decontrolled.

I doubt seriously whether we could breathe life back into the long-dead corpse of the price-control structure. Controls which cut down on production certainly are not the answer. But it also is no answer to say that families must eat less—many already are doing that, and men who eat less cannot produce more.

MEN WHO DO NOT EAT CANNOT WORK

No; it is no answer to say that men must eat less. Nor do we answer the problem of inflation when we allow the profits of some companies to swell from 50 to 85 percent above their 1946 levels, as shown by the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

We are not answering the problem of inflation when we sanction, by inaction, the growing trend toward monopoly control of prices—a trend pointed up this week by the Federal Trade Commission which showed that since 1940, big business had gobbled up little business by mergers to the tune of $5,200,000,000 in assets.

FARMER'S SHARE DIMINISHING

We are not answering the problem of inflation when the farmer's share of what the consumer pays for food drops to the lowest point in 5 years, as it did last month. I find it hard to reconcile a spread of several hundred percent between what a citrus grower receives for a grapefruit, and what I pay for it at breakfast. If you want figures, in May of this year, the annual cost of food for a family of three was $692 and of that amount the farmer who produced the

food got $346—just about half of what you paid. The dollar's worth of bread you buy puts only 18 cents into the farmer's pocket. He gets 54 cents out of your dollar's worth of milk. I cannot reconcile such figures with blaming high prices on the producer.

We are not answering inflation when we permit the gray market to add several hundred dollars to the price of a new automobile. Those dollars don't go into the pay envelopes of men who make the cars, nor into manufacturers' profits, nor the profits of legitimate agencies which distribute the cars.

OUR COMMON OBJECTIVE

You may disagree with some or all of these ideas. But we do agree on the objective of maintaining our prosperity; the objective of forestalling the depression for which the Communists so confidently hope.

I submit the idea of the Breadbasket Committee as a possible answer. It could work night and day, with the help of all pertinent committees of Congress and the best brains of the Nation. And ample precedents exist. During the war, we put our rubber problems into the hands of a disinterested committee; we asked Republicans and Democrats to work out our foreign policy together; Republicans and Democrats worked side by side in writing the Charter for the United Nations; on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Senator VANDENBERG sits across the table from Senator CONNALLY, and I have the honor and privilege of working with my distinguished colleague, an earnest Republican, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

This Breadbasket Committee would not try to fix blame on Republicans or Democrats. It would not try to elect or defeat any candidate. Its one purpose would be to dig into the causes of inflation and come up with solutions.

ACCEPTANCE BY THE PEOPLE

I believe the people of America would accept those solutions, as they accepted the Marshall plan, out of the knowledge that it was bipartisan policy.

We have met every challenge of our 172 years of history. But we are not going to meet this challenge by choosing up Democratic and Republican sides and throwing rocks at each other.

As Mr. Walter Lippmann observes this morning, if we go about solving inflation in terms of party politics, national unity is impossible.

ANY BETTER IDEAS?

If my breadbasket idea does not appeal to you, come up with a better idea. But let us not say that the problem is too big for us, or that the subject is too entangled in politics to tackle. To do that would be to turn our backs on every worried housewife and breadwinner in the Nation.

Let us start licking this thing before it really gets away from us. If you see merit in the "Breadbasket Committee," let us get it to work, and hold this Congress in recess until it reports, so that we can immediately go to work on whatever solutions it proposes.

But let us not say we are whipped. Americans have never yet found a problem too big for them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

THE PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks made by our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], I wish to say to start with that I happen to represent a district that has in it some of the largest and I might add the best paper mills in the United States.

It is an easy matter to get up here and pick out one or two industries and point to the profits they may make. I may say that I follow the profits of all large corporations as shown in the reports of the National City Bank of New York.

To be perfectly fair for the sake of the RECORD, I wish to point out that the profits of the paper pulp people have not been out of line with the profits of other corporations. In fact many other corporations have shown much greater profits. I just do not want to let the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts go into the RECORD unchallenged. I call attention to the fact at this time, and I repeat, it is easy enough to come in here and say some particular industry should be curbed. Why single out this industry? Who took the excess-profits tax off of corporations? What Congress did it? Did these bad Republicans do it? Or was it the Seventy-ninth Democratic Congress that took the excess-profits tax off?

At this late hour to come in here and criticize the paper and pulp people is not exactly cricket, according to my formula. I resent the picking out of this particular industry.

I repeat, the paper and pulp people have not made excessive profits when compared with the other industries of the country.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman is voluntarily defending his own industry, and I respect him for it. My remarks were simply to show the impact on the newspaper publishers.

Does the gentleman defend the steel industry?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am not familiar with the steel industry. I cannot get into the steel business. But I do defend the paper and pulp business.

Mr. MCCORMACK. But the gentleman does not defend the steel industry?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I neither defend it nor attack it, but I do not wish to see the paper and pulp industry singled out for criticism. These paper and pulp people have had splendid labor relationship with their employees for many years. They made a great contribution to the war effort. They are entitled to the same consideration given all branches of industry.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

THE OBLIGATIONS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the Members made inquiry a little while ago on whether or not I intended to utilize the time at my disposal this afternoon to make a valedictory address. Let me assure you it is not a valedictory. There is work to be done. I want to do my full share and for that reason I propose to discuss the issues which confront the country and Congress and make reply to the recommendations submitted to the special session by President Truman.

APPLAUSE FOR THE PRESIDENT

One of the afternoon newspapers in Washington mentioned specifically that among others the President was applauded by Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois. That is precisely correct. I have great respect for the office of the President. I have respect for the incumbent of the Presidency no matter who he may be and no matter to what extent I may disagree with his views.

For 16 years in all my public service I have done my utmost to generate respect and regard for all branches of the public service. One of the difficulties in the country today is a strange cynicism and suspicion with which too many people regard public officials and public office. There are some who deem it smart and clever to demean the Supreme Court, the Congress and the Presidency. They can be demeaned to the point where all faith in these established institutions is lost and then we shall go the way of all other republics in the world.

In my feeble way I seek always to dignify and to exemplify my faith in and regard for every high office in Government. It is only in proportion as this concept is diffused that we can be sure of the perpetuity of our Republic.

The respect for Government is the very foundation of its continuance.

THE PRESIDENT'S MANNER

Somehow there was a singular lack of warmth in the President's smile when he appeared last Tuesday with his message. His words carried no real conviction. At least that was my impression. It was so very diffusive. To be sure the President would have been conscious of the fact that he was invading the lair of that branch of Government which he referred to on occasion as "the worst Congress in our history." It embarrassed a great many of his personal friends and he must have been conscious of that fact that they were smarting under this criticism. Perhaps that was in his mind and contributed to a seeming uneasiness as he delivered his message.

A SINGULAR OMISSION

There was a singular omission in his message. Other than to say that the Communists would like to see our domestic structure weakened by depression, he did at no time allude to conditions abroad. Not a single reference was made to what we had been led to believe was a delicate foreign situation. One would reasonably suppose that when the Chief Executive under his Constitutional power summons the Congress into extraordinary session, he would say something about the extraordinary circumstances which exist in the world and which confront this country in its relations with the Soviet Union. For reasons best known to him he made no statement whatsoever on this subject despite daily headlines and visits from our own diplomatic officers abroad. It can, therefore, scarcely be argued that Congress was summoned into session for the purpose of giving attention to delicate international matters.

General Clay was here only a few days ago. As a matter of fact it was only on Friday of last week, just five days before the President's message to us that General Lucius Clay and the American Ambassador Mr. Murphy arrived in Washington in response to a special summons from here. They held a number of conferences. A few hours before General Clay visited with the President the Washington press carried a statement by the President that the prospects for world peace were excellent. That statement was made as I understand before he had a conference with General Clay.

General Clay honored the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House with a visit. Only a few members were present. The very genial chairman, CHARLES EATON, invited me to attend. For some three-quarters of an hour there was an opportunity to discuss with General Clay and Ambassador Murphy many aspects of the situation abroad. I asked a good many questions based upon the many weeks I spent in Germany last fall.

But, oddly enough, notwithstanding the hurried trip of General Clay to Washington, the Chief Executive who is the steward and director of our foreign policy failed to make any comment on conditions in his message. Who can deny that this is a bit singular, particularly so when 531 Members of the House and Senate had been summoned from the Territories and the 48 States of the Union into special session. Manifestly we are interested because it is vital to the destiny of our country and to the future of the young men who might be eligible for military service. We are interested in the delicacy of the situation and whether it is as precarious as we have been led to believe.

The President would have done well on this occasion to have said something to Congress about this matter. Inasmuch as he did not do so I reaffirm that we can reasonably suppose that matters are in such a state that they did not warrant a recall of the Congress into special session. I am sure I bespeak the sentiment of every Member of the House and Senate when I say that we would only too gladly remain in the Nation's Capital continuously if conditions abroad warrant. However, the President, has not confided to us on that matter and certainly no valid argument can be advanced that we are now here as watchdogs and monitors of affairs abroad.

THE DOMESTIC FRONT

History will bear witness that his message to the special session was monumental in the sense that it covered everything and contained a bewildering volume of proposals and recommendations. It occurs to me that the President really presented three programs instead of one.

The first of these might well be called his "must" program. We are quite familiar with that term. It would naturally embrace his recommendations on high prices and housing. In addition it would include his suggestions on excess profits, consumer credit controls, additional Federal Reserve power, standby rationing and price control powers, allocation and inventory-control controls, and curbs on speculation in the commodity markets.

His second program might be called an "urgent" program and would embrace the suggestions which he made on aid to education, modifications of the Social Security Act, changes in the displaced persons act, appropriations for the permanent home of the United Nations, the international wheat agreement, appropriations for power projects, revamping the Federal pay and classification scales and the civil-rights program.

Then comes what might be called the spare-time program, to which we might address ourselves if time is available after we had disposed of programs one and two. Here the President set down recommendations for an over-all health insurance program, the repeal and replacement of the Taft-Hartley Act, the long-range farm program, a modification of the Reciprocal Trade Act, the National Science Foundation, amendments to the antitrust act, universal military training, and the St. Lawrence seaway.

Who will deny that this is, indeed, a program of monumental proportions that would require months upon months for study and exploration not to speak of the crystallization of public sentiment because so many of these are of the highest controversy as every Member of this body so well knows.

THE PRESIDENT'S SENSE OF TIME

There is something whimsical in the statement made by the President in his Philadelphia acceptance speech to the effect that "they could do this job in 15 days if they wanted to—and they would still have time to go and run for office."

Here, indeed, is an amazing concept of what should be the deliberative processes of government where it relates to matters of broad policy involving not millions but billions of public expenditure.

Let me say here and now that one of the outstanding virtues of the Eightieth Congress was that for the first time in a great many years it took ample time to examine carefully and thoroughly into all proposals which were submitted and to dig relentlessly for the facts so that no grave mistakes might be made which could not be retrieved.

For the first time in years the Eightieth Congress restored representative government. It did not rubberstamp the proposals which came to it, and it quickly divested the Congress as an institution of the obloquy which goes with the appellation of rubber stamp which was used so freely everywhere in the country. People were in truth and in fact losing faith in Congress as a representative body, and it was the Eightieth Congress which restored that faith.

To be sure, the President came by this shotgun technique in the legislative field quite honestly. It is not at all surprising that he should believe that such a monumental program could be encompassed in so short a time, even if there was an occasion for it.

I remember so well the condition which prevailed in the first session of the Seventy-third Congress in 1933. It has been popularly referred to as the "100-day session." It was then that the plan was laid for a complete reorientation of government and for a change of governmental philosophy which we refer to today as the New Deal.

Speed seemed to be the only consideration. What was in the first bills which came from the executive branch seemed of secondary concern, even though the policies contained therein had a great impact upon our system of government.

I see my old friend and colleague, Representative DONDERO, shake his head in approval. He and I came here together. He, too, remembers so well those hectic days.

One of the first if not the first bill introduced in that celebrated special session was an act to maintain the credit of the United States Government. It became commonly known as the Economy Act. It sought to economize at the expense of the mail carriers of the country. It sought to economize at the expense of the veterans and hundreds of thousands of veterans were removed from the Federal roll.

I lived to see the day when virtually every phase of the Economy Act was expunged from the books. I was one of those who voted against it and was roundly chided by my own people for failure to support the President on some of the powers which he requested. Such was the hysteria and the emotion of that day.

But the important thing about that first act in 1933 was that it was presented to the Congress in typewritten form. Printed copies of the bill were not available. The Members had to take it or else. They did not know what was in it. They had no way of spelling out its implications. A special committee was created under the chairmanship of the very able Mr. Woodrum, of Virginia, to handle this legislation. It was, indeed, a precipitate shotgun approach to the serious business of legislating. There was so much of it that it is no wonder that Congress became known as a rubber-stamp body.

All that, the Eightieth Congress rolled back. It has taken time to examine into

legislation of a broad general character as well as every appropriation bill.

Last year as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations we conducted 7 weeks of hearings. We heard more than 400 witnesses. We took ample time to examine into the proposed expenditure of every dollar of the people's money. This is the solemn responsibility of Congress. It is why we are here. It is why we call this a representative government and when we fail in that capacity we lose our representative character.

It is, therefore, a bit astounding that the President should say to the whole country that his program, whatever he had in mind at Philadelphia, could be consummated in 15 days and then we could go home to the hustings. The people whose money we spend and who are affected by the legislation enacted by Congress have a different idea about the time which should be devoted to the exploration of legislation and particularly that which is so vital to the ultimate welfare of every man, woman, and child in the Nation. I fancy that the President will have to reexamine his ideas about our people on this.

PERMANENT CHARACTER OF SOME OF THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Next, let me observe on the permanent character of some of the matters which the President recommended Tuesday for consideration during this special session. Consider for a moment the St. Lawrence seaway. That issue has been on the doorstep of Congress for 16 years to my certain knowledge and, I suppose, a great deal longer. It will involve the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. Once it is authorized and funds appropriated and the construction of this seaway begins, it is a work which cannot be undone. It is easy enough to talk about the enactment of such a project along with others in 15 days, but it will embrace hundreds of millions of the taxpayers' money and, as everyone knows, it is highly controversial and public sentiment has by no means crystallized. Is that why the President called us back to Washington?

Consider universal military training. I have expressed myself in favor of this program but I would be less than candid if I failed to say that I was not insensible to the cleavage of opinion everywhere in this country on this vital issue. Who can forget how Congress was bombarded a few months ago with respect to this matter by those who were in favor and those who were opposed. It would involve training for all of the youth of the country, and once established, it will be here for a long time to come. We dare not make a mistake on a matter so important as all that notwithstanding my own opinion on the mater. Will it be said notwithstanding that this could be consummated along with other things in 15 days and is this one of the reasons why Congress was summoned into special session?

Consider the proposed amendments to the Antitrust Act. The Sherman Antitrust Act has been on the law books for 58 years. It has been amended from time to time and never has there been undue haste because it deals with competition, monopolies, restraints on trade, and more than that, it deals with the whole business and industrial structure of the country.

An example of how important it is, can be seen from the fact that as a result of the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called Cement case. There is a prospect now for a complete change of the basing point system of pricing on cement, steel and other items which if finally consummated will result in a complete modification of pricing policies of industry which will work to the advantage of some sections of the country and to the decided disadvantage of others. It could have the effect of Balkanizing the country into different industrial sections. Is this the kind of a thing to be considered within a short space of time and is this the reason why Congress was called back to Washington?

Consider the bill to establish the National Science Foundation. I have no doubt that this measure may have some merit notwithstanding the fact that a good many professional men of my acquaintance are genuinely hostile to the idea for fear that it may ultimately bring about the regimentation of scientific and professional men throughout the country. Is this a matter to be considered in haste and at a special session of the Congress?

Consider the President's proposal for the repeal and replacement of the Taft-Hartley Act with what he calls something better in the field of management-labor relations. The Taft-Hartley Act has been on the statute books for some time. It is operating very well. It deserves a full and fair chance. It has diminished work stoppages which are so disastrous to continued production. It has exposed the communism issue in certain labor organizations of the country and received the approbation of people everywhere.

Taken by themselves the 10 essential items in the Taft-Hartley Act according to various polls have received the substantial approval of union and nonunion members alike but now comes the President to suggest that within a short space of time we repeal this act and fashion something else to take its place. If that were desirable or necessary it would require months upon months of hearings and study to do the job. One may, therefore, appropriately ask, is this the reason why the President summoned the Congress into special session?

Consider health insurance. It is a monumental bill which proposes the socialization of medicine and dentistry and contains a host of things which must be carefully spelled out if we are not to impede the high standard of health and the high standard of medical practice which obtains in this country.

I had opportunity to make a casual examination at least of socialized or panel medicine as it exists abroad and know a little something about the character of medical service which the common man enjoys in some of the countries of Europe. It cannot hold a candle to what we enjoy in the United States. It is a bill that provides for hundreds of millions of dollars in the form of grants and aid to States in addition to the administrative expenditure which would be involved in a program so far reaching as this.

Is this the kind of a thing to be consummated in a few days and is this one of the reasons why the Congress is called back into special session?

A similar argument can be made on his proposal for revamping Federal pay and classification scales. It can be made with respect to his proposal for aid to education and the requested appropriation for certain power projects. It can be made with respect to the international wheat agreement and to changes in the Social Security Act.

The very nature of these things and their possible impact upon the country since they are permanent legislation demands the same kind of consideration which this Congress has given to all other matters and it will take more than these to justify summoning Congress into extraordinary session.

POINTS OF AGREEMENT

Now it is only fair to say that there is a point or two of agreement between every Member of this House and the President. I refer to the fact that we are not insensible to the new tempo of the inflationary force which is abroad in the land. We know full well that inflation is moving us into a danger area. I, for one, believe that an issue of this kind does transcend partisanship. We are not insensible to the housing needs of the country. Moreover, I, for one, yield to no one in my concern for the future of this Nation. The first assignment which I had in the Seventy-third Congress in 1933 was membership on a select committee known as the Sabath Committee to Investigate Bondholders Protective Organization Committees to survey into the real estate security market as a result of the crash of 1929.

I was something of a youngster then and it was, indeed, an experience that is indelibly engraved on my recollection. That committee took testimony in all sections of the land. It filled 16 volumes of printed hearings. The final report which the committee filed was some 600 pages in length.

I can assure you it is no felicitious experience to be confronted with thousands of persons in all sections of the country clutching pieces of paper that were once valuable bonds and securities on real property. These were securities covering commercial buildings, theaters, apartments, and homes. These securities and their holders were victims of the crash. In many cases those securities were not worth a nickel on the dollar. They represented the lifetime savings of millions of people.

As a matter of fact there were some 9,000,000 investors in real estate securities and when the washout came, at least $11,000,000,000 worth of values on commercial real estate including apartments and perhaps another four or five billions in values on homes in the land were washed out.

No one can live through such an experience without having a sacred regard for the economic welfare of this country

and I shall leave no stone unturned and I shall do nothing by word, deed, or act that will jeopardize the values and bring our economic house tumbling down over our ears. I am sure that every member in this body has an equal and abiding concern as he surveys conditions at home and will gladly support those things which in truth and in fact have some relationship to the principal issues of housing and high prices if legislation is necessary and if sound suggestions can be made which will improve rather than harm the country.

OUR OBLIGATIONS

At this point I am inserting two pages from the hearings on the independent offices appropriations for 1949 which were inserted by the Budget Bureau at the request of Representative WIGGLESWORTH. Members of that committee every year make a careful exploration of the direct and contingent obligations of the Federal Government so that we may know in some detail, the extent to which we are indebted and the extent to which we may be indebted if this blessed country should ever be visited by an economic dislocation again.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Public debt and other liabilities of the United States Government

As of Dec. 31, 1947:	
Direct public debt:	
Interest-bearing debt	$254,205,178,490.85
Matured debt on which interest has ceased	401,485,987.76
Debt bearing no interest	2,293,180,375.50
Total direct public debt	256,899,844,854.11
As of June 30, 1947:	
Contingent liabilities:	
Obligations guaranteed by the United States	89,520,185.16
Obligations issued on credit of United States:	
Funds due depositors by Postal Savings System	3,402,375,361.00
Federal Reserve notes (face amount)	23,444,193,468.08
Total contingent liabilities	26,936,089,014.24
Unliquidated obligations incurred against appropriations and contract authorizations	13,787,000,000.00
Loan guaranties outstanding:	
Insured housing loans—Federal Housing Administration:	
Title I insurance—primarily property-improvement loans	93,827,466.00
As of June 30, 1947—Continued	
Title II mortgage insurance:	
Sec. 203—mortgages on small homes	$2,402,494,605.00
Sec. 207—multifamily rental development	44,040,780.00
Title VI—mortgage insurance—war and veterans' emergency housing	1,335,224,549.00
Guaranteed war production and termination loans (V and T loans)—War and Navy Departments and U. S. Maritime Commission	3,218,000.00
Guaranteed loans secured by agricultural commodities — Commodity Credit Corporation	38,592,044.00
Agreements to participate in loans by commercial banks to business enterprises — Reconstruction Finance Corporation (including Smaller War Plants Corporation)	310,170,000.00
Loans advanced through agent banks — Export-Import Bank	192,835,479.75
Guaranteed loans to veterans of World War II under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended — Veterans' Administration: [1]	
Home loans	1,916,736,213.58
Business loans	52,989,789.16
Farm loans	76,050,160.69
Guaranteed premiums on life-insurance policies and guaranteed interest on policy loans to military personnel under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940—Veterans' Administration	7,494,870.00
Total loan guaranties outstanding	6,473,673,957.18
Insurance in force:	
Life insurance:	
United States Government life insurance	2,310,338,804.00
National Service life insurance	34,115,000,000.00
Marine and war-risk insurance—War Shipping Administration	98,950,000.00
As of June 30, 1947—Continued	
Insured deposits in commercial and mutual savings banks — Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	$73,000,000,000.00
Insured share accounts and creditor obligations of savings and loan associations — Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	6,749,109,000.00
Total insurance in force	116,273,397,804.00

[1] Reduction in loan guaranties outstanding resulting from partial payments is not reflected.

OVER-ALL FEDERAL PAY ROLL

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Now let me ask you about the over-all Federal pay roll.

As I understand it, from testimony of the Civil Service Commission, as of the beginning of this fiscal year there were in the United States about 1,849,871 civilian employees. It is anticipated that as of July 1, 1948, there will be 1,750,000, and that the same figure will apply as of June 30, 1949. Does that coincide with your views?

Mr. WEBB. That is substantially correct. Mr. Lawton has a statement there. I would like him to check those figures against his statement.

Mr. Chairman, you understand the seasonal nature of this employment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do. If these figures are correct, then between July 1, 1947, and July 1, 1949, a period of 2 years, there will only be a drop of 99,000, and furthermore you do not foresee the reduction of a single worker on the Federal pay roll during the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. WEBB. If the Congress approves the national-defense program and the international program as recommended by the President, I do not think you will have a reduction in employees.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Does that include the 5.7 billion dollars for new legislation to which you referred?

Mr. WEBB. Yes, sir; although the number of employees are not in proportion to that and will not increase according to the amount of the money, because a lot of it will go for material.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. When you say there will be no reduction in personnel in fiscal 1949, does that assume that legislation putting into effect recommendations calling for $5,700,000,000 will be enacted?

Mr. LAWTON. It does not take into account new legislation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. So that if any part of that were enacted, it would very probably result in an increase?

Mr. LAWTON. There would be an increase. Any rationing program would cause an increase as well as the foreign-aid program.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not talking about the foreign-aid program. I am talking about all the items.

Let me summarize them:

These figures are as of June 30, 1947, and may be modified somewhat as of June 30, 1948, but the aggregate total would be about the same. The first item is our direct public debt which is set down at nearly $257,000,000. The second item embraces contingent liabilities. That word "contingent" is, indeed, an interesting word that has had common usage since 1933. No matter how fancy the word, they are still obligations and

liabilities of this Government in case something should happen. You will note that they aggregate nearly $25,000,000,000 The third item is unliquidated obligations incurred against appropriations and contract authorizations and it totals nearly $14,000,000,000.

Now examine the next item. It includes all loan guaranties on housing to veterans and other items and totals about six and one-half billion dollars.

Finally note our obligations on insurance policies and bank deposits which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The total is $116,000,000,000. Now add our direct and contingent liabilities of all kinds and you can see that this Government is obligated directly and potentially for nearly $430,000,000,000. What a staggering figure it really is.

In the face of this direct, contingent and potential obligation of the Government which we serve and of the people whom we represent, how can anybody be other than anxious and concerned about the fiscal integrity of our country and the effect which any inflationary force may have thereon.

For this reason I approach my own responsibility with the utmost of caution. There are so many things in the President's recommendations which are no doubt socially desirable but the problem and the responsibility of the Congress is to determine always how far we can go and what things we can do now. It is our responsibility to determine what things we believe we cannot and dare not do now, no matter how desirable, for fear it may jeopardize our fiscal integrity and be the force which could start the country on the toboggan. To this responsibility I summon a prayerful approach as I consider with you the two principal items in the President's recommendations, namely, housing and high prices.

I am sure that some Members of this body look with favor on some of the social legislation proposed, but the question is, Do we consider them now in the face of uneasy conditions?

THE TESTIMONY OF MR. BARUCH

Before the President prepared his recommendations on housing, high prices, and inflation he could have done well to have gone back and examined the testimony of a great patriotic American whom I like to call Mr. Fixit. He is a great businessman in his own right. He is a sterling American. On many occasions when big difficulties arose in government he was called in and his advice was sought. He is a sort of friend in court. I refer to Mr. Bernard Baruch.

On March 25, 1946, he appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency. That was about 8 months after VJ-day. We in Congress, like other citizens, were wondering about the backlash of war and what it might do to our economic structure. We were seeking advice on every hand, and particularly expert advice. So Mr. Baruch was summoned to appear.

His testimony dealt with four broad policies, namely, production, prices, wages, and fiscal proposals.

What did he say about production. He said it must be increased. He said it was the law and the prophets and that without production his other suggestions were meaningless. He urged that surplus war goods be made available to build up our inventory of available goods. He urged that small business be stimulated to produce. He urged that work stoppages be eliminated so that production would not be obstructed. It was a fervent plea for more goods for more people in more places.

Is there anything in the President's program which relates directly to the stimulation of production? If anything, some of the President's proposals would, in my judgment, retard production and thereby add fuel to the fires of inflation.

In this connection I point out to you a statement in a release from the Department of Agriculture dated July 23, 1948, in which "the suggested (wheat) goal is 71,500,000 planted acres, about 6 percent less than estimates of this year's seeded acreage." It is only fair to point out that the Department endeavors to make a case for this reduction in wheat goals, but how can we decry inflation and high prices in one breath and pursue a policy for the reduction of the production of bread grains in another?

That same release indicates that "the Department recommends a beef-cattle breeding herd goal which would maintain not less than 15,500,000 head of beef cows on farms and ranges on next January 1. Achieving this goal would result in a further moderate decrease of about one-half million head below the number on the farms last January 1."

I presume there is an explanation for it but it is a little difficult for me to understand this calculated and planned reduction in breeding beef cattle now when steaks are well above a dollar a pound in all sections of the country. It is scarcely consonant with a policy of production and more production in order to meet the very problem which the President has placed upon the doorstep of the special session.

The second item on which Mr. Baruch testified was prices, and he said that Congress should continue controls only for 1 year. Now, mind you, that was in May of 1946, more than 2 years ago. He was rather emphatic about the time limit and yet the President comes before us now with the plea to give him authority for stand-by price controls and rationing.

The third broad observation by Mr. Baruch related to wages and he made a statement which should be emblazoned in the skies. Here it is. He said, "stop bunking the public by saying that wage increases can be granted without an increase in the price levels." The President was very careful to observe in his message to us that where noninflationary wage increases could be granted, it would be perfectly all right to do so. In all candor I ask you, is there such a thing as a noninflationary wage increase? It is an anomoly in itself. However, the President continues to popularize the idea that there can be noninflationary wage increases. It should be elementary to all that every dollar which goes into the financial and economic bloodstream of the country whether it is a wage dollar or a dividend dollar or any other kind of a dollar is inflationary when there is an abundance of money and a shortage of goods.

Incidentally it might be well to go back for a moment and ask who first initiated this fallacy of noninflationary wage increases. It was first announced by a well-known gentleman by the name of Henry Agard Wallace when he was the Secretary of Commerce in the present administration. Somehow he had obtained it from some report and very blithely announced to the world this new and fantastic doctrine. When economists and the press sought to ascertain the source of this new idea, Mr. Wallace was very noncommunicative but subsequently it developed that it came from a study prepared for a labor organization. This is the same Mr. Wallace who seeks the Presidency of the United States. I want to observe about him that as an individual I like him well enough but I will say now what I said recently in Detroit and in Milwaukee that because of his views and policies I regard him as the most dangerous single individual in the United States today. If the policies which he espouses ever become the policies and the fabric of this Government, it will spell doom to freedom and free enterprise in this the last free solvent republic on the face of the earth. I do not laugh him off because he is too dangerous. He is the one who first gave currency to this strange policy that there can be noninflationary wage increases.

Mr. Truman of course does not abide by his own views on this. You will remember that when the first demand for a horizontal increase in the steel industry threatened to disrupt production at the very time when every industry including the housing program was crying for steel and it looked as if a strike were imminent, it was Mr. Truman himself who arbitrated that controversy and then announced an increase in wages in the steel industry and an increase of $5 per ton in the price of steel.

Mr. Baruch was so eminently right that the business of bunking the public by talking about noninflationary wage increases is positively dangerous to our future economic security and it should be stopped.

The fourth item with which Mr. Baruch dealt in his testimony before the Banking Committee related to fiscal policies. Number one on his list was to stop increasing the money supply. That is simple enough. Stop increasing the money supply in order to check inflation. Mr. Baruch said also we should stop decreasing taxes until the budget is balanced. It remained for "the worst Congress in history" to balance the budget for the first time in 16 years. Mr. Baruch said cut Government costs to the bone. He elaborated on this by saying "that in time of inflation we should save and in time of deflation we should spend."

THE PRESIDENT'S VIEW

Now then, is this the President's view of inflation? Indeed, it is not. One might

very well say that the President proposes in part to cure inflation by pouring gasoline on the fires of inflation to put them out.

The initial appropriation for the aid-to-education bill would be $300,000,000 per year and that is exactly so much placed in the spending stream of America. Is this the way to cure inflation? No matter how desirable aid to education may be—and I am frank to confess here and now that I was the cochairman of a joint committee with my good friend Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, to stimulate interest in this bill—but in every case it is a question of whether we should do it now.

I have no doubt that the minimum wage should be raised in some areas, but shall we do it now and add to the inflationary fever? I have no doubt that certain public power projects are desirable, but shall we do it now and shall we accede to the President's request for an additional $56,000,000 for projects on some of which the Appropriations Committee has held hearings and which were carefully considered.

Shall we modify provisions of the Social Security Act now and add so much more to the spending power of the country and feed the fires of inflation?

The National Health Insurance Act not only contains grants to States for more than $2,000,000, but it includes a hospital program which would divert material from the housing programs for which there is so much clamor. There would be so many more millions to enlarge the money supply at a time when there is still a shortage of so many goods. This is, indeed, a paradox that is difficult to understand because it is almost elementary that the way to cure inflation is to reduce the supply of money, restrict credit, and produce more goods for more people in more places. At so many points then the President has departed from this very simple and elementary formula which was presented to the Banking Committee of the House more than 2 years ago.

RELATION OF CERTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS TO INFLATION AND HOUSING

At this point it might be well to ask what bearing a modification of the reciprocal trade program at this time would have upon housing and high prices. The manifest answer would be none.

It is fair to ask what effect the creation of a National Science Foundation would have on housing and high prices and the answer would be exactly none.

It is fair to ask what effect a modification of the Displaced Persons Act would have on housing and inflation and the answer would be exactly none. And let me at this point make clear that I, for one, would favor a modification of the date in the Displaced Persons Act as originally suggested by the Judiciary Committee of the House and by Representative FELLOWS, of Maine, who did such an excellent job of piloting that measure through the Congress.

What effect would repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act have upon housing and inflation and the answer would be exactly none.

What effect would the civil-rights program which the President proposed have on housing and inflation and the answer would be exactly none.

Yet these and more too were a part of the recommendations which the President made to us and which can be esteemed to be a part of the reason for a summons of this Congress into special session.

1948 VERSUS 1933

It is rather informative to recollect and go back to the days of 1933 when Congress was summoned into special session to deal with the distressing conditions which then obtained in the land. These conditions were a matter of fact and a matter of record when I first came to the special session of the Seventy-third Congress to deal with these problems.

At that time we had exactly the reverse condition of that which obtains today. The country was in a deflationary spiral. Oats, corn, wheat, and cotton were selling at unbelievably low prices. My good friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] the majority whip, is one of the best farmers in Illinois and he knows full well the depression that was upon the land at that time. The problem was then how to raise prices. The problem today is how to reduce prices. The problem then was to boost wage rates. The problem now is to keep them in line with prices and other elements in our economy. Is it then not fair to say that if deflation was effectively treated by a certain program in 1933 that the exact opposite program would be the proper technique to apply in a time of inflation in 1948?

If the administration was right then it is wrong now, and if it is right now, it was wrong then.

As everyone so well knows, economists and others were called in to see what might be done about the deflation problem of 1933. At long last they proceeded on a very simple theory. It relates to money and it is not so abstruse as one might believe.

Let us start with a very elementary fact that when you say the price of an item has gone up it is another way of saying that the value of the dollar has gone down.

You might have looked at a new hat 30 days ago that could be bought for $10 and when you went back later you might discover that it was priced at $12 and quickly you say to yourself that the price has gone up. It is more correct to say that the purchasing value of the dollar has gone down.

Now then, we had the reverse situation in 1933. The problem was to raise the prices of agricultural commodities, to raise wage rates and to supply jobs for people who were unemployed.

How did they go about it? There were two approaches to cure the deflation of that period. The first was to pump money into the economic bloodstream of the country. Those were the days when we created that variety of alphabetical agencies to do the job.

Possibly you remember the civil works program under the direction of the late Harry Hopkins. The problem was how to get a billion or more dollars into the hands of consumers as quickly as possible without actually putting them on a dole. They were not very particular how it was done.

I remember so well going along the highways of the country. And I saw men cutting sod along the highway, placing it on a truck, hauling it a mile or two and putting it down again along the same highway.

In those days we had the glorified leaf-raking program. It added nothing to the permanent wealth of the country, but it pumped billions into the blood stream of the Nation.

In those days we had the public works program. What an array of schools, courthouses, recreation halls, and other things were built from one end of the country to the other whether they were actually needed or not. It was putting money into the hands of people.

In those days we had the National Industrial Recovery Act. Surely you remember the old blue eagle with a sheaf of arrows in one claw and an industrial wheel in the other.

For years I have been trying to find one of those blue eagle signs, but have been unable to do so, so completely was it obliterated from our economic life. It was the day of the blue eagle, the green light, and the dark-brown taste. Under the National Industrial Recovery Act we even made it possible for industrial and trade associations to violate the Anti-trust Acts with the benign sanction of the Federal Government.

People were urged to get together in industry and business and to work out codes of fair competition, establish wage rates and correlate prices. What great decisions they were. Do not you remember the pants presser in New Jersey who was making money pressing trousers for 25 cents a pair. Unfortunately for him the trade association under its code set 35 or 50 cents as the price for pressing pants and when our New Jersey pants presser refused to comply he was arrested and probably put in jail. I am sure our good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM] knows all the details of that celebrated incident.

You must remember the battery maker in York, Pa., who operated a modest plant where he manufactured storage batteries for automobiles. He kept his price where it had been but was in violation of the code price because he was not charging enough. They then said to him in effect that he must charge more or he would be violating the code and would have to be arrested and put in jail.

Remember the great sick chicken case in New York. The Schechter Bros. operated a poultry house in New York City. Evidently they were selling under the code. They were notified to operate by code prices which were higher. They refused to do so. Accordingly they were charged with violation and the case ultimately went to the Supreme Court of the United States.

It was heralded far and wide as you remember as the sick chicken versus the Blue Eagle. It was too bad for the Blue

Eagle because the sick chicken gave him the knock-out before the Supreme Court from which the fuzzy old Eagle never quite recovered.

We empowered the RFC to purchase stocks and capital notes, bonds and debentures in industries, businesses, and insurance companies. It become the greatest lending institution in history.

We conferred upon the Federal Reserve System authority to make direct loans to industry so that money would be available.

We passed the Silver Purchase Act which is still on the books. Under its provisions it was required that the Treasury purchase silver until the ratio of silver to gold in our monetary system was in the ratio of one to three and to issue greenback money. It not only pumped money into circulation but it was alleged that this might improve the purchasing power of silver-standard countries like Mexico, Peru, Bolivia, and China and help those nations absorb some of our surplus goods.

All these things and more we did to lick deflation in the early thirties and our problem and objective was to pump more money into the bloodstream of the Nation to make prices and wages go up.

Now, we did one other thing. We cheapened the dollar so that it would take more dollars to buy a hat, a bushel of wheat, a kitchen stove, or a basket full of groceries. It was the same logic which is applicable today. As I said before, when you say that prices have gone up, it is another way of saying that the value of the dollar has gone down.

Conversely, when you say that prices have gone down, it is another way of saying that the purchasing value of the dollar has gone up and that it takes fewer dollars to buy the same amount of goods that one had been able to buy before. What should be done about it. The answer was very simple.

We squeeze a few grains of gold out of the dollar, and obviously by diminishing the gold content you cheapen the dollar and it takes more dollars to buy an hour of labor, a bushel of wheat, or a pound of meat. In practice how should this result be accomplished? It was done by Executive order under the authority of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934.

It was a pretty startled Nation that woke up one day to find that the President had announced a program for the purchase of gold at $35 an ounce when the statutory price was a little over $21.

Just as it took more dollars to buy an ounce of gold it took more dollars to buy a given quantity of commodities, goods, labor, and services. That then was the program for defeating deflation in 1933, and if it was right then, why should not the reverse of that program be applied to defeat inflation in 1948? The answer—the real durable answer to inflation will be found not in building another jacket around the boiler in the form of price controls, rationing, inventory controls, and other legislative procedures, but in reducing the intensity of the fires under the boiler and that is a fiscal problem pure and simple.

Mr. Baruch knew it full well when he testified before the Banking Committee in 1946. That is why he said we should reduce the money supply and quit inflating the currency. That is why he said we should reduce Government expenditures to the bone so that there would be no deficit spending which would in turn require the issuance of bonds which in turn becomes the basis for a greater credit expansion.

In time of deflation you add money to the economic bloodstream and in time of inflation you take money and credit away from it. Therein lies the hope and the only hope of bringing about orderly balanced reduction in the cost of living.

Is that what the President proposed to do? He proposes to add more money in this time of inflation by asking for legislation and appropriations which will run into the hundreds of millions, yes, billions of dollars of public funds and aggravate rather than remedy the problem.

This Congress has certainly done its full share to check inflation without resorting to price controls, rationing, supply, controls, and controlled inventories, which will reinvoke black marketing, discrimination, and all the evils with which we became familiar only a few years ago.

By balancing the budget we put an end to deficit spending so that billions in new bonds would not have to be sold to bank and nonbank investors alike as a basis for a new credit expansion.

This Congress labored long and diligently to examine every dollar of public expenditure and cut it to the bone.

This Congress followed tried, true, and trusted remedies for the very condition of which the President complains, and as I survey the President's recommendations over and over again it becomes more and more difficult to understand.

MEASURES WHICH HAVE VIRTUE

There are two or three recommendations in the President's message which deserve careful consideration and they are embodied in a bill which has been presented to the Congress. One of these would authorize the reimposition of controls over consumer credit to be exercised by the Federal Reserve System.

This was in effect prior to early 1947 and was then modified by the Congress. But let us take a good look and see what we did. If you will examine the text of a very short law which deals with this subject, you will find that while Congress abrogated this authority it inserted a provision in the act to the effect that in time of national emergency the President can reimpose consumer credit controls.

Is this an emergency? The President says it is and, therefore, called us back into special session. If so, he can utilize existing law for the purpose of proclaiming that emergency and restore consumer controls.

His second recommendation would authorize the Federal Reserve System to increase the reserves of member banks of the System. This is an item on which Marriner Eccles of the Federal Reserve System testified before the Joint Committee on Economic Report. I have read his testimony very carefully several times and as recently as last week. Despite the disagreement which exists between different members of the Federal Reserve System I, for one, believe that this proposal has merit because it is an orthodox approach and should certainly be considered.

HOUSING

I must apologize to the membership for the length of this dissertation but there is one other item of importance which deserves attention because it is one of the principal recommendations of the President. It relates to housing.

A short while ago my good friend, Representative JENSEN, of Iowa, mentioned the Wyatt housing program. I see him nod now. Representative JENSEN, by the way, has been a contractor and a lumber merchant for perhaps a quarter of a century and knows a good deal about housing materials and the housing business. He is, in fact, a most capable person in this field.

Let us examine a little background on housing. I remember very well indeed the legislation that was enacted over the years in this field. In those distressed days of 1933 we began with the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to provide a reservoir of home mortgage credit. Then came the Home Owners Loan Act to take care of distressed home owners whose mortgages were in default. In 1933 and 1934 Congress created a public housing program and also created the Federal Housing Administration which is in operation today and so widely used for the insurance of mortgages. In 1944 we passed the so-called GI Act which contained a housing title. In 1946 we created the Office of Housing Expediter.

A Joint Committee on Housing consisting of 7 Members of the House and Senate made a pretty thorough exploration of this matter throughout the year and you can believe it or not but that committee is authority for the statement that we have expended or committed or incurred potential liabilities in the field of housing activities since 1932 which is now in excess of $20,000,000,000. It is a staggering sum and I would say now as categorically as I can that I shall want to be pretty sure about my ground in the housing field now before I shall approve additional legislation.

THE ACT OF 1946

You will remember quite well that in January of 1946 Mr. Wilson Wyatt, a very affable gentleman from Louisville, Ky., who nominated Senator BARKLEY for the Vice Presidency at Philadelphia and who was sometimes whimsically referred to as the sunshine salesman, came to Washington at the instance of the President and in a little while a grandiose housing plan was laid before Congress. It called for a Housing Expediter or housing czar. It called for hundreds of millions of funds which were committed to Mr. Wyatt's keeping. It conferred subsidy and insurance powers upon the Expediter. It had for its goal two and three-quarter million houses for 1946 and 1947, about one-half of which were to be completed in 1946. All save 250,000 of these projected houses were to be of permanent construction.

Congress armed Mr. Wyatt with broad powers and an abundance of money and then he sallied forth equipped also with the power to issue rules and regulations

to make housing bloom and grow faster than it ever grew before.

Mr. Wyatt quickly learned a lot of things. For one thing, he learned that it takes lumber and soil pipe and flooring and doors and plaster to build houses and that they cannot be built with red tape and directives. He found bottlenecks in securing bricks, soil pipe, flooring, and other items, and then, lo and behold, he found that OPA was standing in the way.

Such is the manner of Government agencies. In the case of brick manufacturers, the producers could not get manpower back into the brick plants unless they raised wages and they couldn't raise wages unless they could get an increase in the price of bricks. OPA said no and for a long time, as many as 300 brick plants were not in operation in the country. They had similar experiences with soil pipe and flooring.

I remember so well when Mr. John D. Small, Chairman of the Civilian Production Board, which became the successor of the War Production Board, came before the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations and there cried on the shoulder of the committee and ventilated his problems because OPA was standing in the way of stimulating the production of essential housing material.

What happened to Mr. Wyatt's noble experiment in housing notwithstanding the money and the authority which Congress conferred upon him? The whole number of houses under that program was less than one-half of what private industry will build in 1948, and private industry placed no special burden upon the public Treasury. Mr. Wyatt's home-building program died a natural death. It died of sheer inertia and the President made no particular effort to have it revived.

THE PRESIDENT'S NEW REQUEST

What the President is now requesting is legislation broad in scope which, as I recall, will commit this country to an expenditure over a period of 40 years of something in excess of $900,000,000.

Will it develop housing to meet the present need? I am not insensible to the need for housing. I doubt whether there has ever been a time in the history of the country when additional housing was not needed, but I can say to you that the fondest and most earnest supporters of the housing bill which the President requests do not expect it to build a single occupiable unit for 18 months or 2 years. Is that the way to meet a critical housing need for which Congress was called into special session?

What is this legislation which the President requests? It contains a billion dollars for slum clearance and an interesting provision to the effect that slums cannot be cleared unless public housing is first provided for the slum tenants who are dispossessed. I am for slum clearance and, as a matter of fact, have introduced a bill which I regard as workable in this field and which can be coordinated with State activities on a matching basis, but let us get over the fuzzy thinking which presently plagues the country and confuses slum clearance and housing.

Slums could be cleared and converted into parks and playgrounds. Slum clearance is one thing but housing is another. This bill contains a fund to institute yield insurance amounting to a billion dollars. It is designed to stimulate investment in large-scale housing by insurance companies over the country, but I am advised that they regard this provision as of doubtful force and unworkable. There is a provision for a revolving fund for public housing and the payment of annual subsidies to offset the low incomes of people so that they can occupy public housing plus a subsidy out of the public Treasury. As I recall, the subsidies are estimated at $32,000,000 for the first year and gradually go to $160,000,000 so that over a 40-year period about $6,000,000,000 or more is estimated for subsidies on public housing. There are provisions in the bill to build and equip plants to expedite the production of .prefabricated housing. There is a provision for blanket mortgage insurance on 25 units or more to accelerate the construction of on-site prefabricated houses. There is a provision under which the Secretary of Agriculture can issue capital notes up to $250,000,000 for rural housing. Finally, there are provisions in the bill to liberalize and expand housing credit more and more notwithstanding the acts which have already been passed by the Congress. And to me these provisions contain danger signals because they are so at variance with the philosophy expressed by Mr. Baruch, and at variance with tried and tested methods for meeting inflation and preserving freedom.

HOME OWNERSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

One would think from the loose talk which is heard that it requires an unusually fancy income to be a home owner. That is not what the Census Bureau of the United States says. Their 1947 census shows that there are 29,652,000 families in the United States today and that 15,250,000 are home owners. Do all of these home owners have a high rate of income? Not at all. The Census Bureau says there are 533,750 home owners whose total annual family money income is under $500 a year. There are 777,750 home owners whose total annual family money income is less than $1,000 a year. There are nearly 12,000,000 home owners in America whose total annual family income is under $5,000 a year. There is the picture of home ownership in the United States and it is a great thing to say that over 51 percent of the American families own their homes and it embraces families at all incomes and the number is growing.

THE RECORD OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

I am sure there must be millions of people who if they read some of the current literature on the subject of housing must conclude that no houses of consequence are being built and that the only builder who can do the job is the Federal Government. It is high time that the record be made clear to everyone. What then is the record? First, as a part of the record, let us look at our housing needs. The Joint Committee on Housing secured estimates from at least 15 different sources including labor organizations and others as to our housing needs. They ranged from 300,000 units per year to 2,000,000 units per year. There were a number of responsible estimates of 800,000 units per year. There, then, is an estimate of need.

And what has been done to meet this need? In 1947 private industry started and completed 849,000 housing units notwitstanding the manpower and material problems which they encountered. One may be able to build air castles in Spain out of the tenuous stuff of dreams but it takes brick and lumber and soil pipes and other things to build houses, and private industry has been building them. That was for 1947. What is the score in 1948? For the first 5 months the starts by private builders were more than 356,000 units. The latest figure I saw was for the month of June which came from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and indicates that for that month alone more than 92,000 houses were started.

Even the first 5 months of 1948 will show a 28-percent increase over 1947 and before the year is up it will go well above that figure.

Heretofore the peak year of housing construction was 1925 when 937,000 houses were built. We will beat that in 1948 and it will not be a bit surprising if we reach the million mark.

There is the answer to housing.

The Department of Labor says as of May that 2,064,000 persons are employed in the construction industry and that this exceeds May of 1947 by 200,000. Manpower is coming back and houses are going up. If the free-enterprise system has a fair chance it will meet this housing need and raise its construction level year after year until the job is done.

THE PRESIDENT'S IDEA

But now comes the President to ask for more housing legislation involving a 40-year commitment of the public credit which cannot produce any houses for a long time to come. The houses which private industry is building are real. They are not paper houses. They are not built of Federal red tape. They are substantial, and people live in them.

But the President now requests broad-gauge legislation which can possibly and probably jeopardize the forward strides which we are presently making in the housing field.

Suppose this housing bill is superimposed upon what is now being done, what will be the result? It will step up and intensify demand and as demand is intensified it simply adds to the inflationary pressures which the President wants to cure. It will not increase the supply. It will intensify competition for the available manpower and materials and instead of reducing the cost of homes, it will increase it.

It will not mean more housing but more expensive housing.

But what the President wants will do something else. It will expand mortgage credit more and more on slender terms so that scarcely any owner equity is preserved, and thereby further feed the inflationary fire with which we are presently concerned.

In thinking of those who need housing, I want to think also of the 15,000,000 families who have an investment in homes today and who are home owners.

If by any mismove or mistaken course on our part we should bring the economic house tumbling down around our ears, do not forget that it will not only affect those who are seeking homes now but the millions who are home owners at the present time.

That is what happened in 1929 and God grant that this blessed country will never see a recurrence of that phenomena.

If by mistaken action, hasty and emotional judgment on the part of Congress we should jeopardize the values of this country, it will affect not only the millions of home owners but the millions of owners of business properties and the millions of owners of farms as well, and could be a disaster that would shake the country to its very roots.

Yes, my colleagues, I am as genuinely concerned as the President about present and future conditions in this country, and I shall do nothing by word or deed that will jeopardize its fiscal integrity and loosen the rock that might bring on the avalanche.

This is not my personal unsupported opinion. I call to witness an outstanding student in the Government who has been here for a long time. As I remember he came in 1934 and he has been here ever since. Once upon a time he was the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. He is no longer the chairman. It may be that his philosophy and his theories of Government and finance did not find favor in high places and not so long ago he was demoted from his position as chairman and permitted to remain on the Federal Reserve Board. I refer to the Honorable Marriner Eccles. It was on the 13th of April that he appeared before the Joint Committee on Economic Report, of which Senator TAFT is the chairman. I know from reading the testimony that our colleague, Representative HERTER was there and likewise Representative RICH. I know that others were there, and in the course of his long testimony Mr. Eccles addressed himself to home mortgage credit.

This is what he said, and let it sink into your memories:

> Congress is currently considering the continuance of easy mortgage credit for housing. Easy mortgage credit is one of the most inflationary factors in the domestic credit picture.

Read that carefully. He says that easy mortgage credit is one of the most inflationary factors.

And then he goes on and says "The housing shortage cannot be overcome by increasing the competitive pressures on scarce supplies of materials and manpower. They are the limiting factors on the volume of construction." Read that again. It is the old story. It takes manpower and materials to build houses.

Now it is proposed to put the Government in the housing business up to its ears on a 40-year basis at an ultimate expenditure of $9,000,000,000. To do what? To compete with private enterprise for the available materials and manpower and thereby jeopardize the program which is building a million houses a year in which people can live. Are we willing to take that risk and are we willing without far more careful exploration than has been manifest before to undertake this kind of a program with its further liberalization of mortgage credit and which may project us into difficulties which we cannot foresee? If it gets out of control then, of course, the economic structure of the Nation may tumble about our ears, and I, for one, would dread to contemplate that result.

If disaster should come, and God knows I am not defeatist or pessimist, just remember that disaster comes to all and not to just one group in the country. It would not take much of a recession to wipe out the thin and slender equities in hundreds of thousands of homes, and if we should carelessly invite that possibility we would be doing a tragic disservice to the very people who have a little nest egg and who are hoping to acquire a house.

Once more I feel the need for emphasizing the fact that we are moving toward the construction of 1,000,000 homes a year by private enterprise and in the face of that record, do we now propose to place pressures upon material and manpower and cause this program to bog down?

Already it is becoming manifest that the competitive factor is coming back into the housing field. I would be the last to deny that there have been houses built which contain poor material or do not represent in value the price that was paid therefor. I would be the last to contend that there are veterans and others who have not been imposed upon but I do say that by and large there is integrity in the construction industry of the country even as there is integrity in every other segment of the business enterprise of this Nation, and they are moving forward rapidly to lick the housing problem. They deserve a full and fair chance with the manpower and the materials which are available.

CONCLUSION

What then shall we say by way of summary? First, Mr. Truman suggests many proposals to us which have no relationship whatsoever to high prices and housing and which deserve long and careful consideration because they are attended by much controversy not only in Congress but throughout the country as well; second, one may reasonably conclude that Mr. Truman is endeavoring to cure inflation by pouring gasoline on the fire in the form of greater appropriations and expanding credit; third, he would cure inflation in part by imposing controls, curbs, and rationing, which can only resurrect the evils with which we were familiar in another day and which, in addition thereto, would be applied only to a selected group of items and would thereby further aggravate the unbalance in our whole price structure between one commodity and another. Finally, there are a few items which I believe deserve our earnest consideration because they constitute part of a tried and tested approach to the problem of inflation, namely, the field of money, credit, and production. This, then, is my story as I labored long and earnestly on the President's recommendations to this body. This is a feverish and fitful period and, in my humble judgment, the hope of preserving the solvency of this Republic lies in the caution with which the Congress approaches these problems free from bias, free from emotion, and, above all, free from haste.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LEGISLATIVE MUSTS OF THE NEW SESSION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the full 10 minutes because a very important conference of the majority of the House will take place very shortly. I think that is important because we are all eager to secure necessary legislation and wise legislation before we adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, the reception just given the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] shows how the membership of the House feels about the loss of the distinguished gentleman. His loss will be felt because of his eloquence and the vastness of his information and his statesmanship. It will be a tremendous loss not only to us but to the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, too many of us keep forgetting that the housing problem is primarily a veteran's problem.

The veterans' housing problem is today just about as acute as it ever was. Our home builders well may be proud of the large volume of homes and apartments which they are producing, but to the average veteran family these homes and apartments are hopelessly overpriced.

In addition to the barrier of high prices, veterans are facing a serious problem of obtaining favorable home-financing, or indeed, any financing at all. Many veteran families who can afford present-day home prices are unable to become homeowners because they cannot get a GI loan under the GI bill.

The housing bill passed in the closing minutes of the last session will not help solve the veterans' housing problem. Many believe there is nothing in that law which will help to bring down home prices and rentals.

Furthermore, I am told by many persons experienced in the field of home finance that the secondary market feature of that law will be of little, if any, help in making GI loans available to veterans. It is believed that the secondary market provided gives no relief to the lending institutions which are most deserving of relief. These are the lending institutions which have participated wholeheartedly in the GI loan program and as a consequence are now saturated with GI loans. Moreover, the new secondary market offers no assurance or in-

centive to other lending institutions sufficient to induce them to make additional GI loans available to veterans.

Members of the House, we must do something. To do our duty to our veterans we must give them a law which is primarily a veterans' housing law.

During the past year the Congress has considered a host of housing bills. Most of these bills have alleged to be in the interest of veterans' housing. But on closer inspection it is evident that other motives have been dominant in these bills—they have not been truly designed to really do something for veterans' housing.

There is only one bill I know of which is a veterans' housing bill in both name and fact and intent. This bill is H. R. 4488, the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948. It is an amendment to the GI bill of rights and some 29 companion bills were introduced by other Members of Congress. This bill has the sponsorship of the American Legion and was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, during the last session of Congress. Gentlemen, I urge that we make amends for all of our past sins of commission and omission in veterans' housing during a period of many years, and bring this veterans' homestead bill out on this floor for unanimous passage by the entire House.

To refresh your memories, let me repeat the things that the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948 will do for our veterans in need of housing.

The bill will give veterans homes at much lower costs. Through FWA grants and other positive features, the bill will reduce housing costs to veterans by as much as 20 percent.

The bill will give veterans the tools to master their housing problem through their own initiative. Through homestead associations chartered by the Veterans' Administration, veterans can go ahead in their own communities and build their homes without being forestalled by the contrary objectives of others upon whose cooperation they are now required to wait.

The bill assures veterans of the necessary financing. Through loans from the Veterans' Administration and through provisions which assure the availability of an adequate supply of capital for GI loans, home-seeking veterans can be certain of low-cost financing.

The bill will solve the rental-housing problem which is plaguing our veterans in urban centers. Homestead associations can begin immediately to plan and build apartment houses which will feature greatly reduced monthly rentals.

The bill provides very necessary credit aid to GI's who need farm housing. By making low-cost credit available to veterans through the Federal land banks and the Farmers Home Administration, the bill will fill a serious need in many of our farm communities where veterans are now unable to get the necessary financing to provide farm homes.

Necessarily, I have stated the bill's provisions in very general terms. But every point I have mentioned has been previously explained and supported by facts and figures which have been laid before this House. For the convenience of any of you gentlemen, my office will be glad to afford you references to the pages of the RECORD or the sources of other exhibits in which that material can be found.

In short, ladies and gentlemen, the veterans' homestead bill will finally accomplish what Congress should have done 3 years ago. The bill would supplant unrealized promises with real assistance toward assuring the efficacy and success of the aids to home-seeking veterans which Congress undertook to supply 4 years ago last month in enacting the GI home-loan provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

And let me emphasize this point—the bill does not call for huge Government expenditures. The costs of the homestead bill to the Government are extremely moderate. The great bulk of the funds which the bill would make available are not expenditures, but are self-liquidating loans which will be repaid to the Government with interest. The only direct cost involved is the $200,000,000 for FWA grants to aid homestead associations in land development and improvement, and even this cost will be spread over a number of years. I am proud that we have been able to offer a bill which will do so much for our veterans at so little cost.

The Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948 offers veterans a long-awaited square deal in housing. I am confident that those of you who will familiarize yourselves with its merits will join heartily with me in urging its immediate enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include as a part of my remarks a brief description I made of H. R. 4488 at the time our committee reported it unanimously:

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

VETERANS' HOMESTEAD HOUSING BILL

(H. R. 4488; to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide for veterans of World War II homes, and the public facilities necessary therefor, through veterans' homestead associations, and to make available more adequate financing for the acquisition of homes and farms by such veterans. Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request). Introduced and referred November 18, 1947.)

Analysis: The revised reported version of H. R. 4488 amends the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to permit the Veterans' Administrator to charter veterans' homestead associations, composed of at least five veterans for the purpose of providing housing for veterans. Substantial aid would be given for the construction of multiunit housing to be rented or sold on a cooperative or mutual ownership basis. Average cost of each family unit limited to $10,000. Authority expires July 25, 1957.

Individual single-unit houses, either rural or urban, could be built by associations and sold to an individual veteran. Homestead associations could not supply permanent financing to purchasers of individual units.

Association financing to be obtained from Veterans' Administrator at an interest rate not more than one-fourth of 1 percent more than rate he is required to pay the Secretary of the Treasury for the capital required. Loans may be amortized over 40 years for rental multiunit housing and 32 years for housing held on a mutual or cooperative basis.

Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to advance the following amounts:

One billion dollars per year for 5 years to Veterans' Administrator for loans to veterans' homestead associations and such other sums as are necessary to maintain a restricted secondary market for future title III home and farm loans;

Seven hundred and fifty million dollars per year for 5 years for Home Loan Bank Board to make investments in savings banks, cooperative banks, building and loan associations and similar institutions which are members of a Federal home-loan bank or are insured under title IV of the National Housing Act which will make GI loans of $9,000 or less more readily available to veterans (preference to be given in distribution of funds to those institutions in areas needing capital expansion for veterans' housing and willing to make 100-percent loans to veterans);

One hundred million dollars per year for 5 years to Secretary of Agriculture (acting through Federal land-bank loans or Farmers Home Administration loans) to provide farm-loan financing to veterans;

Two hundred million dollars to the Federal Works Administrator for grants, on the customary 50-percent matching basis, for sewer, water, and like facilities required for the housing.

Incontestability clause for GI loan guaranties is included to encourage participation in loan program.

The only nonreimbursable expenditure required will be the $200,000,000 for the use of the Federal Works Administrator in providing grants to the States in the construction of public and community facilities needed by the associations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

INFLATION AND OUR ELDER CITIZENS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 years ago I appealed to the Ways and Means Committee to draft legislation to alleviate the plight of our elder people and I addressed the House on the same subject. At that time I said:

How far will the average old-age assistance go toward paying the grocery bill, the meat bill, and the clothing bill of these people today?

We are so rich, we gave away billions to the other nations of the world after the First World War, eleven and one-half billions of which is still due and outstanding. Now we are contemplating giving more billions to these same nations. If we give them all they are asking, we will make gifts to these foreign nations amounting to more than ten billions more.

What are we doing for our own people who have reached the age of 65? Under the present system we compel them to sign a pauper's oath. If they own their own homes, we compel them to execute a deed turning over their homes to the State. We charge them interest on whatever old-age assistance they receive, whether it is $30, $20, $15, or $10 a month or less; then if they do not pay the interest and the principal of the loan—which the States and the Federal Government wrongfully call old-age assistance—their homes are sold at public auction on foreclosure. I am told that in some States even the life insurance of our senior citizens must be turned over to the State before any so-called old-age assistance is given these American citizens.

It is this unfair and ungrateful treatment of our fathers and mothers on the part of our Government, the richest in the world, that prompts me to appear here today on behalf of these good deserving folks, whom our Government has apparently forgotten in the mad rush of turning over our money and our substance to everybody else in the whole world.

I also compared the prices of food and clothing, as indicated in advertisements in the newspapers of the fall of 1939, when Hitler started on his rampage in Europe, with the prices of the same food items in the fall of 1945. In the fall of 1939, you could buy hamburger for 14 cents a pound, sirloin steak for 17 cents, veal chops for 17 cents, and leg of lamb for 19 cents. Slab bacon was only 9 cents a pound, and early potatoes 19 cents a peck. All standard brands of flour sold for $1.49 a sack. Bartlett pears were $1.49 a bushel, and prunes 69 cents a box, and oranges 15 cents a dozen.

Ladies' sport coats were advertised for $9.50 and $19.50; and, if you wanted fur trimming on the coats you could get them for $16.50 and $37.50. Men's suits with two pairs of trousers sold for $22.50 and $27.50, and they threw in a vest for good measure.

I do not intend to take up your time to list the prices you have to pay for those same items today.

But since that time, everything has gone up. Wages and incomes have gone up, as well as profits and prices. The only persons in our society who have not benefited and the only people whose income has remained dormant are our fathers and mothers, the people who helped to make this country what it is—the pioneers who suffered the hardships and self-denials that accompanied the building of this country.

Those of our elder citizens who are out of employment and have no other means of support have to exist on old-age pensions averaging less than $40 a month throughout the Nation. Some States pay their elder citizens less than $20 a month, and expect them to eke out an existence on a mere pittance at present inflationary prices for food and clothing and everything else that is necessary to keep body and soul together in our complex society. That is a tragic situation, and a shame on the American way of life.

In most States, before a person can get even the pittance of an old-age pension, the pensioner must sign a pauper's oath, and if he has any property he must turn it over to the State. They employ an army of snoopers and will not even let our elder citizens earn anything on the side, whether it is doing errands or baby-sitting, without deducting such meager earnings from the little old-age pensions they get. There have been cases where our old-age pensioners have performed their duty as American citizens by serving on the jury, and have bought a new suit so that they might make a good appearance as a juror—only to find that the amount of their fees as a juror was deducted from their old-age pension checks.

While we are here in special session, why cannot we do something to remedy this terrible situation? There are several discharge petitions on the Clerk's desk waiting for the signatures of the Members to bring out legislation for the benefit of our senior citizens. I appeal to you, my colleagues, all of you—Republicans, Democrats, and Dixiecrats—to step up to the Clerk's desk, sign one or more of these discharge petitions, and do something about this.

The Social Security Act now on the statute books has proved to be a failure. There are now over 7,000,000 men and women over 65 years of age who have been retired from their employment, who should be entitled to social-security benefits, but only about one-fifth of our people over 65 who are in need actually receive benefits under the law. More than 5,750,000 men and women over 65 in this great country who are in need receive absolutely nothing from the social-security fund, although there is more than $5,000,000,000 in the social-security fund at the present time—over five billions doing nobody any good, with almost 6,000,000 people over 65 in need of old-age benefits.

And those who do receive social-security benefits today average only about a dollar a day. That is something for all of us to contemplate.

On the subject of social security, in 1939 testimony was offered before the House Ways and Means Committee to the effect that families of retired workers got an average pension of only $6.40 a week. The Government has collected $9,000,000,000 in taxes for old-age pensions and survivors insurance. It has paid a billion and a half in pensions. It has borrowed and spent the other seven and a half billion on other things.

Can you imagine such a situation in this country that is giving billions to Europe and to China—our country that has already given billions upon billions to foreign countries and to their citizens, even to those who are seeking the downfall of our way of life.

We must do something to right the wrong we have done and are doing to our fathers and our mothers. We, who are giving billions to the relief of foreigners and to those of foreign ideologies, should do something to see that our senior citizens, our own fathers and mothers, shall receive a decent old-age assistance and decent social security. The average of a paltry $1 a day they are now receiving from their State and Nation is a blot on our escutcheon.

I appeal to those of you, my colleagues, who feel the same as I do about this tragic situation, to do your part during this special session to alleviate the suffering of our elder citizens by coming up here and signing one or more of the discharge petitions on the Clerk's desk, so that we can get legislation out on the floor of this House that can be passed, and thus right this wrong that has been perpetrated on our old folks. Let us do it now.

We should not adjourn this special session of Congress until we have done something to curb the rising spiral of inflation and rising prices; and we should not go home until we have done something to alleviate the plight of our senior citizens—and fathers and mothers.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what this report relates to.

Mr. EATON. The report will be on a bill covering the proposal to strengthen the United Nations.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In what respect?

Mr. EATON. By the loan of $65,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CONGRESS CAN HELP TO CHECK INFLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, let no Member of the Congress make a mistake about it—the high cost of living is a vital issue in every American household. It is now at an all-time high. Since controls were dropped 2 years ago the price index has gone up over 40 percent. The American family today expects the Congress to take steps which recognize the devalued condition of the American dollar and to do something about it.

We cannot afford to spend our time here using the present session as a political sounding board. The need for relief for the people is too urgent. I have talked to the housewife, the worker, the farmer, and the small-business man in Montana and they are all fearful that, if something is not done to halt the spiral of inflation, the results will be tragic indeed. It would be ironical if, in the midst of an era of full employment, we should have a depression. That, nevertheless, is a possibility if Congress refuses to meet this challenge of high prices.

We should tighten credit controls and try to attack this problem of inflation at the source. The fault does not lie with the small-business man but it does, in part at least, originate among the corporate giants whose price increases in recent months have sharply influenced the rising spiral of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H. R. 7076, a companion measure to a bill introduced in the Senate yesterday by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY. This bill provides for a 30-day cooling-off period for certain large corporations to show cause why prices should be raised. As the Congress knows we now have a cooling-off period for labor before it can call a strike. It is only fair, therefore, that corporate giants be made to assume their full responsibilities in the grave economic crisis now at hand.

The prices which 146,000,000 Americans pay for the basic commodities they must daily use all over the country are privately fixed by a few giant corporations.

The cost of living rises steadily, but corporate profits are rising even more rapidly. All corporate profits in 1947 rose 42 percent above what they were in 1946, although in 1946 they had reached an all-time high. The income after taxes of the 100 largest manufacturing

corporations in 1947 was 91 percent greater than in 1946, and during the first 6 months of 1948, the all-time record of 1947 was being broken by new profit highs.

Serious danger signals are appearing. Sales of 1,277 firms have fallen off 1.6 percent this year, according to the report of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the lower-income groups, according to the Federal Reserve Board, are dipping into their savings in order to live, extending their credit and going into debt. I do not see how the ordinary working family or those living on fixed incomes or those older citizens receiving a pittance for a pension, can live at today's prices.

This is the road to depression—rising prices, rising profits, dwindling savings, contracting purchasing power, narrowing markets, curtailed production, reduced employment, and then on over the "boom" to end in the "bust."

Mounting prices and mounting profits are undermining the purchasing power of the Nation and are setting the stage for a new depression all at the time when international recovery and world peace depend upon stopping inflation now.

To do this, it may not be necessary to restore all-inclusive price controls. It is necessary to recognize the fact that a few giant corporations have control over the production, the distribution, and the price of basic commodities upon which all American business depends. Put the spotlight of publicity on the pricing policies of these corporate giants and the brakes will be immediately applied to inflation.

The country does not realize the extent to which the people have become the subjects of private economic government. Three meat packing corporations produce 43 percent of all the meat distributed by packers throughout the country, and these same three corporations determine the price that people must pay for all meat.

Three steel corporations produce 49 percent of all steel ingots; three oil-refinery corporations produce 28 percent of all gasoline; three chemical corporations produce 66 percent of all chemicals, and in each instance these corporations actually set the prices for all other producers.

So it goes in other industries. Three corporations produce 67 percent of all farm machinery, 69 percent of all electric ranges, 75 percent of all window glass, 77 percent of all rubber tires, 80 percent of all copper, 87 percent of all gypsum board, 88 percent of all tin cans, and 91 percent of all primary aluminum.

In the case of 121 basic products universally used throughout the country, the total value of which, for each product, was more than $10,000,000 in 1937, more than 75 percent of the total output was manufactured by only four firms. When a few corporations secure control over so large a proportion of the production of any commodity, it is inevitable that they set the price not only for their own particular industry, but also for every other industry and every other business which uses these products as a raw material. Thus the price structure of American business, and, therefore, the cost of living, depends upon the private judgment of the private managers of the few corporations which have gained so tight a control over American production.

To deal effectively with inflation, and this includes high cost housing, it is necessary to deal with these concentrated giants. Their hand is on the throttle of American business. They have the power to turn it on and off. Experience has proved that it is idle to ask them to protect the public. No President from Mr. Hoover to Mr. Truman by politely using the prestige of the Presidency, has been able to persuade them to act in the public interest. They think only of their own welfare, yet when they increase prices in a dangerous situation like the present, they are acting against the welfare of the whole population and against the interest of every State and every community in the Nation.

Let us apply to them the same rule Congress has applied to labor. In the Taft-Hartley Act, and before that in the Railway Labor Act, Congress provided for a cooling-off period before a strike could take place. Why not a cooling-off period before the corporate giants which produce the bulk of our basic commodities may increase prices?

If the workers of the country are required by law to sell their labor for a certain period at a lower price than they believe they ought to have, why should not these huge corporations be compelled to hold the price line for a similar period until an appropriate Government agency can conduct a public hearing to review the reasons for the proposed price increases?

The national interest is paramount. We are dealing with the issues out of which depression and disaster for millions may arise. We are dealing with issues that directly affect world peace and national security. We cannot afford to drift. We must act to prevent the managers of the monopolist economic structure from pulling it down upon themselves and all the people.

I have, therefore, drafted a bill to provide that the price of all basic commodities, 30 percent or more of the total annual output of which is produced by five or less of all producers in any given industry, may not be increased until the producers desiring to make such increase shall have filed with the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Federal Trade Commission a notice of intention to increase prices, and until not more than 30 days after such notice a public hearing has been held by the Federal Trade Commission. At such public hearing it shall be the duty of the members of the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce to examine the applicant with respect to the reasons for the proposed increase.

Competition and free enterprise are being destroyed, States' rights insofar as the States are entitled to protect their own citizens are being undermined, and the people are being exploited by big business not so much because all big business wants monopoly but because concentration of control has proceeded so far that the private interests of the giant corporations are overriding the public interest. Only Congress can protect the people by holding inflation and preserving a competitive economic system.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing that this Congress had better wake up to the fact that the American people are watching to see what we are going to do and it is going to be their responsibility after this Congress adjourns to make their judgment as to what we do or as to what we may not do.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If the picture of the industries to which the gentleman refers as monopolies is as he has painted it, would the gentleman tell the House what is causing the scarcity and disappearance of risk capital?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that, contrary to what he has always advocated, I have not believed that there was an absence of risk capital in this country. I recall when the recent tax bill was debated—and I voted against it the last time as well as two times before that—that one of the arguments raised was that there was a lack of risk capital in this country. There is no lack of risk capital. There is all kinds of capital in the banks which can be used for almost any kind of business, and I am quite sure the gentleman will grant that particular thesis.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But the capital in the banks cannot be used as risk capital. It can be lent to industry today but it cannot be used as risk capital; and that is the catch in this thing, I may say to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not agree with the gentleman even there, that because this money is in the bank and has to be loaned that it cannot be used if the risk is worth while. I should think the businessmen would like to go to the banks to borrow money provided they can get that money on reasonable terms.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it not a fact that most of our risk capital came from those income groups above the $25,000 level, and is it not also a fact that the progressive income-tax collections are such at the present time as to make it impossible for the people in those groups to invest as they previously did?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is a certain amount of truth in what the gentleman says; however, under the recent tax bill it is the people with incomes above $25,000 who get most of the benefits while the people in the lower brackets are the ones who get the least benefits, and those benefits have all been wiped out on account of the high cost of living and the steadily mounting spiral of inflation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It is estimated by, I believe, the most capable men giving attention to this subject that it would require about $71,000,000,000 in current purchasing power to bring our industrial plant up to the 1930 level and, furthermore, the amount of capital invested per capita in productive enterprise is back to about the 1909 level. I want to say to the gentleman that this

is the most serious situation confronting the United States of America today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the gentleman that we are in a very difficult situation, but I do not think that industry is in such a serious condition as the great bulk of the American people because they are the ones who need the help and they are the ones Congress has consistently refused to give assistance to.

CALL OF THE CALENDARS ON MONDAY AND TUESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar in order on Monday next be dispensed with and that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION CLEAR DR. E. U. CONDON

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for 15 long months we have witnessed an unparalleled publicity program by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in which the committee has attempted to smear the character and reputation of one of the Nation's most distinguished scientists, Dr. E. U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. In spite of a preliminary clearance, through an investigation requested by Dr. Condon himself on seeing certain attacks in the press in March of 1947 and conducted by Mr. W. Averell Harriman, then Secretary of Commerce and now Ambassador Extraordinary, in spite of clearance by the Loyalty Board, an investigation which he requested after the program was established; and now in spite of the clearance of the Atomic Energy Commission, after an exhaustive investigation the like of which has probably never occurred before—no doubt, a result of the atmosphere created by the House committee's publicity—in spite of all these investigations and clearances, backed by the FBI, we still see the committee continuing its oblique attacks by press releases.

What has this committee done in this case aside from publicity releases and press statements? The record will show nothing. It is high time that the facts and events in this shameful episode in congressional history were listed and the happenings of recent weeks revealed.

FIFTEEN MONTHS OF ATTACKS

First. March 1947: Two articles, replete with vague innuendoes, appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, indicating that Dr. Condon would be investigated.

Second. June 1947: Mr. THOMAS, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in a signed article in the popular magazine, American, attacked Dr. Condon and said that he would be subpenaed.

Third. June 21, 1947: Mr. THOMAS again repeated the above attacks in Liberty magazine of this date.

Fourth. July 17, 1947: A headline press release was made by the committee which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald repeating past attacks. This vicious smear was analyzed by me on the floor of the House—Smearing the Scientists: Attempt to Discredit Civilian Atomic Energy Control, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 22, 1947.

Fifth. March 1, 1948: A special subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities released a report in which it called Dr. Condon one of the weakest links in atomic energy, and pronounced judgment upon him. This report was allegedly a report to the full committee, and yet at least one member of the full committee admitted that he was never given a copy; it was released to the press in a theatrical fashion at the hospital bedside of Chairman THOMAS, shortly before the House was to consider the committee's appropriation. Its contents were described as a matter "of such importance that it demands immediate attention." The contents of this publicity blurb were analyzed by me on the floor of the House—Sabotage of American Science: the Full Meaning of Attacks on Dr. Condon, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 9, 1948.

In between these major publicity campaigns, the committee continued to emit a steady stream of lighter missiles and these press releases repeat all the old innuendoes.

The reaction of the Nation to the vicious report of March 1, 1948, should have settled this invidious publicity program of the committee, for the responsible press of the Nation, from coast to coast, lashed out at the tactics and procedures of the committee. These were summarized by the gentlewoman from California, the Honorable HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, on the floor of the House—Press Reaction to the Attacks on Dr. Condon, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 14, 1948. At the same time, eminent citizens and the distinguished professional societies and groups of the Nation protested bitterly this unwarranted and vicious treatment of so distinguished a scientist and citizen as Dr. E. U. Condon, and those who knew and had worked with him made clear their views of his integrity. These, too, were summarized by the gentlewoman from California, the Honorable HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, on the floor of the House—Societies and Citizens React to Attacks on Dr. Condon, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 15, 1948.

Meanwhile the committee announced that it would devote its entire staff to secure evidence to substantiate its March 1, 1948, attack. Perhaps galvanized by the flood of reaction, it decided to hold a hearing; April 21, 1948, was set, only to be canceled and indefinitely postponed. Members of the committee subsequently assured Congress that hearings would be held prior to its adjournment, but adjournment time came and no hearings had been held.

DR. CONDON COOPERATIVE

Throughout this period Dr. Condon did his best to help the committee—without avail. On July 9, 1947, for example, Dr. Condon addressed the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] the following letter:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My attention has been called recently to your article in the American Magazine in which you say that I will be subpoenaed to appear before your committee in connection with its desire to learn more about the American-Soviet Science Society. It will not be necessary to issue a subpoena as I will be happy to supply the committee with all the information I have. When two of your staff assistants called on me last March 1, I showed them my complete file on this subject and would gladly do so again. Also I am assured that officers of the society, and the Rockefeller Foundation which is sponsoring the society, will be glad to furnish any information you desire on this subject.

I shall at all times be glad to cooperate with your committee in any way that I can help in its highly important work.

Sincerely yours,

E. U. CONDON, *Director.*

To this day he has never received even the courtesy of a reply. Shortly after this letter on July 17, 1947, Dr. Condon addressed each member of the committee as follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There have recently been newspaper and magazine articles in which it was stated that the House Committee on Un-American Activities intends to investigate me. I think it is important that you should have a copy (enclosed herewith) of the letter I wrote to the chairman of this committee soon after these things were called to my attention.

I shall be happy to cooperate with the committee in every way. Please allow me to suggest the desirability of proceeding without delay because of the grave importance of the issues raised.

Sincerely yours,

E. U. CONDON, *Director.*

From a few he received acknowledgments, but nothing happened. Then on March 5, 1948, after the sensational March 1 attack, Dr. Condon, this time in person, practically forced himself on several members of the committee in their chambers at the conclusion of subcommittee session, renewing his standing offer to help, appear, cooperate, which he made 8 months before. But, as before, nothing came of that either.

DR. CONDON CLEARED REPEATEDLY

I will not go into the many times that Dr. Condon was cleared as a result of his association with many secret wartime projects, including clearance on the atomic bomb project, where he was under the supervision of Maj. Gen. Leslie Groves. Then there was the initial investigation, requested by Dr. Condon because of the press attacks of March 1947. This was prior to the establishment of the Loyalty Board program, and Mr. W. Averell Harriman reported himself satisfied as to Dr. Condon's integrity. When the Loyalty Board was established, Dr. Condon at his own request was again investigated and cleared with the concurrence of Mr. Harriman and the new Commerce Secretary, Mr. Sawyer. Finally, we have seen one of the most exhaustive and thorough investigations of all history undertaken by the Atomic Energy Commission: this investigation completely vindicates Dr. Condon of all the malicious smears, innuendoes, and

gossip that has been peddled for these last 15 months. That report bears repetition:

REPORT OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION AS RELEASED ON JULY 15, 1948

The question before the Commission is the security clearance of Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. In view of Dr. Condon's past association with the atomic energy project, this question arises under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act for reinvestigations of persons who were permitted access to restricted data by the Manhattan District. The question presented is whether Dr. Condon's clearance should be continued to permit him to have access to the restricted data pertinent to his duties as Director of the Bureau of Standards and related activities.

After examining the extensive files in this case, the Commission has no question whatever concerning Dr. Condon's loyalty to the United States. What we have for consideration, therefore, is whether the continued clearance of this distinguished American scientist, whose loyalty is unquestionable, would constitute a security hazard to the atomic energy program. Such a decision calls for a common-sense evaluation of the factors involved.

In considering the case, the Commission has taken note of the prior association of Dr. Condon with the atomic energy program, during which he was given access to information of a high degree of secrecy:

1. In 1940, Dr. Condon was appointed a member of the eight-man uranium subcommittee of the uranium section, National Defense Research Committee, which carried out the first over-all survey of problems related to developing nuclear energy from atomic fission for the defense program.

2. In 1941 and 1942, Dr. Condon served as associate director of research of the Westinghouse Corp., during the period when Westinghouse took a prominent part in the production of the first substantial quantities of pure uranium metal.

3. Also in 1942, Dr. Condon was appointed a consultant to S–1 executive committee of the Office of Scientific Research and Development. This committee was charged with the responsibility for reviewing the basic program of the entire uranium project.

4. For a short period in 1943, Dr. Condon served as associate director of the Los Alamos Laboratory, at that time in the early stages of its organization as the unit of the Manhattan project which would finally turn out atomic bombs. While at Los Alamos he prepared a document known as the "Los Alamos Primer," which was used as an introduction to the subject of the explosive use of fissionable material, to introduce to scientific and technical personnel coming to the laboratory the fundamental ideas under investigation.

5. In 1944–45, Dr. Condon worked at the radiation laboratory of the University of California at Berkeley, which was under contract with the Manhattan District.

6. In November 1945, Dr. Condon, having been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, took office in the position which he now occupies as Director of the National Bureau of Standards.

7. In December 1945, Dr. Condon was designated and thereafter served as scientific adviser to the Senate's Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

8. In 1946 Dr. Condon was named by the President as a member of the Evaluation Commission for Operations Crossroads, and in this capacity attended the Bikini tests.

During the war the Bureau of Standards conducted for the atomic energy program of the Manhattan District certain work of types which the Bureau was particularly suited to perform. The Bureau has continued to perform for the Atomic Energy Commission similar work which can be best carried out by the Bureau. Thus, in his position as Director of the Bureau of Standards, and in other related atomic energy activities in which he would participate, Dr. Condon had need for access to certain types of restricted data.

This meant that under the Atomic Energy Act Dr. Condon's security clearance required "reinvestigation"; that is, it was necessary for the FBI to investigate and report to the Commission on his character, associations, and loyalty, and for the Commission then to determine whether permitting him to have access to restricted data will endanger the common defense and security.

In defining the question before the Commission, it is recognized that, as is the case with thousands of other persons whose security clearances must be passed on by the Commission, Dr. Condon's clearance does not involve access to information on weapons or production or stock-pile data, for the reason that his duties do not require that such access be given.

The five members of the Atomic Energy Commission have personally examined with care the entire record. Although its Personnel Security Review Board expressed the opinion on June 7, 1948, that action by the Commission on the case might appropriately be deferred, pending reasonably prompt action by the House Committee on Un-American Activities with respect to that committee's own investigation and hearing as to Dr. Condon, the Commission considers that in view of its statutory obligations this is a case which the members of the Commission should themselves decide, and that it is our duty to proceed at this time to such a decision.

The record before the Commission includes reports compiled in two FBI investigations. In a most detailed and exhaustive manner, these present a very full picture of Dr. Condon's character, associations, and loyalty, since the FBI interviewed over 300 persons to obtain information, and its investigations were conducted by a large number of agents on a country-wide basis.

In addition, the FBI supplied the Commission the pertinent information relating to Dr. Condon which it had obtained from the files of other Government agencies. The thorough and painstaking investigations by the FBI, and other relevant information available to the Commission, provide the basis on which it is the Commission's responsibility to determine the question of Dr. Condon's security clearance.

In considering the record, the Commission has found that in the opinion of some persons, Dr. Condon's tact, judgment, and discretion appear to be subject to some degree of criticism. On the other hand, there are statements by persons who have been closely associated with Dr. Condon during his long work on classified information, which indicate proper care on his part in assuring that unauthorized persons should not obtain access to classified information.

The file contains unfavorable information of a relevant character concerning certain persons with whom Dr. Condon and Mrs. Condon have from time to time had contacts. The file also shows that Dr. Condon is a man of wide associations, and that his associates include many highly reputable members of the scientific community who have great confidence in him.

In deciding such matters, the Commission has a statutory responsibility to place in perspective the evidence both favorable and unfavorable, and to decide whether the common defense and security of the United States would be adversely affected if the individual concerned continued to have that access to restricted data which is required by the nature of his duties.

On the basis of the voluminous record before it, the members of the Commission are fully satisfied that, in the terms of the statute, Dr. Condon's continued clearance for the purposes stated above "will not adversely affect the common defense and security" of the United States. The Commission considers that his continued clearance is in the best interests of the atomic energy program.

NATIONAL REACTION

The editorial reaction of the press to this report by the Atomic Energy Commission reveals clearly where the Nation stands on this matter, what its evaluation of the House committee is, and what dangers confront the Congress in maintaining its honor and integrity before the Nation in the light of irresponsible committee tactics. Typical of national reaction to the Atomic Energy Commission's report are the following editorials.

The New York Times on July 17, 1948:

CLEARANCE FOR DR. CONDON

The case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, has now reached a point where the Atomic Energy Commission considers him a good security risk, whereas the House Committee on Un-American Activities is still gunning for him. The absurdity in this situation is that the AEC knows all the pertinent facts about Dr. Condon and that neither the committee nor its tireless chairman, Representative THOMAS of New Jersey, has ever produced anything against him but insinuations and innuendoes. The guardians of our most precious secrets are satisfied, but the House committee, which is scared of every public servant who has character, ability, and opinions of his own, is still engaged on what Bert Andrews, chief Washington correspondent of our neighbor, the New York Herald Tribune, has correctly described as a witch hunt.

What has Dr. Condon done? The record shows that he served his country as a teacher, as director of a corporation laboratory, as director for the Government of basic research in radar, as a member of the secret group which demonstrated the possibility of making atom bombs, as an adviser to the Senate committee which wrote the Atomic Energy Act, as an observer at the Bikini tests, and more recently, in his present position, in research connected with the nonmilitary uses of atomic energy. The AEC has now cleared him in spite of vague assertions that he lacks tact, judgment, and discretion. Not even the Thomas committee has questioned his loyalty. There is no shadow of evidence that he gave away secrets to the Russians or anybody else.

The Thomas committee may now proceed, as it threatens to do, after more than a year of baseless rumor-mongering. We think Dr. Condon will come out of any such hearing, for which till now he has asked in vain, with flying colors. But the question of the committee's procedure remains. If good and faithful servants, so judged by those who best know them and their work, are to be persecuted in this fashion our governmental research is likely to fall into the hands of drudges and time servers. Self-respecting scientists will look elsewhere. And the end result will be a deadly blow to our defenses, which from now on depend more and more on the best scientific minds we can enlist.

The Washington Post on July 18, 1948:

CONDON'S SECURITY

It would be refreshing to believe that the security clearance of Dr. Edward U. Condon by the Atomic Energy Commission meant an end to the character assassination of which he has been a long-suffering victim. Unfortunately the instigators of the smears directed against him never have paid much attention to the facts. Last March, on the basis of half truths and distorted evidence, the House Un-American Activities Committee made another of its periodic forays against Dr. Condon, implying that he consorted with Soviet agents and terming him "one of the weakest links in our atomic security." Despite the promises that he would

have an opportunity to answer the charges, Dr. Condon has not yet been offered that chance. At long last it appears that he will be permitted to testify in hearings beginning August 1, though the committee will have to change a lot of its spots if there is to be any confidence that the hearings will be fair.

The Atomic Energy Commission has taken the same attitude that any impartial body would take in reviewing the facts about Dr. Condon. He had, of course, already been cleared by the Department of Commerce loyalty board at his request before the smear was unleashed last spring. The Atomic Energy Commission had at its disposal two separate FBI investigations, one comprising more than 300 interviews. After satisfying itself as to his unquestioned loyalty, the Commission went further and examined two other factors of security, character, and association. It found that although there had been criticism of Dr. Condon's tact, judgment, and discretion, "statements by persons who have been closely associated with Dr. Condon during his long work on classified information * * * indicate proper care on his part in assuring that unauthorized persons should not obtain access to classified information." The clearance given him was unqualified.

This testament to Dr. Condon's reliability, though timely, comes only after repercussions throughout the scientific world. As Director of the National Bureau of Standards and as a former official in the atomic energy project, Dr. Condon occupies a respected position among scientists, and the persecution to which he has been subjected has been regarded widely as an attack on all individualism and unorthodox opinion. The damage is already recognizable in the reluctance of scientists to work for the Government. This condition, too, represents a threat to security which the Un-American Activities Committee can scarcely ignore. Indeed, if the committee is at all sensitive to the unfavorable light in which it has been cast, it could well afford to adopt a precept of the Atomic Energy Commission: "* * * to place in perspective the evidence both favorable and unfavorable." It can flout this principle only at peril of exposure as being interested solely in headline hunting.

The Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., on July 17, 1948:

THE MALICE OF GOSSIP COMES HOME TO ROOST

Today the House Committee on Un-American Activities stands explicitly disgraced. Its chairman, J. PARNELL THOMAS, and his fellow members have convicted themselves of irresponsible sabotage of character and reputation. They have shown themselves willing to ruin a man by innuendo, denying him every right of hearing and every rule of justice which protects the meanest thief or the vilest murderer in the land.

To frighten Congress into giving it money, or to promote military domination of atomic energy development, or perhaps for both reasons, the committee has used the vicious technique of back-fence gossip. It cannot be justified. It should not be permitted any longer to foul American air with the very Gestapo fears and Inquisition charges from which it was designed to protect us.

The case in point, of course, is that of Dr. Edward U. Condon, a distinguished scientist who is director of the Bureau of Standards. Dr. Condon is one of those physicists who gave the United States world leadership in atomic fission. Since 1940 he has had access to and has contributed to military and governmental developments of highly secret and important nature.

A week before the committee's request for a $200,000 appropriation to continue its activities came up in Congress, Mr. THOMAS issued his now infamous statement to the effect that Dr. Condon was "one of the weakest links in our atomic security." This charge it purported to sustain by innuendo and by quotation, out of context, of part of an FBI report concerning the scientist.

All this was March 1. Dr. Condon has been given no chance to defend himself. Now the United States Atomic Energy Commission has cleared Dr. Condon on the basis of "thorough and painstaking investigations by the FBI." The Commission concludes it has "no question whatever concerning Dr. Condon's loyalty to the United States."

The happiest thing about this turn of events—since no one had any idea that Dr. Condon was whatever the Un-American Committee tried to suggest he was—is the dilemma of the Un-American Committee itself. It can scarcely let the matter drop, since it already has set and postponed and tentatively set again hearings on Dr. Condon's case. And whatever Mr. THOMAS and his irresponsible cohorts produce at a hearing will make their position more despicable, if possible, than it is today.

This we hope is the last time the committee will try to assassinate character through hints, innuendo, and gossip's malice.

The San Francisco Chronicle on July 19, 1948:

DR. CONDON VINDICATED

The Atomic Energy Commission's thorough check of Dr. Edward U. Condon, its decision to allow him full access to any atomic information he wants to see, and its statement affirming confidence in his loyalty constitute a triumph of good sense. The hysterical smear attack on Dr. Condon made by Chairman J. PARNELL THOMAS of the House Un-American Activities Committee last March 1 is answered by the Atomic Energy Commission's sober action.

Chairman THOMAS accused Dr. Condon, Chief of the National Bureau of Standards, of being "one of the weakest links" in the chain of atomic security and attempted to make this accusation stand up by withholding information in his possession which disproved the charge. This amounted to a falsification of the facts, and it was widely and rightly condemned.

The full facts became public despite Mr. THOMAS' care in shielding part of them. Although he declared the Condon case was so important as to demand immediate attention, he has done nothing since to bring it out in the open where Dr. Condon might defend himself.

As far as Dr. Condon's standing with the American people is concerned, it is vindicated by the findings of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Thomas committee can direct its attention elsewhere.

The Dallas Morning News on July 17, 1948:

CONDON CLEARANCE ANNOUNCED AT LAST

Dr. Edward U. Condon is at last cleared as a man in every way worthy to be trusted with the life of the United States. That is the real meaning of dismissing charges of disloyalty against him.

To be sure, the investigation should have been carefully made as to Dr. Condon's fitness long ago. The fact that the investigation was not made probably grew out of the general feeling that the dear Russians were our revered allies and would do us no harm. Accordingly, an occasional contact with the Communists in society was a mark of broad-mindedness and so on.

Now we know that every Communist is in some degree an undercover worker. The better Communist he is the better the spy. But the proof is, say our investigators, that Dr. Condon simply isn't the kind of man to give away atomic secrets.

Against the vague charge of disloyalty, the best rebuttal is the whole nature of the man. Under that test, Dr. Condon has stood up. We all know more about the way the Reds work now. Dr. Condon knows more about it, too. It is good to know that the country has lost nothing of value to even unintended indiscretion. Dr. Condon has conducted himself like a gentleman and a patriot while under fire. The report says, in effect, that he is exactly that—a gentleman and a patriot.

The Washington Evening Star on July 17, 1948:

DR. CONDON'S CLEARANCE

The Atomic Energy Commission's statement on Dr. Edward U. Condon ought to impel the House Committee on Un-American Activities either to correct itself regarding him or show good reason why it should not.

Some months ago the committee described Dr. Condon as "one of the weakest links in our atomic security" and cast serious doubt on his loyalty to the United States. It promised to hold a hearing on the subject, and he demanded one, but none has yet been held, though Chairman J. PARNELL THOMAS now asserts that something will be done along that line as soon as possible.

Meanwhile, in justice to Dr. Condon, the American people should acquaint themselves with the findings of the Atomic Energy Commission. Based on painstaking study and a voluminous record including material compiled in two exhaustive inquiries by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the findings may be summarized as follows: (1) The file contains unfavorable information concerning certain persons with whom Dr. and Mrs. Condon have occasionally associated; (2) it also shows that some individuals feel that his tact, judgment, and discretion seem open to a degree of criticism; (3) at the same time, however, testimony indicates that he has exercised proper care in safeguarding classified information; (4) his loyalty is altogether unquestionable, and (5) after placing all the evidence in perspective and weighing it carefully, the AEC is "fully satisfied" that his continued clearance for access to restricted data, far from adversely affecting security, "is in the best interests of the atomic-energy program."

Dr. Condon, of course, is an outstanding scientist who has made a distinguished contribution in the field of nuclear fission. In his capacity as Director of the National Bureau of Standards, he has to have access to certain types of secret information. The AEC has approved his clearance for the simple reason that it could find no sound argument against it, and for the further reason that his continued work with the atom is for the good of the country. His clearance does not cover data on A-weapons, but that remains restricted to him only because, as in the case of thousands of others connected with the atomic enterprise, his duties do not require access to the military phase.

In short, as far as the AEC is concerned, Dr. Condon is a loyal and able American who has not deserved to be branded as a weak link in our atomic security. Unless the House Committee on Un-American Activities can now prove otherwise, it ought to apologize to him and resolve never again to play fast and loose with any man's good name.

The New York Herald Tribune, on July 18, 1948:

CLEARANCE FOR DR. CONDON

The decision of the Atomic Energy Commission to give Dr. Condon access to restricted information in this most sensitive of Government agencies should remove any lingering doubt of his loyalty and trustworthiness. The Commission's report details the scrupulous care with which Dr. Condon was investigated, and the grave deliberation with which the information was sifted by the five Commissioners. From this scouting Dr. Condon has emerged clean and is adjudged an asset to the atomic-energy program.

The circumstances are assurance that this was no superficial examination of Dr. Condon's character and qualifications: For one thing, the Commission, being no more than

human, must have deliberated in an oppressive awareness of J. PARNELL THOMAS and his Committee on Un-American Activities, ready to pounce at the first sign of a misstep. But even had Mr. THOMAS not been directly involved in the case the Commission's decision would carry conviction. Wherever security could be, by any stretch of the fancy, associated with a problem, the Commission has acted in the past with almost painful caution; if it moved at all in the case of Dr. Condon one can depend on it that it moved only over indubitably firm ground.

In spite of Mr. THOMAS's dour predictions, it is difficult to see how he can resume his violent attack upon Dr. Condon. The Commission has had access to all the information in Mr. THOMAS's possession, and no doubt a good deal more. Its action has been clear-cut and decisive. It would be to the best interests of everyone and everything concerned—the Committee on Un-American Activities, the atomic-energy program and Dr. Condon himself—if the books should now be closed upon this thoroughly unsavory cause celebre, which has already been damaging enough to the essential liaison between science and the Government.

These editorials sum up the rational and reasoned opinion of the country with respect to the position of the House committee in this matter. They take intelligent cognizance of the unprecedented and exhaustive investigations of the Atomic Energy Commission which has vindicated Dr. Condon's smeared but still unsullied reputation. They are aware of the dangers to the Nation of deterring scientists from Federal projects, for public-opinion polls, letters, and statements from scientists throughout the country have shown that our scientists are loath to hazard their good names in service which subjects them to congressional calumny and slander; and this means that this committee is endangering the security of the Nation, which depends on concerted and sustained developments in science for its military strength, by its publicity and propaganda maneuvers.

In short, what has the committee done? It ignores the successive clearances granted Dr. Condon throughout the war. It ignores the clearances resulting from investigations prompted by its press campaign, dismissing also the considered judgment of responsible officials in reviewing these clearances, officials such as Mr. W. Averell Harriman; Mr. Charles Sawyer, the Secretary of Commerce; the five public-spirited members of the Atomic Energy Commission which has worked closely with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, responsible for that astounding extensive investigation of Dr. Condon. As for its own activity, there is none. None, unless the committee proposes to justify its appropriations and existence by the tonnage of press releases that it has spewed out with reckless abandon and regurgitated with nauseating frequency throughout the last 15 months. That is its record. No diatribes, no excuses, no rhetoric can dispute this summation of its incredible, its shameful, its sickly conduct for 15 months in a matter of such importance that it demands immediate attention.

On July 22, 1947, on the floor of this House, over a year ago, discussing one of the earlier publicity tirades of this committee, I said: "Rumor-mongering character assassins should put up or shut up." I most emphatically repeat that challenge today. I respectfully suggest that since this committee has not been able to put up, in more than a year of publicity efforts to smear Dr. Condon, it should now shut up in the most graceful way possible considering the disgraceful position in which it finds itself. And it should have the decency to tender Dr. Condon a humble public apology.

CIVIL-RIGHTS ISSUE—NEED OF CHANGING METHOD OF ELECTING OUR PRESIDENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who has a special order, may be allowed to extend his remarks at this point as he was unexpectedly called from the Chamber.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the civil-rights issue was toned down by President Truman in his message to Congress on July 27.

I am glad that he laid stress on the necessity of curbing destructive inflation and of enacting a long-range housing program—and indicated that he was not anxious for the civil-rights issue to be brought up in this special session of Congress.

I hope that the Congress, inasmuch as we have been called back in special session, will enact legislation that will stop the uncontrolled inflation which is about to engulf us. The high cost of living is going to destroy the economic status of the middle and lower class of people unless prices are stabilized. Measures can be taken, and they should be taken. I do not think we need general price control and rationing. These should only be tried as a last resort. Requiring larger reserves for bank loans, curbing consumer credits, regulating the commodity exchange, allocation of steel, and some other measures would help greatly, and, I think, would get our economy in order.

I hope very much that the civil-rights issue will not be pushed at this Congress, for being brought up would only add to the fire of prejudice and the disunity in our Nation.

This is the time when we need harmony and good will in our own country. Disruptions such as the civil-rights issue will hurt our position of world leadership in the cause of peace. Most of the matters embraced in the President's civil-rights program cannot be dealt with by legislation. I have always opposed, and will continue to vigorously oppose, the FEPC, the antilynch bill, and any nonsegregation provisions. The FEPC is, in my opinion, a dangerous step toward regimentation. It is of doubtful constitutionality and it certainly violates the rights of the employers of our Nation. It simply would not work—especially in the South. Any effort to put such a law in operation would cause widespread difficulty which would be very detrimental to the Nation.

The antilynch law is an unjustified encroachment on the rights of the States. Everybody abhors lynching, and of course lynching is murder under every State law. The adoption of the bill would be a step toward making every crime a Federal offense and removing the interest and responsibility of local people in the prevention of crime. The antilynch bill has been before the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, and I have always opposed it.

There is no real demand for antisegregation laws in the South. The Negroes of the South are not interested in this kind of legislation. They want schools, better economic opportunity, and houses. I hope their lot in these respects can be improved. It would not be in the interest of their own welfare to fan the fires of passion and disunity by espousal of Federal nonsegregation laws.

I am not one who merely howls and complains about the President's civil-rights program. When one criticizes he should have a remedy—and I think there is a remedy. The difficulty is in the method of electing a President. The present system of all of the electoral votes going to the candidate who has the majority of the popular votes makes a whipping boy of the South. The Democratic National Committee feels that the South is safe and does not consider us. The Republican National Committee feels that they cannot get any electoral votes in the South, so they do not give us consideration. The same situation exists to a degree in New England and certain Northern States where the Republican Party feels they are safe for their candidate. There is a way of resolving this difficulty. More than 3 years ago I filed a resolution changing the method of choosing a President. The resolution provides that the electoral votes of the States be divided between the Presidential candidates in proportion to the popular vote. A resolution almost identical with mine has now been passed by the Judiciary Committee. A similar resolution is sponsored on the Senate side by Senator LODGE. This is a nonpartisan matter and would not materially affect the balance between the two major parties. If this system had been in operation I feel certain we would not have had a civil-rights message. I also feel sure that both parties, in their platforms, would have given more consideration to the South and New England.

A two-party government is the only satisfactory way of operating a democracy. The present method of electing a President has caused us in this election to have four parties. We will never have two well-defined political parties, between whom the voters can make a choice, until an amendment similar to mine is adopted to the Constitution. Furthermore, this system would insure an equal distribution of the benefits of government and an opportunity for every section to be represented in high executive offices rather than just a few pivotal States. It may be expecting too much for this amendment to be considered at this special session, but if the special session lasts for any considerable time I hope it will be approved by Congress and submitted to the people.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 2, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1703. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1704. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation; in the total amount of $56,428,450 proposed for the fiscal year 1949 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Army (H. Doc. No. 735); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, the Committee on Public Works was discharged from the consideration of Executive Communication 1700, report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Gooseberry project, Utah, and the same was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 7056. A bill to strengthen the national defense by making it possible for persons drafted under the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law 759, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) to choose the type of units in which they serve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 7057. A bill to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7058. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 7059. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 7060. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 7061. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 7062. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 7063. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide annuities for certain widows of employees who died in active service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 7064. A bill to provide for permanent pay increases for Government employees designated as unclassified or ungraded; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 7065. A bill to require payment to certain employees of the District of Columbia of additional compensation authorized by the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 7066. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the necessity of holding an election as a condition to the making of an agreement requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 7067. A bill to provide for a suitable building to be used for residential and office purposes by the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 7068. A bill to transfer the personnel, powers, and duties of the United States Park Police force in the District of Columbia to the Metropolitan Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 7069. A bill to provide for a suitable building to be used for residential and office purposes by the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7070. A bill to provide for the allocation of meat; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 7071. A bill to authorize grants to the States to assist in the construction of elementary and secondary public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 7072. A bill to grant increased retirement benefits to enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps who were recalled from the Reserve or retired list and who served creditably in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7073. A bill to provide nonquota immigration status for certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 7074. A bill to amend section 5 of War Claims Act of 1948, relating to detention benefits payable to civilian American citizens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7075. A bill to amend section 6 (b) of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to compensation payable to individuals who, while held by the enemy as prisoners of war, were not furnished food in accordance with the terms of the Geneva convention; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 7076. A bill to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity on the pricing policies of certain large corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 7077. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. J. Res. 438. Joint resolution requiring that notice be sent to the Members when the President convenes the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. J. Res. 439. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of Dr. William Crawford Gorgas, of Alabama, who achieved national distinction in the field of preventive medicine by conquering yellow fever, thus making possible the building of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. J. Res. 440. Joint resolution authorizing the use of foreign-relief appropriations for the purpose of making payments to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 441. Joint resolution relating to the high cost of living and shortage of housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. Res. 705. Resolution providing for an inquiry on agreements and conditions in Germany and relations with other occupying powers, particularly Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 706. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate and study the scarcity in nonferrous metal scrap, particularly in aluminum; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7078. A bill for the relief of Frederick C. Cowell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7079. A bill for the relief of the county of Maui, T. H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7080. A bill for the relief of Dick Walook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 7081. A bill for the relief of John D. Garrard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7082. A bill to continue in full force and effect patent No. 1,861,647; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7083. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Jan Dunikowski, Karolina Dunikowski, Wanda Octavia Dunikowski, and Janina Grospera Dunikowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Enrico Colandrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John Kaudy (formerly Stella Cappler); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 7086. A bill for the relief of John E. Tate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7087. A bill for the relief of George Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2132. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, relative to giving highest preference for civilian employment to those veterans disabled in the service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2133. By Mrs. NORTON: Joint resolution of the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to proceed with all possible dispatch to the preparation and adoption of necessary legislation designed to encourage and make adequately effectual a comprehensive program of merchant shipbuilding in this country's shipyards and of expanding our merchant marine; to the

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2134. By Mr. SADLAK: Petition of the mayor and common council of the city of New Britain, Conn., petitioning that the disposition by sale of the White Oaks housing project in New Britain, Conn., be postponed for a period of 6 months from August 1, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2135. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Alexander B. Farlinger, Jr., and others, of Evanston, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the repeal of military draft legislation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2136. Also, petition of M. P. Medina, of Cabanatuan, Philippine Islands, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to relief for the Barrio people of the Philippines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2137. Also, petition of James O. McDowell, founder, Arizona-United States Cancer Cure Society, Bisbee, Ariz., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the consideration of his discovery of the Arizona cancer salve for the cure of internal cancers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2138. Also, petition of W. G. MacNiece, city clerk, transmitting a petition of the Common Council of Unalaska, Alaska, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the negotiation of mail, freight, and passenger service for this area and with reference to H. R. 1608; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 30, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, Thou hast created us with a capacity to be like Thee in spirit. Grant that we may witness to the reality and sanctity of this kinship in all of life's divine and human relationships.

Purge us from everything that dwarfs and deadens our capacities for noble service. May we never be recreant to any of the duties of our high vocation as the servants of God and our beloved country.

Show us how we may appropriate and apply the spirit of the Master who went about doing good and inspired His followers to give their strength to the weak, their sympathy to the suffering, their substance to the poor, and their hearts to God.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 29, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF UNITED STATES SURPLUS PROPERTY IN FOREIGN AREAS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas as of June 30, 1948, together with a report of the Foreign Liquidation Commissioner relating to the administration of title II of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixteenth quarterly report of the Treasury Department on war contract terminations and settlements for the period April 1 through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROGRESS REPORT ON SURPLUS-PROPERTY DISPOSAL

A letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly progress report of that Administration on the disposal of surplus property for the second quarter, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE POLL TAX

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate of yesterday, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is recognized for 30 minutes to speak on the pending motion to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield for that purpose?

Mr. STEWART. I do.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	McGrath
Barkley	Green	McKellar
Brewster	Gurney	McMahon
Brooks	Hatch	Magnuson
Buck	Hawkes	Malone
Butler	Hayden	Maybank
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Cain	Hill	Moore
Capehart	Hoey	Morse
Capper	Holland	Murray
Connally	Ives	Myers
Cooper	Jenner	O'Conor
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kem	Pepper
Dworshak	Kilgore	Reed
Eastland	Knowland	Revercomb
Ecton	Langer	Robertson, Va.
Ellender	Lucas	Robertson, Wyo.
Feazel	McCarthy	Russell
Ferguson	McClellan	Smith
Flanders	McFarland	Sparkman
Stennis	Thye	Wherry
Stewart	Tobey	Wiley
Taft	Tydings	Williams
Taylor	Umstead	Wilson
Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Young
Thomas, Utah	Watkins	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is entitled to the floor for 30 minutes. The Chair does not feel that the time consumed up to this point should be charged to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield for a question, or with the understanding that I do not lose the floor by yielding.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROPOSED RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. May I make an announcement for the information of Senators? It is our intention when the business of the Senate is concluded in this session today to recess until Monday next at noon.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATING TO PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield on the condition that he does not lose the floor thereby?

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Virginia on condition that I do not lose the floor by doing so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on June 28, 1948, during the recent adjournment of the Congress, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures compiled material in the nature of an additional report on Federal personnel for the period April–May 1948.

The number of employees on the civilian pay roll of the Federal Government during May was increased by an average of more than 500 a day for the third consecutive month. The average has been nearly 500 a day since January.

Total civilian employment in May reached 2,066,297, an increase of 15,877 over April.

The May increase was divided almost equally between the civilian agencies, which reported a net increase of 7,433, and the Military Establishment, in which the net increase was 8,444. Of the total increase 6,653 were among industrial employees, and the remaining 9,224 were in the classified service and so forth.

Agencies reporting principal increases were Agriculture with an increase of 3,884, Interior with an increase of 1,914, Post Office with an increase of 2,537, Commerce with an increase of 224, Economic Cooperation Administration with an increase of 160, Maritime Commission with an increase of 163, National Labor Relations Board with an increase of 178, Tennessee Valley Authority with an increase of 357, and Veterans' Administration with an increase of 273.

Principal decreases were reported by Treasury with a decrease of 473, War Assets Administration with a decrease of 1,500, and Government Printing Office with a decrease of 109.

In accordance with the practice of the committee over the past 5 years this material is now prepared for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the material in the nature of an additional report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MAY 1948, AND COMPARISON WITH APRIL 1948

(The following report is compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I of the report shows personnel employed inside continental United States by agency. Table II shows personnel employed outside continental United States by agency. Table III shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States by agency. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the total Federal personnel for the month of May increased 15,877 from the April total of 2,050,420 to the May total of 2,066,297. (See table III.)

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment, there was an increase of 7,433 from the April total of 1,196,809 to the May total of 1,204,242.

Total employment for the National Military Establishment showed an increase of 8,444 from the April total of 853,611 to the May figure of 862,055.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 48 from the April figure of 827 to the May figure of 875.

The Department of the Army reported an increase of 4,423 from the April figure of 394,550 to the May figure of 398,973. Inside continental United States the Army increased its civilian personnel 5,132; outside continental United States it decreased 709.

The Department of the Air Force increased civilian employment 1,547 from the April figure of 117,305 to the May figure of 118,852. Department of the Air Force figures cover civilian personnel inside United States only; Department of the Army reports Air Force civilian personnel outside continental United States.

The Department of the Navy reported an increase of 2,426 civilian employees from the April figure of 340,929 to the May figure of 343,355.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Federal personnel within the United States increased 16,112 from the April total of 1,820,294 to the May total of 1,836,406. (See table I.)

Excluding the National Military Establishment, personnel inside continental United States increased 7,199 from the April total of 1,141,290 to the May total of 1,148,489.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for May was 687,917—an increase of 8,913 over the April total of 679,004.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 48 from the April figure of 827 to the May figure of 875.

Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States increased 5,132 from the April figure of 263,770 to the May figure of 268,902.

Department of the Air Force within continental United States increased 1,547 from the April figure of 117,305 to the May figure of 118,852.

The Navy Department within the United States increased its civilian employment 2,186 from the April figure of 297,102 to the May figure of 299,288.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Outside continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 235 from the April total of 230,126 to the May total of 229,891.

An increase of 234 was reported in the overseas civilian employment of the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment, from the April total of 55,519 to the May total of 55,753.

Total overseas civilian employment for the National Military Establishment decreased 469 from the April total of 174,607 to the May total of 174,138.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 709 civilian employees overseas, from the April figure of 130,780 to the May figure of 130,071.

The Department of the Navy increased its overseas civilian employment 240 from the April figure of 43,827 to the May figure of 44,067.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

Total industrial employment during the month of May increased 6,653 from the April total of 564,442 to the May total of 571,095. (See table IV.)

The departments and agencies, exclusive of the National Military Establishment, increased their industrial employment by 970 from the April figure of 21,795 to the May figure of 22,765.

The National Military Establishment increased its total industrial employment 5,683 from the April total of 542,647 to the May figure of 548,330.

The Department of the Army increased its industrial employment 3,111 during the month of May from the April total of 235,483 to the May figure of 238,594. Of this net increase 3,851 was within continental United States, while outside continental United States industrial employment of the Army Department decreased 740.

The Department of the Air Force industrial personnel inside United States increased 563 from the April figure of 69,226 to the May figure of 69,789.

The Department of the Navy increased its industrial employment 2,009 from the April figure of 237,938 to the May figure of 239,949.

The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS)			
Agriculture	73,656	77,399	+3,743
Commerce	37,346	37,467	+121
Interior	44,568	46,323	+1,755
Justice	25,836	25,837	+1
Labor	4,496	4,450	−46
Post Office	486,474	488,985	+2,511
State	7,572	7,576	+4
Treasury	89,477	89,002	−475
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	222	221	−1
Bureau of the Budget	612	593	−19
Executive Mansion and Grounds	91	96	+5
National Security Council[1]	18	19	+1
National Security Resources Board	150	176	+26
Council of Economic Advisers	44	45	+1
Office of Government Reports	18	17	−1
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	47	50	+3
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration	113	273	+160
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,529	4,565	+36
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	----------
Philippine War Damage Commission	6	10	+4
War Assets Administration	23,743	22,266	−1,477
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	3	----------
Atomic Energy Commission	4,987	5,028	+41
Civil Aeronautics Board	579	602	+23
Civil Service Commission	4,091	4,120	+29
Export-Import Bank of Washington	116	121	+5
Federal Communications Commission	1,324	1,328	+4
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,119	1,111	−8
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	369	378	+9
Federal Power Commission	803	792	−11
Federal Security Agency[2]	33,333	33,292	−41
Federal Trade Commission	557	554	−3
Federal Works Agency	21,904	21,981	+77
General Accounting Office	9,262	9,232	−30
Government Printing Office	7,223	7,114	−109
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,681	11,714	+33
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	----------
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,250	2,292	+42
Maritime Commission	7,170	7,332	+162
National Advisory Commission for Aeronautics	6,204	6,169	−35
National Archives	344	344	----------
National Capital Housing Authority	288	286	−2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	23	21	−2
National Gallery of Art	319	317	−2
National Labor Relations Board	1,602	1,780	+178
National Mediation Board	115	111	−4
Office of Selective Service Records	704	721	+17
Panama Canal	534	535	+1
Railroad Retirement Board	2,755	2,656	−99
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,615	5,550	−65

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[2] Includes 1,197 employees of Howard University and 102 employees of Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,111	1,123	+12
Smithsonian Institution	503	507	+4
Tariff Commission	221	218	−3
Tax Court of the United States	126	126	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,697	15,054	+357
Veterans' Administration	200,327	200,594	+267
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,141,290	1,148,489	+9,632 −2,433
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+7,199
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	827	875	+48
Department of the Army	263,770	268,902	+5,132
Department of the Air Force	117,305	118,852	+547
Department of the Navy	297,102	299,288	+2,186
Total, including National Military Establishment	1,820,294	1,836,406	+18,545 −2,433
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+16,112

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	1,695	1,836	+141
Commerce	2,800	2,903	+103
Interior	5,208	5,367	+159
Justice	434	435	+1
Labor	82	82	
Post Office	1,585	1,611	+26
State	14,304	14,314	+10
Treasury	640	642	+2
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Office of the Housing Expediter	25	26	+1
Philippine Alien Property Administration	157	132	−25
Philippine War Damage Commission	778	820	+42
War Assets Administration	420	397	−23
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	111	114	+3
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	
Civil Aeronautics Board	19	20	+1
Civil Service Commission	5	5	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	
Federal Communications Commission	37	38	+1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3	
Federal Security Agency	1,327	1,341	+14
Federal Works Agency	398	428	+30
Housing and Home Finance Agency	42	39	−3
Maritime Commission	91	92	+1
National Labor Relations Board	8	8	

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Office of Selective Service Records	16	16	
Panama Canal	23,721	23,467	−254
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	19	17	−2
Smithsonian Institution	6	6	
Veterans' Administration	1,583	1,589	+6
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	55,519	55,753	+547 −301
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+243
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army	130,780	130,071	−709
Department of the Navy	43,827	44,067	+240
Total, including National Military Establishment	230,126	229,891	−1,016 +781
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−235

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	75,351	79,235	+3,884
Commerce	40,146	40,370	+224
Interior	49,776	51,690	+1,914
Justice	26,270	26,272	+2
Labor	4,578	4,532	−46
Post Office	488,059	490,596	+2,537
State	21,876	21,890	+14
Treasury	90,117	89,644	−473
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	222	221	−1
Bureau of the Budget	612	593	−19
Executive Mansion and Grounds	91	96	+5
National Security Council [1]	18	19	+1
National Security Resources Board	150	176	+26
Council of Economic Advisers	44	45	+1
Office of Government Reports	18	17	−1
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	47	50	+3
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration	113	273	+160
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,554	4,591	+37
Philippine Alien Property Administration	159	134	−25
Philippine War Damage Commission	784	830	+46
War Assets Administration	24,163	22,663	−1,500

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	114	117	+3
Atomic Energy Commission	4,990	5,031	+41
Civil Aeronautics Board	598	622	+24
Civil Service Commission	4,096	4,125	+29
Export-Import Bank of Washington	118	123	+5
Federal Communications Commission	1,361	1,366	+5
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,122	1,114	−8
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	369	378	+9
Federal Power Commission	803	792	−11
Federal Security Agency [1]	34,660	34,633	−27
Federal Trade Commission	557	554	−3
Federal Works Agency	22,302	22,409	+107
General Accounting Office	9,262	9,232	−30
Government Printing Office	7,223	7,114	−109
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,723	11,753	+30
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,250	2,292	+42
Maritime Commission	7,261	7,424	+163
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,204	6,169	−35
National Archives	344	344	
National Capital Housing Authority	288	286	−2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	23	21	−2
National Gallery of Art	319	317	−2
National Labor Relations Board	1,610	1,788	+178
National Mediation Board	115	111	−4
Office of Selective Service Records	720	737	+17
Panama Canal	24,255	24,002	−253
Railroad Retirement Board	2,755	2,656	−99
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,634	5,567	−67
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,111	1,123	+12
Smithsonian Institution	509	513	+4
Tariff Commission	221	218	−3
Tax Court of the United States	126	126	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,697	15,054	+357
Veterans' Administration	201,910	202,183	+273
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,196,809	1,204,242	+10,153 −2,720
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+7,433
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	827	875	+48
Department of the Army:			
Inside continental United States	263,770	268,902	+5,132
Outside continental United States	130,780	130,071	−709
Department of the Air Force	117,305	118,852	+1,547
Department of the Navy	340,929	343,355	+2,426
Total, including National Military Establishment	2,050,420	2,066,297	+19,306 −3,429
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+15,877

[1] Includes 1,197 employees of Howard University and 102 employees of Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1948, and comparison with April 1948*

Department or agency	April	May	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Commerce	1,448	1,565	+117
Interior	5,968	6,628	+660
State	365	374	+9
Treasury	3,689	3,654	−35
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Atomic Energy Commission	236	226	−10
Housing and Home Finance Agency	2	2	
Panama Canal	2,083	2,053	−30
Tennessee Valley authority	8,004	8,263	+259
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	21,795	22,765	+1,045 −75
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+970
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	136,768	140,619	+3,851
Outside continental United States	98,715	97,975	−740
Department of the Air Force	69,226	69,789	+563
Department of the Navy	237,938	239,947	+2,009
Total, including National Military Establishment	564,442	571,095	+7,408 −815
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+6,653

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MORSE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2915) for the relief of James A. Nelson Co., which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me so that I may submit a request that a committee may sit today?

Mr. STEWART. I yield for a brief statement or a question on condition that I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair cannot grant that immunity. Is there objection to the Senator from Tennessee yielding for the purpose indicated by the Senator from Michigan, without the Senator from Tennessee losing his rights thereby? The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may hold a hearing this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAIN AT THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator CAIN at the Republican National Convention June 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER AT THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Herbert Hoover to the Republican National Convention, which appears in the Appendix.]

A PREMATURE CALL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Premature Call," from the Washington Star of July 29, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

INFLATION—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to inflation, by David Lawrence, from the Washington Star of July 29, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

BETTER VOTE YOUR TICKET STRAIGHT—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Better Vote Your Ticket Straight," from the Washington Times-Herald of June 27, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

YOUNG REPUBLICANS—ARTICLE BY RAYMOND MOLEY

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Young Republicans," by Raymond Moley, from Newsweek for June 28, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BLUE-GRAY GAME

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article and editorial regarding the Blue-Gray Game, played in Montgomery, Ala., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, yesterday when the Senate recessed, I had completed the statement I was making, and today I desire to take only a portion of the time allotted me, for which I asked yesterday. I was particularly anxious to place in the RECORD as a part of my statement a paragraph from page 10 of the volume The Constitution of the United States, Its Sources and Its Application, written by Mr. Thomas James Norton, in which he comments on the latter part of section 2 of Article I of the Constitution, which provides that the electors in each State voting for Members of the House of Representatives shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Mr. Norton writes:

> The property qualifications of the voters in the different States, as well as other requirements, were so various that it was concluded to let the practice in each State determine who should be qualified to vote for a candidate for a seat in the National House of Representatives. "To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule," wrote Hamilton in the Federalist, "would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention."

Mr. President, I want to read into the RECORD the statement of Mr. Charles Warren, who gave testimony in the poll-tax hearings held before the Committee on the Judiciary on November 2, 1943. Mr. Warren, as everyone knows, is an outstanding authority on constitutional law, the author of many books of note, and a man whose opinion on constitutional questions is highly valuable.

First I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Warren's entire testimony, which occupies only some twenty-odd pages in the hearings, be printed in full at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES WARREN

Mr. WARREN. My name is Charles Warren. My business address is 710 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed in any way you choose, Judge Warren.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, honorable members of this committee: In order that you may not think that my argument on the constitutionality of this bill is colored by my personal views in favor of a poll tax, I desire to say that I consider that the requirement of a poll tax to make a man eligible to vote is, in fact, unjust and unreasonable and should be abolished by the sovereignty which created it and not by any other sovereignty, that is, by the State and not by Congress.

I was very much interested to read the printed hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate covering hearings in 1941 and 1942. I had a personal interest in various references contained in that volume because a number of the witnesses who appeared in favor of the bill cited the case of Gov. William E. Russell, of Massachusetts, who succeeded in obtaining the abolition of the Massachusetts State poll tax as a requirement for voting after a very vigorous campaign back in 1901.

I said I had a personal interest in that statement because I have a very vivid personal memory of it and personal contact with it. As a very young man, I was appointed private secretary to the Governor of Massachusetts by Gov. William E. Russell. He was the first Democratic Governor we had had in Massachusetts for about 25 years and before my appointment I had, in the previous years, taken some part in Governor Russell's campaign for the abolition of the poll tax as a requirement for voting. His campaign in that respect was successful and the Legislature of Massachusetts abolished it. At that time certainly there was no intimation that the United States Congress had power to abolish it or that any request would be made to Congress to perform an act which at that time was supposed to be a futile act as not within the power of the Congress.

I make that preliminary statement so as to clear the minds of the members of the committee that my argument on the constitutionality has anything to do with my views as to the merits or nonmerits of a poll tax.

Before I go into any questions of detail, I should like to clear away a few of what I might call the debris which has rather clogged and interfered with the real questions at issue which I find in previous hearings. There has been a great deal of talk and argument, so far as I can make out, from the witnesses about the question whether the right to vote for Congress is or is not a Federal right secured by the Constitution. Well,

I didn't suppose there was the slightest doubt that it was a right secured by the Constitution. The proponents of this bill have devoted much time to what they call the Classic case 2 years ago to support that proposition. Why, the Supreme Court has held that for 40, 50 years, that the right to vote for Congressmen was a Federal right secured by the Constitution but the question here is: The right of whom to vote for Congressman? That is the issue here, not whether the right exists; of course it exists. The Constitution created the office of Congressman, a Member of the House. It prescribed when they should be elected. It prescribed who should elect them. So it must be a Federal right secured by the Constitution; but the question is, not whether it is a Federal right, but to whom is the right given?

There is another phrase which has been very loosely used all through the hearings in 1941 and 1942. I find in briefs and all through the hearings references to "Federal suffrage," and to the "rights of national citizenship." I was surprised to find a brief, signed by the dean of the Law School of Nebraska, I think, and concurred in by a group of law professors from Yale, Columbia, and Wisconsin, in which they referred constantly to the "rights of the citizens to vote." Then in their brief they speak later of the "right of Congress to prohibit the States from unduly restricting the rights of national citizenship." Later on they speak of the imposition by the State of proper qualifications for voting "which do not abridge the rights of national citizenship" and they refer later to "protecting the rights of national citizenship." (See testimony in 1941 and 1942, pp. 35–52.)

Now, that, of course, is an entire misapprehension. There is no right of national citizenship to vote. There were many citizens of the United States who could not vote in the past and who cannot vote today. A woman was a citizen of the United States. She possessed national citizenship—but she could not vote until 1920; and this idea that "national citizenship" confers a right to vote for Congress is, of course, entirely erroneous. The right to vote for Members of Congress is given only to such United States citizens as possess the qualifications for voting in the States for the most numerous branch of the legislature. That is the portion of United States citizens—that is the class of United States citizens—who can vote; but there is no right to vote vested in citizens of the United States in general; so that the issue is clogged and beclouded by using such expressions here as are used in this brief of these law professors.

With those preliminary very fundamental remarks about this right to vote for Members of Congress, I now want to take up a phase which is equally fundamental. I am not going to go into the details of the Federal Convention of 1787, what they said and what they did not say. I am not going to go into the details of discussions of recent cases in the Supreme Court. Those have been discussed at great length and, I feel, at unnecessary length in the testimony of some of the previous witnesses.

But I am going to take up now the question in detail of what this section 2 of article I of the Constitution does and does not do. First, at the risk of going perhaps further than is necessary with gentlemen of your distinction and legal knowledge, I am going to impress upon you once again, what article X of the Bill of Rights provides, the tenth amendment. We must not lose sight of that for an instant, in trying to ascertain what the section of the Constitution now involved really means. Article X says:

"The powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

Now, what does this article X actually do? What is its function and what is its content?

In arriving at this method of disposing of the question of the right to vote in the Federal Convention of 1787, there was a threefold contest. The contest was between those members who wished a uniform qualification for electors (freehold property or otherwise) to be prescribed in the Constitution itself; there was another group of delegates who wished the power to prescribe to be vested in Congress, and there was still a third group who wished the Constitution to prescribe qualifications—not uniform qualifications but qualifications such as the respective States prescribed for their own people.

It was the last group who prevailed, and after 2 days of active debate, they left the Constitution in this respect as it now stands in (and I must trespass upon your patience by even reading again) this much-read section—section 2 of article I:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

You notice that that is not a grant of power specifically to the Congress of the United States. In fact, it is not a grant of power to anyone. It is a requirement of the Constitution for the formation of the new Government. The first part of it is a requirement that the people of the several States shall choose Members of the House of Representatives every second year. That was no relinquishment or delegation of power from the States. That was a constituent part of the formation of the new Government and was a command to the States to elect their Members of Congress every second year. That was a command. It was neither a delegation of power nor was it a prohibition. It was a command and is so referred to in the recent cases in the Supreme Court.

The second thing that section 2 did was: It vested a right in the electors in each State who have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature—a right in those persons in the State and those only who were entitled to vote for Members of Congress. That was not a delegation of power by the State because the State never had the power to vote, the State inhabitants never had that power to vote for Members of Congress because there were no such things. That was a direct provision in the establishment of the new Government and it did vest a right, but it vested a right in only certain people to vote for Members of Congress.

Now, the third thing that that section 2 contains is this: It contains undoubtedly an implied prohibition on the States against fixing for electors of the Members of Congress any different requirements for suffrage from those which they fixed for the electors of their own most numerous branch of their legislature, i. e., any qualifications which were not those requisite to render an inhabitant of their own State eligible to vote.

Let me repeat that. There is undoubtedly an implied prohibition that the States cannot establish qualifications for the electors of members of their own legislature which shall be different from those which they establish for electors of Members of Congress. That is neither a delegation nor a grant of power; that is an implied restriction, undoubtedly.

Now, is there in that section 2 any grant of power whatever? Not specifically, of course. I suppose there is, under the necessary and proper clause of section 8 of article I, an implied power to Congress to do certain things, but what is the extent of those implied powers? It is to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper "for carrying into execution" the above provisions of article I, section 2.

What are the provisions? I go back again. First, Congress undoubtedly has power to legislate so as to see to it that the States do elect Members of Congress every second year. Congress undoubtedly has the power to protect the right which the Constitution vested in such persons in the States as had the qualifications requisite to vote for members of the State legislature. Congress undoubtedly has that power, and thinks Congress has, under the necessary and proper clause, power to legislate so as to see that the States make the same provisions for qualifications of electors of Members of Congress as they do for electors of their own legislature.

Those are the only three things that can be done under article I, section 2, and those are the only three things on which Congress can act under the necessary and proper clause, and "carry into execution" under that clause.

Senator CONNALLY. Would it interrupt you if I asked you a question right there?

Mr. WARREN. No.

Senator CONNALLY. Is it your view or contention that in article I, section 2, where it says they shall elect Congressmen and the electors shall possess the same qualifications as the electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature, is that a constitutional fixation by the Federal Government of the absolute requirements to participate in the congressional election?

Mr. WARREN. I will say so—for those who are qualified.

Senator CONNALLY. That is what I mean. In other words, is it or not a fixation by the Federal Government of the qualifications of a man who wants to vote for Congressman and does it not become a Federal requirement that he must possess these qualifications before he can vote?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir; it is a Federal right.

Senator HATCH. The point he just brought out was what I was going to ask: Whether he meant the Constitution in this section does actually prescribe and fix the qualifications of voters.

Mr. WARREN. I haven't any doubt it does.

Senator HATCH. And that qualification is, of course, the same qualification that applies to the State legislature?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator HATCH. Following up that point, if that be true and the Constitution has actually fixed the qualifications, then any law that would either add to or take from the qualifications of the Constitution would violate that section of the Constitution?

Mr. WARREN. Not necessarily the qualifications as they existed in 1787.

Senator HATCH. The qualifications fixed by the Constitution, you say, are the same qualifications that the State fixes for its own representatives?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator HATCH. Now, if the State has a law, a poll-tax law, we will say, as a requirement for voting for State representatives and Congress would attempt to abrogate that, would it not, in effect, change that section of article I?

Mr. WARREN. I do not think so. I think that section refers to any qualifications that the States might fix for their own members of the legislature. No one would claim——

Senator HATCH. I don't believe you get my point.

Mr. WARREN (continuing). No one would claim, of course, that the qualifications were fixed as of the date 1787.

Senator CONNALLY. He did not mean that. I think you misunderstood him, if I may interpret it. If the Federal Government lays down the qualifications which require the same qualifications to vote for the State legislature, then any Federal legislation that would modify that would be in violation of that clause of the Constitution?

Senator HATCH. Yes.

Senator CONNALLY. That was his point. I think he was in entire agreement with you.

Mr. WARREN. Let me change one word, Senator. You say "If the Federal Government lays down."

Senator CONNALLY. When I said "the Government" I meant the "Federal Constitution."

Senator DANAHER. I would like to ask you a question if I may, sir. A moment or two ago you said, sir, that Congress may exercise the power of seeing to it that the State conducted an election every second year for Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. WARREN. I said I thought that probably was within their powers under the necessary and proper clause; yes.

Senator DANAHER. Have you given any thought as to how Congress would cause the State to call such an election?

Mr. WARREN. No; that is beyond the present question, as to how Congress could act. I said it probably had the power to see that that portion of the section was carried into execution. How is another matter. That is not within the purview of the present bill.

Senator DANAHER. One other point. It seems to me in the light of one of your comments on the power that should be exercised that article I of section 2 does not say a State shall hold an election, it uses the word "chosen."

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator DANAHER. And it may make a very real difference in the manner of choice.

Senator CONNALLY. But when it says "electors," that is the implication.

Mr. WARREN. It is the implication, I should say, but I will not go into that because that is a little beyond the purview of my argument, and I was trying, at present, to establish what I consider the limits of the necessity and proper clause as applied to this section.

Senator MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have one question which I hope will be a brief question.

Judge Warren, do you attach any significance to the fact that in section 2 of article I the Constitution uses this language: "chosen every second year by the people." It seems to me that they could have used in place of the word "people," "chosen every second year by the legislators of the several States and the electors in each State shall have certain qualifications."

To me, the fact that the Constitution uses the word "people" is significant, and I just wondered if you wanted to comment on that at all.

Mr. WARREN. I suppose that they were synonymous. If a person is chosen by the people, he is the person who is elected by the people. I suppose that the choice by the people meant the choice by electors.

Senator MURDOCK. I don't mean to make any distinction between "choosing" and "electing" but it seems to me that the use of the word "people" there means something and that when we find a condition as we find it today in some States at least, where half of the people are disfranchised, that it probably would be a violation.

Mr. WARREN. I will take that up a little later in discussing what happened in connection with the fourteenth amendment. That argument, of course, was made by a few selected Senators—only one as I recall—who claimed that universal suffrage was prescribed by the Constitution. Of course, the matter did not get very much further than a similar argument on that subject in connection with the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments—but I will take that up, later, I hope.

Now, going a little further, section 2, of course, contains no power specifically, of Congress to prescribe to the States who they shall qualify to vote for the members of their State legislatures and you have got to find such a power implied if anywhere under the necessary and proper clause. Let us see what the right of the State to prescribe the qualifications, the requirements for voting for its own legislature were when this section was under discussion and when it was adopted by the Convention and when it was adopted by the States.

Before 1787, the States had absolutely full and unlimited power to lay down any requirements which the people of the States, through the constitutions or legislatures of the States in their absolute discretion and judgment, desired in order to qualify anyone of their inhabitants to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature.

There was no limitation whatsoever. The State had the power, either in its constitution or in its legislature, as the case might be, to say to whom it desired to grant the vote for members of the legislature or from whom it desired to withhold the right, and when the people of the State had spoken in their constitution as to who should have the right to vote for members of the legislature, of course that was the last word.

You cannot get behind the people; and when the Convention of 1787 met, the people of nine States had spoken in their own States and fixed by their own constitutions the qualifications of those who should vote for members of their own legislature.

How could the Federal Convention get behind that action of the people of the States through their own constitutions? They did not attempt to meddle with the constitutions of the States in any explicit powers given in article I, section 2, and I can see no implied power under the necessary and proper clause which gave to the Congress the right to say to the people of the State who had already before devised and established their own constitutions, to say to the people of a State, "You shall not have the right to grant or to deny the right to vote for your own legislatures." Imagine that proposition put up to the members of the Federal Convention, that they were embodying in section 2, a denial to a State of its right through its own State constitution to establish the requirement of a State voter to vote for a member of a State legislature.

Why, it seems to me inconceivable, when you think of the jealousies of the States at that time and the extreme difficulty with which they were relinquishing any powers—and here they were not relinquishing specifically the power to qualify electors for the members of their own legislature. It is inconceivable that you can find an implied power under the necessary and proper clause to do that thing, to interfere with the sovereign right of the people to establish in their own constitution the right to vote for members of their own legislature.

In addition to that, of course, among the members of the convention, if any such proposition as that had been advanced it certainly cannot be found in any of the debates whatsoever as they were recorded by James Madison or King or Yates or Lansing or any of them. And how unlikely it was that it would be advanced.

The members of that convention had before them the actual restrictions which their State constitutions had put on the right of their State inhabitants to vote for members of the most numerous branch of their legislature. They had before their eyes the fact that New Hampshire, in 1784, had a requirement for the payment of a poll tax. They had before them that in Massachusetts, in 1780, its constitution required the possession of a freehold. They had the constitution of 1777 of New York, which required that a man should be either a freeholder or a taxpayer of New York or Albany. They had the constitution of New Jersey of 1776, which required that a man should possess an estate of £50. They had the constitution of Pennsylvania of 1776, that a voter for the legislature should be a taxpayer. They had the constitution of Maryland, which required that a voter for the State legislature should be a freeholder of 50 acres or the possessor of £50. They had the constitution of North Carolina of 1776, that he should be a freeholder or a taxpayer, and so on. They had South Carolina and Georgia, which had similar requirements for voting in their State constitutions. The full provisions for voting in the States may be found in convenient tabular form in the appendix to my testimony. It is reproduced from the very valuable book, The Constitutional History of the American People, 1776–1850, by Francis Newton Thorpe (Harper Bros., New York, vol. I, pp. 93–971).

In addition to that, they had the fact that acting under these constitutions, several of the States had also statutes prescribing certain qualifications which were allowed by the legislatures. They had all that before them, and yet it is asked now, "Why didn't they describe what they meant by 'qualifications'? Why wasn't there some debate on the use of that term?"

Answer is, of course, that every delegate from every State knew what his State constitution meant by "qualifications" or what his State legislature meant by "qualifications" and they certainly were not giving power to this new Government to define what their own State constitutions meant or to define what the State legislatures meant.

That was a matter for the State exclusively. No legislature can define the meaning of a word in its constitution, no one can define except the people of the State or the State judiciary, as to everything in connection with the construction and interpretation of section 2. There is an absolute absence of any right granted to Congress to decide or define what a State by its constitution or legislature could demand of one of its inhabitants in order to qualify him to vote for a State legislature.

The absence of anything of that kind shows clearly to my mind that the members of the Federal Convention never had any idea that they were giving any power to Congress to interfere with a State constitution or the State legislature.

Senator MURDOCK. May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murdock.

Senator MURDOCK. If I have followed the judge's argument, it is this: That if Congress were in a position to say that a qualification fixed by a State statute or by the constitution of a State is unconstitutional, it would be exercising judicial power in the interpretation of a State law or a State constitution, and that the Congress has no such judicial power. Have I followed you correctly?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir.

Senator MURDOCK. I might say that that same suggestion was made a few days ago after the previous hearing by Senator MCFARLAND, of Arizona. That was the first time that I had heard it made until you made it this morning.

Mr. WARREN. Yes; I am going to come to that a little later, but I am glad to answer that question now. At this point, perhaps, I will just throw in a suggestion analogous to that.

Not only is it not within the power of Congress to interpret the legal meaning of that clause, but it must also be true, if one thinks of it a little more carefully than some statements that I have seen in the record would indicate—it must also be absolutely true that if you cannot interpret a clause of the Constitution through the exercise of congressional power, you certainly cannot insert something into the section. I notice—and this is said with all due deference, because I suppose we are all entitled to differ, even with the Senators of the United States—I notice that Senator PEPPER in his argument says that "qualifications" means "reasonable qualifications." Of course, if Congress can insert the word "reasonable," it can insert the words "except poll-tax requirements" or any other words that it desires. The idea that Congress has the power not only to define the meaning of a word in the Constitution but to insert some other words that do not exist there—to my mind, if that is the congres-

sional power, I see no limit to the exercise of it; none whatever.

Senator OVERTON. May I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator OVERTON.

Senator OVERTON. You made it very clear that section 2 of article I declares that the qualifications of the electors for the House of Representatives shall be the same qualifications as for electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature. If the two go hand in hand, you cannot have a set of qualifications for electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures and another set of qualifications for electors of the House of Representatives, so if Congress should enact a bill that would prohibit the prepayment of a poll tax as a qualification to vote, it would go further than merely to prescribe the qualifications of electors of the House of Representatives, it would be prohibiting the State from prescribing the qualifications for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Isn't that true?

Mr. WARREN. Unquestionably; and if it passed you would have to have at every polling booth two separate registers of electors.

Senator OVERTON. No; they would not. I beg your pardon, but you do not grasp my point. If the Congress of the United States can constitutionally prescribe any qualifications or can prohibit any qualifications for the House of Representatives, then the State must also make the same requirement with reference to the qualifications of electors for their legislature.

Mr. WARREN. I don't think Congress has the power to require the latter.

Senator OVERTON. I agree with you.

Mr. WARREN. And, therefore, I don't think it has the power to prescribe the former. I think unquestionably the two go hand in hand. If it has the power to do the former, it may have the power to do the latter. I don't suppose anybody in his wildest dreams would suppose that it had the power to restrict the States in prescribing qualifications for their own voters for their own legislatures.

Senator OVERTON. Just to repeat my thought again. I am reading from the Constitution:

"The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite to electors for the most numerous branch of the legislature"—so if Congress does declare that the prepayment of a poll tax shall not be a requirement then it prohibits the State from fixing the prepayment of a poll tax as a qualification for electors of their own State legislature.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator HATCH. Judge Warren, while you are on the discussion of Senator PEPPER, I am sure you are going to come to this, but it is a question I do want your answer to.

I do not think that the main contention of those who favor the legislation is that it must be a reasonable qualification, but rather, as I understand it, the contention is that the State cannot, under the guise of fixing a qualification, fix something which is not either in law or in fact a qualification and if it does, then the Congress is charged with a duty of enacting legislation prohibiting the fixing of whatever it might be which is not actually a qualification.

Mr. WARREN. Well, that is giving the Congress the power to define the word "qualification," which is purely a judicial function and power. To define a word, any word, in the Constitution of the United States is purely for the court. Congress can no more define a word than it can insert a word.

That is my contention, but Senator PEPPER contended in the hearings in 1941 and 1942 that, "in prescribing the qualifications of a voter, they must be reasonable qualifications, subject to the rules of reasonableness." (See testimony, pp. 23, 24, 25.) Of course, that is simply inserting a word into this section 2 of article I of the Constitution and if the Congress has power to insert one word it has power to insert others.

Senator CONNALLY. On that point, may I ask you one question, I don't want to interfere. If Congress should have the power to say what a reasonable qualification was, would it not amount to turning over to the Federal Government the whole question of qualifications?

Mr. WARREN. Of course.

Senator CONNALLY. And instead of leaving it to the State, as we think the Constitution did, if you grant Congress had supervision and can oversee what the State does, then you are turning over to the Federal Government the absolute control of suffrage.

Mr. WARREN. In other words, it is defining what a State in its own State or in its own constitution can do in qualifying its voters for its own legislature.

Senator CONNALLY. Absolutely.

Mr. WARREN. I now want to go into a historical discussion because it is a very valuable illumination on this question. So far as I have been able to ascertain, from 1788 down to 1865, there is no statement of any court, in any law book, in any legislative debate, or by any statesman that Congress had any such power to regulate suffrage in the States. Take the most extreme Federalist writer, for I suppose the man who made the largest claims for extension of Federal power was Mr. Justice Storey.

Mr. Justice Storey, in his Commentaries, written in 1833, describes this section—and discusses it very slightly because he says that there was no question that the States retained the full power over their own suffrage and, therefore, over the suffrage of their electors for Members of Congress. Storey's Commentaries (1933) states (vol. I, sec. 820), after treating at length in a number of sections, the subject of congressional power under article I, section 4, to regulate the "times, places, and manner" of holding elections for Senators and Representatives—

"There is no pretense to say that the power in the National Government can be used so as to exclude any State from its share in the representation in Congress. Nor can it be said with correctness that Congress can, in any way, alter the right or qualification of voters."

That was the situation down to the year 1865.

Then arose that very heated condition growing out of the situation at the end of the war and if there was ever a time in our whole history, and especially in our whole legislative history, if there was ever a time that a claim should have been made that the United States Congress had any power to regulate the question of suffrage in the States, that claim would have been made during the debates over the civil-rights bill of 1866 and the debates on the fourteenth amendment in 1866. I want to read to you, at the risk of trespassing a little on your patience and your time, the very emphatic statements made by the Senators at that time, not only the Senators of the North and East but the Senators of the West—of course, there were no Senators from the South. With the exception of one Senator, there was not a single Senator on the floor of the Senate who claimed or contended for 1 minute that the States did not have the full control of the suffrage.

The only exception to that statement was Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, and even he admitted that the State of Massachusetts had complete power to regulate suffrage with one exception; he did not think they had the power to deny suffrage to the Negro, but, with that exception—and how he worked out that exception is rather a mystery except that Senator Sumner used to insert the Negro into every bill that came along—but with that exception there was not a Senator who denied the full power of the State to regulate suffrage.

Let me recall to you who were the authors of that fourteenth amendment. When I said every Senator, North, West, and East, I meant to include every Senator, Republican and Democratic. Who were the authors of that fourteenth amendment?

First, it was constructed by a joint committee of 15 of the Senate and House, the Senate chairman of which was William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, later President Lincoln's Secretary of the Treasury. The senior Member and the man who took Senator Fessenden's place on the floor of the Senate when Fessendon was later ill was Jacob M. Howard, of Michigan, and then followed John Harris, of New York; James W. Grimes, of Iowa; Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland; and George H. Williams, of Oregon.

And the members of that joint committee on the House side were Roscoe Conkling, of New York; George M. Boutwell, of Massachusetts; Henry T. Blow, of Missouri; John A. Bingham, of Ohio, the author of the first section of the amendment; Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont; E. B. Washburne, of Illinois; and two others—I forget where they came from. I think Grider, of Kentucky, was one of the lone two Democrats on the committee of the House. That was a very distinguished committee, who gave a great deal of thought to this amendment and, therefore, their views at this excited period when, if ever, the most extreme claims of Federal power would have been made, should give you some pause in considering this question.

This amendment was considered twice. The first two sections were considered separately and then as separate resolutions for separate amendments, and then they were later joined together and made articles of one amendment, the fourteenth amendment, as it now appears.

When what is now the first section of the fourteenth amendment was reported to the House, it was drafted by John A. Bingham, a Republican Member of the House from Ohio and in answering it on May 10, Mr. Bingham made these statements (this is on p. 2542 in the Congressional Globe if anyone wants to look it up.) Mr. Bingham said:

"This amendment takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it. The amendment does not give, as the section shows, the power to Congress of regulating suffrage in the several States."

And in the second section—that was the section, you remember, that reduced the representation of the States in case they denied to any person the right of suffrage—Bingham said:

"The second section excludes the conclusion that by the first section suffrage is subjected to congressional law."

In the Senate this first section was discussed by Senator Howard, who was heading the committee in the absence of Senator Fessenden—and he states (May 23, p. 3165, et seq.):

"The first section of the proposed amendment does not give to either of these classes the privilege of voting. The right of suffrage is not, in law, one of the privileges or immunities thus secured by the Constitution. It is merely the creature of law. It has always been regarded in this country as a result of positive local law."

As to section 2 (on p. 2766), Howard said:

"This section does not recognize the authority of the United States over the question of suffrage in the several States at all. Nor does it recognize, much less secure, the right of suffrage to the colored race. It leaves the right to regulate the elective franchise still with the States and does not meddle with that right."

In closing the debate, June 8, and just before the joint resolution was passed upon by the Senate, Senator Howard said (p. 3039):

"We know very well that the States retain the power which they have always possessed of regulating the right of suffrage. It is the theory of the Constitution. That right has

never been taken from them; no endeavor has ever been made to take it from them; and the theory of this whole amendment is to leave the power of regulating the suffrage with the people or legislatures of the States, and not to assume to regulate it by any clause of the Constitution of the United States."

Senator DANAHER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Danaher.

Senator DANAHER. Judge Warren, at the time that article I, section 2, was adopted as part of the Constitution, there was also a provision which read:

"Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to their respective numbers which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons including those bound to service for a term of years and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons."

Obviously, that recognizes a distinction between what were known then as free persons and others?

Mr. WARREN. I did not catch that.

Senator DANAHER. Obviously recognizing a distinction between those who were then known as free persons and all others.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator DANAHER. That section was repealed by section 2 of article XIV.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Senator DANAHER. And amendment XIV says:

"Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed, but when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State or the members of the legislature thereof is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such a State being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States or in any way abridged except for participation in rebellion and other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in proportion that the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of such male citizens 21 years of age in such State."

Do you doubt the power of Congress to enforce that section by appropriate legislation?

Mr. WARREN. It says, in effect, that if the State chose to deny the right to vote to any section of its inhabitants, it should have its representation to that extent lessened.

In fact, that was the whole basis on which that section 2 was finally adopted, that they recognized the right of the State to deny any person the right to vote but they said, "If you deny any such persons the right to vote, then that number of your electors and your representation shall, to that extent and in exactly that same proportion, be reduced."

Senator DANAHER. Do you not agree, sir, that by the fourteenth amendment, section 2, we specified qualifications as a basis upon which abridgment of apportionment could be predicated?

Mr. WARREN. No; I do not see that section 2 states anything about qualifications.

Senator DANAHER. It says they must be 21 years of age. Is that not a qualification?

Mr. WARREN. It says:

"Denied to any person being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States."

Senator DANAHER. Are those not qualifications, Judge Warren?

Mr. WARREN. No.

Senator DANAHER. What are they?

Mr. WARREN. A woman is a citizen of the United States; a minor is a citizen of the United States; a pauper is a citizen of the United States. There are plenty of citizens of the United States who have not the right to vote in a State, under the State constitutions. It has nothing to do with the question of being a citizen of the United States.

Senator DANAHER. Would we have the power, in your judgment, to deny representation—let us take, for example, the State of Texas—by reducing the number of Representatives in the House of Representatives on the basis that the right to vote is abridged as against citizens who are 21 years of age?

Mr. WARREN. Yes. Certainly you have got it specifically granted to you, the right to reduce representation. That is specifically granted by section 2 of the fourteenth amendment.

Senator DANAHER. So that if we were to amend this bill to say that if there be, in any State, a requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite for the privilege of voting and the right of any citizen being 21 years of age is thus abridged, all numbers of such persons so denied the right to vote shall be excluded from the basis of apportionment of representatives allotted to that State?

Mr. WARREN. Unquestionably.

Senator DANAHER. It may be a good answer to this whole bill.

Mr. WARREN. Unquestionably. I am not discussing what Congress could do under some other power than that in section 2 of article I of the original Constitution. I hope you will not confine any illustration to the State of Texas because I notice that the Senator from the State of Texas is temporarily absent from the room.

Senator MURDOCK. This argument and the same discussion as the colloquy between Senator Danaher and yourself happened before the Judiciary Committee of the House when I was a member of that. The argument was made there that the second section of amendment 14 really contemplated that the States may abridge the right of certain people to vote but that if such abridgment or denial did take place that Congress had a remedy by reducing the number of Representatives.

Mr. WARREN. And that was the only remedy at that time until the fifteenth amendment was passed. The fifteenth amendment was passed in order to get away from doing that thing and it was made a part of the Constitution that the Negro should not be excluded from voting.

Senator MURDOCK. You take the position, as I understand you, that under amendment 14, section 2, the exclusive remedy of Congress to meet such an abridgment by a State is the reduction of Representatives?

Mr. WARREN. And it is so stated. I was just going to read that.

Senator MURDOCK. Of course, the people who sponsor this anti-poll-tax law take the position that that is not the only remedy, that it is not exclusive.

Mr. WARREN. I would like now to pursue the statements made by the Senators who constructed the amendment because they are certainly very powerful. I think that the last quotation was from Senator HOWARD who reported the amendment to the Senate.

(I think that Senator Danaher may be interested in this.) When they first took up the second section of the fourteenth amendment, Senator Fessenden, who was then recovered from a slight illness and was, as I say, the chairman of this joint committee, made this statement. He was controverting at the time, I think, Senator Sumner. On February 7, 1866, he said (p. 704):

"The power exists now at the present time in all these States to make just such class or caste distinctions as they please"—

Senator Sumner was claiming it was a class distinction to exclude the Negro:

"The power exists now at the present time in all these States to make just such class or caste distinctions as they please. The Constitution does not limit them. The Constitution, in terms, gives us no power. It leaves to the States, as everybody knows, the perfect authority to regulate this matter of suffrage to suit themselves."

Later in his speech he describes what the second section means in requiring the reduction and he said (p. 705):

"It says to all the people of the United States you shall be represented in Congress, but, as we fear you may be governed by narrow views, as we fear you will do injustice to a portion of the people under your charge * * * we say to you that you shall not have political power any further than you show by your actions that you are disposed to let your charges participate in it."

Senator Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland, a very distinguished—one of the most distinguished lawyers at the Supreme Court bar—and who was the lone Senate Democrat on this joint committee of 15 in the Senate, speaking of the fact that at that time this question of suffrage of the Negro was not a southern question entirely because of the fact that of the States of the North and the East at that time there were only six who admitted the Negro to the right of suffrage for members of their own legislature. In other words, that the free Negro was not admitted to the right of suffrage in any of the States of the North and East except six, and Senator Johnson said, in pursuing that line of thought as to the complete power of the States at that time over the whole subject (p. 765):

"I suppose that even the honorable Member from Massachusetts [Senator Sumner], will not deny that it was for Massachusetts to regulate her suffrage before 1789, and if it was, she has the power still unless she has agreed to part with it by devolving it upon the General Government. Is there a word in the Constitution that intimates such a purpose? Who at that time, in 1787, denied that the State was clothed with the power of prescribing the qualifications for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? * * * The State and nobody else."

He then cited Federalist, No. 54:

"The right of choosing the allotted number in each State is to be exercised by such part of the inhabitants as the State itself may designate. Words could not have been adopted more obviously leading to the conclusion that in the opinion of the writers of the Federalist, the States were to have the sole right of regulating the suffrage."

Then, further down, he says:

"There is nothing innate in the right of suffrage. It depends wholly upon governmental regulation."

There was one other Democratic Senator not on the joint committee, but of considerable distinction, and I am citing these to show you that there was no difference of opinion between such prominent Republican Senators as Howard and Fessenden and the Democratic Senators, Reverdy Johnson and Senator Hendricks, of Indiana. Senator Hendricks said (p. 880):

"I ask the Senators the question: Have the States, under the Constitution, the right to control the elective franchise? Does any Senator question that? The Senator from Masachusetts does. He thinks that Congress may control the right of suffrage in the State, but it has not been a question of dispute whether the State had control of elective franchise. It is absolute and perfect."

Then Senator Sumner got up and he denied the right of a State to deny the Negro suffrage, but he went on to say that the State had entire control over the right of suffrage and could deny it by reason of condition of age, residence, character, education, property, and the payment of taxes, but he claimed it could not be applicable to color. So you see, even Senator Sumner would have denied the right of Congress to pass the present bill.

Coming along in the debate, we find Senator Wilson, who was the colleague of Senator Sumner from Massachusetts, said (p. 1255):

"The men who framed the Constitution made those State constitutions * * * they well knew what the qualifications were. Every State constitution provides for electors, prescribes the qualification for suffrage. The laws of the States provided for qualifications of electors. Every State, from the adoption of the State constitution to this hour, has claimed the authority and exercised it to settle the questions pertaining to suffrage. They never supposed that the Federal Government had the power to change it. They never gave that power and they never intended to give that power."

That is the statement of Senator Wilson, afterwards Vice President of the United States.

Then in closing the early debate on that section, Senator Fessenden, who was chairman of the joint committee that drafted it, made this statement (p. 1278):

"If I understand the Constitution at all, it has always been considered that the clause which I have read"—

That is, the second section of article I of the Constitution—

"acknowledged the right of the States to regulate the question of suffrage. I do not think it has ever been disputed. * * * The States have a perfect right today and they may exercise it as they see fit to make such rules as suit them with regard to the qualifications of electors."

I won't weary you by any further citations.

When the fourteenth amendment was adopted, you will recall that it was claimed by some Republicans, I think by George H. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, who later became Secretary of the Treasury, that the first section denying to the States the power to abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States—although the contrary had been stated time and time again during the debate on this amendment—it was claimed that that privilege-and-immunity clause of the citizens of the United States denied to the State the power to restrict the right of suffrage, and when, in 1868, the fifteenth amendment was under consideration, Mr. Boutwell and some others thought it was not necessary to pass the fifteenth amendment in order to give the Negro the right to vote because they said it could be done by a simple act of Congress under the privilege-and-immunity clause, that is, by an act of Congress enforcing the privilege-and-immunity clause. That attempt was soon dropped. That bill was debated in the House but it was soon dropped, and the fifteenth amendment was adopted in order to establish the power by the Constitution.

The fifteenth amendment was passed, I think, in 1869. The idea that the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States denied in some way the right of the States to control suffrage, that idea prevailed for a number of years until, in 1875, there came along the Slaughterhouse cases; and in those cases there was laid down, you remember, for the first time the distinction between the rights of a citizen and a State and the rights of a citizen of the United States, as such, that is, the rights which grew out of some peculiar relation of an inhabitant of a State to the United States Government.

Then, you remember, very shortly after the Slaughterhouse cases, there came the case which, in fact, applied the general proposition that there was a distinction between the right of a citizen of a State and the right of a citizen of the United States per se, to the specific right of a woman to vote. That was the case of *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wallace 162). On March 29, 1875, in that case the extent of the distinction between the rights of a citizen of the United States and the rights of a citizen of a State with regard to voting was laid down and explained, and Chief Justice Waite said that the "fact that the right of voting could not grow out of citizenship alone was clear when you considered who was a citizen of the United States; everybody born here was a citizen of the United States and, therefore, if voting depended on citizenship, every child, every woman, every pauper, every criminal, every person born here would have the right to vote."

And he concluded:

"Certainly if the courts can consider any question settled, this is one. For nearly 90 years the people have acted upon the idea that the Constitution, when it conferred citizenship, did not necessarily confer the right of suffrage."

And, using those same words here in the year 1943, I should suppose that if any question had been settled in 134 years it was this question that the States alone possessed the right of control of suffrage.

Senator MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, may I ask this question?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murdock.

Senator MURDOCK. Are you familiar with Public Law 712 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, which was approved September 16, 1942, with reference to soldiers voting?

Mr. WARREN. Yes. I know there was such a law.

Senator MURDOCK. Section 2 reads as follows:

"No person in military service at time of war shall be required, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay a poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof."

I assume from your statement here that you would take the position that that section is unconstitutional?

Mr. WARREN. Personally, I should not have had any doubt about it, except for the fact that the war power has received such immense extensions in recent years. Hence, I should not now be at all certain as to how far it extended in that direction. Except for the war power, everything that I have said on the present bill so far would certainly apply. I would have made precisely the same argument if I had appeared before this committee in connection with that bill in 1942, except that I would have frankly stated that I do not know in that respect how far the war power extends. I have about come to the conclusion that all my previous views regarding the extent of power of this Government in time of war must be canceled, and that, at the present moment, I do not know what there is which the Government cannot do if the war makes it necessary.

Now, I take up another branch of my argument. I dislike always, in arguing before a court, for I think it is a very disagreeable thing for the court and I am sure it is for you gentlemen, to cite passages from cases; and yet, tracing this idea that Congress had no power to control the right of suffrage in the State down through the years and decades, I must show how far this statement comes down in decisions by the Supreme Court. I will only cite a few cases to show that it comes down all through the line.

The first case under the legislation that grew out of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments was not decided by the Supreme Court until 1876. You remember there was a series of statutes purporting to enforce the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. A large portion of those statutes were declared unconstitutional because of the effort of Congress to apply them directly to acts of individuals instead of to acts of States, but there was the Enforcement Act of May 31, 1870; there was, of course, the Ku Klux Act of April 20, 1870; and there was the Federal Election Act of June 10, 1872, and there was the Civil Rights Act of March 1, 1875; and they all came before the Supreme Court sooner or later. Under them, many cases involving constitutional rights of citizens arose.

The first case was that of *The United States* v. *Reese* ((1876), 92 U. S. 214), decided in 1876. It involved the fifteenth amendment and the enforcement of it against persons who alleged the States to be discriminating in elections against them. The sections of the statute which were sought to be applied were held invalid because they were not appropriate legislation under the fifteenth amendment, but in the course of that case and decision, Chief Justice Waite said that—

"Before the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, it was possible for a State to exclude a man from voting because of his race, color, or otherwise."

He said:

"Before its adoption, this could be done. It was then as much within the power of the State to exclude citizens of the United States from voting on account of race and so forth as it was on account of age, property, or education."

Then came the *Minor* v. *Happersett* decision, which held that a State might exclude women from voting. Then passing down a long list of cases, there is, of course, the statement in the *Ex parte Yarbrough* case in 1884 (110 U. S. 56), a case, I think, that was cited 10 or a dozen times in the recent Classic case in which Judge Miller said:

"The States, in prescribing the qualification of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualifications for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. Judge Warren, if you desire, in the interest of conserving time, you can incorporate that in the record here as part of the record.

Mr. WARREN. I have only a few other citations. The decision in *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58), in 1900, answers the question, I think, that Senator Murdock asked. In discussing the right to vote for Members of Congress, Judge Gray said:

"They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress."

I call attention to a statement made in *Pope* v. *Williams* (193 U. S. 621), in 1904, which has some bearing upon one of the contentions made here by the proponents of the present bill. Justice Peckham says:

"A State, so for as the Federal Constitution is concerned, might provide by its own constitution and laws that no one but native-born citizens shall be permitted to vote, as the Federal Constitution does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone, and the conditions under which that right is to be exercised are matters for the States alone to prescribe, subject to the conditions of the Federal Constitution."

And I want to call to your attention the following words:

"The question whether the conditions prescribed by the State might be regarded by others as reasonable or unreasonable is not a Federal one. * * * The right of a State to legislate upon the subject of the elective franchise as to it may seem good, subject, we believe, to the conditions already stated being as unassailable, we think it plain that the statute in question violates this right."

We come down as late as 1915 to a decision in *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347). That was the Oklahoma Constitution case which arose under the fifteenth amendment; and in it Chief Justice White stated:

"It is true also that the amendment"—that is, the fifteenth amendment—"does not change, modify, or deprive the States of their full power as to suffrage, except, of course, as to the subject with which the amendment deals"—that is the subject of the Negro.

I want to call your attention particularly to a passage in Chief Justice White's decision, in which he points out what was the contention of the Government of the United States at that time, made through its Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. John W. Davis.

"The United States says that State power to provide for suffrage is not disputed although, of course, the authority of the fifteenth amendment and the limit on their power that is insisted on—hence no assertion denying the right of a State to exert judgment and discretion in fixing the qualification of suffrage is advanced."

That is, the Government, through the Attorney General at that time, did not even pretend or contend that the judgment and discretion of the United States in fixing the qualification for suffrage existed.

I am not going to discuss the Classic case. It has been discussed, I think, in testimony rather ad nauseam. I had rather supposed—and before this question came up, I read that case a number of times—I had not supposed that the case and its decision had anything whatsoever to do with the question of the right of the State to control suffrage. It was simply concerned with whether a primary election was an election within the meaning of the term "manner" of regulating an election as used in this fourth section of article I of the Constitution. I searched in vain, I searched in vain to find a single word in that decision that has anything whatsoever to do with the question of the right of suffrage. But you gentlemen are quite as capable, and probably more capable than I am, of knowing what that decision decides. I simply say that, so far as I can see, it decides nothing whatsoever pertinent to this question I am now arguing; and I had not supposed that, except for the fact it held that a primary election might be included within the term "election" as used in the Constitution, except for that decision, I had not supposed there was a single proposition or dictum or expression in that case that differed in the slightest from what had been held in case after case for 50 years before it.

I have finished what I had to say.

Senator CONNALLY. I agree with you that the fourteenth amendment does not give any power such as asserted in this bill but there are those that do. There are those who assert that the Constitution gives some power to Congress. But I want to call your attention to the fact in 1917, I believe it was, that in the seventeenth amendment for the popular vote for Senators, they reenacted, so far as the qualifications of Senators are concerned, the same clause as contained in section 2 of article I that—

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State elected by the people thereof for 6 years and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

I wanted to ask you whether or not there were any powers in the fourteenth amendment—if it would not, as far as Senators at least are concerned, be repealed by the subsequent insertion in the Constitution of the seventeenth amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Well, I should not have any doubt about that. I should say that when a word had been used in the original Constitution and at least silently construed—that is, no one ever claimed that the qualifications could not be decided by the States—I should say that a word in the seventeenth amendment meant precisely what it meant in the original Constitution. Whether it had the effect of repealing anything in the fourteenth amendment, I do not know. But I have frankly never given any consideration to that, believing so certainly and conclusively and impressively in the statements made by the Senators about the effect of the fourteenth amendment, so I cannot see that there is anything relating to the State rights over suffrage to repeal.

Senator CONNALLY. What I meant was this: That since the seventeenth amendment is specific that it deals with a single thing—the qualification of electors for Senators—and the fourteenth amendment having general terms and things of that kind, with the seventeenth amendment being subsequent to the fourteenth amendment, if there was anything in the fourteenth amendment, it would certainly have to yield to the seventeenth amendment, and even granting the proponents' views, you would have to have two boxes—you would have to have one for Congress and one for Senator and one for State officers, would you not?

Mr. WARREN. I should suppose so, but I do not think it is necessary on the basis of my argument.

Senator CONNALLY. Thank you.

Mr. WARREN. Just one minute. I suppose you are going to adjourn very shortly. I had not intended to cover this whole subject, of course, and I understand one of the great contentions of the proponents of this bill is that even if section 2 of article I gives no power, section 4, which authorizes Congress to adopt regulations as to time, place, and manner, gives the power to regulate the suffrage.

Of course, there is not a single decision of the United States courts from one end to the other that even intimates that manner of conducting an election includes the qualification of electors. But pass that by. If it does, what was the use of section 2? If the Constitution assumed to fix the qualifications of electors by section 2, why should it then pass section 4 and give Congress the right to change everything which it had already fixed in section 2? In other words, it is impossible that the two sections include the same subject matter, because by section 4, if it be true that "manner" includes fixing qualifications, then Congress has full power to do anything about qualifications and Congress has full power to override section 2. Is it conceivable that, having prescribed the qualifications for voting for Members of Congress in the Constitution itself by section 2, the Federal Convention then proceeded, only a day or two later, to adopt section 4, which, on the present theory, empowered Congress to alter or do away with any or all of the qualifications which the Convention had already established by the Constitution itself in section 2? It cannot be that the Convention was adopting two sections, one of which absolutely nullified the other. That is all I have got to say on that subject. If that argument can be overcome, and the fact that no decision of the Supreme Court has ever intimated that manner included regulation of suffrage, if those two arguments can be overcome, I cannot make them any clearer or more forcible and I am not going to take them up.

I have confined my argument purely to the meaning and construction and interpretation of section 2 of article I and, as I say, I cannot find in the legislative debates, in the courts, or in the writings of any lawyer, any attempt to assert that the States did not absolutely control the right of suffrage, until the question has arisen within the last few years and been encouraged by what some people think they find in the Classic case. If I am able to understand the English language, I cannot find there what they think they find; but I am not going into that because you gentlemen are fully competent to decide what you think the Classic case decides.

I wish to thank you gentlemen for your patience.

Senator CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to request the authority of the committee that the stenographer furnish Judge Warren a copy, at the earliest practical moment, of his remarks here and that he be accorded the privilege of inserting in full any matter that he has or embellishing what he has said to make it a full and complete statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered, Senator AUSTIN.

Senator AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to listen to Mr. Charles Warren on this subject. It has been a very illuminating discussion.

There is one point which, if he cares to talk on, I would like to hear his views on, and that is the use or definition of "qualifications" in the brief and in many arguments that have appeared in support of this proposal. The assertion appears that the requirement of the payment of a poll tax is not a qualification and that it is only a prerequisite or condition and that, therefore, this proposal does not offend the Constitution. Do you care to comment on that subject?

Mr. WARREN. When we go back before the Constitution, a qualification to vote meant whatever the State constitution or the State legislature required of a man in order to make him eligible to vote. Therefore, the qualifications which the Constitution speaks of, must mean what it meant in the States and what it meant in the States before 1787, i. e., such conditions, prerequisites or the existence of such other facts or conditions as the States thought it necessary to require before granting to an inhabitant the right to vote. I cannot see how it could possibly mean anything other than that. They were not originating a language. They were adopting the requirements with which they were perfectly familiar, which included the requirement of paying a poll tax; the requirement of possessing so much wealth or so much money and so forth. It was a question for the States exclusively to decide, what they should require of a man before they should render him qualified to vote.

I cannot see it in any other way than that, because if that is not so, then you must find a power of Congress to define a word in the Constitution, and I look in vain for any such power. That is purely a judicial question. Congress has, as I said at the opening, no more power to define a word in the Constitution than it has to insert a word in the Constitution, in fact, to define a word would, in many cases, be to insert it. Just as I said, Senator PEPPER wanted to prescribe reasonable qualifications, which is certainly an insertion.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MCFARLAND.

Senator MCFARLAND. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator CONNALLY?

Senator CONNALLY. I merely want to express my own appreciation, and I am sure all the other members of the committee are grateful to you for this very illuminating and unselfish argument you have made on this subject.

Mr. WARREN. I hope I have cast a few rays of light.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murdock?

Senator MURDOCK. I have asked probably too many questions now. I do want to say I have thoroughly enjoyed the discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator REVERCOMB?

Senator REVERCOMB. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Danaher?

Senator DANAHER. I think you might inadvertently have been led into error in reply to Senator CONNALLY'S question. Surely you do not mean that the seventeenth amendment repealed the fourteenth amendment?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly not.

Senator CONNALLY. I did not make that qualification. It was as to suffrage only that the seventeenth amendment referred to.

Mr. WARREN. My answer was that I did not agree that the fourteenth amendment had anything to do with suffrage at all, so I did not think the seventeenth would repeal it;

but if the fourteenth amendment did have anything to do with State rights over suffrage, then I should say the Senator was correct in thinking that the seventeenth amendment might have repealed it. I would not make that too definite, because in a constitutional amendment I am rather inclined to think that if you are going to repeal some previous constitutional amendment you had better make it specific.

Senator DANAHER. One other question. Surely it is a fact that apportionment is still based upon the fourteenth amendment, section 2?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly. Apportionment of Representatives, you mean?

Senator DANAHER. Yes; and we have a census every 10 years for the purpose of counting the number of persons within the State upon which apportionment shall be predicated.

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Senator DANAHER. And when we passed the fourteenth amendment we certainly repealed explicitly that portion of article I of the original Constitution which had prescribed a distinction between free persons and all others who were to be counted for apportionment purposes?

Mr. WARREN. Precisely. It is precisely the same subject—just as was the repeal of the prohibition amendment. You probably could not have repealed that amendment by implication merely.

Senator DANAHER. I have enjoyed your discussion very much and I have appreciated your contribution so greatly I would like to ask your opinion on a hypothetical point.

Mr. WARREN. My opinion on hypothetical points is usually not very valuable.

Senator DANAHER. It is at least as valuable as the expert witness and I would like to have you comment, if you will, on this assumption:

Assume there were before us a bill which read as follows:

"Whenever any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision, or any person, whether or not acting under color of authority of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof, shall abridge in any way, the right of any citizen, being 21 years of age, to vote in any primary or election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof"—those words following exactly article XIV, section 2—"the number of Representatives from any such State wherein such abridgment exists, shall be reduced in the ratio that the number of such citizens whose right so to vote shall be abridged bears to the whole number of persons in any such State."

Mr. WARREN. I think I have explained to you what I believed section 2 of the fourteenth amendment permitted Congress to do. As to any particular bill, I must answer what I have several times answered to a similar question before the Supreme Court when they have asked me: Would you say that this law applies to such-and-such and such-and-such? I have invariably had to answer that I have enough difficulty in arguing this one case and I certainly will argue the other cases when I come to them.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Judge Warren.

Mr. STEWART. I shall now read certain excerpts from Mr. Warren's testimony. He stated:

I was very much interested to read the printed hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate covering hearings in 1941 and 1942. I had a personal interest in various references contained in that volume because a number of the witnesses who appeared in favor of the bill cited the case of Gov. William E. Russell, of Massachusetts, who succeeded in obtaining the abolition of the Massachusetts State poll tax as a requirement for voting after a very vigorous campaign back in 1901.

I said I had a personal interest in that statement because I have a very vivid personal memory of it and personal contact with it. As a very young man, I was appointed private secretary to the Governor of Massachusetts by Gov. William E. Russell. He was the first Democratic Governor we had had in Massachusetts for about 25 years and before my appointment I had, in the previous years, taken some part in Governor Russell's campaign for the abolition of the poll tax as a requirement for voting. His campaign in that respect was successful and the Legislature of Massachusetts abolished it. At that time certainly there was no intimation that the United States Congress had power to abolish it or that any request would be made to Congress to perform an act which at that time was supposed to be a futile act as not within the power of the Congress.

I make that preliminary statement so as to clear the minds of the members of the committee that my argument on the constitutionality has anything to do with my views as to the merits or nonmerits of a poll tax.

Before I go into any questions of detail, I should like to clear away a few of what I might call the debris which has rather clogged and interfered with the real questions at issue which I find in previous hearings. There has been a great deal of talk and argument, so far as I can make out, from the witnesses about the question whether the right to vote for Congress is or is not a Federal right secured by the Constitution. Well, I didn't suppose there was the slightest doubt that it was a right secured by the Constitution. The proponents of this bill have devoted much time to what they call the Classic case 2 years ago to support that proposition. Why, the Supreme Court has held that for 40, 50 years, that the right to vote for Congressmen was a Federal right secured by the Constitution but the question here is: The right of whom to vote for Congressman? That is the issue here, not whether the right exists; of course it exists. The Constitution created the office of Congressman, a Member of the House. It prescribed when they should be elected. It prescribed who should elect them. So it must be a Federal right secured by the Constitution; but the question is, not whether it is a Federal right, but to whom is the right given?

There is another phrase which has been very loosely used all through the hearings in 1941 and 1942. I find in briefs and all through the hearings references to "Federal suffrage," and to the "rights of national citizenship." I was surprised to find a brief, signed by the dean of the Law School of Nebraska, I think, and concurred in by a group of law professors from Yale, Columbia, and Wisconsin, in which they referred constantly to the "rights of the citizens to vote." Then in their brief they speak later of the "right of Congress to prohibit the States from unduly restricting the rights of national citizenship." Later on they speak of the imposition by the State of proper qualifications for voting "which do not abridge the rights of national citizenship" and they refer later to "protecting the rights of national citizenship." (See testimony in 1941 and 1942, pp. 35–52.)

Now, that, of course, is an entire misapprehension. There is no right of national citizenship to vote. There were many citizens of the United States who could not vote in the past and who cannot vote today. A woman was a citizen of the United States. She possessed national citizenship—but she could not vote until 1920; and this idea that "national citizenship" confers a right to vote for Congress is, of course, entirely erroneous. The right to vote for Members of Congress is given only to such United States citizens as possess the qualifications for voting in the States for the most numerous branch of the legislature. That is the portion of United States citizens—that is the class of United States citizens—who can vote; but there is no right to vote vested in citizens of the United States in general; so that the issue is clogged and beclouded by using such expressions here as are used in this brief of these law professors.

With those preliminary very fundamental remarks about this right to vote for Members of Congress, I now want to take up a phase which is equally fundamental. I am not going to go into the details of the Federal Convention of 1787, what they said and what they did not say. I am not going to go into the details of discussions of recent cases in the Supreme Court. Those have been discussed at great length and, I feel, at unnecessary length in the testimony of some of the previous witnesses.

But I am going to take up now the question in detail of what this section 2 of article I of the Constitution does and does not do. First, at the risk of going perhaps further than is necessary with gentlemen of your distinction and legal knowledge, I am going to impress upon you once again, what article X of the Bill of Rights provides—the tenth amendment. We must not lose sight of that for an instant, in trying to ascertain what the section of the Constitution now involved really means. Article X says:

"The powers not delegated to the United States nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

Now, what does this article X actually do? What is its function and what is its content?

In arriving at this method of disposing of the question of the right to vote in the Federal Convention of 1787, there was a threefold contest. The contest was between those members who wished a uniform qualification for electors (freehold property or otherwise) to be prescribed in the Constitution itself; there was another group of delegates who wished the power to prescribe to be vested in Congress, and there was still a third group who wished the Constitution to prescribe qualifications—not uniform qualifications but qualifications such as the respective States prescribed for their own people.

The statement continues. I wish to point out particularly one or two things in the statement which I think are of particular interest and potency in connection with this debate. Mr. Warren's entire testimony before the committee was on the subject of the poll tax. I have already obtained permission to have his entire statement printed in the RECORD. However, I wish to read a few excerpts from it. He quotes from Mr. Story in his Commentaries in volume 1, page 820. Mr. Warren stated:

Story's Commentaries (1933) states (vol. I, sec. 820), after treating at length in a number of sections, the subject of congressional power under article I, section 4, to regulate the "times, places, and manner" of holding elections for Senators and Representatives:

"There is no pretense to say that the power in the National Government can be used so as to exclude any State from its share in the representation in Congress. Nor can it be said with correctness that Congress can, in any way, alter the right or qualification of voters."

In the statement made by Mr. Warren, which I have just read, he criticizes the brief signed by the dean of the Nebraska Law School and the professors from Yale, Columbia, and Wisconsin, in which they continually refer to the right of citizens to vote. He points out particularly that there is no right of a national citizenship

to vote, and that there were many citizens of the United States who at one time could not vote.

I invite attention to a paragraph at the bottom of page 107 of the book entitled "To Secure These Rights," published in the nature of a report by the President's Civil Rights Committee, in which it is said:

> The extent of Federal power to protect the suffrage varies, depending on the type of election (State or National), the type of interference (whether it affects the voting procedure or is based on race or sex), and the source of interference (State and local officers or private persons). Among the specific sources of Federal power are: Article 1, section 4, which permits Federal protection of the procedure for voting in Federal elections against interference from any source; the fourteenth amendment, which supports protection against State interference with equality of opportunity to vote in any election; the fifteenth amendment, which supports action against State interference because of race or color with the right to vote in any election; and the nineteenth amendment, which supports action against State interference based on sex with the right to vote in any election.

Mr. President, in connection with that statement, in which a position contrary to that taken by the dean of the law school of the University of Nebraska is taken, I wish to point out that Mr. Warren's testimony explodes entirely the idea that there is a right of national citizenship to vote. His testimony continues in the pamphlet.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to point out that Mr. Warren's testimony is of peculiar importance in that he is, as I said at the outset, one of the outstanding constitutional lawyers of the day. I think his testimony completely explodes the idea that the Congress has any right at all to interfere with the question of suffrage in any State. I emphasize again the provision of the Constitution that the election of the Members of the National House of Representatives—and later, by the seventeenth amendment, the same thing is said as to the election of Senators—shall be by those who are qualified in each State to vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. That is the determinative point in this matter, and the determination of those who are qualified to vote in each State for the most numerous branch of the State legislature must be made by the State itself. The passage of any law here, undertaking to define who can vote for Members of the Congress and, by such definition, undertaking to make up a group of persons who cannot comply with the requirement of the Constitution that those who are qualified to vote for Federal officers are those who are qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of the State legislature, would be in direct violation of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I think I have completed my statement. I have not taken the 30 minutes for which I have asked.

I now yield the floor.

MIDYEAR ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the midyear economic report of the President, transmitted to the Congress on July 30, 1948, with an accompanying letter of transmittal, which was read, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1948.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith a midyear economic report to the Congress. This is supplementary to the Economic Report of the President of January 14, 1948, and is transmitted in accordance with section 3 (b) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, The Economic Situation at Midyear 1948, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I had the privilege of reading this midyear economic report of the President last night.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a point of order; namely, that the clerk did not read the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Heretofore it has been the custom of the Senate to read only the letter of transmittal of reports required by statute to be submitted to the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was under the impression that the report was submitted to the Congress in accordance with law, and that it would require unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the view of the Chair that the law requires only the transmission of the report; and it is clearly the practice of the Senate to read only the letter of transmittal, and to refer the report to the appropriate committee having jurisdiction, which in this case is the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

That is the ruling of the Chair in connection with the matter. Of course, any Senator can appeal from the Chair's ruling.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I dislike to appeal from the ruling of the Chair. The Chair is always uniformly fair; but I was under the very distinct impression that the rule requires the reading of the report in its entirety.

However, the Senator from Ohio has the floor, and I do not make a motion in this connection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I had the privilege of reading this report last night, and I think all Members of the Senate will find it very interesting.

In reading the report, it is very difficult to see in the general economic situation any emergency which would justify the calling of a special session of Congress at this time.

In particular, I should like to call attention to the manner in which the report deals with the subject of housing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does not the Senator from Ohio think it desirable to have the report read? If the Senator will yield to me, I shall move to have it read.

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think it necessary to have it read. As a matter of fact, the report is not very long. It is on the desk of each Senator; but rather intensive attention is required in order to understand it, so I would much prefer to read it myself, rather than to have it read out loud to the Senate, which does not listen very attentively to the reading of such matters.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Ohio has announced that he had the special privilege of looking at this report last night and studying it. It has been laid on our desks only in the last few minutes. I dare say that none of the rest of us have had the special privilege which seems to have been accorded the Senator from Ohio. I certainly have not seen it. There are 115 pages of the report. Certainly we cannot digest it in a few moments, so as to be able to comment very intelligently on the remarks of the Senator from Ohio about it.

Mr. TAFT. However, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to one particular portion of the report, so that when Senators read the report, they will pay special attention to that portion.

I may say that the report was transmitted to me by Mr. Nourse himself. I received it on my desk yesterday from Mr. Nourse, and therefore I was able to read it last night when I went home.

Mr. BARKLEY. I congratulate the Senator from Ohio on having that special privilege, not accorded other Senators.

Mr. TAFT. I imagine that it was transmitted to me because I am chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, which was in close touch with the President's advisers, and which is required as a duty to pass upon the report and criticize it and submit a report on it to the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, buttressed by the remarks of the distinguished minority leader, again I ask the Senator from Ohio to yield, in order that a motion may be made to have the report read.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I see no particular value in having the report read. I should like to read some sections of it, so that when Senators read it, as I hope all Senators will, they will notice the bearing of this report on the one matter of housing and its consideration at the special session of Congress.

Mr. President, what I wish to call attention to is that on page 3 of his own

report, the President says this as to housing:

Residential construction is expected to increase the total supply of dwelling units by more than a million during 1948—

That statement appears at the bottom of page 3.

I read further:

This high output—

I may say it is the highest output in the history of the United States—

has been accompanied by an increase in costs that is outrunning consumers' ability to pay for the housing they need.

In other words if the output is further increased this year by any emergency legislation it undoubtedly will increase building costs further. That is further borne out by the report of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, on page 14 where they say:

Residential construction: About 450,000 new residential units in new buildings were started during the half year. Counting also conversions and alterations, more than a million units will probably be added to the residential supply during 1948.

This volume of residential construction is already straining the capacities of the construction industry in many areas and of producers of some construction materials, and is unquestionably competing with other primary national needs. (See appendix C, table 13.) This situation highlights what has become the chronic necessity of developing and applying new methods and substitute materials to the house-building industry.

I shall not read the remainder of it, which discusses other questions, and which suggests the need for further low-rent housing, in which I thoroughly believe. I believe very strongly that the House should have passed the Senate housing bill, but I do not think that construction can possibly start this year, nor under the facts stated by the advisers, should it start this year, because it would only add to the very serious inflation which is already existing. So that, merely as a question of whether it should be considered now or considered at the ensuing regular session, it seems perfectly obvious to me that the long-term program calling for the entrance of the Federal Government into the question of subsidizing low-rent housing presents substantial differences of opinion and should await the regular session, and that seems to me to be fully borne out by the report of the President himself, and it entirely removes the housing question from the emergency status.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senator would continue to read the statement on housing at the top of page 15, he would see that the report states as follows:

During the past year, the average price of new houses has risen about 20 percent, while average family income after taxes was only about 8 percent higher during the first half of 1948 than during the same period in 1947.

Does not the Senator think that that statement indicates the necessity for some legislation to curtail and curb the further rise in building costs, so that the average individual might be able to purchase a home? If the costs continue to rise, will they not rise out of sight and no houses will be purchased?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think the general question of prices is, if you please, Mr. President, an emergency matter. Our committees are thoroughly examining the matter. The Banking and Currency Committees of the House and Senate are examining the whole question of inflation, and I hope this Congress may take action on that matter. But, so far as the housing end is concerned, direct housing stimulation and the building of additional houses this year is in direct conflict, according to the President himself, with the whole problem of trying to check inflation. I was merely calling it to the attention of the Senate in order to show that the housing measure, as an emergency measure, seems to me to be clearly removed from the picture, and I think this session should devote itself so far as we can to the general question of inflation rather than to the question of trying to build a great many more houses this year, when already, according to the President himself, the present housing construction is the highest in history and is seriously increasing the cost of building materials and houses, and bringing about further inflation in that field.

Mr. MYERS. I understood the Senator in his opening remarks to say as he looked at this report, that the report itself indicated it was difficult to see any emergency which would necessitate the calling of a special session. I think the Senator began his remarks with those words.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. That passes over to the general question of inflation and of what can be done about inflation.

Mr. MYERS. Is the Senator in accord with the view that there was no necessity of calling a special session?

Mr. TAFT. That is my own opinion, yes, because in my judgment, the President has full power today to check inflation if he wishes to check it. We are perfectly willing to examine his proposals. We are perfectly willing to see if there are any more powers that might be granted to the President, but inasmuch as he is not using the powers he has, it is very difficult to hope that he would use any further powers.

Mr. MYERS. Would the Senator name the powers which would prevent the increase in the cost of housing by 20 percent?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I should certainly be very glad to do so. But the reason I think the President is not using the powers which are already in his hands is shown very clearly by his own approach to the problem. He does not want to stop inflation. Let me read what the President said at Philadelphia:

Confidence and security have been brought to the people by the Democratic Party. Farm income has increased from less than two and a half billion dollars in 1932 to more than $18,000,000,000 in 1947. Never in the world were the farmers of any republic or any kingdom or any other country as prosperous as the farmers of the United States; and if they don't do their duty by the Democratic Party, they are the most ungrateful people in the world.

That certainly is a very gracious appeal to the farmers of the Nation. He goes on:

Wages and salaries in this country have increased from twenty-nine billion in 1933 to more than $128,000,000,000 in 1947. That's labor, and labor never had but one friend in politics, and that is the Democratic Party and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

And I say to labor what I have said to the farmers: They are the most ungrateful people in the world if they pass the Democratic Party by this year.

That is another very gracious appeal to the electorate of this country for the return of favors apparently given by the party. But that is not my point. My point is this: The President is boasting of high farm prices, he is boasting of high wages, and then he turns round and says, "But of course the Republican Party is to blame for the high prices." How can he possibly take credit for high farm prices, Mr. President, without accepting on the other side the corresponding responsibility for high consumer prices? How can the Democratic Party be responsible for increased farm income and high wages, unless they also take responsibility for the high prices which inevitably must result from high farm prices and high wages?

The President in other words wants credit for those. He is not using his power to check inflation because he knows that if he did so farm prices would go down. He could not appeal to the farmer to show gratitude to the Democratic Party. He knows that wages would not go up. He knows very likely that to some extent there would be unemployment and, consequently, he does not want to stop inflation. He has power to stop inflation. What is the cause of inflation, anyway?

Mr. MYERS. I again ask the Senator to name those powers. What powers does the President have with which to stop inflation?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am not yielding. The Senator, in the first place, has to ask me to yield. I have not yielded to him. I object to a constant interruption without such a request.

Mr. MYERS. Very well. I shall return to the subject in my own time, if the Senator decline to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have not declined to yield. The Senator has not asked me to yield.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Five or ten minutes ago, I asked the Senator from Ohio to designate the specific powers which the President has, which if exercised would bring down the cost of living. I again ask him what specific power the President has with which to reduce and stabilize the cost of meats and the cost of foods. Rather than making political speeches, I think we should determine to address ourselves to the inflation which is upon us, forgetting past recriminations, forgetting who was responsible in 1946 or 1947. Inflation is here, the people expect us to do something about it now; and what are we in the Congress of the United States, in the month of July 1948 going to do about it? What are those specific and definite powers which the President

has which would stabilize the price of foods, particularly?

Mr. TAFT. One of the first powers which the administration has concerns the limitation of bank credit. Bank credit has increased during the past year six or seven billion dollars. That means, of course, that a bank, when it makes a loan, creates that much more money which goes into the market to bid up the price of goods. The causes of inflation do not lie in particular situations; they lie in the general increase of the purchasing power of the American people through all sorts of measures. They lie, of course, in exports. They lie in the increasing Government expenditures. They lie in the burden of Government taxes and in the increase of bank credit. The Federal Reserve Board has not even got the reserves up to the 26 percent which it is authorized by law to do. There is no question that by raising the rediscount rate and refusing to buy all the Government bonds, if the Government wants to sell them, it can very quickly check all bank lending. In fact, experts say that that must be done very delicately, and that if the power is used too violently it will start prices downward much more than is desired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What specific power has the President of the United States to prevent a bank from loaning money to a prospective borrower? He cannot order the Federal Reserve Board to give instructions to banks not to make loans. We all know that the making of loans is an inflationary element of our economy. But the Senator from Ohio has said the President can stop all that. I ask him, in good faith, to tell the Senate and the country what power the President of the United States has to prevent a bank in this country from making a loan to a borrower who applies.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the President has no such power. Is the Senator trying to avoid responsibility for the Federal Reserve Board?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not trying to avoid responsibility for anything. The Senator from Ohio started by saying that the President could do all these things.

Mr. TAFT. The President, without any question, can influence the general policy of the Federal Reserve Board. He has appointed every member of the Board. The particular bill which the Senator introduced asks us to give the Federal Reserve Board increased power to require the banks to increase their reserves.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it the attitude of the Senator from Ohio that the President of the United States could go beyond his powers, which are established by law, to lobby with the Federal Reserve Board to determine what it should do in individual cases?

Mr. TAFT. I think the President, in an emergency, can say to the Federal Reserve Board, "It is necessary to prevent inflation." Why can he not say that, as well as making political speeches to Congress? He would be more able to influence the Board by sound argument than by asking for powers which he knows no sensible Congress would ever grant to him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Supposing the Senator is correct. It is an ill wind that blows no good, because it offers the Senator from Ohio an opportunity also to make a political speech.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Kentucky was asking the question. He is apparently trying to dissociate the administration from any responsibility for what the Federal Reserve Board does or does not do.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am trying to get the Senator to be specific about the powers of the President of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. I included his natural influence and power with the Federal Reserve Board, a board which, after all, can raise the rediscount rate by refusing to buy all the Government bonds and can limit bank reserves. That is a power which we have already given. That is the over-all key power to control inflation and deflation in the United States, and it has been so used for many years. It was used in the 1920's. The Federal Reserve Board has been criticized for using it this way or that way when people thought it should have done something else and that it brought about deflation when it should not have done so. In the 1920's the Board at one point encouraged inflation when it should have been discouraging it. But that is a power which is already available to control inflation in the United States. That is No. 1.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Ohio just a moment ago to say that the President should exercise whatever influence he may have with the Federal Reserve Board and with the Treasury Department to abandon the Government's policy of purchasing Government bonds and supporting the price of Government bonds?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is an open question. He has power to do it. We have not required him to maintain Government bonds at par. He has the power with which to do it. Would that bring about undesirable results? That is the problem which our committee, as the Senator knows, has been studying, and as to which we have come to no conclusion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator to say that he thought the President had power to enforce sound anti-inflationary policies, and one of the powers which he mentioned was the power to abandon Government bonds in the market and let them go down in value. Does the Senator from Ohio recommend that policy?

Mr. TAFT. I would rather have that done than to place price controls on the American people; yes. I do not think it is necessary. I think that raising the rediscount rate, probably on short-term bonds, would be sufficient. As to a choice between that and the reimposition of price controls, I should prefer Government bonds to go below par.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I correct in drawing the conclusion now that the Senator from Ohio did not mean what he said a moment ago when he declared that the Federal Reserve Board could and should abandon the purchase of Government bonds?

Mr. TAFT. I did not say that, and I decline to yield further to the Senator, so long as he has misrepresented what I said.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appeal to the RECORD.

Mr. TAFT. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has declined to yield.

Mr. TAFT. The President has power to limit further the granting of extreme housing credit. We ourselves somewhat limited it last year. We refused to reenact title VI. It is pointed out by Mr. Eccles and in this report that some of the causes of inflation are the programs which have been in operation, and which are excellent programs in themselves. The difficulty is that we have been trying to operate so many different programs on such a tremendous scale that we have gone beyond the capacity even of the United States to meet the demand created by those programs. We have a program of shipment abroad, which is one of the main features of the pressure on our economy, as clearly indicated in the economic report. The report points out very clearly that while undoubtedly the general Marshall plan is highly desirable—

> The unfilled demands of the American market, with its enormous purchasing power, would sustain our prosperity for the present even if foreign markets were sharply reduced. We are deliberately subjecting ourselves to inflationary pressures on the domestic economy in the short run, in order to contribute to international security and economic stabilization in the long run.

No one wants to stop the housing program. We have many Government public-works expenditures. High prices are a result of the Government programs which have been particularly stimulated by the Government, and the hang-over from the war, resulting in building up the public debt and increasing by several billion dollars the currency of the United States which is still coming into the market.

I do not say that any one of those programs should be abandoned, but if we want to stop them it must be done gradually. With reference to some programs, we have granted money and the President has no power to stop its expenditure. But there are many other cases in which he could cut off 10 percent here and 10 percent there and indirectly reduce the pressure on the American economy. Incidentally, that is what his own economic advisers told him a while ago, apparently, before the session was called. The Wall Street Journal reports that the President's experts made a report to him, and I quote from the Wall Street Journal of July 17:

> Specifically, the President's experts were ready to tell him these are the best weapons:

Careful spending: The experts think there is water that can be eliminated in the Federal budget, especially in the military sections.

I think there are many other Federal programs where the President can deliberately hold back even the amount appropriated, which was somewhat less than what he asked. Certainly that should be so if we knew there was an emergency because of which we would have to change all our ideas.

I read further from the Wall Street Journal:

Careful timing in Government spending: This means buying when commodities are relatively plentiful, delaying purchases when tight shortages develop. It also means using substitutes wherever possible. The experts hold that many shortages today are spot shortages. They can snowball if the Government buys heavily at the wrong time.

Industry-labor cooperation: The Government should try to work with industry and labor to stop the price-wage spiral. The experts have no solutions for this now. They think education on economic facts of life is what's needed.

Housing runs about $7,000,000,000, the increase in bank loans runs from about five to seven billion dollars a year, the foreign-aid program amounts to about $7,000,000,000 a year. The export surplus this year, apart from foreign aid, will run about $8,000,000,000. Last year it was $11,000,000,000. Of course, that means that foreigners are buying $8,000,000,000 worth of our goods without putting a single pound of food or anything else into the market to meet that amount of purchases. In other words, the demand is increased by $8,000,000,000, with no increase in the supply. Of course that is an inflationary element. We gave the President full power to limit exports. All the exports, which run about $15,000,000,000, are not a part of the European aid program. In fact, about half of them go to other parts of the world. Certainly we should ration steel to South America and China before we begin to ration steel to the producers of the United States. There again the President has full power, under the export control powers we gave him, to cut down that tremendous push on the American economy, which tends constantly to drive up prices.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator believe that the export of some steel to South America or China is probably responsible for the $10 a ton increase in the price of steel?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not. To a certain extent the price of steel is an artificially low price. It has gone up very much less than the prices of agricultural commodities, about 45 percent, compared to 150 percent for agricultural products. The demand for steel is still in excess of the supply, and might be even if we cut off exports. So that if we had a completely open market, as in wheat, the price of steel probably would be $50 a ton higher, which would be a very unfortunate thing, I think.

Mr. MYERS. That is a problem which I cannot understand. The Senator has indicated that one power the President has is to restrict some of the exports, yet he admits that if he restricts them it will not decrease the cost of steel.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it would decrease the cost of steel today, because the demand from this country would still probably take up the entire output. However, there would then be many more products made of steel in this country. There would be more agricultural machinery, there would be other products, as to which the pressure for lower prices would very soon be heard.

Mr. MYERS. We have had vastly increased production in the past 18 months, but the more the production, the higher the prices go.

The Senator has mentioned restricting bank credit. The Senator has also mentioned some of the other programs which he himself says we cannot abandon, such as public works, in connection with which we might curtail a little here and there, but he does not advocate the abandonment of any of those programs. He has mentioned the restriction of bank credit. I should like to know what other specific powers the President has the exercise of which might stabilize the cost of living.

Mr. TAFT. I have already listed some half dozen of the powers. He has power to limit the export of steel.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator says that would not affect the cost of steel.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it would affect the cost of steel; I do not think the mere cutting off of the exports of steel probably would do more than merely balance the demand for steel, but the steel which was not exported would be used in the United States, there would be a much greater production of all the products made of steel, and the prices of those products, particularly where there is a completely free competitive market, would tend to go lower.

Mr. MYERS. When the Senator mentions the powers the President has, will he suggest whether or not he recommends the exercise of those powers?

Mr. TAFT. I do. I think the President should try to limit every one of these programs to a reasonable extent. If all the programs were limited by something like 10 percent—and I think most of them can be held back—it would take up a tremendous inflationary pressure in the United States. The matter cannot operate both ways; it is not possible to have high farm prices and not expect to have high consumer prices, or have high wages and not expect to have high prices. The President cannot possibly have it both ways. If we really desire to restrain inflation, we cannot do some of the things we might like to do, and so far as I am concerned, the whole Government program can be cut all along the line. I think we have appropriated too much. We all realize the pressure people brought to bear, but I think the Government budget is too great. I think all the programs should be limited, and I think the President can limit them if he wishes to do so.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator recommend that we curtail the funds we appropriated for the Marshall plan?

Mr. TAFT. I do, indeed; and I think they are being held back. I doubt very much if we will use the whole $7,000,000,000, and if we do not use them that will be an anti-inflationary element, and a very worthy one.

Mr. MYERS. The Congress refused to curtail those funds, and the Congress determined the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. TAFT. No appropriation of money forces the President to spend it. In the past year we appropriated about $39,000,000,000, and the President spent $36,500,000,000. I commend him for that.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator wants the President to take the responsibility for curtailing the funds. Congress should have the courage to do what the Senator recommends.

Mr. TAFT. I think Congress is to blame. I do not say the Congress is not to blame for inflation. Of course it is. I say that the programs we have insisted on, as has everybody else, are bringing about inflation, and we cannot hope to escape the necessary results of our own acts. But the President in every case has the right and power, if we have now reached a state of national emergency requiring the meeting of Congress in the midst of a political campaign, to review the situation in the light of that emergency, and he can make cuts in every one of these expenditures, where he has the legal power to do it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to take a little exception to what was said about the responsibility of the Congress, because the Congress very wisely placed limitations in the law. I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the provision of the Economic Cooperation Act, first, on page 2, where it is said:

Provided, That no assistance to the participating countries herein contemplated shall seriously impair the economic stability of the United States.

Then we went further, on page 12, under the heading "Protection of the domestic economy," and placed there a whole page of provisions as to the functioning of the program, with due regard to the problem:

SEC. 112. (a) The Administrator shall provide for the procurement in the United States of commodities under this title in such a way as to (1) minimize the drain upon the resources of the United States and the impact of such procurement upon the domestic economy, and (2) avoid impairing the fulfillment of vital needs of the people of the United States.

One can go on reading section after section of the act enacted under the wise supervision of the Committee on Foreign Relations relating to the protection of our domestic economy and the responsibility of the President therefor.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator from Maine.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the business pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending business before the Senate is a motion to consider House bill 29.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that the poll-tax bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised that the Senator from Ohio would contribute to the filibuster on the poll-tax issue.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that raises a question which I shall be glad to discuss somewhat. In the first place, I do not understand there is any filibuster against the poll-tax bill. Certainly, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to continue for 2 or 3 days the general debate on measures before Congress before we call the debate a filibuster and before we undertake to use the parliamentary means at our disposal to bring the question to a vote. That has always been true in the Senate. I must say that the speeches which have been made against the bill up to this time have been well prepared and devoted to the subject. I have felt that we should leave this week open for a general discussion of the poll-tax bill and for other matters upon which Senators, after some weeks' absence, desire to speak.

On Monday morning I hope we may be able to secure some kind of an agreement to vote. If not, we will try to use every means at our disposal to bring the poll-tax bill to a vote, certainly not later than Wednesday. I hope very much that by that time the Committees on Banking and Currency will have examined the President's proposals and perhaps other proposals, to determine whether there are any additional powers which ought to be granted by Congress to help him handle the economic situation.

I have pointed out that I think the President already has many of those powers, but there may be others which will appear upon examination. The things I think of mostly deal with the question of bank reserves. One reason why at the last session we did not act on the subject of bank reserves was that the President's advisers could not agree on what they wanted along that line. Mr. Eccles came before us with one plan for a new kind of 25-percent reserve in Government bonds, which was immediately repudiated by Mr. Snyder, and there never was any agreement on the part of Government officials as to what they wanted.

Now if they have reached an agreement—and I understand even today they have probably not reached an agreement—there still seems to be a serious doubt as to whether the provision in the bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] increasing the reserves of member banks without increasing the reserves of nonmember banks is a feasible thing. And if it is not practical to do it in that way, then we have the serious legislative problem whether we have the power to increase the reserves of nonmember banks. So that, even in that respect, we do not know what will happen. But in that field I certainly would be perfectly willing to grant additional power. There may be something in the way of increasing the gold reserves against United States and Federal Reserve deposits. There may be something in the general field of limiting consumer credit.

I may say respecting consumer credit that last year the Senate passed a bill limiting consumer credit. The House did not pass it. The House did not pass it on the ground that Mr. WOLCOTT took the position that the President today can limit consumer credit if he chooses to declare the existence of a national emergency. I think there is probably pretty sound support for his position. The act which was passed expressly reserves his right to act, under the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, to limit consumer credit if he chooses to declare the existence of a national emergency.

Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. MYERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Alabama, but I should like to complete my statement. So there is a field of limiting credit in which the President may act.

I hope we may dispose of the pending measure by noon on Wednesday next. I hope that we may be able possibly to agree on legislation in this general field and on the other matters which the committees by that time may have processed. At least I am hoping that we may be able to adjourn by a week from tomorrow under those circumstances. But that is the general program which we have had in mind and have discussed.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. I asked the Senator to yield so that I might make a brief comment on one point he made; that is, in connection with his statement to the effect that the President could control consumer credit by declaring the existence of a national emergency. It seems to me that is wholly inconsistent with the earlier statement which the Senator made that there was no emergency, and that the report of the President's economic advisers showed that to be true. However, I asked the Senator to yield for the purpose of making this statement with reference to the increase of the reserve requirement. Mr. Snyder testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning. Mr. McCabe and Mr. Eccles testified before that committee yesterday. I can say that they are in complete agreement with reference to the proposed legislation.

Mr. TAFT. If they are, that is good news to me. But there is that serious problem. As I understand, Mr. Snyder this morning expressed serious doubt whether there should be required an increase of reserves in the nonmember banks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That question was brought up by some members of the committee. It was brought up yesterday also, and with other witnesses, because the legislation that has been proposed does not require it for nonmember banks. Some members of the committee have suggested that it ought to be extended to nonmember banks.

Mr. TAFT. Did not Mr. Eccles testify yesterday that, in his opinion, it was absolutely useless to do it at all unless it was extended to nonmember banks?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Some said it should be extended to nonmember banks, but that it was a question for the Congress to decide whether it might be able to get that legislation through in this short session. The witnesses have all said that if the Congress would give them that power they would welcome it, and they would like to have it.

Mr. TAFT. I understand considerable objection has been raised among smaller banks, and considerable doubts have been expressed as to the constitutional power of Congress to increase the reserves of State banks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Eighty percent of the deposits of the country are in the member banks, even though the number of member and nonmember banks is the same.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have been very much interested in the discussion of the Senator from Ohio. I have never been particularly interested in the fixing of blame in this particular matter; I want to know what we can do. I heard the Senator from Ohio say that he had rather let the bonds of the United States fall than to impose price controls on the American people. I desire to ask the Senator if he now thinks the time is ripe when the United States Government should abandon the support of the Government securities?

Mr. TAFT. I would not be prepared to say yes or no at the present time. The matter is still under study. We have had bankers before us testifying that that position should be abandoned. I should think that the weight of opinion in banking circles, however, is that it should not be abandoned. Of course, there is this difficulty in restraining bank credit: If we maintain the open-market policy, if we are willing at all times to buy from the banks Government bonds at par, we practically remove any opportunity of controlling the banks. We can increase their reserves if we want to, but nearly every bank has Government bonds up to fairly close to 50 percent of its assets; and if at any time it can hand those bonds to the Government for cash, it has that cash available to turn around and lend the money. So we have that dilemma facing us. So long as we maintain the Government policy of keeping Government bonds at par and buying, which means buying from the banks, the Government bonds they own at par, it is almost impossible to devise a reasonable plan of restraining bank credit.

I think an increase in reserves would have some effect—and perhaps an increase in rediscount rates. One witness testified that if we were willing to increase the interest rate on short-term bonds, we could still keep the 2½'s at par and simply let the short-term bonds go down, gradually to be replaced by bonds at higher interest rates. We would simply have bonds at higher interest. The problem is a difficult one, but there is no question that the power already existing could be used absolutely

to smash the economy. It goes that far. It is that powerful. If it can go that far, surely by delicate treatment of it we can to a certain extent reduce inflation and move toward a more stabilized economy.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, who I think was first on his feet.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask one question. I think everyone in the country is greatly interested in the question of the high cost of living and inadequate housing. I am wondering whether or not the Senator has any information from Governor Dewey as to where he stands with respect to what the Congress could do on the question of the high cost of living and the question of inadequate housing.

Mr. TAFT. I have no information.

Mr. LUCAS. It is very important that we find out, before we adjourn a week from Saturday, where the Republican candidate for President stands upon such important measures as we are now discussing.

Mr. TAFT. I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, 3 or 4 days ago the Senator from Ohio stated that he had consulted Governor Dewey with respect to the work of the session. Are we to understand that that consultation resulted in no information?

Mr. TAFT. I consulted him with respect to the statement which the Republican leaders issued. I so stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did he approve that statement?

Mr. TAFT. The only statement made by Governor Dewey appeared in the press, that in his opinion Congress should not adjourn last Wednesday, but should give consideration to the President's proposals, as we are doing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Governor agree with the Senator's prognostication that the Congress ought to adjourn a week from Saturday?

Mr. TAFT. I have no information on that subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. When the Senator rose he spoke about the economic report of the President, and read a sentence or two with regard to housing. He seemed to use that as an alibi against any action by this session of Congress on the subject of housing. The Senator knows that he very actively sponsored housing legislation in the last session, and that he was assisted by many other Senators, including myself. We passed what we felt was an adequate housing bill. The bill went to the other body, which is a coordinate branch of the Congress. Does the Senator feel that by a week from tomorrow the House of Representatives will pass the bill which he and I and others worked so strenuously to have enacted, and which the President specifically recommended in his message last Tuesday?

Mr. TAFT. I have urged them to do so; but I think their attitude is exactly what it was before, that they disagree with the bill. I think it is unfortunate that the House did not pass the bill.

There are many things which will come before the next Congress, and that is one which I shall continue to press with all the force at my command. That is not the present question. The present question is whether or not this is an emergency matter for this year. The President's report shows very clearly that it is not.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. We would not want to increase the number of houses constructed this year if we could. We have reached the limit of labor and materials; and pushing the program further would probably result in further increases in prices.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall have something to say on that subject a little later, in my own time.

I presume the Senator is speaking not only in his capacity as a Senator, but as chairman of the policy committee of the majority party in the Senate. I should like to inquire whether the remarks which he has made and the attitude which he assumes represent the attitude of the policy committee, of which he is chairman.

Mr. TAFT. I have not discussed with the committee this emergency question, because the report has just been placed before us. I do not think I can speak for the policy committee on the questions which the Senator asks.

Mr. BARKLEY. So the Senator is now speaking as an individual Senator, and not as chairman of his committee?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator feel that the Congress should adjourn this session, which has been called by the President in the exercise of his constitutional authority, without taking action upon these subjects? The President determined that an extraordinary occasion required an extraordinary session of the Congress. I grant that there may be differences of opinion, based somewhat upon political expediency, as to whether he should have exercised that authority, even though he was convinced that it ought to be exercised. But that is neither here nor there. The President exercised the sound discretion which the Constitution gives to him. Although the call of the President seems not to have met with the approval of the Senator from Ohio and his colleagues, the President exercised the power to call Congress. He has called it, and we are here. Does the Senator believe that if the Congress should adjourn a week from tomorrow it could pass, or will pass, any housing legislation, or any educational legislation? The Senator from Ohio sponsored an educational measure, with respect to which he received our assistance, which measure the President specifically recommended for adoption by the House. Does the Senator believe that by that time the Congress will enact that legislation, or housing legislation, or any substantial amount of legislation dealing with the subjects involved in the economic report referred to by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. Dealing with the general question of what the Congress may do, I might perhaps read first the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky himself, made just before Congress adjourned in June.

Mr. BARKLEY. Those remarks have been quoted in the statement issued by the Republican leaders.

Mr. WILEY. Let us hear them again and again.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am happy to acknowledge the compliment paid me by the Republican Party in using me as an authority. It is probably the most authoritative authority which it has used in regard to the whole subject. I am perfectly willing to have the Senator read my statement; and if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to comment on my own statement and the use made of it by the Republican majority, which seems to have difficulty in finding any reason except by quoting me.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky spoke the truth, and I think the inevitable truth, much as we may regret it. At that time the Senator from Kentucky said:

> I have done what I could to cooperate with the majority in bringing about an adjournment because I think if we sit here until after the convention, or if we sit here between the conventions, or after the two conventions, the entire time of the Congress will be taken up with political bickering and political legislation and political oratory, and I do not want that to be brought about. I want to finish what we can finish and adjourn the Congress, and I have tried my best to cooperate with the leaders on the other side to bring about an adjournment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I am not reading this statement merely to quote the Senator. I am only saying that that is inevitably the fact. So far as I know, no special session of Congress has ever been called in the midst of a political campaign, except, I believe, in one instance, when the President was not a candidate for reelection. Inevitably in such circumstances, it is exceedingly difficult for us to sit down and try to work out a legislative problem as it ought to be worked out. I think we worked out those problems in the last session probably as free from political bickering, and with as much dismissal of the political effect as was possible. I think the tone in the Senate has been very good.

So far as I am concerned, I take an interest in legislation, and try to make the legislation right. We cannot do that when every move is determined by political considerations. That is inevitably so in the midst of a political campaign. Therefore the decision which was made by our committee, which was the decision of the House and Senate leaders, and which was printed in the RECORD, was that we should not take up at this time any long-term program. After all, today there is an infinite variety of subjects with which Congress must deal. The Federal Government has its nose in everything, and we can never get through. If we were to consider the entire program, it would be a good job if we did it in 6 months, because the President raises all sorts of questions, and deals with a great many subjects, many of which require detailed consideration and study.

I think the only reasonable decision to make was that we would examine the President's proposals, and that if we should find that any of them arose out of an existing emergency which could be handled with reasonable dispatch, then we ought to handle them, but that we ought not to stay here through the campaign. Nothing would be gained by prolonging the session.

We have asked various committees to examine the President's proposals, not so much from the standpoint of their merits, but from the standpoint of whether they present emergency problems which ought to be dealt with now, and which cannot possibly wait until the next session of Congress. That is the general conclusion, and that is a conclusion drawn from the conditions which the Senator from Kentucky so aptly and well described in the statement which he made on June 17.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not retract any part of the statement I made on the 17th of June. At that time I was dealing with a session of Congress then in existence. I was dealing with a truthful statement when I said I had cooperated with members of the majority to bring about an adjournment prior to the meeting of the conventions because I felt that if we came back between the conventions, having escaped the Republican Convention, and then being on the verge of the Democratic Convention, if we then met for a week or two we would deal with nothing but politics, and if that session even recessed until after the conventions, with unfinished business, I felt that in view of the two conventions we would engage in a lot of politics. I felt that way about it. But in making that statement I in no way was attempting to foreclose the right of the President under the Constitution to call the Congress back into session if he chose to do so. I was talking about a hang-over session after the two conventions.

There is nothing in the Constitution which says that the President shall not call Congress into session during a political campaign. In my own judgment, I think the President is to be commended if, in spite of the fact that there is a political campaign under way, he felt that a special session was required in order to have action taken on the emergency matters he called to our attention in his message.

All of us know—the Senator from Ohio knows it, as well as the rest of us do—that without this session of Congress, on the record made by the Eightieth Congress in both sessions, certain matters might have been legitimate objects of discussion in the campaign between now and the election. If the President of the United States felt in all sincerity that Congress ought to take those matters out of the realm of political controversy by enacting legislation concerning them, he is to be commended for making that sincere effort rather than to allow things to drift along until they got worse, in order that we might have a campaign issue against the party represented by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. If that is what he thought——

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, I think that is what he thought.

The Senator has accused the President of playing politics in calling this session of Congress. I deny that charge, but if we may admit for the sake of argument that it is true, the Republicans of this Congress can play even smarter politics by carrying out his recommendations and placing the appropriate laws on the statute books.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I wonder whether he was consulted about the calling of the special session, before the day on which the President called it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I talked to the President on several occasions during the recess and between the conventions. I cannot say that I was particularly consulted about it, but I was advised about it before he addressed the Philadelphia convention. Does that answer the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. That answers the Senator. I understand the position of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator from Ohio will be equally frank, not only now but during the remainder of the session, as to what advice he gets from the Governor of New York.

Mr. TAFT. Inasmuch as the Senator from Kentucky is a candidate for Vice President, undoubtedly he will be consulted. Whether I shall be consulted is a matter that I am not prepared to pass on at the present time.

Mr. President, I rose only to outline the general theory of the session. I hope we may well be finished by the end of next week, if the committees do their job in time. If they do not get through that soon, we shall have to stay another week; but certainly I would hope that the 14th of August would be the limit of this session of Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator will yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A moment ago there was some discussion with respect to the power the President has to restrain credit, particularly by the manner in which the bonds of the United States are managed through the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department. I understood the Senator from Ohio to say at that time that he believed the President could act to hold inflation in check if he would persuade the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department to abandon the policy of supporting Government bonds. Did the Senator make that statement?

Mr. TAFT. No. I said that the Federal Reserve Board by raising the rediscount rates, by limiting its Government bond purchases, and by increasing the rate on short-term Governments could undoubtedly check the increase in bank loans, and that would have a substantial effect on inflation. Among those powers is the power to let Government bonds drop below par. Whether I would go that far, I would not say, but certainly it would stop inflation; and I would rather do that, so far as I myself am concerned, instead of imposing another price control, wage control, and rationing system on the American people.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would the Senator prefer to do that, rather than to impose selective control?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. Mr. President, that raises a question which was before us previously. The President says he wants selective controls. What are selective controls? According to the bill which has been introduced, what the President is asking for is unlimited power in his own discretion to impose selective controls. He says, "I will use it selectively." But the bill which has been introduced at his request covers unlimited power to fix prices in all fields of operation and to allocate and to ration any scarce materials whatsoever. That is the President's request.

We told him we might grant selective controls. That is what the Flanders bill did last year. It said, as I recall, "Here is power over grain for distilling, if you find that is necessary and if you send to Congress a message saying that here is a commodity which is in such short supply that there must be some kind of control." Then we said we would consider that and would consider granting specific controls.

But that is not what the President has asked us now. He has asked for unlimited controls.

So far as limited controls are concerned, there may be some fields in which there can be limited control which can be kept limited; but our general experience has been that that cannot be done. It is impossible to limit the price of meat unless one is prepared to limit the price of corn and the price of oats and the price of wheat. It is impossible to limit the price of meat unless one is prepared to go on and limit the price of chickens, because they go right along with meat.

Not only that; it is not only a theory, because in 1946 the President's charge against Congress—a Democratic Congress, I may say—concerning the Price Control Act was that the Congress then removed some things from control. "Therefore," he said, "I cannot control the others," and he himself on that account took off all the price controls which he could have continued until July 1, 1947. He took meat off of control just before the election, and he took the others off of control immediately after the election, before the Republican Congress could even return to Washington.

So when we talk about selective controls, that is just a smoke screen.

What the President is talking about is economic power to control and, even, to destroy everything in the United States, and power to control prices, including the power to reduce the prices of farm products. Of course, he will not do so. He will not exercise the power, even if we give it to him; but that is the power he is requesting.

If one thing is certain it is that when we had the last price control in effect we saw that unless wages are fixed, it is not possible to fix prices. The President admits that in a kind of mild way in his message, that, after all, he must have a little power to fix wages. I may say that the bill which has been introduced pur-

ports to deal with wages; but as a practical matter, when we examine it, we find that under it no one could fix wages. The Board would be able to consider wages, but under the bill there is no power to fix wages.

One thing that is certain is that if we are going into a planned economy, it certainly will not work unless we give the power to fix wages over half the manufactured products in the United States. So that when the question of selective control comes up, I say we can dismiss it as window dressing. What we want to know is, Are we going to authorize the President to impose a regimented economy on the United States, or are we going to rely on a free economy to get the protection necessary to meet the present situation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I, of course, do not at all agree with the Senator's appraisal of the President's program, but that is beside the point. What I should like to ask the Senator again is whether there is any form of inflation control which he would be willing to support with his great influence rather than permit Government bonds to decline.

Mr. TAFT. I am quite willing, as the Senator knows, to consider the various proposals for an increase in reserves, such as Mr. Eccles' plan with respect to a 25-percent reserve. I never even dismissed that from my mind, except that Mr. Eccles could not seem to get anybody in the Government or any banker or anybody else to support him in his plan for a 25-percent reserve in Government bonds. I am willing to consider the straight increase of reserves proposed in the Barkley bill. I am willing to consider any other general over-all powers affecting credit, because I think that in credit lies more the beginning of inflation than in anything else. I hope very much we may pass a bill which will deal with credit and which will give the President powers, so that if he does not want to go too far on the bond question, he can try the others. Up to date, I have not been convinced they are going to be very effective, so long as we insist on maintaining a rate of interest on bonds at par.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Ohio make any suggestion to the President as to how far we should go in allowing Government bonds to drop?

Mr. TAFT. That is a question which is still before the committee, and I am not prepared to make any recommendations at all in the inflation field. I hope by next Wednesday or Thursday the committees will act, and I am sure I shall in all likelihood agree with their action.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator hold out to the Members of Congress and to the public that this Congress will do anything about final enactment of the consumer-credit bill, which was passed by the Senate with the endorsement of the Senator from Ohio, but which has been held up in the House?

Mr. TAFT. I should like to have it passed, but, of course, the position of the House is that the President can take the necessary action now. That is based on this fact, which I think I might set forth, so that the Senate will understand: As Senators know, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System set up Regulation W imposing consumer-credit controls. That was done in accordance with the proclamation of the President, relying on the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When was that done? What was the date?

Mr. TAFT. It was during the war some time; I do not know just when.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the point—it was during the war.

Mr. TAFT. On August 8, 1947, the Congress passed Public Law 386, Senate Joint Resolution 148, which I shall read:

> That after November 1, 1947, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not exercise consumer-credit controls pursuant to Executive Order No. 8843, and no such consumer-credit controls shall be exercised after such date except during the time of war beginning after the date of enactment of this joint resolution or any national emergency declared by the President after the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

So, if the President, under the Trading With the Enemy Act, is willing to declare a national emergency, then presumably he has the same power to issue regulation W today that he had during the war. Whether he had that power is just a little doubtful, if the Senator wants to know my opinion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I knew the Senator's position on that question.

Mr. TAFT. So far as I was concerned, I was in favor of passing a law dealing with the subject, but the President exercised the power once in time of war, and presumably his legal advisers would tell him he can exercise it again if he declares a national emergency, because the Trading With the Enemy Act said either war or national emergency.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that the Senator will agree with those who contend that the Trading With the Enemy Act may be used in time of peace to declare a national emergency, to do what one of the Houses of Congress has refused to do, and that it would be a proper exercise of Executive power.

Mr. TAFT. The House refused to do it, as I understand, on the ground that the President already had the power, so I do not think it can be said that the House has refused to give this power.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator thinks the House should give the President the power, does he not?

Mr. TAFT. Of course, as the Senator knows, the President in 1933 closed all the banks of the country under that same provision of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was an emergency which was brought about by the unsound policies of the Republican Party—policies which are again being adopted, and which, if they are not stopped, will bring about the closing of the banks again.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the banks of the country need be alarmed by the Senator's threats. I am quite sure they will not be closed again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I make no threat. We, of course, adopted, during the New Deal, a bill which was sponsored by the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, providing a Federal guaranty of bank deposits—a measure which was opposed by the very same forces which are now opposing any step toward the regulation of inflation.

Mr. TAFT. I understand it was also opposed quite a bit by the President of the United States at that time, although he finally agreed, under the strong persuasion of the distinguished Senator from Michigan at that time, that he would sign the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was not the President who is now asking a Republican Congress to help him restrain inflation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire to ask a question?

Mr. TOBEY. I desire to make a statement about 30 seconds long. Does the Senator want to get the statement or not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Thirty seconds would be very good.

Mr. TOBEY. Very well; here it comes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield from 30 seconds to 1 minute to the Senator from New Hampshire for a statement.

Mr. TOBEY. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I still have the floor. I should like to yield the floor. Before I do so I ask that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks an editorial in this morning's New York Times entitled "The 'Roll-Back' Bill."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "ROLL-BACK" BILL

Commenting yesterday on the President's appointment of Paul Porter, former OPA head, as his adviser on anti-inflation legislation, we suggested that the move seemed almost deliberately calculated to destroy at the outset any hope of cooperation on legislation in this field. If the naming of Mr. Porter did not accomplish this result, then the bill introduced yesterday by Senator BARKLEY, presumably reflecting the ideas of this adviser, should certainly do so. If any measure ever was put forward by an administration with its tongue in its cheek, this is such a measure. No intelligent Congress, Republican or Democratic, could possibly stomach this bill, and the administration must know it.

The proposed legislation includes the whole hodge-podge of recommendations contained in that part of the President's message dealing with rising prices and living costs. But that is not all. A pleasant surprise has been added by way of giving this legislation the authentic OPA touch. For it includes, as it were, an invitation to revisit that Alice in Wonderland of economics in which the country lived during the reign of OPA. That is the land of Let's Pretend, whose chief industries are statistics and regulations, in which high taxes and black-market prices don't count, and where the basic philosophy is that inflation that you can't see can't hurt you.

Those who may have wondered precisely what Mr. Porter's contribution to the anti-inflation campaign was going to be do not have to wonder any longer. The secret is out. Incredible as it may seem, the surprise is price roll-backs. Roll-backs would be applied to any cost-of-living item which has risen "or which threatens to rise" 20 percent

or more since June 1946 (when price controls were scrapped). Prices picked for the roll-back would remain under ceilings until June 30, 1950.

There is no magic, of course, by which the administration or any other human power can roll prices back, by word of command, to some appointed level. The term "roll-back" is simply a euphemism to describe a process whereby a producer is induced to sell his product at an agreed price, with the difference between that price and the market price made up to him by Government subsidies. And the cost of the subsidies? That, of course, is footed by the taxpayer.

Subsidies are to be distrusted under any conditions, and distrusted particularly when they come, as they come in the case of price roll-backs, in disguise. But the proposal to reintroduce them into the American economy at the present time represents a new high in economic futility. Britain has been chided by her critics for spending almost two billions a year since the war to hold food prices down. We can be charged with the even greater folly of having spent similar amounts to keep farm prices up. But, never until now has it been seriously proposed, here or anywhere else, that a nation's taxpayers shoulder the burden of subsidizing price inflation in one political area and price deflation in another, at one and the same time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, due to previous engagements, it is necessary that I be away from the Senate for the remainder of the day and until Monday. So I ask unanimous consent that I may absent myself from the sessions of the Senate until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

MIDYEAR ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. TOBEY rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire to make a comment?

Mr. TOBEY. I merely wish to say a word with reference to the discussion that just took place between the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and my colleague the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Regulation W was spoken of in that discussion, and I want to clarify a point on inflation which I think has some bearing on this special session and the attitude of the Congress, especially the House of Representatives.

Regulation W had expired. The Senate of the United States, through the medium of Banking and Currency Committee sponsorship and vote, passed in renewed form regulation W, and it is now in the House, where it reposes. It has a position similar to that of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and other bills, and it would seem, without criticizing the other House, which I esteem very highly, that anything that comes over from the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate having to do with inflation or credit or controls is "behind the eight-ball," it is a bar sinister. Now they tell us over there that they can pass the Trading With the Enemy Act and declare an emergency, recall that act, and instantly and automatically put into effect regulation W. If they want to follow regulation W, why the subterfuge? To pass it would be the simple thing to do, and we should then have taken one step in the inflation problem. But I am unable to understand the attitude of calling up the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, and asking the President to declare a national emergency, just to get regulation W. It is in their hands now. It has passed the Senate. Let the House pass it and let it become a law. In that way we shall be taking one step at least toward holding down inflation in this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield, if I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill was also passed by the Senate, and that that bill is now in the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from New Hampshire for his comment. I think it is eminently sound. It is just as sound as was the comment of the Senator from Ohio when he filed with the Senate of the United States on the 19th of December 1947, the interim report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in which credit control through regulation W was discussed. I think it altogether appropriate, Mr. President, that there be read into the RECORD at this point the language of the Senator from Ohio:

> The committee agrees that one means of reducing inflationary pressures at this time is through restraints on excessive expansion of consumer credit.

This was the language of the Senator from Ohio in December 1947. Then he proceeds as follows:

> Specifically, it approves for immediate enactment an extension of consumer installment credit controls similar to the system in effect under regulation W.
>
> Voluntary efforts to curb the liberalization of credit practices, with consequent expansion of installment credit, have not been adequate, as is demonstrated by the prompt loosening of installment credit terms with the ending of regulation W on November 1, 1947.
>
> The committee emphasizes that its endorsement of credit controls is directed only to the restraint of excessive granting of consumer installment credit at a time of inflationary pressures. It does not wish to see all installment credit prohibited, to the disruption of normal business activity.

This language contained in the report submitted by the distinguished Senator from Ohio was the consensus of opinion of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and it is my understanding that it represented also the judgment of the Banking and Currency Committee, of which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is the chairman. In any event, the law authorizing it in time of peace, without any monkey business about the Trading With the Enemy Act, was passed by the Senate and has been held up in the House.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for approximately 2 minutes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I wish to speak to both my party and the Democratic Party. What I shall say is the voice of America, and I ask the Senate to heed what I am now about to read. It comes from the grass roots. It has punch and soul to it. Let both great parties take notice. I am getting heartily sick and tired of the jockeying for position going on in this Chamber and on Capitol Hill. People may not be dying, but they are suffering and are calling us to an accounting. Listen to this letter from the grass roots. Pardon the personal references, for I shall read it all:

PLYMOUTH, N. H.

The Honorable CHARLES WILLIAM TOBEY,
Senator from New Hampshire,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TOBEY: Yesterday morning I heard over the radio the plans of the two parties to spend this session blocking each other and trying to get each other in bad with the public.

This morning I heard you quoted as saying that you felt the Republican Party should try to do something constructive.

It seemed to me like a ray of light. I hope you succeed. I am a Republican and want to be able to be proud of the Republican Party. Also I am an ordinary citizen and I think the housing situation, the cost of living, and the continuing spiral of rising prices, rising wages, rising prices, rising wages are a terrible menace to the economic security of the American people.

May I tell you a brief story of something that happened to us some years ago? We had a summer home at the beach and there were two men in the community who worked at intervals at our various house problems. When the cesspool suddenly ceased to act properly but instead, to our horror, began to back up, we called both these men, hoping to get speedy action. But they were very antagonistic and jealous of each other, and when either one suggested something to do to make that cesspool work the other at once explained that that remedy would never work.

The place was sandy; there was a tide problem; it wasn't simple; but we needed help and needed it at once. (Did you ever live in a house where the cesspool doesn't work?) After listening for some time while each told me why the other's ideas were all wrong, I finally lost patience. I got them together and said, "I do not care who solves this problem or how—what I want is for you to stop trying to prove each other wrong and get together and use your brains and your energy to work out a way to cure this condition."

And they did.

It is my belief that the American people today feel that way toward their public servants in the two parties, and that for both to ignore that feeling and just go on trying to get the other party in bad is both foolish and wicked at such a crucial time.

These are strong words but I think many people feel strongly. I do not know what you can do, Senator TOBEY, but I was very happy to hear that you had spoken up for some constructive, instead of destructive, program.

Very sincerely yours,
(Mrs. Royal) PERSIS D. BROWN.
JULY 27, 1948.

Mr. President, that is the voice of America, as I understand it. It is a cry out of a human heart, sick and tired

to death of these petty jealousies and petty ambitions of mere politicians. There are 140,000,000 people who are dying for one thing, and they are tired of waiting for it. I am speaking now of the people who are feeling the tragic burden of high prices and lack of adequate housing. They are wondering whether the Congress of the United States gives a damn about them except to get their votes at election time. This is the cry of a human heart, and we had better accept our trust, our obligation. The party which matches up to its trust and its obligation will be the party which God will favor. A word to the wise should be sufficient.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair again will state to the occupants of the galleries that the rules of the Senate prohibit any demonstration of any sort. The Chair earnestly requests our guests to obey the rules of the Senate.

PEOPLE ARE TIRED OF CONFUSION AND MISREPRESENTATION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from New Hampshire for his statement. I likewise join in the applause which we have heard. The letter which the Senator has read is a correct analysis of the situation which confronts the country. There are two kinds of politics. I am tired of hearing people say, when some Government official seeks to obtain action in the public interest, that he is merely playing politics. The playing of politics of which the Senator's correspondent and millions of persons throughout the United States are getting tired is the playing of politics which seeks to introduce confusion, misunderstanding, and misrepresentation of the issues. The Senator's correspondent in New Hampshire is correct. The cost of living and the lack of housing are two questions which are pressing upon the minds and the bodies of millions of Americans, and it makes no difference whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

I say, Mr. President, it is the duty of Congress to pass upon these problems. If we undertake to postpone action because of some fancied effect upon the result of the election, then the Congress is abandoning its constitutional functions. This is a legislative body. What matters it that Members may rise upon the floor and say the President, by Executive action, can do this or do that? What is wrong in the world is that the legislative function has been undermined, and only here in the United States do we have the opportunity to maintain the power of the people through their representatives to deal with the issues which affect the people. It is the highest degree of politics to undertake to serve the people.

I was reading from the report submitted by the distinguished Senator from Ohio in December 1947, recognizing the existence of inflation as long ago as that, and recommending one certain type of action.

Months have passed, and nothing has been done. There is complete agreement, at least in this body, between the joint committee which is headed by the Senator from Ohio and the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is headed by the Senator from New Hampshire, that this consumer credit bill should become the law. There is nothing partisan about that. There is no jockeying for position about that. That is the recommendation of two duly constituted committees of Congress, and everybody knows that the country is in the midst of inflation. Of course, these matters are not simple matters, but when the Senator from Ohio rises on the floor of the Senate and attempts to convince the country that the President by executive action, without any legislative action on the part of the Congress, can check inflation by throwing the bonds held by citizens of America upon the market and letting their price go wherever it might, I challenge him with his own language written in the majority report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it should be called to the Senator's attention that all E bonds, F bonds, and G bonds by their terms are redeemable, and of course would not be covered by any such action. The great bulk of the bonds which would be allowed to go below par are bonds held by the banks, certain long-term 2½ percent bonds, bought for long-term investment, which of course would be ultimately paid.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am perfectly well aware of that, but I am also aware of the fact that these E, F, and G bonds, held by the little people of the country under a provision of law which guarantees their full payment, are affected by what we do or do not do to maintain a sound economy in the United States. Those bonds are demand paper. The holders of those bonds may walk down to the Treasury any day and say, "I want my cash, 100 cents on the dollar," and get it.

PETTY POLITICAL MANEUVERING AN INVITATION TO DISASTER

O Mr. President, if we, by petty political maneuvering, in order to win a Presidential campaign and a congressional campaign, allow this economy to become so undermined that the bonds of the United States held by the banks are quoted below par, and the little people, seeing what is happening to the bonds, come marching up to the Treasury door and say, "Give me the cash," there will be created such a demand upon the resources of the United States for immediate cash payment as to bring about a collapse.

Mr. President, we are not dealing with a Presidential election; we are dealing with the very substance of free government. If it is not preserved here in the United States, it will be destroyed everywhere.

What does it mean when people are so confused that some thousands of them ally themselves with the so-called third party, the Progressive Party, which in a recent convention had only condemnation for the Government of the United States and only praise for the Soviet dictatorship? What does it mean when American young people are so confused in their minds that some are willing to give adherence to such an absurdity that an American party should become the defender of the totalitarian absolutism of the Kremlin? Does anyone think that confusion can be cleared up if the Congress of the United States, face to face with the inflation that is eating into the substance of our people, refuses to do anything because it says "Oh, the President has the power"?

Let me read what the Senator from Ohio said with respect to these bonds when he submitted the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the 18th of May, just a month before the adjournment, the hasty adjournment, of Congress, with its job undone. This is what the Senator from Ohio said:

> There is a substantial question whether any increase in reserves can have any effect on bank credit so long as the banks hold such a large proportion of their assets in Government bonds, and so long as the Federal Reserve System maintains the policy of supporting the Government bond market at not less than par.

Here he raised the issue, Shall the Government support Government bonds at not less than par, or shall it not? Did he have any recommendation then for congressional action or for executive action? Would he recommend to a Republican President that he follow a policy of abandoning the support of Government bonds? This is what he said:

> Some bankers and economists feel that this policy which uses Government power to hold down the interest rate should be abandoned—

Observe, it is carefully limited to "some bankers and economists." The sentence proceeds:

> and perhaps must be abandoned. The committee expresses no opinion at this time pending completion of hearings on the whole question which it is now holding.

CONGRESS CANNOT PASS THE BUCK

If the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, on the 18th of May, through its majority leader, its chairman, was unwilling to recommend the abandonment of Government support of bonds, how can any leader in Congress excuse Congress from doing something about inflation control merely by saying that the President has the power, by abandoning the support of Government bonds, to stop inflation?

I was happy to hear the Senator from Ohio say it would also be the power to destroy the whole credit and structure of our Government. Of course it would, and that is why the Senator from Ohio did not recommend any such action as is now proposed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. The President has that power now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course he has.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator should make it clear that the Congress never told him to maintain Government

bonds at par. That was a policy which had been adopted by the Federal Reserve Board. They have power not to maintain Government bonds at par if they do not care to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, but I think it is a very sound policy that they are maintaining Government bonds at par, and the Senator from Ohio does not dare to say that they should be permitted to go below.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have waited for the Senator from Ohio to respond to that remark. He has not responded.

Mr. TAFT. I have already responded to it. I said to the Senator that I should hesitate to use the power. I should be quite willing to explore other methods, if they wanted other power, but I would rather use the power than impose upon the Nation a regimented economy through the fixing of prices, wages, and a return to rationing. I made it perfectly clear that such power, if pushed too far, might be the power to destroy. But it is not at all necessarily a power to destroy if wisely and temperately used. I think it is certainly open to debate and question as to whether it should be used, and I have not made up my mind on that point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, because I am quite sure that he will never make up his mind to abandon the bonds.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that I think a great many of us on both sides of the aisle recognize that the problem of high prices is of concern to the country and to the Congress, as well it should be. But I also think that it is important to the Congress and to the country that we be sure that the cure is not worse than the disease.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, that is so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. To put the Nation into a regimented economy and to take it down a totalitarian road would, in my judgment, be a cure that would be worse than the disease.

Now, calling the attention of the able Senator to Senate bill 2910, the bill introduced by the minority leader yesterday, presumably on behalf of the administration, I call his attention particularly to the sections therein relating to the conditions under which maximum prices might be set, and the discretionary powers which are given, and then I call his attention to section I on page 11 which provides: "or hoarding, in connection with any commodity which in its judgment are equivalent to, or are likely to, result in price increases inconsistent with the purposes of this title."

I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming, who comes from a great cattle producing State in the West, whether or not in his judgment this would give the President the power, which he indicated in October 1946 he would seek, to seize cattle on the ranges of the country if the ranchers were not willing and did not feel that they could afford to sell the cattle at OPA price ceilings? I ask whether the Senator thinks that this language would give to the Federal Government the power to go to the ranches and the ranges of the Nation and seize the cattle, something which had once before been advocated by the President of the United States, and whether the Senator thinks that is consistent with the free enterprise system.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed, following my earlier colloquy with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the following information which I did not have available at the time. I made some reference in my remarks to a speech by the President of the United States made in October 1946. I wish to read several paragraphs of that speech which appeared in the newspapers of October 15, 1946. This is from the Washington Post, which gives the text of the President's address. The President went on to say:

> Another remedy suggested by many people was to have the Government seize the packing houses. This offered no real solution, however, because the seizing of empty packing plants would avail us nothing without the livestock.
>
> Some have even suggested that the Government go out onto the farms and ranges and seize the cattle for slaughter. This would indeed be a drastic remedy, but we gave it long and serious consideration. We decided against the use of this extreme wartime emergency power of Government. It would be wholly impracticable because the cattle are spread throughout all parts of the country.

Mr. President, I wish again to call to the attention of the Senate that this was considered in the Cabinet of the President of the United States. They gave it long and serious consideration. It was turned down, not because of a constitutional question as to whether the Government of the United States had the right to go onto the farms and ranges of the country and seize the cattle, no. That question apparently did not bother the executive branch of the Government. The only reason, apparently, why it was turned down was that it would be impracticable because the cattle were scattered over too wide an area.

I say, Mr. President, we have come a long way in this country when in the Cabinet of the President of the United States consideration was given to that violent remedy.

Now let me read the next paragraph:

> It has also been suggested that we import dressed meat from other countries. This would do little good, however, because the amount of exportable dressed meat, not already contracted for, which could be brought to this country is very small in comparison with our demands. Anyway, we would not think of asking for this meager supply for ourselves, because the people of other countries must have it in order to exist. The figures show, for example, that during this year the people in England and France will consume, per person, only a fraction of the meat we consume.
>
> So all these and other proposals and recommendations as alternatives to the removal of controls on meat were carefully weighed and considered. They all had to be rejected.
>
> There is only one remedy left—that is to lift controls on meat. Accordingly the Secretary of Agriculture and the Price Administrator are removing all price controls on livestock, and food and feed products therefrom, tomorrow.

Mr. President, experience is a great teacher. We did have an opportunity to see how price controls would function. The able Senator from Ohio today has pointed out that experience in this country and the experience in the controlled economies of Europe have clearly indicated that it is not possible to control the price of a commodity effectively unless there is a willingness to control all the factors that go into the making up of that price. That requires the control of all the materials which go into the final end product. It requires control of wages.

Mr. President, if wages are frozen and a man in plant A has his wage frozen at $1.50 an hour and a man in plant B has his wage frozen at $1.75 an hour, there is a natural inclination, in order for the workers to benefit themselves, for them to move from plant A to plant B. The experience in England has clearly shown that the next inevitable step that must be taken, if there is to be a beginning of that type of a controlled economy in peacetime, is to freeze the worker to his job because plant A may be putting out a highly essential product when plant B is putting out somewhat of a luxury product. Therefore, it was found in England they had to issue the so-called control-of-engagements order, under which the Government can say to a firm, "We do not believe you are manufacturing an essential product. You are going to be put out of business. We are going to supply you with no materials." Then they say to the worker in that plant, "Whether you like it or not, the Government is going to have the power to assign you to a coal mine, to assign you to a railroad, to assign you to a farm." When that road has been taken, Mr. President, a long step has been taken toward a totalitarian government. I rather doubt whether it is possible to maintain free institutions over an extended period of time, as we have known them, if that route is followed.

Mr. President, I am making these remarks in no narrow, partisan spirit because under our constitutional form of government, as the able Senator from Wyoming has pointed out, we are the legislative body of this country, and it is our responsibility, when matters are presented such as the new price-control bill presented by the minority leader, apparently for the administration and on its behalf, to examine it carefully and to debate it, to point out its imperfections, to see whether in our judgment the cure being offered would be far worse for the American people than the disease which we all recognize. It we did not discharge our responsibility in that regard, I feel we would be remiss in our duty.

It has been charged at times in the past, and over the past 16 years particularly, that at times the Congress of the United States has been more or less a rubber stamp for the executive branch of the Government. We certainly do not want the Congress to be a rubber stamp

for this or any future administration. If we are, we also travel a good way down the road away from constitutional government.

I am making these remarks, Mr. President, merely to keep the record straight, to show that within a period of just 2 years proposals have been made which would have enabled the executive branch of the Government, for the first time in the history of the United States, to seize cattle and seize other commodities, as well as plants.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I first suggest to the Senator from California that he is mistaken in the assumption that the President made any such recommendation in 1946. I recall that the President did say that that suggestion had been made to him, and that he had rejected it.

Secondly, I say to the Senator I have not had an opportunity to read the bill which was introduced yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and therefore I am not in a position at this moment to judge the effect of any language that is contained in that measure.

CONGRESS SHOULD PLACE ITS DUTY TO THE PEOPLE BEFORE POLITICAL INTERESTS OF ITS MEMBERS

I do want to say, however, that I will not be in favor of granting any such power to the Executive. My point in the discussion here is not with respect to any specific policy. My point is that it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to serve the people before it adjourns to serve the interests of its Members who are candidates for reelection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to ask the Senator from Wyoming a different question from that just asked him by the Senator from California. In view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming relative to the totalitarian methods of the Kremlin, I should like to ask him a question, because I respect his judgment, and because he comes from the same territory from which I come. My question is whether he is favorable to price control as it was formerly imposed by the OPA?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not. I do not believe that OPA controls should be restored. I never have. I take a simple position with respect to this matter.

I have observed, let me say, that in these arguments which are made about details, the effort is always made to make it appear that those of us who believe that there should be some Government action are advocating a particular method which the inquisitor believes would be condemned by the public as a whole. I am not here at this moment discussing details, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska. I am talking about the fundamental basis upon which this issue of price and inflation appeals to the American people, and what the result will be if the Congress does not act.

CONGRESS TALKS ADJOURNMENT WHILE AMERICA CRIES FOR ACTION

The Senator from Nebraska belongs to the majority side. The Senator is the acting majority leader of the Senate. The Senator can use his influence with the majority membership, with the majority conference, to induce them to forget this notion of adjourning by a week from Saturday night, and try to induce them to stay here and work out in a nonpartisan manner legislation which the people of the United States are crying for.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it was in that spirit that I asked the nonpartisan question whether or not the distinguished Senator from Wyoming in arriving at an approach to the cure of high prices would support title III of the bill introduced by the minority leader. He has already stated that he has not read the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not read it.

Mr. WHERRY. And that he does not want to comment about it at this time. I understand his position in that respect. But I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that I am just as much interested in reducing the high cost of living as is any one else. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to consider any anti-inflation legislation that can be presented to either House of the Congress, and, regardless of the political maneuver which was indulged in when we were brought back into session, I am perfectly agreeable to take the position that the only thing we should do—and that applies not only to the leadership, but to individual Senators—is to pass constructive legislation at any time and anywhere if it will help cure fundamental causes of inflation. But it occurs to me that the only solution which has been presented time and again, or rather the main one, and it is contained in the economic report, and now it is brought forth by the minority leader in his bill, is again to impose price controls to a greater extent than has ever been done before.

I say respectfully to the senior Senator from Wyoming, who comes from a territory where food commodities are produced, that he knows that under the price-control system of 1946 production was curtailed. It did not add 1 pound of beef to the family table. It did not provide one suit of clothes for any member of the family. It destroyed production. It increased black markets. I hope the American public will not forget that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just one moment, please. Will the Senator indulge me until I ask my question of him. What I am saying now is by way of prelude to my question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. I wish to keep the record clear.

Mr. WHERRY. Eighty percent of meat and meat products went to the black markets of the United States. It was impossible to secure hides. It was impossible to secure shoes. Those who needed it could not even secure insulin through the drug houses of the country. We certainly do not want a repetition of that condition, do we?

So I ask the Senator from Wyoming this question: In approaching the cure of this evil, which we should approach as Americans, and not as partisans, does the able Senator from Wyoming subscribe to price controls generally to bring about such a cure?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Congress of the United States must take some action to prevent steadily increasing prices.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that mean price controls?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will tell the Senator what I have advocated and what I have introduced. But, in the first place, I may say to the Senator I think he is in error if he interposes what he calls a nonpartisan suggestion by referring to the President's call of this extra session as a political maneuver.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It might not have been a political maneuver. I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that back in——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator please get back to the issue.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That back in June 1946——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator answer my question respecting price control?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On June 29, 1946, the President vetoed the OPA extension bill, and in his veto message I find this paragraph:

> As far back as September 6, 1945, I urged the Congress to pass an extension of the Price Control Act at an early date so as to avoid the uncertainties which have made control more difficult for the last few months. Had this been done there would now be no necessity for these last-minute decisions. I repeated my request to the Congress to extend price-control legislation, without crippling amendments, again and again, on January 21, 1946, May 22, 1946, May 25, 1946, and June 11, 1946.

PRESIDENT HAS REPEATEDLY CALLED FOR ACTION—CONGRESS CONTINUES TO DRIFT

It is true that the President addressed those calls to a Congress which was controlled by the Democratic Party. There is no doubt about that. But from that period he has been calling upon the Congress to act with respect to inflation and price control.

I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that it is not sufficient to say, as he has said many times forcefully and eloquently on the floor of the Senate, that the OPA Act was a terrible law. It is not sufficient to say that the bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is a bad bill. The only answer is for the Senator to come forward with a bill which he proposes, because the issue is here. Shall we act, or shall we drift?

Mr. WHERRY. If I were to do that, would the Senator subscribe to the general provisions of the Price Control Act which we had, or the system proposed under the provisions of the bill which has been introduced?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me ask the Senator from Nebraska——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator please answer my question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator from Nebraska to read the bill which

I introduced day before yesterday, Senate bill 2908, in which I propose a system by which I believe we could halt inflation now.

Mr. WHERRY. That has to do with excess——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am not here under cross-examination.

Mr. WHERRY. I have asked the Senator a question. He has asked me to bring forth a solution. The Senator from Wyoming speaks for the minority. He was a Presidential candidate and a Vice Presidential candidate. I ask him now, in the light of what he said—that we ought not to impose upon the young people of the country totalitarian controls—whether the sure cure for inflation is again to impose the OPA, or whether the cure lies in the provisions of the bill to which he refers. If I read the provisions of the bill correctly, it would give the President the power to establish allocations. It would give the President the power to establish the price of wheat, and to confiscate wheat at that price. Would the Senator go that far?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to the Senator from Nebraska, as I said to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that I have not read the bill, and I do not propose to be cross-examined with respect to its details. I say that the issue before us is not what the President presented but what the Senator and the Republican Party in control of Congress are willing to do. What do they propose to do to stop inflation? That is the issue.

Mr. WHERRY. The bill was introduced in the House and in the Senate, and hearings are being held on it today. Mr. Porter is advocating the passage of the bill. Certainly I have the right to ask the Senator, who is a Democrat, whether or not he is for the bill or for the general principles of a price-control act. The Senator has not answered the question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I have not answered it, because I stated that I had not read the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking about the general principles of a price-control act. Would the Senator subscribe to them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have introduced a price-control bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana. I recognize the fact that these inquiries are designed to go off in diversionary alleys, away from the central question. I shall return to it. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. At the present time we are considering price-control legislation. I have not spent much time on the floor of the Senate. I have been listening to the testimony of witnesses in respect to doing something about the subject rather than standing on the floor of the Senate talking about it.

I should like to ask the able Senator from Wyoming——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that the only reason I am here talking about this subject now is that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] took up considerable time of the Senate doing the same thing.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator one question, and then I shall go to the Banking and Currency Committee, where possibly we can do something about the problem. Would the Senator be willing to freeze all prices as of midnight last night, on all commodities in the United States?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In times past I have thought that that would be a very good plan. If we really want to stop inflation, there is one sure and certain way to do it, and that is to freeze everything—to freeze prices and freeze wages and salaries. On the 18th of June the Congress of the United States—this same Congress, controlled by Republicans complaining about inflation——

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator mind answering my question so that I may return to the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will answer the Senator's question. He started this discussion. Let me finish it.

The Senator from Ohio and others are saying that the cause of inflation is the increased money supply. Nevertheless, the Congress passed a bill increasing the salaries and wages of Federal employees. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], whom I see in the Chamber, is the author and sponsor of a bill to impose a sales tax upon the people of the District of Columbia so that wages and salaries of District of Columbia employees may be increased. In other words, we have this same Congress increasing the money supply——

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator wish to answer my question or not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did answer it.

Mr. CAPEHART. The question is, Is the Senator in favor of freezing all prices as of midnight last night, or are we merely going to talk about the subject? I introduced legislation last December to do the job. Every member of the President's Cabinet appeared before the committee and talked against it. Are we sincere and honest about wanting to control prices, or do we only want to talk about it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Has the Senator yet succeeded in convincing the leadership of the majority?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am asking the able Senator from Wyoming his opinion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator says that he is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Has he convinced the Republican members of that committee that the proposed action should be taken? Let me say to the Senator that I think it would be an effective way of stopping inflation. I should like to read the Senator's bill, however, because I am not altogether certain that he may not have in it certain phrases which mean something different from what he intends.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is the same old answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor. Does the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Wyoming has taken at least 5 minutes, and has not yet answered my question. I introduced a piece of legislation last December to freeze all prices as of midnight on December 13. That bill is still pending before the Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the Republican control of the committee will not support the Republican Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. My question to the Senator is, Will he support that particular piece of legislation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think there are more effective ways of doing what we want to do, without destroying or upsetting the economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. What are those effective ways? If we are to control prices, we must control them. They are either too high or they are not too high. If they are too high, let us freeze them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. One effective way is by means of the bill which I have introduced. The Senator is merely talking about a particular bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am talking about something effective, and that is to freeze prices so that they cannot go any higher. If anything could be more specific, more positive, and more to the point, and do the American people any more good than that, I should like to know what it is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator can induce his Republican colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee to report such a bill——

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator support it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And if he can induce the majority leadership to support such a bill, I think he will find no objection on my part.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator still has not said whether he would do what I suggested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; because I wish to leave the way open to decide after I have seen the Senator's bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order that there may be orderly debate, the Chair wishes to point out that under the rules of the Senate the Senator from Wyoming has the floor. If other Senators wish to speak, they must first address the Presiding Officer, to have him ascertain whether the Senator from Wyoming will yield. If we follow the rules of the Senate in that connection, the Chair is sure there will be more orderly debate.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield for a question. I am trying to get my basic thesis before the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. I shall not detain the Senator very long. In company with the Senator from Indiana, I am trying to refer to the matters the Banking and Currency Committee is now discussing. I wonder whether the Senator is familiar with the President's proposal to reduce

the rediscount rate of the Federal Reserve banks as a further restriction on bank credit. Let me ask the Senator whether he is in sympathy with the report and proposal in that connection made by the President.

INFLATIONARY EXPANSION OF CREDIT SHOULD BE RESTRAINED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am in sympathy with the principle. I have not read the language which attempts to carry it out. As a Member of the Senate, I know that language does not always correctly state objectives.

Mr. CAIN. Let me say that in the committee we are deeply troubled, because the President's proposal would result in increasing the reserve requirements of member banks of the Federal Reserve System, but without reference to the nonmember banks. All of us are fully aware that we have a dual banking system in this country, and it seems to some of us that it would be most unwise and potentially injurious to the Federal Reserve System of the United States to place it in a noncompetitive situation so far as the nonmember banks are concerned.

That is why I seriously raise the question as to how we can restrict the expansion of credit by restricting one portion of our great banking system, without taking similar action in respect to the other portion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The difficulty is, to use the Senator's words, that the Federal Reserve banks are now in a competitive position in regard to the State banks, with respect to increasing credit and promoting inflation.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that if the Congress undertakes to halt inflationary bank credit on the part of the Federal Reserve banks, the wisdom of that course will suggest itself to the nonmember banks, and they may fall in line.

It might be that upon reading the testimony which will be presented before the committee, I may come to the conclusion that an amendment of some kind to bring in the nonmember banks, too, if such an amendment could be drafted, would be desirable. I think it is tremendously important to stop the rise of credit, because that is where everyone agrees the additional inflation is coming from.

Mr. CAIN. Probably we are in agreement that if we stop the expansion of credit in one part of the banking system, if our efforts in that connection are to be effective in any way at all, the expansion of credit must likewise be stopped in the other parts of the banking system.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that would be desirable. But if we are not successful in spreading the control to the nonmember banks, nevertheless I believe it is far more desirable to pass the bill dealing with the member banks alone, rather than to allow bank credit to expand without restriction.

Mr. CAIN. Very serious consideration is being given to that specific proposal, but we are interested in the fact that Members of the Congress have found it necessary to raise these obvious questions——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. CAIN. Because no one in executive authority in this country has yet referred to what we are likely to do to the Federal Reserve System if we force an increase of its reserve requirements, without taking similar action in regard to the other parts of the banking system in the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to call attention to the fact that in the proposal submitted to us last year, the Government did ask for an increase in the reserve requirements of member banks and nonmember banks. The explanation which is made is that that request is not being made now because of the shortness of time and the feeling that there would be considerable opposition to the inclusion of nonmember banks. It was stated that for that reason they were not requesting it, but that if the Congress gave that power to them, they would welcome it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not being a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I am very happy to have the information given by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield for a further comment, I should like to call attention to the fact that when we speak of making this discrepancy between member banks and nonmember banks, actually we are not making any discrepancy. If there is a discrepancy, it already exists. In other words, the present powers vested in the Federal Reserve Board to set reserve requirements are now limited to the member banks. Consequently, so far as the competitive status is concerned, it already is established.

But we were told just this morning by Secretary of the Treasury Snyder that the State banks, the nonmember banks, have cooperated very nicely, and that the various State banking departments have cooperated, and that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has cooperated, and that heretofore they have not had any trouble in working out the situation cooperatively, and that they do not anticipate any trouble, even if we do not grant that additional power.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The great need is to place a restraint now upon inflationary expansion of credit. That should be done, in my judgment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee hopes it can recommend something constructive. I wish to say in that connection that the Senator from Alabama is quite correct. As I recall, he said that Mr. Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury, and yesterday, I think, Mr. McCabe, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, said that they were not going to recommend what they would like to recommend—which is to cover all banks with increased reserve requirements—because of the opposition likely to be encountered. Yet, Mr. President, we have been told that what we face is a national crisis and emergency. So it seems a little strange to some of us that we should duck economic realities simply because someone might be opposed to taking the needed action.

PATRIOTIC AND INTELLIGENT ACTION NEEDED NOW

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my purpose in rising today was to call attention to the profound feeling which exists in the minds and hearts of millions of American citizens that in this country and in the world there exists a serious condition which can be solved only by the patriotic and intelligent action of the Congress of the United States. The Congress is the legislative branch of government. The President may propose, but only the Congress can dispose.

All through the world the underlying confusion in the minds of people is being manifested by radical action and by war. We are now in session, the competent democratic authority of the people of the United States, to act with respect to a condition, the existence of which is recognized by everyone. The cost of living is rising steadily. Congress has in many ways indicated its conviction that something should be done. Last June the Senate made clear that it believed there should be housing legislation, because it was of the opinion that millions of people in the United States are without roofs over their heads.

HOMELESS PEOPLE MORE IMPORTANT THAN POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY

The distinguished Senator from Ohio joined in that belief and sponsored the bill, with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], a Democrat, and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], a Democrat, to provide a solution. He was anxious that the bill should pass the Senate. It has not passed the House. The question arises, if it was a desirable thing to solve this crying need of millions of people last June, why is it not a crying need to solve it now, in July? Or shall we say to those who need housing in the great cities, "Be patient; wait until after the election, and wait until a new Congress comes. Get whatever housing you can, in the meantime." That, Mr. President, is not serving the interests of the people.

"Oh," they say, "this inflation is caused by Government action, which increases the money supply and increases the demand." That is true. Of course, it is true. But it is Government action in which the Congress has joined the Executive. The Congress of the United States passed the draft bill. There was no opposition on the part of any party or party leadership here against the draft bill. The Congress passed the bill providing appropriations to build housing facilities for draftees. That was increasing the demand for commodities in short supply. The Congress of the United States, Democrats and Republicans alike, voted for the extension of the Air Corps. That creates a demand. The Government is using the taxpayers' money to buy materials in short supply to build housing for the draftees and to build equipment for the Navy and for the Army. That was the decision of both

parties. Can we now say, after the decision of the Congress has been rendered, "Cut the air force down 10 percent—that is the way to stop inflation?"

RISING PRICES AND PROFITS INCREASE THE COST OF GOVERNMENT AND DEFENSE

Why, of course, all we have got to do is to stop defense preparation, and we can cut out inflation. We can stop Government buying. But I call your attention, Mr. President, to the fact that when the United States Steel Co. just a few days ago increased the price of steel by $9.34 a ton it was increasing the cost of Government in the United States, because between 7 percent and 10 percent of all the steel produced in the United States goes to the Government. When the steel companies increase the price of steel by $9.34 a ton, they are increasing the cost of national defense. Shall we say, as a Congress representative of the people of the United States, "It means nothing to us; we are willing that this rising cost of government shall continue," particularly when we read in the report of the steel companies themselves that they are making greater profits than ever before in history?

There is no profit for the draftee, Mr. President. When the Government of the United States rests its hand upon the shoulder of a young man and says, "Leave your home, leave your business, leave your schooling, and go into the Army or the Navy," he goes, regardless of profit or loss. But the manufacturers who produce these commodities, which are needed in the national defense, raised their prices, and the responsible leadership of this Congress proposes to adjourn the Congress a week from Saturday night, in the face of that. That, Mr. President, is why I say there are millions of people in this country who echo the words that were read by the Senator from New Hampshire—do away with this factional brawling, do away with this petty criticism, this attempt to assess the blame for a condition that exists, for you were responsible, I was responsible, he was responsible. Whoever was responsible, the condition is here. The cost of living is higher than it ever was in all the history of the United States. The people can do nothing about it, but we can.

I say, Mr. President, if the Members of this Congress allow the session to adjourn without having done anything about it, they will hear about it at the ballot boxes in November. We are dealing with the fundamental principle of government, in the interests of the people. The interest of the people now demands that we halt the rising cost of living, that we stop those inflationary causes which we can stop. It is idle to say, "Abandon the European recovery program." That issue was fought out here. There were isolationists in both House of Congress who said, "That will increase the cost of living." But the Congress of the United States, echoing the words and the thought of millions of Americans, enacted the European recovery legislation because it was their conviction that the United States should do something to stimulate economic recovery in Europe in order to save the free political system. That is what we are dealing with, Mr. President. We are not dealing with the Presidential election. It does not make any difference whether President Truman is reelected or Governor Dewey becomes President. If we in the Congress have permitted the economic system to be undermined by our inaction, the people will pay the price, no matter who the President is. I suggest, Mr. President, that the alternative to the action of the Congress in the democratic method by legislation, will be the Executive method by directive.

The suggestion has been made here upon the floor that there are some in the Congress who say the way to check consumer credit is for the President to exercise a power that was granted in the Trading With the Enemy Act. He has asked for power in this iterim peace period, and the Congress refuses to grant it. Is that not a sidestepping of the issue? Nobody denies that unwise installment credit, by increasing the money supply and increasing the demand, will continue inflation. The fact is, and nobody can deny it, that production in the United States today is running far greater than it was when the shooting stopped. Civilian production has expanded in almost every line. We know that the production of wheat and corn, with the crops coming in, will be much greater than has been anticipated. Industrial production is higher than ever before. But the demands which we have created, out of necessity, are taking that increased supply. The demands for national defense, the demands for European recovery, are far beyond any other demand that is being exerted upon the productive supply of America. With so many people being employed, they have their demands. They are buying goods. But the Congress is willing to pile consumer credit upon a high money supply, and decline to act in order that its members may get back to their States or their districts so that they may run for reelection.

THIS CONGRESS CAN STOP THE PRICE SPIRAL—AVOID CONSEQUENT DEPRESSION—SAVE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT

O Mr. President, within a month certainly, this Congress could take effective action to hold prices. Congress could take effective action to provide housing. It is true, of course, that expenditures for housing also created a demand, but the alternative is to let people who need houses go without them. That is why we must necessarily step in with Government action.

History is clear, Mr. President. It has happened over and over again, that when we have a demand which exceeds supply, and prices rise, then inevitably there comes a time when there are some people in the economy who cannot buy at the high prices the things which are needed. They go out of the market. When they go out of the market, purchasing power is thereby limited. Then the demand for the products of the farm and the factories is cut down. Then business begins to hesitate and, finally, to die, and then comes a depression. That is the story, over and over again.

No one wants to restrain profit when a boom is on, hoping that somehow or other he may escape the inevitable result. But no one can escape the result now, Mr. President, because the debt of the United States, hovering around $250,000,000,000, is the greatest debt that was ever assumed by any people in history. True, we have reduced it somewhat, but not enough. We have chosen to decrease the receipts of the Federal Government at a time when we were increasing its expenditures. It was our deliberate act. It is an act which eventually promotes deflation and depression. We are laying here the groundwork for another crash; and if another crash comes, Mr. President, if another depression comes, as historically they have always come after a boom, then let us ask ourselves, How shall we save our democratic system of government, a free government, and a free economy? We do not realize the extent to which we have surrendered to a small group, power over our economy. The concentration of economic power in this country has become so great that we are now subject to private economic government. The private managers of a few giant corporations in almost every basic industry regulate the supply and fix the price.

WE STILL HAVE PRICE CONTROL—BY BIG BUSINESS

We do not have price control by the Government; we have price control by big business. Business management, Mr. President, over and over again, has pushed the desire for profit over the precipice. Not only will the managers of big business and the stockholders in these giant collectivist units pay the price, but the masses of the people of the United States will pay it.

TURN THE SPOTLIGHT ON PROFITEERS

Mr. President, I have a statement which I prepared and released to the press on July 19, last, in which I propose that we should authorize a public agency of the Government to scrutinize the increasing prices on basic commodities which are the subject of all living and of all American business. The Federal Trade Commission, under existing law, has the power to investigate the action of corporations in fixing prices. But the Congress denied the Commission an appropriation last June to do that work. It has the power, however, but it is a power which, under present law, can be exercised only after the fact. I propose in my bill that that power may be exercised before the fact, by prohibiting any increase in the price of basic commodities, the production of which is in concentrated control, until a notice of intention has been filed with the Federal Trade Commission, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, and until after a public hearing has been held.

GIVE BUSINESS THE SAME TREATMENT AS LABOR—A "COOLING OFF" PERIOD ON PRICE INCREASES

We have not hesitated to say in the Taft-Hartley Act and in the old Railway Labor Act that labor may not strike under certain circumstances. Congress has said that the price of labor shall be frozen for a period of time. That is what is known as a cooling-off period. I sug-

gest that there be a cooling-off period on spiraling prices for basic commodities.

I do not ask that any power be given to the Federal Trade Commission to prohibit increases; I ask only that there be public scrutiny, so that the public may know the reasons for the increases and whether or not they are justified. That bill is before the Banking and Currency Committee. I understand that similar provisions have been written into the bill introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement dealing with the subject may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR O'MAHONEY PROPOSES PUBLIC SCRUTINY OF PRICE INCREASES—COOLING-OFF PERIOD PROVIDED FOR LABOR SHOULD APPLY TO CORPORATE GIANTS, SAYS WYOMING SENATOR WHO IS DRAFTING BILL TO HALT INFLATION BY PROHIBITING PRICE ADVANCES BY CORPORATIONS CONTROLLING THE ECONOMY UNTIL AFTER PUBLIC HEARINGS BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The prices which 140,000,000 Americans must pay for the basic commodities they must daily use all over the country are privately fixed by a few giant corporations.

The cost of living rises steadily, but corporate profits are rising even more rapidly. All corporate profits in 1947 rose 42 percent above what they were in 1946, although in 1946 they had reached an all-time high. The income after taxes of the 100 largest manufacturing corporations in 1947 was 91 percent greater than in 1946, and during the first six months of 1948, the all-time record of 1947 was being broken by new profit highs.

Serious danger signals are appearing. Sales of 1,277 firms have fallen off 1.6 percent this year, according to the report Saturday of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the lower-income groups, according to the Federal Reserve Board, are dipping into their savings in order to live, and those whose savings are exhausted are finding their income insufficient to cover their necessities. The voluntary savings bond sale has not been a success, and voluntary allocation of materials is not meeting the needs of local business.

This is the road to depression—rising prices, rising profits, dwindling savings, contracting purchasing power, narrowing markets, curtailed production, reduced employment, and then on over the "boom" to end in the "bust."

Mounting prices and mounting profits are undermining the purchasing power of the Nation and are setting the stage for a new depression all at the time when international recovery and world peace depend upon stopping inflation now.

To do this, it is not necessary to restore all-inclusive price controls. It is only necessary to recognize the fact that a few giant corporations have control over the production, the distribution, and the price of basic commodities upon which all American business depends. Put the spotlight of publicity on the pricing policies of these corporate giants and the brakes will be immediately applied to inflation.

The country does not realize the extent to which the people have become the subjects of private economic government.

Three meat-packing corporations produce 43 percent of all the meat distributed by packers throughout the country, and these same three corporations determine the price that people must pay for all meat.

Three steel corporations produce 49 percent of all steel ingots; three oil refinery corporations produce 53 percent of all gasoline; three chemical corporations produce 66 percent of all chemicals, and in each instance these corporations actually set the prices for all other producers.

So it goes in other industries. Three corporations produce 67 percent of all farm machinery, 69 percent of all electric ranges, 75 percent of all window glass, 77 percent of all rubber tires, 80 percent of all copper, 87 percent of all gypsum board, 88 percent of all tin cans, and 91 percent of all primary aluminum.

In the case of 121 basic products universally used throughout the country, the total value of which, for each product, was more than $10,000,000 in 1937, more than 75 percent of the total output was manufactured by only four firms. When a few corporations secure control over so large a proportion of the production of any commodity, it is inevitable that they set the price not only for their own particular industry, but also for every other industry and every other business which uses these products as a raw material. Thus the price structure of American business and, therefore, the cost of living, depends upon the private judgment of the private managers of the few corporations which have gained so tight a control over American production.

To deal effectively with inflation, it is only necessary to deal with these concentrated giants. Their hand is on the throttle of American business. They have the power to turn it on and off. Experience has proved that it is idle to ask them to protect the public. No President from Mr. Hoover to Mr. Truman by politely using the prestige of the Presidency, has been able to persuade them to act in the public interest. They think only of their own welfare, yet when they increase prices in a dangerous situation like the present, they are acting against the welfare of the whole population and against the interest of every State and every community in the Nation.

Let us apply to them the same rule Congress has applied to labor. In the Taft-Hartley Act, and before that in the Railway Labor Act, Congress provided for a cooling-off period before a strike could take place. Why not a cooling-off period before the corporate giants which produce the bulk of our basic commodities may increase prices?

If the workers of the country are required by law to sell their labor for a certain period at a lower price than they believe they ought to have, why should not these huge corporations be compelled to hold the price line for a similar period until an appropriate Government agency can conduct a public hearing to review the reasons for the proposed price increases?

The national interest is paramount. We are dealing with the issues out of which depression and disaster for millions may arise. We are dealing with issues that directly affect world peace and national security. We cannot afford to drift. We must act to prevent the managers of the monopolist economic structure from pulling it down upon themselves and all the people.

I am, therefore, drafting a bill to provide that the price of all basic commodities 40 percent or more of the total annual output of which is produced by 50 percent or less of all producers may not be increased until the producers desiring to make such increase shall have filed with the Secretary of Commerce, the Attorney General, and the Federal Trade Commission a notice of intention to increase prices, and until not more than 30 days after such notice a public hearing has been held by the Federal Trade Commission. At such public hearing it shall be the duty of the members of the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce to examine the applicant with respect to the reasons for the proposed increase.

Care will be taken in drafting the bill to guard against evasions through the activities of corporate affiliates or subsidiaries, or other devices, and to protect from reprisal by big business producers those consumers who may give testimony.

Competition and free enterprise are being destroyed, States' rights insofar as the States are entitled to protect their own citizens are being undermined, and the people are being exploited by big business not so much because all big business wants monopoly, but because concentration of control has proceeded so far that the private interests of the giant corporations are overriding the public interest. Only Congress can protect the people by holding inflation and preserving a competitive economic system.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. MAYBANK obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the thought of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, but there are other Senators who wish to speak this afternoon, and I should prefer not to have a quorum called at this time.

Mr. President, I listened with much interest to the discussion early today of the President's economic report, and also to the various remarks made, not only today, but yesterday, in connection with inflation.

When in Philadelphia the President called the Congress to meet in session, I said then, and I believe now, that there would be but little done, and that it was entirely unnecessary for him to take that action.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to say that I voted for and supported legislation to control credits, which passed the committee 9 to 4, last spring, and passed the Senate. I was a member of the same committee when on six different occasions it reported the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which was passed by the Senate. I voted for other controls, because, above all, I deplore inflation, and hope that some means can be found to curb it.

However, Mr. President, Mr. McCabe, testifying yesterday morning, stated, in connection with title 2 of the new anti-inflation bill, that long and careful hearings should be held before such a measure was passed, because it affects 7,000 Federal Reserve banks on one side and 7,000 State banks on the other.

So, Mr. President, the housing legislation having passed the Senate last spring, and there being nothing else on the calendar to be considered, we are faced here with what the President suggested in Philadelphia in the way of civil-rights legislation.

I heard the President say on the radio that he would call Congress back into session and that the Senate could invoke cloture. In other words, the President wants to cut off debate. That is what he said on the radio from Philadelphia.

Cut off debate on what? On the poll-tax bill. Then what is next? The anti-lynching bill. Certainly cut off debate on that. Then what is next? The FEPC bill. Cut off debate on that bill. Then what is next? He will concoct some other segregation bills to send to Congress along the line of what he tried to do with the Army, but he did not get away with it.

Mr. President, I realize that under rule XIX I have two opportunities to speak on the pending measure. I realize that there are many distinguished Senators who desire to speak. So today I shall be reasonably long, but not too long. I direct my attention to the poll-tax measure which is before the Senate because my colleague the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has a resolution which he is going to bring up on Monday providing for the adjournment of Congress. He said before Congress reconvened that he would submit such a resolution. He has submitted it. So I hope that on Monday I may be able to help in my small way to bring about an adjournment of Congress so we can go home and the country can have peace and progress may be made throughout the country.

Mr. President, any Federal legislation calling for the repeal of any poll-tax laws in the several States is clearly unconstitutional. The right of qualifications for suffrage is a matter for the States and has been so since the founding of the Government. It justly should remain so.

Both political parties felt their responsibility under the Constitution of the United States to leave this poll-tax matter alone for the several States to handle under section 2, article 1, of the Constitution, which was written in 1787—that is, up until the Philadelphia conventions of 1948. As a matter of fact, in the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution the provision relating to voting requirements is reiterated. As Senators know, this amendment allowing United States Senators to be elected by direct popular vote was ratified in 1913. It is an exceptional point in that the provision as to the qualifications of electors appears again in this second place in the Constitution.

Should the Congress of the United States pass legislation concerning the poll tax as a voting qualification, it could, by the same precedent, determine all the voting qualifications in any or all of the various States.

The Constitution under which we now live has done a great work in building a Nation and holding it together. It has been good enough to tide us over all kinds of troubles. It is satisfactory for all the problems of today. Our future prosperity and safety require that we let it alone.

It is still true that the qualification for suffrage is, under constitutional government in America, a question for the individual States. If we are tiring of this healthy constitutional principle and wish further to amend the Constitution such action will, in my humble opinion, provide an opening wedge by which the Congress could drive even deeper into the sovereign sanctity of State rights.

The problem before us is not whether the poll tax is right or wrong. It is clearly a point of constitutionality. If the poll tax should be abolished, it is the constitutional right of the residents of the individual States so to determine. I am happy to note that there is a spreading tendency for the States themselves to do away with this tax. It remains in effect today in only seven States. There is growing sentiment for its repeal in even these few remaining States.

In my State of South Carolina, for instance, the constitution states that the tax is an educational one and is to be used for educational purposes within the State. The poll tax is a part of the revenue for the operation of all the public schools in South Carolina.

It is interesting to note, at this point, that the poll tax or "pole" tax, as it was called, was first levied in South Carolina in 1702 as an act of the general assembly to make Charles Town defensible. It seems that in those days the trouble was with the Indians. The assembly resorted to revenue by a pole—p-o-l-e—for the defense of Charles Town. Now, for a dollar a year, we are forced to defend our constitutional rights.

I should like further to observe that the poll tax is not levied today on women or anyone over the age of 60. It is not levied on anyone who takes an oath that he is not able to pay the tax. This leaves only about 30 percent of the voters who are called upon to pay this $1 a year, nonretroactive tax.

Under no stretch of the imagination can I see how the levying of a poll tax could in any way restrict the suffrage of voters.

Let us face the reality of this blown-up, exaggerated iniquity. For the privilege of smoking a pack of cigarettes we pay more than 7 cents in State and Federal taxes. For the privilege of providing a part of the educational facilities for our children—and in many cases it is the only tax paid—about 30 percent of our people pay $1 a year, which is less than 2 cents a week, in the form of a poll tax.

It is not for the retention of the poll tax that we oppose this legislation. We oppose it because a serious departure from governmental principles is involved—a clear invasion of the liberties of the American people. It is a process designed by and for politicians who would create political turmoil for their own benefit at the expense of an already overly abused South—a South which has been a political prisoner of war since 1865. It is time we repatriated our displaced sovereign rights without the ill-advised aid of vote-conscious meddlers.

In 1941 and 1942, particularly in 1942, I had the pleasure and the privilege of being in the Senate, and I attended the extended hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary at that time in connection with the anti-poll-tax legislation which had been introduced. I went through the filibuster which was had at that time. I see Senators present who were with me in that long filibuster, when we absented ourselves from the Senate so no quorum could be had. Finally, a motion was adopted to send out the Sergeant at Arms to bring us back to the Senate in order that a quorum could be had.

Mr. President, we won that fight. We fought for the principles of the Constitution. We are here to fight today for the same principles of the Constitution. Speaking for myself, representing in part South Carolina—and I feel I speak for the other Senators who have been together in meetings day after day arranging to combat this legislation—I say we are going to use every power we have, and invoke every rule that is available to us, and do everything we can to stop this proposed legislation because we know that if we break down in this fight and the proposed legislation is passed, it will be followed by civil-rights measures, more civil-rights measures, and still other civil-rights measures until we shall have no rights at all remaining.

Knowing that this would be the issue, I stated that the President's statement in Philadelphia with respect to the imposition of cloture, and his call of the Congress under the guise of stopping inflation, were totally unnecessary. Yesterday, in the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, his own appointees testified that extended hearings were necessary. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] read into the record a report of the Department of Agriculture calling for the production of fewer cattle, fewer head of poultry, and less wheat. The Senator who now occupies the Chair [Mr. YOUNG] comes from the great wheat-producing territory. The report of the Department of Agriculture advised the farmers to grow less wheat and less of other articles of food. At the same time it is said that we must stop inflation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I ask the Senator if he noticed the statement by Mr. Brannan, only recently appointed Secretary of Agriculture by the President, which statement was reported in the press last Monday. The Secretary of Agriculture was reported to have asked the farmers to store their grain and not put it on the market, in an effort to keep prices from dropping, which I interpret to mean an effort to keep prices up.

Mr. MAYBANK. I noticed the statement.

Mr. COOPER. Did the Senator read the statement?

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not read the details. I simply read the headlines. I could hardly believe what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] read, to the effect that the Department of Agriculture wanted to reduce the production of wheat, meat, poultry, and eggs, the very things which the poor people need.

Mr. COOPER. On the very day when we were called here to attack inflation and high prices, particularly high prices of meat, which are certainly affected by the price of grain, the President's appointee, the Secretary of Agriculture, was asking the farmers to keep their wheat in storage so that prices would be held up.

Mr. MAYBANK. Furthermore, as the Senator well knows, he asked that the acreage and amounts in years to come be reduced. It is utter nonsense. They

want to return to Henry Wallace's theory of scarcity—kill the pigs and plow up the corn. It simply does not make sense. No one is more opposed to inflation than I am. But we cannot plant less wheat, have less poultry and less meat, and at the same time stop inflation by passing a law to ration what little there may be.

Mr. President, I digressed from the poll-tax statement because I wanted the RECORD to show clearly that it is my judgment that this special session was called for one reason, and one reason only, and that is to impose force bills upon the people of the South.

Last spring when the poll-tax measure was before the committee, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] asked various southern Senators to communicate with their governors and have prepared a brief and a record so that he, as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, along with others, could carry on the battle for us in that committee, which he so ably did. He made the minority report for the committee. Yesterday he spoke at length, and in my judgment delivered a speech which will be remembered for a long time, not only because of the able way in which he dealt with the constitutional question, but because of the righteousness of the speech, and the manner in which he delivered it.

At the time he asked my colleague the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and me to communicate with our Governor and have a statement prepared, I immediately did so. The attorney general prepared a statement of the situation in South Carolina. The junior Senator from South Carolina and I appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration to hear the statement delivered for the record.

At this time I shall read the statement. It is quite lengthy, but I wish to read it into the RECORD for the reason that the Senator from Mississippi desires the statement to be made a part of the RECORD. The Senator from Mississippi knows, as I know, that if the pending bill is passed—I am certain that it will not be, but if by chance it should be passed, the next step which the Southern States which have the poll tax will take will be to carry it to the courts. The attorneys general of the various States will carry the fight forward. I intend to read this statement; and at a later date I intend to read the entire hearings of 1942, together with the statements made by the then Governor of South Carolina, Mr. Jeffries, the then president of the senate, Senator Brown, and the present attorney general, John W. Daniel, plus the statements of many witnesses who appeared at the hearings, which extended over a long time. I intend to read those statements later, but at this time I shall content myself with reading the statement of the attorney general, so that Members of this body may be apprised as to what our laws are and what our attorney general thinks of the situation. If and when the bill is ever passed and we must go before the courts, there will be a record in the greatest record of all, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I now read the statement of the attorney general:

A STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNOR AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR SOUTH CAROLINA IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED ANTI-POLL-TAX LEGISLATION

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND CONCERNING SOUTH CAROLINA'S POLL TAX

The practice, custom, and tradition of levying a poll tax in the State of South Carolina had its origin prior to the American Revolution. In 1702 the General Assembly passed an act for the purpose of raising revenue to be used in the defense of Charles Town. This act provided that £550 per annum be raised by a poll tax (spelled p-o-l-e). It provided for the payment of 20 shillings per annum by each man within the bounds of the town who was capable of bearing arms. It is interesting to note that this act also provided for the payment of 20 shillings per annum by every single woman or widow that was a housekeeper within the bounds of the town. Thus we find that from the earliest time the poll tax was used as a revenue measure which, indeed, it is today in South Carolina.

After 1702 the poll taxes were often levied by the Legislature of South Carolina, and by the year 1865 it had become the custom and accepted tradition of the people of the State as a means of raising revenue necessary for the support of the government. On June 13, 1865, Benjamin F. Perry was appointed provisional Governor of South Carolina by President Johnson (the Supreme Court of the United States having declared that the seceded States of the South had not been out of the Union). Governor Perry called a convention of the people of the State for the purpose of reorganizing the government of the State. An order for the election of delegates for the convention to meet in Columbia on September 13, 1865, was promulgated by Governor Perry. This convention was held as scheduled on September 13, 1865, and a new constitution for the State was proposed. Section 1 of article I provided as follows:

"The General Assembly, whenever a tax is laid upon land, shall at the same time impose a capitation tax, which shall not be less upon each poll than one-fourth of the tax laid upon each $100 worth of assessed value of the land taxed; excepting, however, from the operation of such capitation tax all such classes of persons as from disability or otherwise, ought, in the judgment of the General Assembly, to be exempted."

This new proposed constitution was actually adopted in 1868 and we find article IX, section 2, reading as follows:

"The General Assembly may provide annually for a poll tax not to exceed $1 on each poll, which shall be applied exclusively to the public-school fund and no additional poll tax shall be levied by any municipal corporation."

It is to be remember that at this point in the history of the State, South Carolina was under the rule of those who had migrated to the State of South Carolina for the purpose of personal gain, and Congress should take notice of the fact that these rulers considered the poll tax an important and necessary means of raising revenue within the State.

In 1876 Wade Hampton was elected Governor of the State of South Carolina, thus returning the official leadership of the State back to the citizens of South Carolina. Shortly thereafter the legislature passed an act providing for the collection of a poll tax referred to in the constitution of 1868 which is quoted above. This act was ratified on March 22, 1878, and reads as follows:

"That the several county treasurers shall retain all the poll tax collected in their respective counties; and it is hereby made the duty of the said county treasurers in collecting the poll tax, to keep an account of the exact amount of said tax collected in each school district in his county * * * and the poll tax collected therein shall be expended for school purposes in the school district from which it was collected."

We therefore find that since March 22, 1878, the poll tax has been earmarked for school purposes. The constitution of 1868 remained in effect until 1895. The people of South Carolina lived under this constitution (1868) which was adopted in a convention composed almost entirely of carpet-baggers, scalawags, and Negroes, and which contained a provision for levying and collecting from the people of the State the tax known as the poll tax. In 1895 the Honorable Benjamin Ryan Tillman led a movement for the adoption of a new constitution. The section dealing with poll tax in this constitution of 1895, which is to this date the constitution of the State of South Carolina, is article XI, section 6, which in part reads as follows:

"There shall be assessed on all taxable polls in the State between the ages of 21 and 60 years (excepting Confederate soldiers above the age of 50 years) an annual tax of $1 on each poll, the proceeds of which tax shall be expended for school purposes in the several school districts in which it is collected."

Article XI, section 4, of the South Carolina constitution, dealing with the "qualification for suffrage" reads in part as follows:

"Managers of elections shall require of each elector offering to vote at any election before allowing him to vote proof of the payment 30 days before any election of any poll tax then due and payable. The production of a certificate or of a receipt of the officer authorized to collect such taxes shall be conclusive proof of the payment thereof."

Thus we find that the poll tax is not a levy of recent years but rather that it is a source of taxation which has been used in the State of South Carolina since the American Revolution and even prior to the American Revolution when the State was a mere colony.

THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation is in direct conflict with article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States in that it attempts to take from the several States a right guaranteed to the States by the Constitution. This proposed legislation, known and designated as H. R. 29, and entitled "An act making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers," is in effect changing the qualifications for electors for national officers in violation of article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States reads as follows:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature."

This section of the Constitution is clear and unambiguous. The framers of the Constitution wisely decided that the qualifications requisite for electors of the House of Representatives should be left entirely to the several States. It is true that the qualifications of these electors may not be the same in each of the several States, which itself shows that the framers of the Constitution did not desire uniformity.

The State of South Carolina has a poll tax of $1 which is provided for by article XI, section 6 of the constitution of 1895. This section of South Carolina's Constitution reads as follows:

"There shall be assessed on all taxable polls in the State between the ages of 21 and 60 years (excepting Confederate soldiers above the age of 50 years) an annual tax of

$1 on each poll, the proceeds of which tax shall be expended for school purposes in the several school districts in which it is collected."

This section of the State constitution shows clearly that the poll tax is purely and simply a revenue measure, even going so far as providing the purpose for which the proceeds of the tax may be used.

In order to insure the collection of the poll tax as provided in the constitutional sections above quoted, the framers of the State constitution deemed it advisable to require the proof of the payment of the poll tax, 30 days before any election, as a prerequisite and qualification for suffrage. This section of the constitution, designated as article II, section 4 (e), reads as follows:

"Managers of elections shall require of each elector offering to vote at any election, b fore allowing him to vote, proof of the payment 30 days before any election of any poll tax then due and payable. The production of a certificate or of the receipt of the officer authorized to collect such taxes shall be conclusive proof of the payment thereof."

The Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina held in *Mew* v. *Charleston & S. Railway Company* (55 S. C. 90; 32 S. E. 828), in construing this section of the constitution, as follows:

"This section prescribes the qualifications for an elector, as suffrage is the right to vote, and not the act of voting."

There we have the supreme court of the State declaring judicially that article II section 4 (e) specifically defines the qualifications for an elector.

From the above we find that in South Carolina the State constitution provides for a poll tax for the purpose of raising revenue for school purposes (art. XI sec. 6). We also find in the State constitution that qualification for suffrage is the payment of the poll tax provided for in the foregoing section. We now have clearly before us the qualifications of an elector for the House of Representatives as defined by the constitution of the State and judicially determined by the supreme court of the State of South Carolina. Let us now look at the Constitution of the United States and find what that document says with reference to the qualification of the electors of the House of Representatives. We find the answer in article I, section 2, of the United States Constitution, which reads as follows:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

From the foregoing we find that in order for an elector to vote for a person seeking election to the House of Representatives or the most numerous branch of the State legislature, the elector must be registered and in addition he must show "proof of the payment 30 days before any election of any poll tax then due and payable."

The Constitution of the United States in article I, section 2, clearly defines the qualifications of an elector voting for Members of the House of Representatives. This elector must have the qualifications of an elector voting for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. This section is mandatory. We therefore submit that it is beyond the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of the qualifications of electors for Members of the House of Representatives without doing violence to the solemn provisions of article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States. To do so would change the qualifications so defined by the constitution of the State of South Carolina and the Constitution of the United States.

Let us now look to the State and Federal courts for their construction of the sections of the Constitution quoted and discussed above. The Supreme Court of the United States has already judicially determined that a State may provide for the collection of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting without violating any of the provisions of the Federal Constitution. In the case of *Nolen R. Breedlove* v. *T. Earl Suttles, Tax Collector* (302 U. S. 277–284; 82 L. Ed. 252; decided December 1937), the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the right of the State of Georgia to collect a poll tax of $1 as a prerequisite to voting and specifically held that such requirement did not violate the equal protection of the laws, nor did it abridge the privileges and immunities as guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment. In passing upon the question the Court said:

"To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate." (*Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall 162, 170 et seq.; 22 L. Ed. 627, 629); *Ex Parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651, 664, 665; 28 L. Ed. 274, 275; 4 S. Ct. 152); *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 37, 38; 36 L. Ed. 869, 878; 13 S. Ct. 3); *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347; 362; 59 L. Ed. 1340, 1346; 35 S. Ct. 926; L. R. A. 1916 A, 1124).)

Mr. President, in view of the fact that I mentioned the State of Georgia, I may say the State has since that time repealed its poll tax. Certain other States have also repealed the poll tax. They have done it in a constitutional way, through the State legislatures, submitting constitutional amendments to the people. The subject has been before the legislature of my State for several years. Action was taken by one branch of the legislature one year, and by the other branch in another year.

I may say that in 1942 I myself said I thought the State should repeal the poll tax. I am not here advocating a poll tax, but I am opposing Federal interference with the State of South Carolina or with any other State. As I said a little earlier, the poll tax remains in but few States. I hope I shall see the day when perhaps all the other States, observing due process, will, in proper manner and in a constitutional way, through the legislature and through the ballot box, repeal those taxes. I hope, on the contrary, I shall never see the day when the Congress of the United States or the Federal Government will tell the people of my State or of any other State what they must do or what the Government is going to do to them.

In the same case the Supreme Court of the United States said, "The payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting is a familiar and reasonable regulation long enforced in many States and for more than a century in Georgia."

As to the constitutional requirement that evidence of the payment of the poll tax be offered as a prerequisite to voting, the Court said:

"That measure reasonably may be deemed essential to that form of the levy. Imposition without enforcement would be futile. Power to levy and power to collect are equally necessary. And by the exaction of payment before registration, the right to vote is neither denied nor abridged. * * * It is fanciful to suggest that the Georgia law is a mere disguise under which to deny or abridge the right of men to vote."

The Breedlove case, supra, is the final word from the Supreme Court of the United States with reference to the imposition of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, and we see by that case that such a requirement is in harmony with the United States Constitution. This case has been followed with approval since 1937 in the following cases: 68 Fed. Sup. 748; 164 Pa. (2d) 169; 207 S. C. 489; 163 Tenn. 370.

Again, in 1941, the Supreme Court of the United States, in an opinion by Mr. Chief Justice Stone, passing upon the meaning of section 2, article I, of the United States Constitution, said, in the case of *United States of America* v. *Patrick B. Classic* (313 U. S. 298; 85 L. Ed. 1368):

"Section 2 of article I commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes. The right of the people to choose, within its appropriate constitutional limitations, where in other respects it is defined, and the mode of its exercise is prescribed by State acts in conformity to the Constitution, is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right."

It is argued by some that the Classic case, supra, to some extent overruled the principles enunciated in the Breedlove case, supra. This position cannot be maintained, however, when the language of the Court and the authorities cited therein are carefully analyzed. It is important to bear in mind that the statute involved in the Classic case regulated only the manner of holding elections. The language used by the Court and relied upon by those who maintain that new and different legal principles were established by the Classic case is as follows:

"While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (citing cases), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.'"

To sustain this proposition the Court cited: *Ex parte Siebold* (100 U. S. 371; 25 L. Ed. 717); *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 663, 664; 28 L. Ed. 278; 4 S. Ct. 152); *Swafford* v. *Templeton* (185 U. S. 487; 46 L. Ed. 1005, 22 S. Ct. 783); *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58, 64; 45 L. Ed. 84, 88; 21 S. Ct. 17).

All of the authorities cited in the Classic case definitely hold that the several States have supreme power to prescribe the qualifications of the electors who are to vote for the most numerous branch of their legislatures, and consequently their Senators and Representatives in Congress. The first case cited, *Ex parte Siebold*, involves solely the question of the power of Congress to provide for the supervision of elections for Representatives in Congress by Federal marshals and their deputies, and by supervisors appointed by the Federal judges. These Federal officers were required to be present at the voting places and it was made a crime by an act of Congress for anyone to interfere with them in the disposition of their duties. The opinion of the Court did not touch upon the question of qualifications for suffrage or even refer to section 2 of article I. It was restricted solely to the power to regulate the manner of holding the election, as appears from the language in the opinion. This language is as follows:

"The clause of the Constitution under which the power of Congress, as well as that of the State legislatures, to regulate the elec-

tion of Senators and Representatives is as follows: 'The times, places, and manner of holding an election for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators.' "

This expressly excludes the possibility that the Court considered section 2 relating to qualifications of electors as included in the power to regulate the "manner of holding elections." If this were not correct, reference would have been made to section 2 as well as section 4 of article I.

The second case cited in the opinion in the Classic case is *Ex parte Yarbrough*. In this case the Court expressly recognized the power of the States to prescribe such qualifications, saying that the States " * * * define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State."

If the language relied upon by those who did propose such legislation quoted from the Classic case had been intended to mean that Congress is empowered to "define who are to vote" at such elections, the Court certainly would not have cited the Yarbrough case in support of that proposition. In fact, the Yarbrough case is authority for the principle that Congress has no such power.

The next case cited by the Chief Justice in the classic case is *Swafford* v. *Temple* which involved the question whether a person qualified to vote under State laws, who is wrongfully denied that right, has a cause of action for damages arising under the Constitution of the United States. In answering the question in the affirmative the Court referred to the Yarbrough case, supra, and interpreted that opinion:

"That is to say the opinion was that the case was equally one arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States whether the illegal act complained of arose from a charged violation of some specific provision of the Constitution or laws of the United States, or from the violation of a State law which affected the exercise of the right to vote for a Member of Congress, since the Constitution of the United States had adopted, as the qualifications of electors for Members of Congress, those prescribed by the State for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State." (46 L. ed. 1007-1008)

It is significant to note that the Court says that the Constitution adopts the qualifications of electors prescribed by the State, not that Congress adopts same. Since the Constitution adopts them it necessarily follows that Congress is without power to alter this adoption or in any manner change the same.

The last case cited by the Chief Justice in the Classic case is *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* which also held that the right of a person qualified under State laws to vote for the popular branch of the legislature is also qualified to vote for Members of Congress and such right is protected by the Constitution. The opinion quoted with approval the proposition laid down in the Yarbrough case that the States define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature and the Constitution of the United States says that the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. The power of the several States to define these qualifications is supreme and paramount.

Certainly these cases cited in the Classic case should dispel any argument by the proponents of such legislation that the language in the Classic case was intended to overrule the principle long established in this country that the qualification of electors is to be prescribed by the several States.

The principles enunciated by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Breedlove case and in the Classic case were again affirmed on October 13, 1941, when the Supreme Court denied certiorari in the case of *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 Fed. 2d. 218 (certiorari denied 86 L. ed. 68; 62 S. Ct., Rep. 64)). In *Pirtle* v. *Brown* the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, in a unanimous decision based largely on the Breedlove case, held the poll tax requirement constitutional. Thus the Supreme Court again placed the stamp of its approval on the Breedlove case and approved it as the controlling authority to sustain the validity of the poll tax qualification in elections solely for congressional Members.

There are numerous State-court decisions sustaining the validity of the poll-tax qualification. Time and space will not permit a review of all of these authorities. Suffice it to say that in the following States the courts are unanimous in holding that failure to pay a valid poll tax imposed as a condition of voting has the effect of disqualifying the voter and rendering his vote invalid: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and South Carolina. (See Annotation A. L. R., vol. 139, p. 572.)

Congress itself has heretofore recognized the principle discussed above, for on two occasions Congress proposed amendments to the Constitution. The sole purpose of each was to restrict the unlimited reserved power of the States over suffrage. The fifteenth amendment prohibits denial of the right to vote "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." And the nineteenth amendment prohibits such denial "on account of sex." If Congress had considered that it possessed the power to prohibit such denial, there would have been no necessity for these two amendments, since a prohibitory statute would have obtained the desired results in each case.

In other words, Mr. President, if Congress had believed that women suffrage could have been put through without a constitutional amendment, it would have done it, in those days. If Congress had believed that the other amendment relating to race, color, and previous condition of servitude could have been put through without a constitutional amendment, it would have done so, likewise, in those days. But the Constitution had to be amended to cover those points, and it is my belief, and it is what the Supreme Court has stated, that the Constitution must be amended to cover the subject of the poll tax.

Thus by submitting those two amendments Congress has construed the Constitution as reserving in the States full power over the qualification of voters, and the States by ratifying same have placed a like construction thereon.

All that has been said with reference to the qualification of electors for Members of the House of Representatives applies with equal force to the qualification for electors for Members of the United States Senate, for the obvious reason that the seventeenth amendment to the United States Constitution so provides. This amendment reads as follows:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, selected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

From the foregoing we clearly see that the imposition of a poll tax by Constitution or statute, and the payment thereof as a prerequisite to voting has been judicially determined by many of the State courts and by the Supreme Court of the United States to be within the constitutional rights of the several States. We also find that Congress itself has interpreted the Constitution to mean that the qualification of suffrage is power reserved to the several States, and this interpretation has been accepted by all of the States. Conversely, we find that the qualifications of an elector voting for Members of the House of Representatives are specifically defined by the Constitution of the United States in article I, section 2, and that the qualifications for electors voting for Members of the United States Senate are specifically defined in the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It therefore necessarily follows that since these qualifications of electors are defined in the Constitution, any attempt on the part of Congress to limit, restrict, or enlarge these qualifications by congressional action would be clearly unconstitutional.

CONCLUSION

The principle is as old as the Constitution of the United States and as new as the most recent decision of the Supreme Court on the issue that there is no Federal suffrage. The power to create such suffrage was not one granted to the Federal Government in the Constitution. The several States are the source of the right of suffrage. It is their function and prerogative alone to deal with that right. This principle has always been regarded as one of the bulwarks of the liberty of the American people, because it guarantees them against the ability of a Federal administration to perpetuate itself in power through Federal control of the ballot boxes of the Nation.

Certainly this is not the hour in our history for Congress to propose legislation in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States, as well as the customs and traditions of the people of the several States, all of which have been mellowed by age; and such action on the part of Congress would merely divide the country over domestic issues, while at the same time war clouds are gathering for the third time within one generation.

Respectfully submitted.

J. STROM THURMOND,
Governor of the State of South Carolina.
JOHN M. DANIEL,
Attorney General for the State of South Carolina.

MARCH 22, 1948.

Mr. President, I wanted to say a word about what I understood might happen this afternoon, namely, that the Senate might adjourn or recess over Saturday. I understand that many Members have work to do in their offices. There have been many committee meetings which many of the Senators have had to attend. So I understand that there may be no session tomorrow. As the distinguished President pro tempore knows, we had a meeting of the Armed Services Committee on the first day of the session, which lasted all morning. General Hershey appeared before the committee. He is to select men for the Army and the Navy. He went into full detail. He even discussed the draft in the First World War, under President Wilson. He discussed it at length with all of the members of the committee, in connection with the Second World War, in which, of course, he was the citizen who was put in charge so that it would not be a military appointment at that time.

In other words, he was considered a citizen whose duty it was, back in 1940, 1941, and 1942, and continuing throughout the war, to get soldiers necessary for

the Army and the sailors necessary for the Navy. He went into a discussion of the pool, there being some 9,000,000 between the ages of 19 and 25 as he estimated, who would be forced to register. Then he went into a long, detailed statement about the number coming of age each month and each year. I have forgotten the figures.

We spent the time until, as I remember, the President was about to speak, or it was the next day. There has been so much to do this week that it is hard to remember what happened on each day. But we had the President's address, and perhaps we have not been in the Senate as much as we should have been, there has been so much going on in the committees particularly, and I can understand why many Senators want to attend to their mail and various appointments tomorrow, Saturday.

Yesterday we had a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which heard Mr. McCabe in the morning at 10 o'clock. Then we had to rush over to the Senate at 12 o'clock to listen to the discussion of what was to be done, and what bills were to be brought up. Finally it was decided that the poll-tax bill would be brought up. Then yesterday afternoon again the Committee on Banking and Currency had a meeting which lasted all afternoon. Unfortunately, I had to be present yesterday afternoon in the Senate to listen to the debate, and had to prepare the few remarks I have made today, so I missed that meeting. But the committee met, as I remember, at 2:30 o'clock, and had a long list of witnesses, and most of the members of the committee remained throughout the meeting. This morning we started the meeting at 10 o'clock, before I could get through with my mail, and the witness, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] stated a while ago, was Mr. John Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury, who testified on the anti-inflation bill, which concerns title I and title II.

Title I, of course, is the bill on consumer credit which we passed in the committee last March, I think it was. In fact, our committee tried to keep that section in a free conference report last July. I happen to be a member of the free conference committee, but the House struck that out. We labored long and hard to keep it in, but we could not succeed. Then we passed the bill and sent it to the House, and it has been there ever since. That is, title I. I supported it, and I am glad I did. I think it should have been agreed to.

Title II concerned certain Reserve banks and what interest charges they might make and what reserves they might have. It is quite a long title. The chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. McCabe, testified on it at some length, and he had with him a book with charts showing what would happen and what would not happen if it were adopted.

What concerned me, and what concerned the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and others yesterday, was what would be the reaction of the 700 State banks which would be covered under this title. I heard the Senator from Indiana discussing the matter here today, and he said he questioned the States' rights end of it, that it would enable the Government to go into a State and tell the State bank examiner what he could prescribe for a State bank; and Mr. McCabe said he questioned that, too.

After quite a discussion was had, I came to the conclusion that perhaps Mr. McCabe was right and that we should have hearings over a period of several weeks, so that we would not do anything that would endanger the right of bank examiners and of State banks and those in charge of State banks, because we must remember that the Federal Reserve interfered in the State banks some years ago, when it made a ruling cutting out the exchange right the State banks had, and ruling that a State bank without a State could not charge exchange, which disrupted many State banks and caused confusion, particularly among the smaller banks in the smaller towns. The 700 State banks under the Federal law are in all the States of the Union, but the 700 Federal Reserve banks have a great deal more money on deposit and on loan, with more resources, so that the proportion would not be 50—50 so far as money was concerned, but in actual numbers it would be.

After Mr. McCabe talked about that matter—and he was quite frank in discussing it—he advocated only the Federal legislation. I cannot quite figure how it is possible to have 700 banks in 48 States operating under one law and 700 State banks in 48 States operating under another law. Some are bound to be done harm, and some are going to suffer.

I am glad the committee is meeting again this afternoon. I saw the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] leave the Senate Chamber to go to the meeting, and, of course, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] asked the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] a few questions before he left, and he went to the committee meeting. I do not see any of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency at present on the floor of the Senate, and I presume they are in attendance at the meeting. I have attended every meeting except the one now proceeding. Of course at this time it is my duty to be present here. So, I realize the work Senators have had to do. I am personally familiar with the operations of only two of the committees. I am not a member of the Committee on Education and Labor or Civil Service, or the Committee on Public Lands or Welfare and Public Works or the Committee on Foreign Relation. I know the Committee on Foreign Relations and the members of that committee have been under great strain, with the European situation as it is. I realize that the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] offered a resolution, I think day before yesterday, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for very, very careful study.

So, when I take into consideration all the committees, and what Senators have had to do, and the many meetings they have had to attend, I realize that other Senators, like me, have many problems to handle, and when the President called the Congress back into session, there were many matters in the Departments about which our constituents had talked when we were at home, and which they wanted looked after. In fact, I may say that several delegations have been here from my State, and I was happy to have them here, but all that takes time.

I hope that tomorrow I may be able to catch up with some of my mail, and I feel certain that by Monday, when we reassemble, I may have that all out of the way. I understand that on Monday we are to have a vote on the joint resolution offered by my colleague [Mr. JOHNSTON] for adjournment. If that shall not be agreed to, I understand we are to continue to discuss the merits of the poll-tax bill. In the meantime, if I shall not be here, I shall be in attendance on the Committee on Banking and Currency or some other committee.

Now to review what perhaps might be done about the housing bill. Much talk has been had about the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It has been discussed in committee and on the floor of the Senate. Naturally, there would be much discussion concerning it. The bill was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency after months of hearings. Last year such a bill was reported from the committee by a one-vote majority. This year again a housing bill was reported from the committee by a one-vote majority. It was debated at great length. Several substitutions were offered for it. At one time the attempt was made to do away with everything in it except title VI. Some attempted to do away with the slum-clearance provisions of the bill. Some attempted to do away with the financing provisions of the bill. Some suggested that provisions for supplying funds to States and cities be deleted, but that title VI remain in the bill. I cast my vote six times on that bill in committee and in the Senate. Every time I voted I voted in favor of the bill. Every time I voted I voted in favor of veterans' housing.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] read from page 3 of the Midyear Economic Report of the President that about 1,000,000 dwelling units were going to be built during 1948. I agree with him that housing construction has reached an all-time peak.

I want to see the housing bill pass. If we do not pass it this year what assurance do we have that it will be passed next year? I think the thing to do is pass it now. Let the veterans have the housing. Let us pass title VI of the bill. Let us pass the provision with respect to slum clearances. If it is desired to have an amendment placed in the bill to the effect that funds shall not be used for construction until materials are available, very well. We want to be fair. We put such a provision in the road bill we passed 2 or 3 years ago. At that time a great argument arose over the scarcity of materials. When such a question comes up there is always talk of scarcity of materials. That was always the great argument used. As I remember, we passed a road bill providing $7,500,000 in 1945 to develop highways and streets, to develop farm marketing roads, forest roads, and all kinds of roads. The ques-

tion that was raised then in the Senate is the same question that is raised now. It was contended that there was a labor shortage, that there was a shortage of labor skills. Of course, there was such a shortage at that time, toward the end of the war. A similar question arose respecting materials. What were we going to do by way of materials? An amendment was placed in the bill providing that the money could be spent when materials and labor were available. So there will be no misunderstanding, I will read the language appearing at the bottom of page 3 of the President's midyear economic report as follows:

Residential construction is expected to increase the total supply of dwelling units by more than a million during 1948. This high output has been accompanied by an increase in cost that is outrunning consumers' ability to pay for the housing they need.

I agree with that statement. The cost of houses is becoming entirely too high. Construction costs are becoming entirely too high. But that is no reason why we should not pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. That is no reason why we should not pass the bill containing a provision whereby we would place a limitation on funds until materials are available. We can spend or loan so much money based on the materials and labor available because the veterans must have some help. The veterans who made it possible for us to be in this Chamber today, who fought the war, are entitled to some aid.

The Senator from Wyoming said today—and he said it very excellently—that we did not ask these boys whom we took from school or from college or from home any questions. We simply took them. The Congress took them and placed them in the war. While they were in the war, profits were made by others who stayed at home. I, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, voted to establish an excess-profits tax. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who was at that time the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, after hearings were held on the subject, proposed the excess-profits-tax measure which took away excess profits from the firms engaged in making war materials.

Now residential construction is reaching an all-time high. More than 1,000,000 dwelling units will be added during the year 1948. Think of that, Mr. President. But that is not doing any good to speak of to the veterans. It will benefit only those who have good credit or have the funds with which to build. Therefore, we should pass the housing bill.

The economic report of the President continues:

For 2 years it has been asserted that if matters were left alone there would be so great an increase in production that it would take care of prices. Increasing the supply of goods is, indeed, to be sought through every practicable means. But historically no important inflation has been cured in that manner.

Of course, Mr. President, everyone has his own ideas as to how to cure inflation. I neglected to state that after Mr. McCabe testified yesterday in the Committee on Banking and Currency for quite some time and had given his views, Mr. Eccles came and gave his views. Then this morning Mr. Snyder gave his views. So most of those who write the economic reports have varying views, just as Senators on this floor have varying views.

The report says:

But, historically, no important inflation has been cured in that manner; nor has this one, despite the fact that every factor of high profits, heavy market demand, and large funds available for investment has been favorable to the expansion of production.

Production has expanded. But I was surprised to find from the Federal Reserve report on yesterday—I do not know if other Senators have read it or not—that they estimate the expanded production on the basis of dollars, which, of course, is a rather difficult way to understand production because prices have been increased so that if there is 100 percent production, we will say, in some article on the basis of dollars, it might not be more than 20 or 25 percent more of actual goods. It is quite difficult to get down to the actual amount of production increase there has been.

Mr. President, I voted for the European recovery program. Such a program naturally would make certain things scarce in this country, but, even so, I would vote for it again, for I believe it has and will continue to stop the pressing forward and closer to us of the iron curtain, and that the program has been of real help to the European nations who were our allies in World War II—France, England, Holland, the Netherlands, and our friends in the Mediterranean countries, as well as our friends in the Scandinavian countries. Yes; I voted for ERP, and I would vote for it again if it were brought up again. I am frank enough to admit that I believe it has made for certain scarcities in this country. Some persons say that it has caused all the scarcities that exist. In that I do not agree. Some people, however, say it does not affect the economy of our country. Mr. President, it does. If we export 10 percent of the goods we produce, it will make a difference to us. That is the 10 percent that makes inflation. Take the item of lumber. Shipload after shipload after shipload has gone from the town from which I come. Where does it go? It goes to Holland, to England, to France, and to other countries. Does anyone mean to tell me that that does not make a shortage of lumber at home? Of course it does. But I am happy to have had the privilege and pleasure of voting for the European recovery program, and I would do it again if it would be necessary. I assert, Mr. President, that that program has had much to do with bettering conditions in western Europe today. But it has increased the cost of goods. It has caused tremendous exports of many scarce commodities.

Today there was considerable discussion about the price of steel. I was very much interested, because Senators were talking about the effect of the exportation of steel. Of course, we have exported a great deal of steel. We cannot obtain any recovery in Europe without basic commodities which we use. This is no relief measure. This is no UNRRA program that we are now conducting. America has assumed world leadership and responsibility. Former Secretary Byrnes, Secretary Marshall, and others, after months of careful study, and following the great work which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and other members of the Foreign Relations Committee did, set up the plan now in effect, known as the European recovery program. The Congress determined to go along to the end, and to use every effort to prevent another war. The Congress determined to build up the democratic nations of Europe and to revive Christianity.

When the Congress established the recovery program it created a "watchdog" committee to watch the administration of the program, to see that it was a real recovery program, and to see that the funds went for recovery, and not relief. The funds were not intended to be handed out to the Communists, but were intended for worth-while relief, to rebuild Europe so that again there would be Christian democracy in the world, and so that there would be nations with which we could trade.

The Committee on Foreign Relations suggested, and there was placed in the bill, a provision that the nations receiving aid should do away with trade barriers, and that to the best of their ability they should balance their budgets. The European Recovery Act was one of the greatest acts ever passed by Congress. If we are willing to fight to keep out of world war III by exporting materials, we must be reconciled to the fact that we shall feel the effect at home. It is far better to export such materials and bring back our friends so that we can trade with them in future years than not to export them. But there is no use in saying that the program does not affect us, because it does.

I read further from the economic report of the President:

The policy proclaimed in the Employment Act requires us to devise and adopt positive measures to stop the inflation and secure relative stabilization. It is not too late for preventive measures, and we are not yet forced by the tragic consequences of depression to adopt measures which would interfere with our free economy far more than would any or all of the measures I have proposed. I realize that the anti-inflationary program I have offered will impede some business plans, will curb some profit opportunities, and may limit some wage advances. It is of the very essence of a plan to counteract inflation that this be done. All groups will ultimately benefit when it is done.

Mr. President, I do not take issue with those who say that the program might impede some business plans or curb some profit opportunities, because I realize that that will be necessary. I am in thorough accord with the statement with regard to employment. There has been no depression. There is no unemployment. There are more people working today than ever before. Wages are better today than they have ever been in the history of the country. It is true that prices are too high, but every time

wages are increased and everytime we increase the production of materials made by workers receiving increased wages, whether in the form of a tractor on the farm, or a loom in a cotton mill, naturally prices go up.

I wished to express my opinion about inflation. I am in agreement with those who believe that the European recovery plan has to a certain extent caused a little increase in prices, and will in the future cause a little increase in prices. But let me say again, so that there may be no misunderstanding, that I would vote for the European recovery plan every time, notwithstanding the increase in prices.

In 1943 I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with the War Department appropriation. I voted for one appropriation bill which contained an appropriation of $50,000,000,000 for the War Department. As I recall, there was an appropriation of $30,000,000,000 for the Navy. We spent nearly $100,000,000,000 in 1 year on the Army and Navy. As everyone knows, we now owe approximately $250,000,000,000. I suppose the total amount spent during the war would reach approximately $450,000,000,000, taking into consideration the taxes collected. So after voting for an appropriation of $60,000,000,000 for the Army to make weapons with which to shoot and kill people and to develop the atomic bomb—because the Manhattan project happened to be included in that bill—I am glad that I had the opportunity to vote for an appropriation of $4,000,000,000 to try to prevent a war.

I read further from the economic report of the President:

Employment in the first half of this year ran continuously above the level of a year ago. Some 850,000 workers were added to the labor force, yet unemployment in June was only 2,200,000—400,000 less than a year earlier. June civilian employment set a new record of 61,300,000.

Industrial production reached a new postwar peak in February, and after the work stoppage in coal mining approached it again in June. Improved industrial relations and high business confidence reinforced by increased Government commitments for foreign aid and defense give promise of continuing high-level output for the rest of the year.

There has been considerable discussion about labor. I am delighted to know that, according to the President, there are improved industrial relations, and that there is high business confidence, reinforced by increased Government commitments for foreign aid and defense.

Reading further from the President's economic report:

Agricultural production ran below the level of the first half of last year because smaller numbers of livestock and tight feed supplies have reduced the output of most livestock products. At midyear, our second largest wheat crop was being harvested, and generally favorable crop reports were highlighted by an indicated production of over 3,300,000,000 bushels of corn—a new record. While such a crop could not remedy the meat shortage during the rest of this year, it would provide the basis for more ample supplies of livestock products in 1949 and thereafter.

I am delighted to know that the chances are that we shall have more livestock supplies in 1949. I hope that will prove to be a fact, and that the recommendation of the Department of Agriculture, about which I read in the press, will not take effect. That recommendation called for reduced production of beef cattle, hogs, chickens, and eggs. The President's report distinctly says that we have an excellent chance to increase production, because of the larger grain crops of 1949.

I read further from the President's economic report:

Consumer income ran at an annual rate of about $208,000,000,000, compared with $195,000,000,000 in 1947. Consumer income after taxes increased from a rate of $174,000,000,000 to a rate of $186,000,000,000.

Consumer expenditure, as a result of some buyer hesitation in the first quarter, increased less than disposable income, leaving a small increase in net consumer saving.

The distribution of income, according to the most recent data, has changed but little since 1946. A survey of families, however, showed half the Nation's consumer spending units falling substantially behind in the race of incomes with living costs during 1947. One-fourth of the family units spent more than they earned. Low-income people were spending past savings predominantly for current expenses, higher income people more often spending theirs for durable goods or converting them into residential or business investments.

Mr. President, that is exactly what I said—that the higher-income people would get the benefit of the 1,000,000-unit increase in dwellings.

I repeat:

Residential construction is expected to increase the total supply of dwelling units by more than a million during 1948.

Again I say there is no excuse for not enacting the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

As to the distribution of income, the report states that—

A survey of families, however, showed half the Nation's consumer spending units falling substantially behind in the race of incomes with living costs during 1947. One-fourth of the family units spent more than they earned. Low-income people were spending past savings predominantly for current expenses—

Imagine that, Mr. President; we find that they were spending not just what they were making but what they had saved—

higher income people more often spending theirs for durable goods or converting them into residential or business investments.

Consumer credit continued to expand during the first half of 1948.

Business investment took a larger share of the national output in the first half of 1948 than during 1947. Equipment outlays have been exceptionally high since the war; plant construction expenditures have increased less strikingly. Present indications are that such outlays will continue high throughout the rest of the year. Nonfarm inventories increased markedly during the first quarter of the year, when sales lagged, but leveled off in the second quarter as sales picked up.

Profits exceeded last year's average, reflecting higher prices for a high volume of output. First-quarter data, however, indicated a drop in profits of small manufacturing firms.

Mr. President, I repeat that, because I always have believed that this would be one of the biggest years of national income we ever have had, and so I had no hesitancy in voting for the tax-reduction bill, so as to take from the backs of the taxpayers some of the burdens they bore. I voted for that bill for several reasons. One was that we included in the bill the provision for the splitting of incomes between husbands and wives. The State of South Carolina and other States had such a provision on the basis of their original constitutions. In addition, the bill drops from the tax rolls thousands and thousands of income-tax payers. Of course, we know that we had a large surplus last year, and I figured that we would have approximately the same surplus this year, even with the reduction of taxes, because even then, as this report states—

Profits exceeded last year's average, reflecting high prices for a high volume of output.

The report goes on to say:

First-quarter data, however, indicated a drop in profits of small manufacturing firms.

I have understood that the large firms have made more money than ever, but that there are some small firms that have made less money. I am indeed sorry for that situation, and it should be reversed. I hope it can be reversed in the next quarter, and that if there is to be any lessening of profits, it will be among the large firms, rather than among the smaller ones. But of course the lack of various strategic materials, such as steel, lumber, and so forth, probably is responsible for this condition.

I read further from the report:

Net foreign investment, at less than half the rate of the last quarter of 1947, in part reflected decreases in exports and increases in imports in our trade with all continents. The foreign-aid program will increase our surplus of exports during the rest of the year.

Mr. President, I think the reason why much of the foreign shipments fell off at that particular time was that Army and Navy surplus war materials and materials handled by various other Government agencies, and certainly all the surplus property left over from the war, was shipped in 1946 and the early part of 1947. In fact, most of that business was done in the early part of that year. I think that is the reason why exports fell off. As the President's report points out here, I think the foreign-aid program will increase our surplus of exports during the rest of the year. In other words, it will increase from now on, because we are in the midst of the European recovery program; and although between the closing of UNRRA operations and the shipment of materials from the War Assets Administration, and the surpluses of the Army and the Navy there was a little lull, I am certain that shipments will materially increase now. There is already a good demand for lumber, logs, some cotton, and some textiles in my part of the country.

I read further:

Wages continued the third round of increases that began last fall though inter-

rupted by the break in commodity prices. Most of the third round increases have roughly corresponded to the rise in cost of living since the previous contract.

Of course that is their report. In some cases I think that would be correct, but in some instances among white-collar workers and other classes of workers I think that would be incorrect. I do not think their wages have followed the increase in prices.

I read further:

Foreign aid and defense expenditures during the present fiscal year will increase pressure on the domestic economy.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that statement, because that is what I was claiming before I came to this part of the report. It is just my idea:

Foreign aid and defense expenditures during the present fiscal year will increase pressure on the domestic economy.

Of course it will increase pressure on the domestic economy. We cannot export cotton, wheat, corn, lumber, logs, steel, and various other critical materials, some of which are in short supply, without affecting the economy. But, Mr. President, if we are exporting them in connection with a program to put the European recovery plan into operation and to get Europe back on its feet, it will be well done.

I read further:

New defense expenditures will not be great during the next few months, but will rise thereafter. Both programs hav a special impact upon such short-supply items as steel, other metals, and farm machinery, and will draw increasingly upon our already fully employed labor force. More adequate allocation authority is needed if we are to avoid progressively more serious disruptive effects of these programs upon supplies, prices, and the organization of production.

The reduction in income taxes will reduce Federal revenues by about $5,000,000,000 at the same time that expenditures will be substantially increasing under the new programs. The deflationary influence of recent Government cash surpluses will thus be replaced by the inflationary influence of additional expenditures on the part of consumers whose tax burdens are reduced.

The general outlook as to inflation shows conflicting influences. On the one side, the supply situation in a number of industries is improved over a year ago. Bountiful crops are in prospect. Postwar expansion programs are nearing completion in many lines of production, and we should experience a gradual increase in output from an enlarged and modernized industrial plant. Commendable caution continues to be shown by business in avoiding speculative overexpansion, and many leaders in both industry and labor can be applauded for the conscious restraint they have exhibited in their pricing policies and wage demands.

The immediate situation is dominated, however, by three interacting processes making for continued inflation. First, consumer demand for goods and services, business demand for investment goods, and demands arising from expanding Government defense and foreign-aid programs press strongly upon production. Second, we are currently in the midst of a round of substantial wage and price increases in major basic industries. These developments foreshadow continuing and ramifying effects on cost structures and prices in many related lines of production, on the cost of living, and on further wage demands. Third, credit expansion, partly a cause and partly a result of inflation, still persists.

The facts add up to a clear and disconcerting conclusion. In spite of some favorable factors, we are in the very midst of gathering inflationary forces, which day by day are imposing additional hardships upon countless families, and day by day are undermining the foundations of the remarkably high level of postwar prosperity that we have thus far maintained.

The hard facts of today leave no room for complacency. Though most people are optimistic about the immediate business outlook, lasting prosperity is not assured.

Mr. President, nobody can assure lasting prosperity. I was very much concerned to read in the paper that Mr. Eccles had predicted a depression, but on reading further I saw that he had merely predicted a depression, without saying when.

Even in the midst of the present prosperity, the average American sees that the value of his accumulated savings has declined, and that many of his neighbors living on pensions or fixed salaries are actually worse off than they were a year ago.

Let us note that, about that being incorrect. That is one reason why I said that, in many industries, wages and salaries did not keep up with price rises.

Looking abroad, we see that, despite great progress, many countries are still far below the living standards needed for sustained production and are dependent on outside help for any hope of further advance. We must be on our guard lest our national prosperity and security be undermined by inflation at home or by misery abroad.

Our American prosperity depends in part on world events, but far more on our own action or inaction right here at home. More than 90 percent of all the goods and services that we produce are for domestic purposes.

But thus far we have shown a blind disregard of the dangers that beset our path. Despite my repeated warnings and recommendations, we have not adopted adequate legislation for controlling inflation. The failure to control inflation effectively in the past makes it increasingly urgent that we adopt and apply vigorous measures to guide us safely from the uneven postwar boom to an era of sustained and stable prosperity.

We are now challenged to carry out the pledge to the American people contained in the Employment Act of 1946 that it shall be the policy of our Government to "utilize all its plans, functions, and resources * * * to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power," in an economy of free competitive enterprise.

It is no less important to take action to forestall a business collapse than it is to use Government measures to overcome a depression once it has arrived. Our success in this effort is essential for the reconstruction of a peaceful world.

Mr. President, we had a recommended program here, and the economic report was presented this morning. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] suggested it be read, but the Chair ruled that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] had the floor, as I remember. I was seated in the rear of the Senate Chamber and did not hear all that was said. Of course, no one questioned the ruling by the Chair. I do not say that it should have been questioned. No one questioned it, and the report was not read. I think at this time certain portions of the report should be read into the RECORD. I may read the recommended program:

[Excerpt from the President's message to the Congress, July 27, 1948]

Positive action by this Government is long overdue. It must be taken now.

That goes into all the President's recommendations.

Under the heading "The economic situation at midyear 1948," contained in the Midyear Economic Report to the President by the Council of Economic Advisers, we read:

I. EMPLOYMENT, PRODUCTION, AND PURCHASING POWER

We enter the second half of 1948 with our labor force fully employed, with total production high, and with inflationary pressures continuing. A review of some major economic events of the first half of 1948 will indicate where we stand and what trends can be foreseen.

THE COURSE OF EMPLOYMENT

The employment situation has continued strong, with the demand for labor so active that a relatively large inflow of additional workers was readily absorbed. There were about 850,000 more workers in the labor force in the first half of 1948 than a year ago, nearly double the rise that would have been expected on the basis of population changes and prewar trends. This increase was due mainly to the abundance of job opportunities at good wages, but it also appears that the pressure of living costs induced many housewives and teen-agers to seek jobs.

Total nonagricultural employment rose to record peacetime levels, while agricultural employment was somewhat below 1947.

Mr. President, that is a bad situation, when so many people have left the farms and when agricultural employment has gone down so much that it has become one reason for the lack of even more increased production. Production has been increased a great deal. Of course, farm machinery has displaced a great deal of farm labor. There are all kinds of farm machines, including the cotton-picking machine, which has itself replaced a great deal of labor. It is still regrettable to me to note that farm labor continues to decrease.

In June, civilian employment stood at 61,300,000, compared with 60,100,000 a year earlier. (See chart 1 and appendix C, table 7.) Thus, 60,000,000 jobs becomes a floor to be protected by every means possible in the future, no longer an objective that the faint-hearted said our business enterprise could not attain.

With more than 61,000,000 in civilian employment, the unemployment figures have continued low. There were 2,200,000 persons unemployed in June of this year, compared with 2,600,000 in June 1947. While some workers in certain areas had difficulty in finding suitable work, there has been no general unemployment problem. In fact, some employers have continued to have trouble in securing the types of labor they needed.

The broad underlying demand for additional workers has been felt in almost all major lines. Construction has been setting the pace, but significant gains have occurred also in manufacturing, finance, and services. Employment in mining, transportation, and public utilities, and Government has changed little. (See appendix C, table 8.)

On the other hand, the leather industry experienced a greater than usual seasonal down-turn this spring, followed by a substantial recovery in June. Employment in the

rubber industry has been declining steadily, averaging about 10 percent below the first half of 1947.

CHART 1. LABOR FORCE

Civilian employment in June exceeded 61,000,000 for the first time. Unemployment continued at a very low level.

There appears at this point in the report a chart with respect to employment in agriculture and nonagriculture and in the armed forces, and also with respect to unemployment. The report then continues with a lengthy discussion, as follows:

THE COURSE OF PRODUCTION

Total production has maintained very high levels. The output of industrial goods (including minerals and manufactured goods) for the 6 months was not quite 3 percent above the 1947 average level. (See chart 2 and appendix C, tables 11 and 12.) As to particular industries, the volume of construction and the output of electric and gas utilities have both been running considerably higher than last year. Transportation just about equaled the levels of a year ago. Basic industries such as steel, chemicals, and construction have operated close to present capacities. The petroleum industry has had difficulty keeping up with demand even though running with wide-open throttle. Consumers' goods continued, in general, at high-level production.

The short corn crop of 1947 resulted in a tight feed situation and, in combination with declining numbers of livestock, led to reduced marketings of livestock products in the first half of 1948. The total volume of farm marketings in the first half of this year was about 7 percent below the level of a year earlier.

The output of goods would have been even higher but for certain specific shortages—notably of fuel, electric power, freight cars, and steel. These shortages continue to impede expansion, but there has been some improvement over 1947.

While industrial disputes, particularly in coal mining, reduced output considerably in March and April, the return of coal mining to normal operation has resulted in a substantial improvement in industrial output during May and June. By midyear, industrial production approximately regained the postwar peak reached in February. The fragmentary evidence available indicates some improvement in labor productivity during the first half of 1948.

PRODUCTION PROSPECTS

The heavy demands of consumers, business, government, and foreign buyers for the output of American farms and industries emphasize the urgent need to expand production. The production outlook for the coming half year is good, but not significantly better than in the last half of 1947 or the first half of this year.

Since we are currently operating at maximum employment and maximum capacity in most fields, any further increase in production is dependent largely upon increased efficiency and improved technology. Such gains cannot be very great in the short span of a few months or a single year. Other factors such as weather, industrial relations, and business psychology are likely to have a far more influential short-run effect.

On these counts, the immediate prospect seems promising. Industrial relations, while disturbed in some industries, promise to be better than they were in the first half of the year, particularly since relatively few major wage contracts come up for negotiation in the late summer and fall. Forward commitments under the foreign aid and defense programs, added to the vigor of the domestic market, give confidence to merchants, manufacturers, and bankers.

In June 1948, there were 2,200,000 more persons working in nonagricultural employment than a year ago. The flow of materials, while still not adequate in the durable goods fields, should permit production to proceed with fewer interruptions than we have witnessed during the past year. There is a likelihood that nonagricultural production in the second half of the year may be slightly higher than it was in the first half.

In agriculture, the season of damaging floods is past, and present crop prospects are excellent. If the favorable weather we have enjoyed so far this season should continue, we may hope for a record-breaking corn crop and a general level of crop production rivaling 1946, the best previous year.

Animal products present a different picture. The number of cattle on farms and ranches has been declining since 1945. Dairy-cow numbers are down to prewar levels. Sheep numbers are the lowest in over 75 years. There are fewer hogs on farms than last year, and the spring pig crop was down 3 percent. The numbers both of laying hens and of young chickens are lower than a year ago. The combination of the reduced livestock population and the continuing tight feed supply means inevitably that the output of most livestock products will continue to run less than last year, until some months after the new corn crop comes in this fall.

Favorable crops may more than offset the unfavorable livestock prospect to make the total output of our farms somewhat higher than last year. But in the case of crops especially, much of this year's production does not come to market until next year. A bumper corn crop may even reduce this year's meat production by encouraging holding animals over for heavier feeding. Consequently farm marketings, in physical terms, will continue to run less than a year ago. For 1948 as a whole they will probably be down 3 or 4 percent. Domestic consumption of food for 1948 will show about the same decrease, around 3 percent on a per capita basis. Food exports will be down somewhat, but the reduction will be chiefly in cereals and, to a smaller degree, in edible fats and oils. Meat and most other livestock products, the shortage of which will be most keenly felt in coming months, have been exported in only relatively minor amounts.

Domestic food consumption will continue above prewar levels. But in relation to postwar levels of demand we must expect, during the remainder of 1948, a relatively tight supply of food, which is the largest component in the workers' cost of living.

THE FLOW OF GOODS AND PURCHASING POWER

The gross national product, that is, the total value of goods and services, which ran at an annual rate of $227,400,000,000 during the first half of 1947, and $235,900,000,000 during the second half, rose to an annual rate of $246,500,000,000 during the first half of 1948. (See appendix C, table 1.) The increasing flow of income and expenditures can best be shown in the accounts of consumers, domestic business, international transactions, and government.

CONSUMER INCOME, EXPENDITURE, AND SAVING

Consumer income: Personal income, which expanded at an annual rate of nearly $10,000,000,000 from the first half of 1947 to the second half, leveled off in 1948 at approximately the December rate of $208,000,000,000. (See appendix C, table 4.) Employment and wage rates continued to increase, but the upward trend in cash farm income was very slight.

TABLE 1.—*Per capita disposable income, current dollars and 1947 dollars*

PERSONAL INCOME AFTER TAXES

Period	Current dollars	1947 dollars [1]
1939	536	859
1946	1,127	1,288
Annual rates, seasonally adjusted:		
1947—First half	1,179	1,208
Second half	1,229	1,200
1948—First half [2]	1,274	1,200

[1] Deflated by the consumers' price index, which does not fully reflect changes in the cost of living of all groups of consumers.

[2] Estimates based on incomplete data.

NOTE.—The figures in this table are based on revised estimates and are different from those published in previous economic reports of the President.

SOURCES: Department of Commerce and Department of Labor. (See appendix C, table 6.)

Real per capita purchasing power dropped from 1946 to 1947, as stated in earlier reports. No measurable change occurred in the first half of this year, the rise in the over-all average of money income per person being just about offset by the rise in retail prices.

In a period of rising prices and high-living costs, the distribution of consumer income becomes increasingly important. Of particular significance is the progressive deterioration in the economic position of those individuals and families whose dollar incomes have fallen far behind in the race with rising prices. Comprehensive statistics on income distribution for the first half of this year are not available. A survey comparing 1946 and 1947 showed that 30 percent of all families (spending units) had no appreciable increase in dollar incomes and almost 20 percent suffered a reduction, during a period when consumer prices increased nearly 15 percent.

While the disappearance of large-scale unemployment and the increase in the number of gainfully employed persons per family tended to narrow the disparity among incomes during the war period and immediately thereafter, this trend has been arrested more recently. As there are relatively more people with fixed incomes in the lower income brackets than in the higher brackets, the favorable effects of full employment upon the distribution of income have been offset by the unfavorable effects of inflation during the past year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from South Carolina finish with the message today?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have omitted a great deal of the message concerning the poll-tax legislation which we fought in 1942, awaiting my other speech, under rule IX. I have been reading the President's economic report because I purposely wanted to retain the 1942 hearings and testimony before the Judiciary Committee at that time for my next speech.

Mr. WHERRY. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, I feel that unless there is something else to be brought before the Senate, and if the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has concluded, we might recess.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have 2 or 3 minutes to make a few remarks, and I should like to do it in my own time, if I might.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina yields the

floor, and the Senator from Oregon is recognized.

THE FIRST WEEK OF THE SPECIAL SESSION—OBJECTIVES WHICH SHOULD BE ATTAINED

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take just 2 or 3 minutes to express my views on the progress or lack of progress made to date in 1 week of the special session of the Congress.

I think it is obvious that, with the eyes of the Nation on Congress, certainly the first thing the President should have done before he called the special session of Congress was to call a special session of Democrats to see if any unity whatsoever could be obtained on any phase of the program for which he called the Congress back in session because, if anything has been demonstrated here this week, it has been the fact of a complete lack of unity on the Democratic side of the Senate.

We are confronted now with what is obviously the beginning of a prolonged filibuster on one section of the President's program; namely, the civil-rights section. I do not think the Congress should adjourn without the clear responsibility for this situation being placed on the Democratic side of the aisle because the Republican side all week, for hours past now, has been ready and willing to proceed to vote on a motion to take up for consideration House bill 29, the anti-poll-tax bill, but we cannot even secure action on that simple motion because the Democratic Members of this body, by their prolonged and quite irrelevant speeches on the subject, refuse to let us come to a vote.

I think it is very important that the people of the United States should place the responsibility where it belongs and should realize that good government in this Nation is going to be endangered so long as there is this great split between the White House and the President's own party in the Congress, and between the White House and the Congress as a whole. This illustrates very clearly the desirability of proceeding as rapidly as we can—and the first opportunity will be in November—to elect a President with a majority of his own party in the Congress.

Conditions being what they are, and the international crisis being what it is, the welfare of your country and mine, Mr. President, demands that the American people take action at a free ballot box at the first opportunity, to see to it that the deadlock between the White House and the Congress is brought to an end, so that we may put into effect the forward-looking program and platform my party adopted at Philadelphia.

I am aware of the fact that in the special session there is an opportunity for us at least to try to make a constructive march forward in an endeavor to put that platform into operation, but I think we have had a demonstration here for a week which ought to make crystal clear to the American people why in this special session of Congress we are stymied because it is perfectly clear that the President's party itself is not united behind him in going forward with the program he proposes.

I think on the basis of my record in the Senate I have demonstrated that I am sufficiently nonpartisan, at least when great nonpartisan issues are before the people, to put the blame for nonaction where it belongs. I am perfectly aware of the fact that if we stay in special session—and I underline the word "if"—then there is an obligation on this side of the aisle to make up its mind next week as to what issues we are going to press for final determination in this special session of the Congress.

I recognize that in this first week of the session it has been necessary for the committees of the Senate to give due consideration to the various proposals the President has recommended to the Congress and to the bills which are being developed and framed as a result of those proposals; but I say to the members of my party on this side of the aisle that they cannot escape the gaze which 145,000,000 American people are fixing on us these days, and by next week I am satisfied the American people are going to ask us in this body, "What is going to be your answer on the issues presented to you?"

Mr. President, if we are to proceed on the anti-poll-tax issue—and there is certainly justification for getting the civil-rights question out of the way at the beginning of this special session of Congress—then let us face that issue openly and frankly, and with a united determination to break the prospective filibuster which the Democrats in the Senate obviously contemplate imposing upon us. If our decision is to press for the civil-rights program, then, when we meet on Monday, let there be no more adjournments of the Senate until we break the filibuster, and if it means we have to stay here 24 hours a day for a week, the junior Senator from Oregon here and now says he is ready to remain.

If, on the other hand, after we consider this matter thoroughly, and the possibility of our disposing of a civil-rights program in the special session of Congress, we believe that there has been a sufficient demonstration of a united determination by a group of Democratic Senators to prevent the passage of a civil-rights program in this session of the Congress, let us say so openly and frankly to the American people, but let us also make clear to them, as Republicans, that, come January, when we have a Republican President and a substantial majority of Republicans in both Houses of Congress, we intend then to keep faith with the Republican platform plank on civil rights, adopted at Philadelphia, and at the regular session, press and put through a civil-rights program, so that under the Constitution equality will be afforded to all Americans, and let us break the filibuster at that time.

I have said before on the floor of the Senate that I think the best time to break a filibuster is at the beginning of a regular session. At one time I submitted a resolution which would give us an opportunity to proceed with such a program. In order to break the filibuster I suggested in January that we do something, which is long overdue, namely, proceed to amend the rules of the Senate so that a filibuster cannot be imposed on motions and questions which are now not under the rules of the Senate by precedent defined as "measures" within rule XXII. In other words, we must amend rule XXII so as to bring under the cloture meaning of that rule motions affecting the Journal and motions relating to any item of business that comes before the Senate, because until we adopt such an amendment, then of course those who will to filibuster can filibuster on a great many items that do not come within the definition of the term "measure," as its meaning has already been interpreted under rule XXII.

There is something else, Mr. President. We mean business in facing this filibuster evil in the Senate of the United States, and, as I have said before, it is an evil because it threatens majority rule. I say that, Mr. President, as one who, under the rule on occasion has debated at great length and has filibustered, but I have done so in order to protect the rights of the minority in the Senate.

If we are going to adopt a rule which would bring to an end the filibuster in the Senate—and we should adopt such a rule soon—then let us so amend the rules that minorities will not be trampled upon by a predominant majority in the Senate of the United States.

I refer again to my antifilibuster resolution which is pending on the books of the Senate, which would give, after cloture, a minimum of 2 hours of debate to every Member of the Senate, with the privilege of farming out a part or all of his 2 hours to any other Senator. I say that that important provision in my antifilibuster resolution will protect to the maximum extent necessary minority rights in the Senate. Until that is done, Mr. President, I, of course, would take the position, as I did on a past occasion, that we must protect the minority, so that adequate time for debate on the merits may be guaranteed.

Mr. President, if we decide next week that a clear demonstration has been made to the American people by a disunited Democratic Party in the Senate of the United States that a civil-rights program cannot be passed in this special session of Congress, then I think we should look into the question of prices and housing. My mail, and not only my mail, but several hundred telegrams I have received today, make perfectly clear that the consumers of America recognize that we are on the threshold of a great economic crash unless something is done and done speedily, about it. I have no doubt in my mind, Mr. President, that we cannot continue with this spiral of ever-upward higher prices and not find ourselves in a very serious economic condition within a very few months.

I say to the leadership of my party that I think the political history of America makes perfectly clear that, regardless of who is in control of the Congress and the White House at the time a great economic crash occurs, whatever party is in

control at that time receives, rightly or wrongly, the blame of the American people for the crash. We only have to go back a few years to the crash of 1932 for complete support of the observation I have just made.

If the economic spiral of ever-increasing prices continues, and we win the election in November, as I am sure we shall, and we do not take the necessary steps to do whatever Government can do to protect the consumers from the great economic hardships that inflation is causing them, we, the Republicans, are going to receive the blame if a crash occurs. We may find ourselves as early as 1952 out of office because of the fact that we did not do all we could have done or that the people think we should have done to prevent a crash. So I say to the leadership of my party that there is no escaping the fact that as we sit here in these historic days, from the standpoint of the future of the Republican Party, we are dealing with some very vital matters as to our future.

Of course, I believe that there should be a maximum of voluntarism in this country. I am at a complete loss to understand why the great industrialists of America, the great business leaders of America, the farm leaders and the labor leaders, and the leaders of various economic groups, cannot read the handwriting on the wall, because the script is large, Mr. President, and those who can see certainly should be able to read it if they have any intelligence at all left in their heads.

We cannot price millions upon millions of free Americans out of homes and not reap a repercussion of political consequences, no matter what party may be in power at the time. The fact is that today millions of Americans cannot buy homes. They cannot buy homes which are available, because they cannot afford to pay the prices the homes cost and they know, as we know, that most of such homes are overpriced—and mark my figures, Mr. President—at least 33⅓ percent, and in many instances more than 50 percent.

Oh, I would that a program of voluntarism for which we have pleaded in the Congress of the United States the past 2 years, would be made to work by those who can put it to work. The only ones who can put it to work are, of course, the leaders in the building-construction industry, including the leaders of labor. I wish to say to my labor friends, Mr. President, that they have everything to lose and nothing to gain by this constant pressure for higher and higher and higher wages. I realize, of course, that they must have the money with which to meet the high prices, but the fact remains that the constantly pressing up of wages is one, though only one, of the causes of this ever-increasing spiral.

I wish to say to American industry, and to those who have been reaping profits, exorbitant profits, from overpriced homes, that they will have none but themselves to blame when the crash comes and they find the homes dumped onto the market to the great economic detriment of the building industry.

Oh, I would that the leaders of industry and of labor and of agriculture had been cooperating for months past. Yes, Mr. President, under the legislation we passed in the last session of Congress, I would that the President of the United States had kept faith with us, had given us the cooperation for which he pleaded from us, and had called a series of conferences of the representatives of industry and labor and agriculture in an attempt to make a good-faith start toward putting a democratic system of voluntarism into operation. It has not been done. The result is that today we are faced with a serious economic crisis all over the land, and people are confused.

There is something more, Mr. President. Most American people are rapidly becoming exceedingly resentful. Let Senators read their mail. Let them read such telegrams as I received today. There can be no denying the fact that the American people are calling on the Congress of the United States for action. They do not know what action they want, because they, too, are not sure of the facts; but they are sure of one fact, which is that their savings are disappearing, their debts are climbing, and they cannot meet the high cost of living inflation is placing upon them.

Therefore, I am frankly willing, as I know my colleagues are on this side of the aisle, to let the answer to the one question which should determine our conduct in this session of Congress be determinative of the action we take. That question should be asked of each of us, and we should seek the answer. What are the facts about the economic crisis which confronts us? Secondly, what, if anything, can be done by legislation to answer those facts?

I am not one who takes the position that government is ever helpless to meet a crisis confronting its people. I am not one who takes the position that any legislation which seeks to impose reasonable restrictions upon greed and selfishness—legislation passed by the representatives of the people elected through a free ballot box—endangers democracy. We can unite as a people to protect our national safety and to make possible a free economy, as we did from Pearl Harbor to VJ-day, while prosecuting successfully a great war. I say that we can unite now—yes; even in the midst of an election campaign—as a Congress, to protect the economic interests of our people from a threat to their economy which I think is as serious, so far as the economy is concerned, as the threat which existed following Pearl Harbor. It is not so dramatic, it is not so easily understood, but the fact is that we must unite to win the peace on the home front as well as on the foreign front. I fear that today we are losing the fight in both places.

I did not want the Senate to adjourn this week end until I had at least voiced my prayer and expressed my hope that next week the leadership of my party—as I am sure it will—will decide which course of action will be taken at the beginning of the week—whether we shall proceed with the civil-rights legislation, or whether we shall accept the demonstration of the past week, which makes it perfectly clear that there is no intention on the part of the Democratic side of the aisle to permit a fair consideration of the civil-rights issue in the few short weeks we can be expected to remain in session during the special session. If the latter should be our decision, I think we should write out next week what we think can be done in the short period of time which is available to us.

Make no mistake, Mr. President. I know, and I think we can make clear to the American people, that in 2 weeks, 3 weeks, or a month we could not possibly begin to cover the manifold subject matters which the President submitted to us in his special-session message. We could not do a statesmanlike job on those many subjects in less than 6 months at the minimum. I believe that 9 months would be required to do a real job.

There are some things we can do. We can face the fact which presents itself with regard to credit. We can take note of the undeniable objective fact that installment buying in the United States has now reached the greatest height in all our history—greater than before the crash of 1929.

We can take note of some other objective facts. There is a great deal of uncertainty and rush for cover on the economic plane on the part of a great many persons who still possess some money. What can they do to hedge? That is the question they are asking. They are asking, "How can we preserve what we have been able to save?" When we see the people so restless in the economic field, we see the first signs of economic hysteria. So I think we can do something about bank credit.

As the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] pointed out earlier this afternoon, for months past the President of the United States could have done something about it. After all, we must do those things which will stop the cheapening of the dollar, because the basic problem is the problem relating to the value of the dollar. I believe that we have some credit controls which could be placed in operation, and I hope will be placed in operation, in order to prevent the further devaluation of the dollar. I am perfectly willing that the committee assigned to the task of considering the proposal shall come forward with facts supporting its conclusion, facing openly the question of allocation of scarce materials.

There is no doubt about the fact that that question is basic to our problem. Drive across the country, as I have, and see vitally needed building materials going into nonessential building, from coast to coast; see steel girders going up for race tracks and stadiums; recognize the tremendous waste when we are dealing with questions of essential use in a time of shortage of building material; recognize the great waste which has characterized building for the past 12 months, and you cannot deny the fact that the housing needs and rights of the American people justify a free government elected by free people in saying, "You cannot proceed to use vitally needed materials, which are in short supply, for such nonessential uses while millions of families go unhoused."

What is there about such a proposal which conflicts one iota with sound democratic principles of constitutional government? To the contrary, I say

that if we are to keep faith with the duties of representation as set forth in the Constitution, we, the Congress, can do no less than bring to bear reasonable and fair regulations upon our economy in such a period of crisis.

The question which faces us on this side of the aisle as we adjourn for the week end is, How far are we willing to go in recognizing the fact—and I say that it is the fact—that the voluntary system, without any regulation by Government during the past 12 months has resulted in a type of exploitation and profiteering on the part of some segments of our economy which our Government must halt by fair and reasonable legislation? I have no doubt that my party will do so next January. If it is possible in this short period of time to prepare the data so that we can act intelligently on the subject before adjournment, I think we should do so.

In conclusion, let me say that I believe that next week ought to bring forth a decision as to whether or not we are to recognize that the disunity of the Democratic Party is so great that we cannot succeed in passing a desirable legislative program at this session of Congress, and go home and take this issue to the American people in the election; or whether we are to decide to make an attempt to pass the minimum legislative program which can be passed in this special session of Congress, in the face of Democratic opposition, which will at least check, to the extent we can check by law, the threatening, rising, spiraling inflation which I think will end in an economic "bust" unless the Government does something about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29.

THE STOPPING OF INFLATION—RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am about to ask that the Senate take a recess until Monday noon. Before doing so, I should like to say, in response to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, that at that time the pending business will be the question which has just been stated by the distinguished occupant of the chair, the President pro tempore of the Senate. We shall proceed to consider that motion until we can either agree to it or terminate the discussion in some other manner.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon has made an eloquent plea for action. I assure him and other Members of the Senate, and also the American people, that so far as I am concerned, I subscribe once again to the statement issued by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], chairman of the policy committee, in behalf of the leadership on this side, that the Congress is ready and willing at this session to consider any legislation having to do with stopping inflation which can be processed through committees and brought to the floor for debate. I think all of us agree that that is the main problem, and that if anything can be done it will be done.

Certainly we have before us a bill which is being offered by the President of the United States. It was introduced by the candidate for Vice President on the Democratic ticket, and the bill is now being considered before the House committee. After the hearings are concluded in the House committee or in the Senate committee, if the proposed legislation is brought to the floor, it will be debated.

However, as we close this day's session, in view of the fact that the issue was raised this afternoon, it seems that if price ceilings are to be imposed and a complete over-all control of prices and wages is to be instituted, the sooner we on this side of the aisle find out whether the Senators on the other side of the aisle are or are not backing the President's program, the better it will be in the consideration of legislation along that line. I was dumfounded this afternoon, when we were trying to find out whether there would be cooperation in connection with this bill, to observe that time and time again the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] refused to answer the question whether he would support title III of the proposed legislation. Certainly if we are to have unity of action and cooperation, the least we should know is whether the Democratic Senators, those on the other side of the aisle, will back up this bill or whether they will not back it up. Certainly we have a right to know that; and, Mr. President, believe me, I, for one, am going to find out whether the Senators want it or whether they do not want it. If the Senator from Wyoming, who was mentioned as a possible candidate on the Democratic ticket for Vice President, is not in favor of this bill the sooner we find out what his remedy is for curing the meat situation, the better off all of us will be in settling the great issue that is confronting us now.

So, Mr. President, I think we should do a great deal of thinking between now and Monday morning. I am going to do so.

I say once again that, so far as I am concerned, whether it is a special session or not, whether it was called for any reason other than in the interest of the American people, I am ready—yes, prayerfully anxious—to do anything that can be done to promote the welfare of the American people at this particular time; and I shall lend what leadership and ability and industry I have to see that proper measures are brought out and, I hope, are passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, and then I hope they will receive the same kind of consideration when they reach the White House.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, August 2, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 30 (legislative day of July 28), 1948:

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Aubrey B. Fennell, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. (Judge Fennell is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 7, 1948.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 3, district of Alaska. (Judge Dimond is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 10, 1948.)

SUPREME COURT OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Hon Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Emil C. Peters, term expired.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Albert M. Cristy, elevated.

Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947.)

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, by Thy mercies we are spared and by Thy power we are sustained. Inspire us daily to live and labor in faithfulness and in the fear of the Lord. Establish within us those loyalties and integrities which cannot be shaken.

We pray that we may be more responsive to Thy voice, calling us to minister to the needs of humanity with hearts of compassion and hands of helpfulness.

Grant that our minds may be impervious to all thoughts of personal aggrandizement. Deliver us from every selfish propensity and from those attitudes which are alien to the spirit of the Master.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 30, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators desire to present matters for insertion in the RECORD. I feel that I should not be in a position of being accused of farming out time. I desire to comply with the mandate laid down by the President pro tempore at the beginning of the special session. Therefore I shall be glad to yield for insertions and

routine matters; but if Senators wish to make speeches, I trust they will do so in their own time.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the sixth special session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico for the period May 14 to 21, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIM PAID BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, the payment of a tort claim by that Commission under the Federal Tort Claims Act from the date of the enactment of that act through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from K. A. Parker, president, Louisiana Democratic Civic Association, New Orleans, La., praying for the confirmation of the nomination of A. Miles Pratt to be collector of customs for the port of New Orleans; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from May Taylor, of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against any increase in the number of Federal employees, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Workmen's Circle of the National Executive Committee, signed by Ephim H. Jeshurin, president, and Joseph Baskin, general secretary, New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation submitted by the President to the special session of the Eightieth Congress; ordered to lie on the table.

A petition signed by sundry citizens of the States of New York and New Jersey, praying for the enactment of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, etc.; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Shanghai Refugee Council, Shanghai, China, praying immediate relief for 5,000 European displaced persons in Shanghai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRICE CONTROLS—RESOLUTION OF MONTANA STOCKGROWERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the sixty-fourth annual meeting of the Montana Stockgrowers' Association at Bozeman, Mont., May 13 to 15, 1948, protesting against price and rationing controls.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Resolution 16

"Price control

"Whereas President Truman has requested that Congress grant him authority to reinstate such price and rationing controls on food and other products as he deems necessary to regulate prices and consumption; and

"Whereas such regimentation was accepted by the American people as a war measure justified only by the danger to the Nation requiring emergency measures; and

"Whereas no such emergency can now be claimed to exist to justify such a sacrifice of individual rights and responsibilities, particularly when experience shows that the controls demanded are foredoomed to failure: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we again point out that production and efficient utilization provide the most effective controls upon prices and distribution, and we express our opposition to price and rationing controls."

This is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 16 adopted by vote of the members of the Montana Stockgrowers' Association in its sixty-fourth annual meeting at Bozeman, Mont., May 13, 14, 15, 1948.

Attest: E. A. PHILLIPS,
Secretary.

HIGH-VOLTAGE LINE FROM STERLING, COLO., TO NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the board of directors of the Nebraska Association of Rural Public Power District and Membership Association, Inc., at its regular meeting held July 26, 1948, favoring the appropriation of sufficient funds to cover the engineering and construction costs of building a high-voltage line by the Bureau of Reclamation from Sterling, Colo., to North Platte, Nebr.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is a dire shortage of electric power in the State of Nebraska due to the rapid increase in demand, the inability of the public power system (the hydros) to have had installed generating capacity sufficient to meet the need for electricity; and

Whereas this shortage of current, according to the estimates of well qualified persons will continue to be so serious and severe even after the plants now being rushed to completion by the Public Power System are put into operation in 1949, that use of electricity on the farms of Nebraska will have to be curtailed unless additional facilities are made available; and

Whereas this condition will continue until 1954, when it is expected current will be available to Nebraska from the Fort Randall project in South Dakota; and

Whereas the Reclamation Bureau has stated 30,000 kilowatts of electric energy from Bureau projects in Colorado could be made available by 1950–51 provided a transmission line is built from Sterling, Colo., to North Platte, Nebr., and thus materially relieve the situation; and

Whereas it has been the desire of the Bureau of Reclamation to construct said transmission line, as soon as funds were available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Association of Rural Public Power District and Membership Association, Inc., urges Congress, while now in session, to appropriate sufficient funds to cover the engineering and construction costs of building a high-voltage line by the Bureau of Reclamation from Sterling, Colo., to North Platte, Nebr.; and be it further

Resolved, That this association, representing and speaking for 33 rural electrification districts and associations in Nebraska, and the 65,000 farm and rural customers served by those projects, urgently requests the entire Nebraska delegation in Congress to place these resolutions before the proper congressional committees and to work diligently to secure the appropriation of said funds during this present session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to Members of Congress, the rural electrification projects of Nebraska, and other interested persons and organizations.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE RUSSIAN ALLIANCE, INC.

During the delivery of the speech of Senator ROBERTSON of Virginia,

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Connecticut for an insertion in the RECORD with the understanding that I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). With the definite understanding that such yielding does not prejudice the rights of the Senator from Virginia to the floor, the request is, without objection, agreed to.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that yesterday afternoon, in Bridgeport, Conn., there was held a large meeting of American citizens of Russian extraction, several thousand being in attendance. Those present at that meeting adopted a resolution attesting to their loyalty to the United States of America as citizens, and to their belief in our fundamental principles of living and government, and in the American way of life.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That we, gathered here today, Sunday, August 1, 1948, in Stadler's Park, Bridgeport, Conn., comprising over 5,000 American citizens, and, as members of the Holy Ghost Russian Orthodox Church and the Carpatho Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist, do hereby unanimously manifest and reaffirm our love and faith in the American way of life, and that we, as American citizens, are proud to demonstrate our complete loyalty to the United States Government, and to uphold the Constitution which guarantees us real freedom and equality. God bless America.

RUSSIAN ALLIANCE, INC.,
JOHN FOPP, *Chairman,*
STEPHEN JANKURA,
Cochairman.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2916. A bill for the relief of Donato Dipinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 2917. A bill to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation and to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal field service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 2918. A bill for the relief of Emery and Eleanor Nussbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2919. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgages of certain veterans' housing corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. MORSE) introduced Senate bill 2920, to require payment to certain employees of the District of Columbia of the additional compensation authorized by the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2921. A bill for the relief of Antonia Raczyk Drozdowski; and

S. 2922. A bill for the relief of Helena B. M. Rebalska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDRESS BY JAMES A. FARLEY AT DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION SECONDING THE NOMINATION OF SENATOR BARKLEY

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the Democratic National Convention, seconding the nomination of Senator BARKLEY for the Vice Presidency of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

COL. JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him concerning the distinguished record of Col. James P. S. Devereux, United States Marine Corps, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY RALPH E. BECKER AT THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Ralph E. Becker, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, before the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia on June 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY H. GRAHAM MORRISON TO THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF TENNESSEE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. H. Graham Morrison, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, to the sixty-seventh annual session of the Bar Association of Tennessee on June 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three newspaper articles discussing the subject matter of Senate Resolution 200, relating to the counting of electoral votes, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX AND PROHIBITION—EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY OKLAHOMAN

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Poll Tax and Prohibition," published in the Daily Oklahoman of July 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE QUESTION OF INFLATION—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to inflation, entitled "How Serious and How Sincere," written by Walter Lippmann, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PAPER DOLLAR—EDITORIAL BY FELIX MORLEY

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Paper Dollar," written by Felix Morley, and published in the Pathfinder of July 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DISPLACED PERSONS ACT—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW WORLD

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Priest Denies Charges DP Bill Is Anti-Catholic," published in the New World of July 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTIC ACTIVITIES IN UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON—EDITORIAL FROM THE SEATTLE POST-INTELLIGENCER

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The University and the Canwell Inquiry," published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—TESTIMONY OF MARRINER S. ECCLES

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Eccles Hits Back," published in the Washington Evening Star of Sunday, August 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TOLERANCE IN SOLUTION OF RACIAL PROBLEM—ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column entitled "Gradual and Expanding Tolerance Seen as Only Way To Solve Racial Problems," by Dorothy Thompson, from the Washington Star of July 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

By unanimous consent, on request of Mr. FERGUSON, the investigating committee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments granted permission to conduct the hearings.

By unanimous consent, on request of Mr. CAIN, the Committee on Banking and Currency was granted permission to sit during the session of the Senate today.

THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION—LETTER FROM JOHN W. STUDEBAKER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, by Mr. John W. Studebaker, former Commissioner of Education of the United States, which I believe it would be well worth while for every Member of the Senate to read.

I merely wish to point out that Mr. Studebaker for 14 years was Commissioner of Education, and made an outstanding contribution in that position for the benefit of education in the United States. I think some of the points he makes in his letter are of great concern to the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 30, 1948.*

Hon. OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: In my letter of resignation, dated June 14, 1948, addressed to the President, I stated the basic reason why it seemed inadvisable for me to remain longer in the Government service beyond July 15; namely, the impossibility of providing for the proverbial rainy day with the top salary allowed for the Commissioner of Education.

Now, however, I desire to supplement various communications I sent you and conversations I had with you while in office on matters having to do with your policies of organization and administration, for the purpose of pointing out again some of the implications of the program you have had under way during recent months.

In summary it is my considered opinion that if your purposes and program are carried out you will do great harm not only to proper and adequate work of the United States Office of Education, but indeed also to the vital need for Federal participation in the support of equal educational opportunity among the States.

Before going further I wish to say that in presenting certain facts and points of view herein, I do not feel the slightest personal animus toward you or anyone else, regardless of the extent to which I obviously share with educators and the people in general a deep anxiety concerning the functions and control of education.

While of course many of your policies and administrative procedures affect the other constituent or operating organizations of the Federal Security Agency (U. S. Public Health Service, Social Security and Welfare Administration, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Food and Drug Administration), I shall not presume to speak for them, although I know there exists great uneasiness and a markedly low morale among the personnel of all branches of the Agency. Nor do I wish here to write at length relative to the adverse effects of your program on education. I shall therefore confine my statements to some basic principles and a few illustrations.

A fundamental fault in your policies lies, it seems to me, in your failure to recognize that imaginative, competent, and productive work in any institution or agency is done by imaginative, competent, and zestful individuals who are happy in their work and who are eager to assume and carry responsibility, not by elaborate, regimental schemes of organization. Your program of administration therefore violates the great principle which has energized American life—the encouragement of personal responsibility; it violates the principle of decentralization and distribution of initiative and responsibility which results in great strength and productivity in the Nation because there is great strength and productivity among its millions of individual citizens.

Your program develops frustration and a feeling of futility among the employed personnel because individuals and units of individuals in the agency cannot control the means to the ends for which they are responsible.

The most successful private and public enterprises are those in which to the maximum practicable extent the spheres of authority

and of responsibility of individuals and of units of individuals are kept identical. Your program leaves responsibility with people down the line in the organization, so to speak, but strips away from them the control of the essential means by which their responsibility must be executed. You vest authority in your immediate staff members, but they are not and will not be held responsible by the people for any shortcomings or failures of the operating organizations of the agency. As frustration and futility develop, responsibility for the exercise of initiative, for the use of judgment, for securing results, also tends to move up the line. Here we see at work what might be called bureaucratic statism within a government originally dedicated to the principle of individual responsibility and respect for personality. Thorough regimentation always has been and always will be destructive of individual responsibility, a quality vital to the continued progress of our country.

Let me illustrate. For many years, always I assume since the United States Office of Education was established 81 years ago, and I know during 7 (1934–41) of the 14 years while I was Commissioner of Education, the articles, bulletins, addresses on educational matters were written freely by the professional people in the Office of Education in their respective special fields and were published. Sensing their individual responsibility, these professional people sought advice from competent persons from time to time, even though they were writing in their own fields of competence. So far as I know there was never any difficulty or embarrassment experienced by the Office of Education as a result of this policy.

After Pearl Harbor and during the war, there was a willingness that the OWI should check and approve all public statements. We were at war and citizens generally accepted necessary wartime controls. We in the Office of Education naturally assumed that with the war ended such controls of professional writing would be relinquished. They were not only continued, but they have been made more sweeping, complete, and time consuming within the Federal Security Agency. Now, any statement written by anyone in the Office of Education to be presented to any group or audience outside the Office, must be submitted to someone on your immediate staff for approval. These approvals, of course, involve statements ranging all the way from articles on such technical questions as planning science classrooms to the more general problems of education.

A specific example may be cited. Last April one of the staff members of the Office of Education, a well-trained man, with excellent experience in secondary education, was invited to speak to the high-school principals of the State of Massachusetts. He was to speak on the subject Teaching Zeal for American Democracy. Under an appropriation by Congress for 1948 made to the Office of Education, specific reference was made by the Congress to the need for such a program and especially for an educational program that would make clear to our young people the nature and tactics of communism and other forms of totalitarianism.

This man in the Office of Education himself decided to read his address. He prepared it. Consequently, under your regulations the address had to be submitted to your staff for approval. A few paragraphs of the address stressed the importance of developing means of teaching high-school pupils what communism really is, how inimical it is to the free world. Your staff member in a written comment said in part, "Much of this is very good. However, the Office of Education should, I am convinced, leave to the State Department and to the FBI the task of exposing the tactics and dangers of Russian and native Communists and travelers."

Now in the light of the main purpose of Congress in making the afore-mentioned appropriation, an action obviously based on a clear recognition of the great need for an educational program that would adequately inform young people concerning the serious conflict between totalitarianism and freedom, is it not amazing that a leading educator in the United States Office of Education operating under a thoroughly bipartisan mandate of Congress should be told by one who had been put in a position to tell the Office of Education what it could and could not do, that the educational task of "exposing the tactics and the dangers of Russian and native Communists and travelers" should be "left to the State Department and the FBI"?

All of us in education fully appreciate the parts that the State Department and the FBI should play in exposing Communists. These agencies know what their parts are and they know their function is not to work with schools and colleges on the development of educational programs dealing with this problem. To accept the dictum that the educational "task of exposing communism" should be left to these agencies would be tantamount to not having this vitally important educational task done at all, at least so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

The result was that the man from the Office of Education abandoned the plan to present a written address. He had no time to try to revise it and to receive approval. He therefore held an off-the-record meeting with the Massachusetts high-school principals. In the meeting he said, ad libitum, all he had on his mind and heart about how education can help in the solution of a problem the magnitude of which is daily becoming more apparent to everyone. Thus, the representative of the Office of Education was able to express his opinion to the principals of Massachusetts, and that's what the principals wanted. They had not requested the opinion of someone on your immediate staff not known to them.

Another illustration. I made an address at the University of California at Los Angeles last March entitled "Education and the Fate of Democracy." Senator KNOWLAND, of California, as you know, is chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Federal Security Agency and the Office of Education. The Senator, being very much interested in the whole subject, had the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the address, among other things, about communism, I said the following: "Whether or not the Communist Party in this country should be outlawed, I do not presume to say. But of this I am convinced: That no avowed or proven Communist is fit to be entrusted with the job of inculcating the American way of life in any school; and I make that statement on the rather obvious ground that education for American democracy cannot be entrusted to the enemies of American democracy."

Since the Office of Education has had only a relatively small appropriation for printing, every reasonable economy has been exercised in carrying out the major purpose of the Office as provided in its basic act; namely, to diffuse information about education.

The California address was printed on one sheet of paper. I requested enough copies so that one copy could be sent to each college, one to each public and private high school, and one to each superintendent of schools. The Office of Education requisition for these copies, to be paid for by the Office (about $250), was held up by one of your staff for several days and was only approved after he and I had engaged in a vigorous discussion of the matter in which for the most part he was trying to convince me that such language as I used in the address should be toned down and that if the address were released (this in spite of the fact that it had already been printed in the public record), he felt sure it would bring unfavorable reaction from a large number of educators. It was released and distributed in May. I have heard no objection from anyone.

Last December, copy was read for a special issue of the monthly periodical School Life. The issue was to be devoted entirely to contrasting totalitarianism and freedom and in pointing up various educational implications of the conflict. I was away when the manuscript, in accordance with your regulations, was submitted to your staff for approval. It was reported to me later that there was very definite resistance by another one of your staff to the entire publication. It was finally published and has been a Government best seller ever since.

These are only two illustrations of the way in which your policies leave the professional people in the Office of Education responsible for achieving fruitful results in helping to improve American education while transferring to your immediate staff the authority to control the means and procedures by which these professional people carry their responsibility. This divorcement of responsibility and authority with respect to the work of the Office of Education necessarily results in the same divorcement in the divisions and sections of the Office and with all of its individuals. The result is a strange feeling of uncertainty and fear among employees. The whole scheme is well designed to devitalize and demoralize the staff.

Apparently you do not feel that your present, large, immediate staff can control, to the extent you desire, the detailed activities within the Office of Education and the other constituent organizations of the agency having to do with publications, editorial work, and information services. Accordingly under date of May 26, last, you had an order issued under which you propose to centralize in your office all personnel now engaged in such services in the various constituent organizations, including the Office of Education. Under the order you propose to transfer 17 people from the supervision of the Office of Education to the administrative supervision of the office of the Administrator, in spite of the fact that the appropriation that supports these people was made to the Office of Education.

I pointed out in my memorandum under date of June 12, 1948, the inappropriateness of the proposal and ways in which it would, if executed, work to the disadvantage of the services which the Office of Education is expected to render. My purpose here is merely to reinforce the arguments I made in that memorandum. In it I tried to make clear the intimate relationships which exist between the services of these people and the work of all other persons in the Office. Verbally I had reported to you and other members of your staff that it has been the plan of the Office of Education to decentralize as much as possible among the several divisions of the Office of Education these types of services rather than to build up a large central staff even within the Office of Education. Eighty-one years of experience in the Office of Education proved the validity of the plans as formulated. Therefore it is not surprising that there should be among the personnel of the Office of Education such an unfavorable reaction to your proposal.

There can be no honest claim to economy in the transfer of administrative control which you propose. The 17 persons in the Office of Education have been working as hard and as efficiently as people could work. Besides, they have been working intelligently and enthusiastically because they were closely associated with the other people in the Office to whose work their services are directly related. Merely to aggregate them with others in a centralized organization operating at a greater distance from those with whom they are expected to work and to put them under the supervision of someone on your staff who is not primarily interested in

education will certainly reduce both their efficiency and enthusiasm, so far as education is concerned.

In another order issued by your office under date of June 12, entitled "Agency Office of Publications and Reports" the following statements are made:

In accordance with the Administrator's memorandum of May 26, relative to information service the following should be understood by all concerned:

1. There will be a central information office under the direction of the Director of Publications and Reports.

2. Job classification sheets which have been applicable up to this time will be used until such time as it is possible to develop new sheets consistent with the organization to be established in the office of the Administrator.

3. As indicated in the original memorandum all persons will remain on the pay rolls of the constituents for the fiscal year 1949.

4. The 1950 budget will be prepared in such a way as to show in the Administrator's budget an Office of Publications and Reports consisting of the Office of Publications and Reports, Office of the Administrator, plus transfers made by the Congress from the Social Security Administration Informational Service. Other information jobs will be budgeted so that they will appear on the pay rolls of the constituents.

Apart from the gross weaknesses in the proposed arrangement which I have tried to point out in this letter and elsewhere, does it not seem even to you illogical that the constituent units of the Federal Security Agency should be expected to prepare and justify appropriation estimates to include persons to be carried on the pay rolls of the respective constituents to work in the fields under discussion, but to work under the direction of the Director of Publications and Reports on your staff? If it is logical and proper that these persons should be centralized into one unit for the Agency in general to be supervised administratively by your Director, would it not also seem logical and proper that they should be supported on a pay roll secured under an appropriation made in terms of the policy of administration which you propose to follow?

In other words, why do you propose to have them carried on the pay rolls supported by appropriations made by Congress to respective constituent units of the Agency, and then put them under the administrative supervision of someone on the Administrator's office staff? If they should be thus supervised (of course I do not believe they should) why are they not to be justified in the 1950 budget estimates as a part of the Administrator's office?

Under the arrangement you propose I do not see how Members of the Congress can act intelligently as they consider appropriations which must of necessity, be related to lines of organizational administration. Your plan seems to me to make nonsense of the serious efforts of Congressmen to consider requested appropriations in terms of the location of the direct responsibility for the administration of the functions to be supported by the appropriations.

No doubt you think of the Federal Security Agency as just one large monolithic welfare organization. Consequently you think of education as merely one phase of welfare. When the problem is understood, very few people will agree with your conception. But if you really believe that the relationships between social security and education, health, and education, and social security and health are exceedingly intimate and that education as a function in this country should be quite exclusively related to and integrated with health and welfare functions (I certainly do not), then you should ask the Congress for a single appropriation for a Federal Office of Welfare. But since the function of education is not a welfare function, since it necessarily represents a wide range of human interests and operates through well-defined agencies and institutions, it should be supported by an appropriation made to the United States Office of Education in terms of justifications presented to Congress and break-downs therein determined.

These are some of the evidences of how your policy and program seems to obliterate the identity and the unity of action of the respective constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency; namely, the United States Public Health Service, Social Security Administration, United States Office of Education, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration. There are others. Your order requiring the elimination of the words "United States" before the term "Public Health Service" and "Office of Education" in every case where it could be appropriately done; your suggestion that you did not see the sense in having an annual report for each of the constituent units, but only one for the Federal Security Agency as a whole; your policy to have yourself quoted in public releases even on technical matters of statistics and other reports of a factual character based on research of highly professional technicians instead of having these technicians and their immediate supervisors quoted exclusively, all point to a trend toward centralization which is, as I have stated above, destructive of morale, of initiative, and of the kind of productive work on the part of a large number of employees to which the tax-paying public is entitled.

Finally the capstone of the argument against the centralization of control which you are developing, at least so far as education is concerned, is to be found in the fact that you are admittedly a partisan politician. You work hard for your party. Personally I have the most wholesome respect for our party system of government in the United States. I have never met finer men and women than those elected by both major parties to membership in the National Congress. But there is a deep-rooted tradition in this country, born of the harrowing experiences of the centuries, that the function of education in a democracy should be completely removed from partisanship. Political party control of public education is destructive of democracy and has proved to be so down through the years and especially in recent decades in Italy, Germany, Russia, and Japan.

Being a partisan, you secure to the extent possible, as your immediate associates persons who share your partisanship. Under the direction of yourself and of these associates you move constantly to centralize all policies, all approvals, in short all control of the activities of the constituent organizations, including education. These controls contemplate the approval of personnel, of budgets, of substantive programs, and practically all details connected therewith. I am certain that such management of education on the Federal level is not what the great rank and file of the people of this country desire. On the contrary, they want the United States Office of Education to provide an adequate staff of competent professional educators who are in their positions to carry out the nonpartisan purposes for which the Office was established; they want a continuation of the devoted and completely nonpolitical professional service to American education that characterizes the work of the superior men and women who now comprise the staff of the Office of Education.

The American people may justly be proud of the personnel of the United States Office of Education. Every person in the office has been selected through Civil Service in open competition and solely on the basis of his personal and professional qualifications. In my 14 years of intimate association with the employees in the office, I never saw the slightest indication on the part of any one of them of any political party preference. Their lives are not actuated by partisanship; their backgrounds, their professional pride, their sense of obligation to true education in a democracy guide them in an unswerving devotion to the high calling of teaching. These are the kinds of people who in the Federal Government and in the States can really help education through schools and colleges to make its unique contribution to the preservation of our American free way of life. They are giving their lives passionately to that great objective. It isn't strange then that they, together with their colleagues throughout the country and citizens in general, regardless of political affiliation, should resent any attempts to color education with partisanship and cause its policies and processes to yield advantages to a political party.

This letter has become much longer than I intended. That is because there is so much to say on the subject.

I am sending copies of this letter to Dr. Willard Givens and Dr. E. B. Norton, who are, respectively, the executive secretaries of the National Education Association and the National Council of Chief State School Officers, organizations which, among many others, always have been active in efforts to secure a more adequate United States Office of Education and to insure such policies and methods of administration of educational activities in the Federal Government as would encourage sound programs of education in the States. I am also sending copies to the two chairmen of the Subcommittees on Appropriations for the Office of Education, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND and Representative FRANK B. KEEFE.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN W. STUDEBAKER.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS—LETTER FROM PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am indebted to the Reverend Father Ralph G. Kutz, of Festus, Mo., for calling my attention to a document of historic interest. It is a letter written by the Honorable Harry S. Truman, at that time a Senator from Missouri, to the editor of the St. Louis Star-Times, and published on the editorial page of that newspaper under date of March 6, 1944.

A tax bill had just been vetoed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Senator Truman complained that the language used by President Roosevelt in his veto message was unnecessarily harsh. Senator Truman wrote:

Had the President returned the tax bill with a plain statement that he did not think it produced enough revenue and would have to have one to cause a heavier tax return I don't think there is a doubt in the world but what both the Senate and the House of Representatives would have supported the veto, but when he attacked the integrity and the intelligence of the Senate and the House of Representatives he got just exactly what was coming to him. The vast majority of the legislative branch of the Government is just as hard working and just as patriotic as any other branch of the Government, and it is my opinion they are much more patriotic than some of the administrators who have been charged with the carrying out of the war effort on the home front. A little more common sense in the administrative approach to things that have to be done and a little less demagoguery for the purpose of appealing to the ignorant and uninformed would make it much easier to carry on the

war effort and to win the war that much more quickly.

Senator Truman continued further:

The bulwark of free Government is the elected legislative branch of the Government which holds the purse strings, and which has the power to levy taxes upon the people to meet the expense of the Government. I honestly think the founding fathers believed the Congress to be the most important branch of the Government or they would not have outlined its organization and its powers first in the Constitution.

May I interpolate that this reference to "the purse strings" is reminiscent of President Truman's impromptu remarks preceding his Jefferson-Jackson day dinner address, on February 19, 1948, when he declared: "Conditions are too grave in the world at this time to put a Congress in control of the purse strings of the country."

Senator Truman, in his letter to the Star-Times, paid his respects to the press of the United States in the following language:

Ever since I have been in the Senate it has been the policy of the majority of the press of the United States to make it appear that the legislative branch of the Government is made up of morons and that there are no men of intelligence in Congress. That policy has been pursued by the press of the United States and your editorial is no exception. When it was in the public interest for the Congress to cooperate with the President in carrying out the program to meet the depression the press almost unanimously called us a bunch of pin-heads and rubber-stamps, but when we assert any rights under the Constitution to control the appropriation of money and the levying of taxes we get exactly the same result. Now what is it you want—a dictatorship or a republic? For my own part I want a republic.

Finally Senator Truman summed up the proper relationship between the executive and regislative branches of the Government. He said, referring to President Franklin D. Roosevelt:

He must merit our respect just as we merit his, and demagogic veto messages will not create that respect.

I am glad to share this interesting letter with my colleagues of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD in full as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITOR, STAR-TIMES:

I read with much interest your editorial with regard to the Barkley incident, and I am somewhat surprised at your slant on that affair. No man on earth is perfect—I don't care whether he is President of the United States or the editor of a great metropolitan newspaper. There is not a possibility for any man to be right all the time, particularly when he has a big job to perform as the President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the armed forces has at this time.

The President has been consistently neglecting his political contacts ever since 1936, and in my opinion Senator BARKLEY should have kicked over the traces long ago. Remember, that in a republic politics is government. When you imply that the Congress has no intelligence and that it is merely a place where men of no brains congregate I rather think you are doing the bulwark of free government a slight injustice, to say the least.

Had the President returned the tax bill with a plain statement that he did not think it produced enough revenue and would have to have one to cause a heavier tax return, I don't think there is a doubt in the world but what both the Senate and the House of Representatives would have supported the veto; but when he attacks the integrity and the intelligence of the Senate and the House of Representatives he got just exactly what was coming to him. The vast majority of the legislative branch of the Government is just as hard working and just as patriotic as any other branch of the Government, and it is my opinion they are much more patriotic than some of the administrators who have been charged with the carrying out of the war effort on the home front. A little more common sense in the administrative approach to things that have to be done and a little less demagoguery for the purpose of appealing to the ignorant and uninformed would make it much easier to carry on the war effort and to win the war that much more quickly.

The administrative management of the whole program has been a headache, and I don't think anyone is in a position to know more about it than I am. It has been my job to find the weak points and suggest that they be remedied.

The bulwark of free government is the elected legislative branch of the government which holds the purse strings, and which has the power to levy taxes upon the people to meet the expense of the Government. I honestly think the founding fathers believed the Congress to be the most important branch of the Government or they would not have outlined its organization and its powers first in the Constitution.

I have always been of the opinion that the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives should not under any circumstances have any interest or any personal connections with the executive branch of the Government. I think it is our business to outline the policies and then follow them through by investigation to find out if these policies are being carried out as the people intended them to be carried out. I believe in party responsibility, and when we depart from party responsibility and a two-party system with a strong and virile opposition we will simply depart from free government.

No man in an executive position can carry on his program and the politics [sic] outlined by the legislative branch unless he has an administrative set-up which is loyal to him and which will work with him.

I think the President was right in taking members of the opposition party in his Cabinet when the war broke out. He was endeavoring to get full cooperation from all sections of the country, but when he puts the operation of the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board in the hands of his bitter enemies he can expect to get the results he is now getting from the representatives of the people. These local administrators who are against the President make the enforcement of these distasteful laws just as hard and inconvenient to the people as they possibly can.

Ever since I have been in the Senate it has been the policy of the majority of the press of the United States to make it appear that the legislative branch of the Government is made up of morons and that there are no men of intelligence in Congress. That policy has been pursued by the press of the United States and your editorial is no exception. When it was in the public interest for the Congress to cooperate with the President in carrying out the program to meet the depression the press almost unanimously called us a bunch of pinheads and rubber stamps, but when we assert any rights under the Constitution to control the appropriation of money and the levying of taxes we get exactly the same result. Now what is it you want—a dictatorship or a republic? For my own part, I want a republic. I think Senator BARKLEY did a heroic thing and I think he did the right thing.

I have been a consistent supporter of the President and expect to continue that policy, but I have never hesitated to call attention to mistakes and bad administration when I know they exist. I shall continue to do just that. As I said in the beginning, no man is perfect and no man can be entrusted with too much power. The Congress is the only check on administrative mistakes and administrative power.

The Congress has given the President all the power and all the money he has asked for to meet every emergency as it has come up. They have done that for 11 years, and they will continue to do it. However, he must merit our respect just as we merit his, and demagogic veto messages will not create that respect.

HARRY S TRUMAN,
United States Senate.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask to whom the letter was addressed?

Mr. KEM. It was addressed to the editor of the St. Louis Star-Times, and appeared on the editorial page of that newspaper on Monday, March 6, 1944, page 10.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement with regard to the international wheat agreement, now pending before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since 1941, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and in my votes on the floor of the Senate, I have gone along, have supported in the main, the bipartisan foreign policy which we decided held the best prospects for a peaceful postwar world, and for the future prosperity and happiness and security of the people of the United States. I supported the United Nations Charter, the British loan, Bretton Woods, Greek-Turkish aid, the Marshall program, approving the principle in general that we could well afford to take the calculated risks involved in the interest of a better and safer world.

The most of these programs have been based on the United States giving much and taking little—aside from the calculated risks involved. I am not criticizing that at all. As I say, I went along, and am not voicing any regrets that I did so.

Now comes up the international wheat agreement, one of the few proposals which at least attempt to give some direct returns, in the future, to an important segment of the national economy of the United States. And I am disturbed to find a disposition in some quarters to reject the proposed agreement, almost, I might say, without real consideration of its purported merits and demerits.

The proposed agreement, in the nature of a treaty between the United States and 35 other nations, is a well-considered attempt by the 36 nations concerned to try out, for a 5-year period, a plan by which the three nations which ordinarily produce wheat in surplus quantities agree to supply 500,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat annually to the 33 nations which ordinarily have to import wheat if their people have enough bread to eat.

On the other hand, the 33 importing nations agree to take 500,000,000 bushels of wheat from the 3 exporting nations during the 5-year trial period. The United States share of wheat exports covered by the agreement is 185,000,000 bushels. That is

considerably better than 100,000,000 bushels more than we can expect to export after the world gets going again, judging from past history. The other 315,000,000 bushels are divided between Canada and Australia.

It is true that Argentina and Soviet Russia, the other two big exporting nations, have refused to come into the agreement. Argentina stayed out, I take it, for economic reasons, gambling she can do better on her own. Russia's reasons for staying out, I take it, are more political than economic. What surplus Russia has we may expect her to use to further Russian political interests.

I am aware that our present foreign policy apparently requires that the United States, at times, consider the interests and policies of the rest of the world ahead of our own interests. But I do not understand that we are obligated to take either Russia or Argentina as our guides in all matters relating to our own welfare.

As of today, I would not say that our wheat growers would be satisfied with the range of prices provided in the agreement. These are, as the members of the committee know, a maximum of $2 a bushel (in storage at Fort William or Port Arthur, Canada) for No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat. According to the Department of Agriculture and Herman A. Praeger, president of the Kansas Farm Bureau, that would mean around $1.87 at Kansas City. According to the grain trade, $1.78 at Kansas City. The minimum would be $1.50 this marketing year (same basing points) and would drop 10 cents a year to $1.10 minimum the fifth year.

The prices for each year would be fixed by agreements between the governments; sales would be through private trade agencies, in theory at least. I will say that the grain trade and the millers have made very good arguments against entering into any such agreements. I am not particularly disputing the points they make. I realize the possibility that the agreement recognizes the possibility of state trading rather than private trading in international trade. I do not know whether this particular agreement will add much to that situation, under present world conditions, nor in the 5 years covered by this agreement. We are not living in an ideal world today, certainly not from the viewpoint of private enterprise.

I must admit also that even the maximum price under the agreement is below the Government support price for this marketing year. And that the minimum-price scale is below what wheat growers, at least, anticipate will be the support price during the period. And that will call for the Federal Treasury to make up the difference on such wheat as is exported under the agreement.

But I also would call your attention to the fact that we have the support-price guaranties without reference to this agreement. And I leave it to you if it would not be better for the Federal Government to have a guaranteed market for 185,000,000 bushels of export wheat, sold admittedly at some loss, than to have to take over the entire surplus and hold it, threatening thereby bigger hold-over surpluses for each following year, and ultimately greater losses to the Treasury—and to our own wheat growers in the long run?

It is probably just a matter of a few years—perhaps not too many months—until the United States is going to face again the problem of wheat surpluses. The more we can export, the smaller the surpluses, and the less the necessity of Government controls of production and of marketing. It may well be that the private trade will fare better under this agreement than it will under the more stringent controls which could follow the piling up of undisposable surpluses.

In this connection I want to call your attention to two paragraphs from the Midyear Economic Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, submitted to the Congress last week. I read the following, starting on page 44 of the report:

"Despite our high degree of industrialization, the tremendous importance of agriculture cannot be overlooked. The world shortage of foods and other products of agricultural origin, continuing up to this year, has had an immense inflationary impact upon the whole price structure through the relation that farm prices have to the cost of living and to industrial wages, prices, and profits. Although the full effects will not be felt for some time, greater abundance in basic agricultural crops should be of signal aid in the checking of inflation and progressive working out of stable relationships.

"That end," the report continues—and it is this paragraph to which I would especially direct your attention—"That end would not be promoted if the enlargement in supply of farm products were to coincide with some serious curtailment of demand to produce a collapse of farmers' incomes. Such a collapse shortly after World War I spread to rural merchants and bankers, to manufacturers of farm equipment and consumer goods, and to other commodity markets. But a repetition of such a debacle today is precluded by a policy of farm-income supports, implemented by procedures worked out and tested over the past 20 years, though not yet perfected."

Just two points in connection with that report. First, the danger of too low farm prices in their cumulative effect on the rest of the national economy; and, second, the fact that we already are pledged to price-support programs. Losses to the Federal Treasury may well be greater from supporting wheat prices if we do not have the export outlets which it is hoped this agreement will provide, than if the Government has to buy wheat without that export market.

I do not pretend to guarantee that this international wheat agreement will work out as intended. I admittedly am not as hopeful over all these international agreements as some other members of this committee. But I do say that if this committee is as strong for international agreements and promoting international trade as it has recorded itself in the past few years, it certainly should recommend this agreement favorably to the Senate.

I will say one thing more. When the National Grange and the National Farmers Union are in agreement, and both also agree with the American Farm Bureau Federation on some action to be taken, you may rest assured either that American agriculture is facing a desperate situation, or the proposition has a lot of merit from the viewpoint of these three great farm organizations. I hope the resolution is favorably reported to the Senate.

THE FARMER'S STILTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Farmer's Stilts," published in the July 29, 1948, issue of the Omaha Evening World-Herald. While we may not agree with all the thoughts expressed in the editorial, I am sure it will be interesting to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER'S STILTS

There seemed to be a note of panic in the Department of Agriculture's request to farmers the other day to reduce next year's wheat acreage by 8 percent.

There should have been.

For it appears that the old problem of farm surpluses, which vanished during the war, is back with us again. This is it.

Bumper crops of wheat and oats are assured. A huge crop of corn is in sight. The latest Government estimate was 3,300,000,000 bushels, but some grain men are guessing that the crop may hit 4,000,000,000.

Grain prices, in consequence, have been skidding. Wheat has been selling in Omaha at $2.14 a bushel—but only because the seller could not find elevator space to take advantage of the Government loan of $2.24 a bushel. New corn is still selling at 10 cents a bushel over the loan price, but is likely to be down there soon.

Plainly, a lot of 1948's grain harvest is going to the Government, through the device of Government crop loans. Well-informed grain men think that eventually the Government will be the owner of about a billion bushels of the 1948 crop. If so, it will have about $2,000,000,000 invested in it.

In recent years, because of the abnormally heavy demand for food, the only crop the Government has had to buy in quantity has been potatoes. Potatoes may furnish a guide as to what will happen with grain.

In 1946 the Government spent $93,000,000 buying potatoes. In 1947 it spent $40,000,000. So far in 1948 it has spent about $16,000,000, and the potato harvest is just beginning. To get rid of its unwanted surplus, the Government has burned potatoes, thrown them in the ocean, and sold them at 15 cents a hundred to people who would promise to feed them to animals rather than eat them themselves.

The Government has exhorted farmers to raise fewer potatoes. But why should they? One Nebraska potato grower this year has raised 500 bushels of potatoes to the acre and sold them to the Government at $1.60 per bushel. It will take more than exhortation to make him give up a crop that returns $800 an acre.

The potato story, when repeated with grain, will be a lot bigger and more expensive. Intolerably expensive, maybe.

What's the cure?

Acreage control? Remembering the troubles of the 1930's, everybody shudders at the thought.

Chemurgy—that is, the use of farm products as industrial raw materials? This offers a shining prospect in time, but no short-term solution.

A theoretically ideal method of disposing of surpluses would be to do away with support prices and let the law of supply and demand operate. Sold cheaply enough, almost anything will be used, and certainly food. And, with the demand for food still great, it seems unlikely that prices would go so low as to be ruinous to the farmer.

Yet a case can be made for continuance of some sort of support. Labor has a backstop in its unions, the manufacturers of basic commodities have one in cartels and trade agreements, many smaller businessmen one in the various fair-price laws. Only the farmer, except for Government intervention, sells in a free market.

The Aiken-Hope Farm Act, passed by the last Congress to be effective next year, aims at eliminating the rigidity of farm prices by instituting a system of flexible price supports. The main question about the Aiken-Hope Act is whether it is flexible enough. It provides a floor of 60 percent of parity rather than the present 90 percent. Even 60 percent of parity may price some farm products out of the market, or at least encourage huge surpluses.

In the face of this situation, some of the self-appointed friends of the farmer in Congress seem to be out of touch with reality. They are demanding that the 90 percent of parity—and even more—be restored.

Such proposals are nothing short of madness. They would simply compound present insanities—such as the fact that there is too much grain, but grain is too costly to feed to

animals, so the animal population is abnormally low, and the housewife who wants to buy a steak can't afford one.

If matters go on as they are now, or even as they may be under the more sensible Aiken-Hope Act, catastrophe is all but inevitable. A catastrophe that will make the fiasco of the old Hoover Farm Board, which bought up surpluses until it went busted, look small.

The simple fact is that—the planners and the professional friends of the farmer to the contrary—agriculture cannot stay on stilts forever. The inexorable laws of economics will chop the stilts away, and the longer the chopping is postponed the worse the crash will be. The sooner agriculture becomes a normal part of the economy—with minimum safeguards against too great a shock—the better.

REDUCTION OF POSTAGE RATES ON RELIEF PARCELS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I wrote to Hon. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, under date of July 30, 1948, in relation to reduction of postage rates on relief parcels to countries behind the iron curtain.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 30, 1948.

HON. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: I am writing to you on the matter of a possible reduction of postage rates on relief parcels sent to individuals in lands behind the iron curtain. As you know, the Economic Cooperation Administration, as authorized by law, has enabled a 4-cent-per-pound reduction on parcel post rates for relief parcels going to the Western European nations participating in the European recovery program.

A few days ago, Mr. Hoffman, Administrator of E. C. A., in response to a letter of inquiry from me, stated that postage rate reductions could not be made on parcels going to people in Poland, for example, because Poland is not one of the participating countries as defined in the economic cooperation law. Therefore, at this time I should like to ask your kind and sympathetic consideration of my proposal that the Administration recommend a change in policy so that parcels going to the iron curtain lands can also be facilitated by postage rate reductions.

It seems to me that the following points justify such action:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC RELATIONS THROUGH PARCELS

1. The best public relations in the world for America and the American way of life consists in the relief parcels going abroad. It has been my experience during a European trip that the billions of dollars sent by the American Nation, as such, were comparatively unappreciated, whereas the hundreds of thousands of relief parcels sent by American citizens, as such, to their kin and acquaintances abroad, were tremendously appreciated. This proved to be a particularly powerful means of propaganda in the cold war when relief parcels were supplemented by individual letters sincerely written by American citizens to their kinfolk abroad.

I firmly believe that a pound of baloney sent in a relief parcel is worth 100,000 words of verbal baloney sent by American short wave to lands behind the iron curtain. Our verbal propaganda, surreptitiously heard by a relatively few people listening to radio sets, cannot possibly be compared in its limited effectiveness to the powerful appeal of United States relief parcels. I do not underestimate the value of verbal propaganda, but Europe's hungry stomachs are far more concerned with baloney that people can eat rather than baloney that they presumably hear.

CAPITALIZING ON ANTI-RUSSIAN SENTIMENT

2. The Russian cement in the iron curtain is apparently cracking. Marshal Tito's defiance of the Cominform indicates something of the tremendous unrest and dissatisfaction among the peoples supposedly under complete Russian domination. If we can get relief parcels through, we will serve to increase the bonds with our own land and further untie the bonds with Russia.

3. America fortunately this year is blessed with a superabundance of crops. If some of our abundance can be translated into relief parcels and sent to Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, untold good for United States relations can develop.

RELIEVING OUR CITIZENS OF HEAVY COSTS

4. If we can secure postage rate reductions on these relief parcels going to lands behind the iron curtain, we will help the millions of Americans who have relatives abroad to make additional shipments. I need not tell you what a heavy financial drain it is upon American citizens with relatives, for example, in Poland, who have to bear the very heavy charges for postal rates.

These American citizens with kinfolks in lands behind the iron curtain are taxpayers, and, after all, they, too, are paying for the cost of the Economic Cooperation Administration. It is only fair that they be not discriminated against in this postage rate-reduction policy as against Americans with kin in the western European countries, who are fortunately benefiting from the rate reduction.

PROMOTING SAFE, PROMPT DELIVERY

I feel that this policy of facilitating some of these relief parcels should be supplemented by our postal officials in doing everything possible to insure the safe and prompt delivery of these parcels in the iron-curtain lands.

LOYALTY OF OUR CITIZENS FROM EASTERN EUROPEAN LANDS LIKE POLAND

I know that I need not mention that Americans with kinfolk in these lands have proven their loyalty to our way of life. Moreover, to cite one country without in any way underestimating other countries, the people of Poland have throughout their history demonstrated their undying loyalty to the very principles of liberty and freedom which gave birth to our Nation. It seems to me that in the spirit of Kosciusko and Pulaski, yes, in the spirit of Kossuth, and all the other European patriots who helped give birth to freedom in America and/or in their own lands, we can maintain aflame the lamp of liberty and the hope of liberty behind the iron curtain by a policy such as I have recommended.

Thanking you for your kind attention to this subject, and assuring you of my highest esteem and of my appreciation of your always prompt and thorough response, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in the past few days there has been speculation expressed in the public press and otherwise as to whether, in view of the recent legislative history, it would be necessary for the President to send the names of the Atomic Energy Commissioners back to the Senate for confirmation. I can say, Mr. President, that there is not the slightest reason to believe that there is any necessity for the resubmission of any of the names of the Atomic Energy Commissioners for either appointment or confirmation.

On Saturday last I addressed a letter to the President of the United States setting forth the legislative history of House bill 6402, recently enacted, which extended the terms of the Commissioners. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 30, 1948.

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Within the past few days several news stories have been circulated in the press and otherwise speculating upon the possibility that it might be necessary for the resubmission of the names of the Atomic Energy Commissioners for confirmation, under the Term Extension Act. While the terms of this Extension Act, H. R. 6402, seem unquestionably clear in providing that the terms of the present Commissioners are extended to June 30, 1950, without any necessity for reappointment; nevertheless, I respectfully submit certain legislative history to you for your consideration.

Under the terms of the act, H. R. 6402, which is identical with S. 2589, it is provided that—

"The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office prior to June 30, 1950, shall expire at midnight on June 30, 1950."

In the report on H. R. 6402 made to the House of Representatives by the House members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and in the report made to the Senate on S. 2589 made by the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it is stated as follows:

"The passage of this bill will immediately give assurance of uninterrupted continuity in office for 2 years and 2 months following the date of this report during which the present Commission can continue without disruption or without the necessity of reappointment."

In the debate on H. R. 6402 in the Senate, the following discussion was had between Senator CONNALLY and myself, found on page 9062 of the RECORD of June 19, 1948:

"Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

"Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

"Mr. CONNALLY. Under the arrangement [the arrangement to extend the terms until June 30, 1950], there would be no need of confirmation; would there?

"Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

"Mr. CONNALLY. In other words, this measure would automatically extend the present terms of office; would it?

"Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. We would simply take August 1, 1948, out of the calendar, really, and would insert in its place June 30, 1950.

"Mr. CONNALLY. So the Senate would not have to act on the question of confirmation; is that correct?

"Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is quite correct."

Again, on page 9072 of the RECORD of June 19, 1948, in a discussion between Senator BARKLEY and Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, the following question and answer occurred:

"Mr. BARKLEY. If the bill is passed, as I understand, it will extend the terms for 2 years without confirmation. Is that the fact?

"Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true."

As shown by the committee reports to each House of Congress on this measure and as established in the legislative history of the debate, it therefore seems clear beyond con-

troversy that it was the complete understanding and clear opinion and intent of both Houses of the Congress that this measure would provide for the extension of the terms of Commissioners appointed prior to June 30, 1950, up to that date without the necessity of reappointment or confirmation. At no time was it advocated by any Member of either House of Congress that any other purpose or intent was contained in the legislation, and I assure you that it is my clear and firm opinion that this was the exact and unchallenged intention of the Congress in connection with this legislation.

I give you this history and these views because of the speculative stories that have become public. I regret exceedingly the recurring agitation of atomic-energy administrative matters, and I assure you that I shall continue my efforts toward orderly, vigorous development of our atomic-energy program so that its evaluation and progress can be free of bias or temporary expediency.

I have the honor to remain,

Respectfully yours,

B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Chairman,
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask a question or two?

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Florida be good enough to withhold his questions until we can have a quorum call?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Myers
Baldwin	Hill	O'Conor
Barkley	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Butler	Jenner	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Capehart	Kem	Robertson, Wyo
Capper	Kilgore	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cooper	Langer	Smith
Cordon	Lodge	Sparkman
Donnell	Lucas	Stennis
Downey	McCarthy	Taft
Dworshak	McClellan	Taylor
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McKellar	Thye
Feazel	McMahon	Umstead
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hayden	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is necessarily absent, attending the funeral services of a close friend.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senate has now been in session 1 week. After the Senate was ready to proceed with business and take up legislation, a motion was made by the junior Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29, the so-called anti-poll-tax bill, which all Senators, I believe, have heard discussed.

The motion to take up this particular piece of legislation has been debated for several days. I think it is quite obvious that if it is to be considered at this emergency session of Congress the subject matter of the legislation must be brought before the Senate without further debate.

The question of civil rights, and especially the question of the poll tax, is generations old. While it is true that each and every time the legislation is brought up for discussion and debate there are some new features, yet in general the legislation before us really has nothing new in it. It is my opinion that we could discuss this motion for days, and there would be little new evidence upon which those who wish to resist the motion to take up the bill could advance their cause. Certainly in all fairness the proponents of the anti-poll-tax legislation should have their day in court on the subject matter rather than on the motion to take up.

As acting majority leader I point out that time and again on other occasions, even though I did not agree with the subject matter involved, I did my level best to bring legislation before the Senate for consideration in order that it might be discussed, and that the Senate might take action.

So, in that spirit, Mr. President, in the spirit of full cooperation, in the spirit of fair play, in the spirt of permtting Senators who wish to discuss this measure to do so and to have a vote upon the subject matter, I wish to propose a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 5 o'clock this afternoon, the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon the motion now pending, which is a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election of national officers, and that the time between the hours of 3 o'clock and 5 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the motion, and controlled, respectively, by myself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the request which has been made by the Senator from Nebraska for cooperation in this matter. I like to cooperate with the Senator when it is possible to do so. However, I am afraid that I miss the sweet spirit of Christian charity with which it is said the request is clothed. I know of no reason why this matter should be brought to such an early conclusion. On Thursday of last week the Senator from Nebraska moved to proceed to the consideration of this measure. The motion has been before the Senate in two normal legislative sessions. I respectfully submit—and I am sure the RECORD will bear me out—that at least half the time has been consumed in the discussion of extraneous matters by those who say they are in favor of the bill, which the Senator from Nebraska seeks to bring before the Senate.

Those who are opposed to this measure have discussed the merits of the questions and the reasons why the Senate should not proceed to the consideration of the bill at this time. The Senator from Nebraska stated, at the time he made his motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill, that there was no other legislation ready for the Senate to consider. I am quite sure that the calendar of the Senate will reflect the fact that no bills have been reported by the committees since that statement was made.

The Senator from Nebraska has referred to the fact that this was emergency legislation, being considered in an emergency session of the Senate. Mr. President, at the time of the ratification of the Constitution 159 years ago poll taxes or other property qualifications more onerous were required of all voters; and yet we are told that this is a great emergency, and for that reason we should agree to the unanimous-consent request.

Every one of the Original Thirteen States, at the time the States ratified the Constitution, had property qualifications for voting, most of them much more onerous than a dollar poll tax, in those cases in which the States did not have a poll tax.

Mr. President, we who are referred to slightingly, in the sense of opprobrium, as being southern Democrats, shall seek to find time to present our case to the country. I realize that this is a Presidential campaign year; and we do not desire to be caught between the upper and nether millstones of the two major parties fighting for votes of certain minority groups in this campaign. We shall not willingly surrender any right we have to present this question to the country. Therefore, I object.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what the Senator from Georgia has said may apply to the consideration of the poll-tax bill itself, but I cannot see how it applies to the motion to take up the bill. We

have spent 3 days on a motion to take up the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Two days. The Senator from Ohio himself used considerable time in discussing extraneous matters.

Mr. TAFT. If we were to spend 2 days on every motion to take up a bill in the Senate, we could never get anything done at any time.

What we are urging is that the motion to take up the bill be voted upon. Is the Senator willing to state any time at which he would be willing to vote on the motion to take up the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not care to commit myself at this time as to a time when we would consent to vote on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. We are operating under very unusual conditions. Though the cry of politics is being hurled all over the city, and the motives of every person are suspect, there are those of us who sincerely believe that we have a case against the bill, and that if we can ever get it across to the people of the United States, they will compel its withdrawal from consideration by the Senate.

We are laboring under tremendous handicaps. We who live in the South do not control the means of communicating news over the country. We do not control the press of the Nation, the commentators, and the airways, to influence public opinion. We ought to be able to debate a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill for 3 or 4 days without anyone complaining about it. This year we spent 5 or 6 weeks on the St. Lawrence waterway bill, and not once was the cry of "filibuster" raised. As soon as one of these political bills aimed at the South is brought up, almost before we have an opportunity to take the floor, the cry of "filibuster" is raised. It is raised in the newspapers; it is raised over the air waves; and the merits of the issue are completely obscured by the publicity which goes out about the alleged filibuster. We have never yet had a fair chance to get the merits of our position before the country, and every fair-minded Member of the Senate knows that to be true. So we do not propose to shackle ourselves, under the specious plea that is made, and preclude ourselves from utilizing the few opportunities made available to us.

Complaint is made about this so-called slow and tedious process, but by this process we propose to endeavor to get before the people the larger issue of importance of preserving the power of the several States to control their elections, rather than to endanger the rights of all the people by the creation of machinery for Federal control of elections from Washington.

That is why I object to the unanimous-consent request which has been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia objects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection so that I may make a brief observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief observation, also.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Georgia has objected, and that is his position, I shall withdraw my request, because I feel that no further debate is necessary. I should like to make a brief statement regarding the pending matter, but I shall not do so if the Senator is going to object, if that is his position.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement requested a moment ago has been objected to, while I agree that a matter of judgment is involved, I believe that the time has arrived when we should attempt to limit the time on the motion to have the Senate take up the bill.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, for whom I have profound admiration, that he has a perfect right, as does each and every other Senator, to talk about the merits of the matter or to discuss objections to the proposed legislation; but, Mr. President, I submit to all Members of the Senate that it can be done under the debate on the subject matter itself, and my opinion is that that is where it should be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska state how much time he would be willing to give us to discuss the merits?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to wait a moment, please.

The concurrence of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate voting is required for the adoption of a cloture petition. I submit to the Members of this body that if two-thirds of the Senators voting feel that this proposed legislation is of such importance that it should be taken up, then we should abide by such two-thirds vote, and should proceed to discuss the merits of the bill. In such case, every right a Senator now has in connection with the motion will be available to him in connection with the bill itself, so far as concerns debating the merits of the measure and debating the procedure connected therewith.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator to wait a moment, please, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, as to the emergency which has been referred to, I agree with the Senator from Georgia that I myself would not say that the point as to whether this particular piece of legislation is an emergency is not a debatable one. However, we are now in the midst of an emergency session of the Congress. We have been asked by the President of the United States to take up the civil-rights legislation as a part of the second category of legislation which should be passed. Because of that fact, I think it behooves us to bring up, as I stated at the beginning of the session, the only piece of proposed legislation I know of that is ready for consideration, which is the bill that is requested to be enacted on the subject of the poll tax.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. In a moment, please. Mr. President, furthermore, I feel that if we are to have before us for consideration any other proposed legislation, inasmuch as a cloture petition could not be voted upon before Wednesday, under the rule, by that time certainly there will be other proposed legislation for us to consider. If two-thirds of the Senators present vote to adopt a cloture petition, we would be ready to discuss the proposed legislation to which it relates. If a two-thirds vote is not obtainable, then we could proceed to the consideration of any other proposed legislation which might come before us, under the recommendations of a committee.

I hope the Senator from Georgia will feel that I am doing this in justice and in fair play, under the sole theory that if there is anything new about the subject, if there is any evidence on which a case can be made for or against this particular piece of proposed legislation, the time to do so is in connection with the debate on the subject matter involved, and not in connection with a motion, the pendency of which prevents the subject matter itself from being considered and terminated one way or the other, either at this session or any other session of the Senate of the United States.

It is in that spirit and in that light only that I now send to the desk a cloture petition which I feel meets all the requirements of the rules. I submit the petition, and ask that it be read, and that the proper procedure be had relative to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the Presiding Officer is required immediately to lay the cloture petition before the Senate. Without objection, it will be read by the clerk, instead of by the Chair.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

AUGUST 2, 1948.

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the pending measure, namely, the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national offices:

1. KENNETH S. WHERRY.
2. ROBERT A. TAFT.
3. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.
4. JOE MCCARTHY.
5. RALPH E. FLANDERS.
6. I. M. IVES.
7. HOMER FERGUSON.
8. GUY CORDON.
9. CLYDE M. REED.
10. W. E. JENNER.
11. ARTHUR CAPPER.
12. H. ALEXANDER SMITH.
13. B. B. HICKENLOOPER.
14. H. C. LODGE, JR.
15. JAMES P. KEM.
16. WAYNE MORSE.
17. EDWARD MARTIN.
18. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.
19. CLAUDE PEPPER.
20. ALBEN W. BARKLEY.
21. J. HOWARD MCGRATH.
22. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

Mr. WHERRY. I now yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is recognized. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUSSELL. I decline to yield at the present time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Georgia will yield to me for a moment. I previously tried to obtain the floor, when I requested the Senator from Nebraska to grant me the courtesy of yielding to me for a moment. But that courtesy was not accorded me by the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Florida without jeopardizing my rights to the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that the distinguished acting majority leader has seen fit to take a position which in effect operates to shut off one point of view which has not had so much as a moment's consideration on this floor. I do not mean the point of view of only one Senator, but I mean the point of view of a number of Senators representing various States which once had a poll tax requirement but which, in their sound judgment, have since terminated it as a prerequisite for their elections.

Mr. President, the distinguished acting majority leader may think he has been through the mill in this connection, but I wish to state that one does not have to be a Member of Congress to go through the battle on this question. At one time when I was a member of the Florida Legislature, this issue was a heated and controversial one on which numbers of our best citizens were alined, some on one side and some on the other. It was debated for days. It was decided with nothing like unanimity.

It happens that the junior Senator from Florida was one of those who supported the abolition of the poll tax, and successfully voted for abolition of the poll tax. Under the constitutional requirements of our State it was a legislative matter resting solely in the discretion of the legislature as to whether a poll tax should exist and, if it existed, whether it should be a prerequisite for voting.

Therefore, Mr. President, I speak from the point of view of one who comes from a State which has abolished the poll tax, after having had it for many years; and I also speak from the point of view of one who personally has advocated and voted for the repeal of the poll tax as a qualification for voting in the elections of his particular State.

Mr. President, I think it is unseemly indeed for a group of States, represented by a number of legislators, to preclude other Senators from presenting here, an explanation and statement of our position, which necessarily differs from that of other Senators, in their respective States, because as we view the matter, a question of fundamental constitutional law is involved, and one which we cannot ignore, and beyond that, questions of far-reaching policy are involved which, as we think may not be ignored, not solely from the standpoint of properly serving our own people and our own States, but of properly serving all the people of all the 48 States of the Union.

I regret exceedingly that the acting majority leader has taken such an arbitrary position, and I call to his attention and to the attention of numerous of my friends on the other side of the Chamber, and on this side likewise, who I notice signed the petition for cloture, that I sat here and listened, not merely for one day, but for days on end, to learned statements and erudite speeches by certain Members of this Congress, and I generally enjoyed those statements. In most particulars I thought they were justified in consuming the length of time that they consumed. I remember, if he will give me his attention a moment, the learned speech made by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CONNELL] on the portal-to-portal question. I thought it was an excellent speech, and exhaustive. It went into every point which he thought and which I could think of that the Supreme Court might raise in looking at that legislation, which had as its origin and for its necessity a ruling of the Supreme Court. I shall not attempt to say how many hours the argument of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri consumed, but my recollection is it took five calendar days of the Senate's time. I did not think the time was wasted, and I did not get up and go out, leaving him to talk to empty benches. I did not decline to listen to his position. No one thought of trying to shut him off. To the contrary, we felt he was honoring us by giving a clear and exhaustive exposition of a matter which he thought was of great importance. Frankly, I agreed with him in his feeling that it was of importance.

I see another Senator over there, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to whom I listened hours on end—I would say probably 40 hours—in the 1947 session, on the subject of labor-industry relations. Nobody tried to shut him off. Nobody tried to preclude him from expressing his convictions which he thought were sound from the standpoint, I am sure, of serving not only the industry of his State, but the industry of the Nation. Whether I agreed with his convictions or not, I sat here and listened to them and gave him the courtesy of a chance to express himself.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, to whom I shall yield in a minute, that I think the statement I was proposing to make on this subject, after I had given it long study and had searched my conscience, as well as the records and the history of our Nation in this matter, should be made before a decision is reached as to whether this particular bill shall come up. My proposed statement goes, in the main, to the question of whether or not the subject matter should be dealt with under a statute, by way of the proposed bill, or under a constitutional amendment, as was so learnedly and ably suggested here the other day by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I think the time to make that decision, certainly a proper time, would be before the vote to take up the particuluar measure here offered, which is nothing but a bill which, if enacted, becomes a statute.

I want to say without rancor and without resentment that I am at a loss to understand the change in attitude of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, here serving as acting majority floor leader, because I have always thought he was rather generous in his attitude toward other Senators in his desire to see that their viewpoint was given fair expression. I do not believe by searching the RECORD in the nearly 2 years I have been here that the distinguished Senator can point to any one time when I have occupied the floor of the Senate in excess of 30 or 40 minutes, and those occasions have been very few. So it seems to me that ample time should be afforded, recognizing the fact that there are three groups on this side, one coming from poll-tax States, which are still laboring under the poll-tax requirement; the second coming from poll-tax States which are now moving to remove that requirement. I note that the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], coming from one of those States, is here prepared to state the viewpoint of those States, and of the Senators who come from those States. Then there is the third group, and it happens in my case peculiarly, that, as to the junior Senator from Florida, I think he is entitled to the courtesy of having a chance to express his position, which by many of his people may be questioned or misunderstood because they may think it differs from the position he took in the legislative halls at Tallahassee, whereas it does not differ, because of the vastly different issue prevailing here.

I must oppose this bill. I shall gladly support, not only here on the floor, but by my influence, for whatever it may be worth, for its adoption in my State, the submission of a constitutional amendment dealing with the matter. I must say, if I may be allowed one more minute before I sit down, that I am disappointed that the distinguished acting majority leader has not seen fit to grant us the courtesy of a hearing, when three times here on the floor before he submitted the cloture petition I asked for the courtesy of the chance to be heard and to explain a position which I think is worth explaining, and to have a chance to make my statement here on the floor of the Senate in my own time, but not at too great length. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 30 seconds?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield under the same understanding, to a brief statement by the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the same circumstances, the Senator from Georgia yields to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Georgia. The argument made by the distinguished Senator from Florida,

which I think is very fair and very honorable, certainly could be made against a cloture petition filed against the subject matter of the poll tax, and I certainly would agree with him, and I would be the last man in the Senate to make a motion to cut off debate on the subject matter before the United States Senate. But this cloture petition is filed only on the motion to take up, that is all. It is in a different category from the St. Lawrence seaway. In that case the question was on a motion to reconsider and to recommit. It is in a different category from the portal-to-portal legislation, in connection with which the information the distinguished Senator brought to the Senate proved very valuable, and on which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] delivered an illuminating speech.

I simply want to say—and I hope the Senator will not lose faith in the acting majority leader—that I do think it is a matter of judgment as to whether or not there has been sufficient time on the motion. I think there has been, but I would be the last man in the Senate to offer a cloture petition on the subject matter if I thought ample time had not been given for debate. I assure the distinguished Senator that if two-thirds of the Senate vote to sustain the cloture petition, ample time will be given to the distinguished Senator for the presentation of his argument.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield on the same terms?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield, on the same terms.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to point out one other thing, that the Senator will have all day today, he will have all day tomorrow, and if cloture should be voted, he will have another hour after that to make all the remarks he wants to make on the motion to take up the poll-tax measure, without even debating the merits of the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. For a question?

Mr. PEPPER. Only for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the able Senator from Georgia whether he proposes to address himself to the parliamentary situation now existing since the filing of the petition, and whether he thinks it would be effective to curtail the debate, even if it were adopted by two-thirds. Does the Senator propose to address himself to that parliamentary question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I intend to address myself to the parliamentary situation, after I have made a motion.

Mr. President, I desire to lodge a point of order against what purports to be a cloture petition. Before I do so, I desire to move the yeas and nays on the motion made by the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of H. R. 29.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia asks for the yeas and nays on the motion to take up House bill 29. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the adoption of the motion for the yeas and nays in any way affect the right on the petition which has been filed before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks not, although it does affect the right of the mover of the motion to withdraw it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Chair mean the motion to take up the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Chair rules, then, that the granting of the yeas and nays in no way affects the parliamentary situation, so far as the petition is concerned?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. So far as the Chair understands and can anticipate the situation, that is the Chair's view. The Chair cannot know what the Senator from Georgia has in mind. The Senator from Georgia has asked for the yeas and nays. There is a sufficient second, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the motion now pending before the Senate is the motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill, which has been made by the acting majority leader. The Senator from Florida would like to propound an inquiry as to whether the effect of an order for the yeas and nays would be that the motion would not be withdrawn except by unanimous consent, on the pending measure before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the Chair's understanding.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Florida, for exampie, should have ready to offer in the Senate an amendment to the aircraft bill, which is Senate bill 2644, the pending measure, a bill, I believe, which is being sponsored by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]—if the Senator from Florida wished to offer an anti-poll-tax amendment as an amendment to the pending measure, I should like to know whether, if the motion made by the acting majority leader should be withdrawn, such a proposed amendment to the pending measure would be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Chair has declared the yeas and nays in order, so the question is entirely moot.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is moot, but the Chair will answer it. Except as the pending motion submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is withdrawn. But it cannot be withdrawn now in view of the order for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PEPPER. Has the Chair announced the order for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to submit a point of order against this attempt to apply cloture to the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill. This question has been discussed in the Senate for a number of years, and all parliamentarians have universally held that a cloture petition would not lie against a motion to take up a bill. The cloture petition now presented undertakes by its terms to avoid this ruling by calling the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill a measure. Calling the motion a measure does not make it so. It is a confession of the weakness of the position of those who are undertaking to file the petition. They undertake to confuse the issue by labeling as a measure the motion to proceed to the consideration of the poll-tax bill. But the statement in the cloture petition does not alter the rules or the precedents of the Senate. The rule which applies in this case, Mr. President, is rule XXII of the Senate, paragraph 2, from which I read:

> If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure—

The whole crux of the matter is found in those two words "pending measure"—

> is presented to the Senate, The Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate—

And then the rule proceeds to outline the procedure which follows in the case of a cloture petition being filed upon a pending measure.

Mr. President, it has always been universally conceded that a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill was not a pending measure. Certainly it could not be a pending measure. A pending measure means substantive legislation, not any of the various collateral motions used as a means of operating the parliamentary machinery of the Senate.

I desire to point out a precedent in this matter, which is not direct, but which is certainly persuasive to the correctness of the point of order before the Senate. When the so-called FEPC bill was before the Senate in 1946 we had practically the same parliamentary situation, except that we were discussing a motion to correct the Journal instead of a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill. Those who sought to bring the debate to a close on that matter admitted that a cloture petition did not lie as against a simple motion of the Senate. It was undertaken to bring the bill to a vote by filing a cloture petition to the bill, although it was not before the Senate at the time. The Chair properly ruled that the bill was not before the Senate, and therefore that a cloture petition did not lie.

The rules of the Senate may be very vexing to us at times. All of us are wearied by long-drawn-out debate. We have had no long-drawn-out debate in this instance. The subject was presented to the Senate only on last Thursday. Speeches have been made relating to the economic condition of the country and to the European situation, and the only Senators who have discussed the merits of the question are those whom you are now seeking to gag with this cloture petition. The opponents of this bill have discussed only the issues involved in the

proposed legislation, and half the time has been consumed by other Senators on other matters. The Rules of the Senate may be irksome at times, but they were not written to enable a majority of Senators to gag the minority on the floor until the minority have had every opportunity to present their case—ofttimes the minority of today becomes the majority of tomorrow. The majority is not always right. The rules of the Senate have never contemplated precipitate action before Senators have full opportunity to express themselves.

Every rule of the Senate was written with a view to keeping the Senate a great deliberative body. There is no greater bulwark of constitutional government than is freedom of debate in the Senate of the United States. The founding fathers planned wisely, and those who sat in the first session of the Senate and wrote the rules wisely conceived of a time when there would be good reasons for men who were in the minority to talk until the voice of reason and justice could be heard. Our institutions of free government will be endangered if we ever permit minority groups and representatives of special privilege to force through legislation without allowing such adequate debate that the people of the Nation may be fully apprised of the nature and implications of the pending issue. It was never intended, under Senate rules, to deal lightly with the question of free debate in the Senate. It was never intended that a cloture petition should be applied to a mere motion in the Senate. If that were the case, certainly the authors of this rule would not have so carefully written the words "pending measure." A pending measure certainly cannot be a motion to proceed to consideration of a bill. This is the first time, to my knowledge, that any Senator has contended that a cloture petition would lie as against a motion to proceed. I know of the pressures to which the Chair might be subjected in making a ruling. For my part, I have implicit confidence in the sense of fairness and justice of the Chair and that he will adhere to the precedents of the Senate.

I submit the point of order, with full confidence of being sustained by the Chair, that a cloture petition would not lie at the present time. It is admitted, even in the efforts which have been made in this Congress to amend the rules to make a cloture petition apply to a motion, that it does not lie at the present time as the rules are now written.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. On the question of what is the pending measure, if this motion were agreed to, would there be any change in the law relating to legislative action? On the other hand, if the motion were rejected, would there be any change?

Mr. RUSSELL. A pending measure is a bill or other piece of legislation before the Senate. A mere motion to consider it cannot have the effect of law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Whether the motion be adopted or rejected, it cannot have any effect whatever.

Mr. RUSSELL. Rule XXII is very clear, Mr. President. I am willing to submit my case to the Chair on that point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia makes a point of order against the cloture petition.

The Chair would like to state that the subject is not new to him; it has been a matter of study for many years; and the Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules, I should like to make a statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will hear the Senator from California briefly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise merely so that the RECORD at least will be reasonably complete, and show that there is another point of view in this matter of rule XXII.

If we assume that the point raised by the Senator from Georgia is sound, and if we assume that some of the more recent precedents, which as yet have not been passed upon by the Senate itself, are correct, then I submit to the Senate that rule XXII is absolutely meaningless and there is no protection in the Senate of the United States at all. In each and every case, in order to circumvent rule XXII, a Senator need only conduct a filibuster against the motion to take up a bill, and, as we all know, a bill cannot be taken up unless a motion is made to take it up, except by unanimous consent. As a result, rule XXII would be absolutely meaningless, under those conditions.

I submit, Mr. President, that under the interpretation which appears in Webster's New International Dictionary the word "measure" means, according to subsection 11:

> A step or definite part of a progressive course or policy; a means to an end.

Certainly a motion fits into that category.

I call attention to the very able statement made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in his individual views on the amendments which had been offered to the cloture rule submitted by a number of Senators, including the junior Senator from California, at the time when the amendments to rules suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts were favorably reported to the Senate.

In the original debates in the Senate on rule XXII it seemed clear that at least the Senators who were here at that time thought that by a two-thirds vote they did have a means of controlling unlimited debate, and I submit, Mr. President, that if that contention is not followed, the Senate has surrendered into the hands of a single Senator the power to obstruct the legislative processes of government. That is more power than the Constitution gives to the President of the United States in the use of his veto, because a two-thirds vote of each House of the Congress can override a Presidential veto.

If this contention is allowed to stand without correction by the Senate, one Senator or two Senators, or a small handful of Senators, can completely upset the orderly processes of representative government.

The Senate was confronted by a filibuster at the close of the last session of the Congress, when two Members of this body were able to obstruct for a time the entire legislative process, among other business to block the Selective Service Act, which was vitally necessary to the national defense of this Nation. I said then, and I repeat today, that is too much power for any responsible person to want, and too much power for any irresponsible person to have.

Mr. President, I am quite frank to admit that there is a legitimate argument which can be made to sustain the contention that cloture should not apply by a mere majority vote. I have somewhat changed my views on that subject. I offered an amendment to the rule which would have permitted cloture to be applied by a majority vote of the entire membership of the Senate. I am willing to admit that there is certainly an honest difference of opinion on that score, and perhaps it would not be wise to go that far in amending the rules. But I say that if the contention made, that cloture does not apply to a motion, is allowed to stand, we actually have no rule XXII, and the Senate has no protection in conducting its business in an orderly fashion. For that reason I hope that the decision will be made applying cloture under the circumstances confronting us today.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to intrude upon the time of the President of the Senate or impose my views upon him, except very briefly. I had to deal with these problems on two or three former occasions when I was majority leader, when efforts were made to secure consideration of anti-poll-tax and similar legislation. I have had to combat the effort to delay consideration by every means I thought within my power.

My attitude on the anti-poll-tax legislation is well known. My attitude on antilynching legislation is well known. I have made my views known here in the Senate and in speeches which I have made during much of my life. Nearly a generation ago the Legislature of Kentucky submitted to the people an amendment to our State constitution seeking to impose the requirement of the payment of a poll tax as indicating the right of a voter to cast his vote. I opposed that amendment to our State constitution, and the people overwhelmingly defeated it, and it is not in our fundamental law.

I had intended to call the attention of the Chair to the various definitions referred to by the Senator from California in regard to the meaning of the word "measure." There are many meanings of that word. A condition may exist requiring a remedy of some sort, whether legislative or otherwise, and it is a common thing to say that "steps ought to be taken" or "measures ought to be taken" to correct the condition, whatever it may be. I do not think there has been in the Senate any legal definition as to what a "measure" is, but colloquially we have been in the habit of referring to a bill as a measure, or to a resolution as a

measure; but when a bill or resolution is passed by the Congress and signed by the President, it is no longer a measure, it is an act. So that the definition of "measure" would not apply in that case.

I have not any doubt that when the Senate adopted the rule XXII it intended to make it possible for the Senate to bring to a termination debate upon any matter before it. If it be true that a measure is a step, among other steps, in a progressive course to bring about the consummation of some action, certainly a motion would be a measure within that sense. A motion to reconsider the vote by which a bill had passed would likewise be a measure within that sense.

I am merely urging that the Chair give consideration, if he has not done so, to that phase of the definition of "measure" in reaching his conclusion as to the validity of the petition which has been filed in order that we may bring this matter to a conclusion.

I have no desire to labor the point. I do believe that when the Senate adopted this rule it adopted it with the view and the intention and the conviction that it could bring any matter to a conclusion by the adoption of cloture. Since it was adopted, devices have been discovered and utilized by which the effectiveness of the rule is nullified, and I agree with the Senator from California—and I have said so heretofore when we were in the majority and when I was the majority leader—that the object of the rule is to bring to a conclusion a discussion upon a pending matter, and if we cannot bring it to a conclusion upon the preliminary motions which may be regarded as measures toward that end, then the effectiveness of the rule is completely destroyed, and the object of those who wrote it and adopted it has been completely defeated.

The object of all legislation is to secure action. The object of all rules is to bring about legislation within legislative bodies, and in any parliamentary assembly the object of rules is to facilitate the transaction of business and not unduly to obstruct it.

Having in mind the obvious intention of the framers of this rule and of the Senate when it adopted it, and the definition which is applicable, in my judgment, it seems to me that it is a proper procedure to file the petition at this particular time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from California mentioned the minority views which I filed on Senate Resolution No. 25 to amend the Rules of the Senate with respect to cloture. I should like to invite the attention of the Chair to a very significant fact in connection with that resolution. It was submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts on January 6, 1946, was considered in the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration for more than 2 months, and finally the resolution, as amended, to change rule XXII, which now reads that cloture may be imposed upon any pending measure, was reported, and as reported the words "motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business" were added to it.

It was the deliberate judgment of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, after careful study, that at the present time the Rules of the Senate do not permit a cloture petition to be filed either upon a motion to approve or amend the Journal or a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill. If the Chair were to reverse that position he would go directly contrary to the action taken by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which to my mind would be parliamentary hijacking, in which neither the Chair nor the Senate should indulge.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I want to submit only a brief observation upon this matter. The decision which the Chair is about to make is of grievous import to the country and possibly to the world. I am aware that the precedents favor the point of order made by the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in that decisions of previous presiding officers in the chair on other occasions sustain the point of order. However, Mr. President, every presiding officer, if I may say so, stands upon his own authority. He exercises his own power. He has the authority to make a decision in accordance with the rule, its language, and intent, which the distinguished presiding officer himself thinks is right and proper in course of his duty.

Mr. President, the language of rule XXII, of course, contains the words "pending measure." The pertinent portion of the language of the rule is:

> If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate—

But, Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that the word "measure" was used synonymously with the word "matter." Any pending matter; any pending question; any pending measure; whichever one may happen to choose to use. Those who in 1917 were trying to correct the error that permitted a filibuster against the arming of merchant ships upon the eve o World War I, as requested by President Wilson, were not making merely a futile gesture that would leave a door wide enough for any filibuster to pass through. That group of Senators, in my humble judgment, as has been better said by others, intended to give two-thirds of the Senate the power to determine what is the pending business in the Senate, and when debate shall be brought to a close upon any pending question.

Mr. President, the first time cloture was applied was on the treaty of peace with Germany at the end of World War I. The second time it was applied was in respect of the adherence of this country to the World Court in 1927. This is the poll-tax measure today. It might have been the Marshall plan a month or two ago. It may be a peace treaty in this session or the next session of Congress. It may mean selective service. It may mean any measure, Mr. President, which goes to the power of the Government of the United States to act; and to say that four-fifths or five-sixths or nine-tenths of the Senate cannot determine what its calendar of business shall be, and cannot determine when debate shall be brought to a close is to give a minority the power to throttle and to strangle the legislative power, which means the functioning of the Government of the United States. No minority has the right to such power.

Today, so far as the rules are concerned, the question presents itself to the able Presiding Officer as to how he should rule upon this question, and he has the same prerogative that courts have and exercise to reverse their decisions when they become convinced that they are not correct or proper. I believe if the Chair had this question anew to decide, that there would be no question but that the Chair would decide that two-thirds of th Senate may determine what the Senate's business is, and two-thirds of the Senate may bring debate to a close.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may I be permitted to make one very brief statement?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, dire pictures have been painted here, as in times past, as to the evils of unlimited discussion in the Senate of the United States. But it is a historic fact, Mr. President, that though there have been innumerable filibusters in this body—so designated by those who are on the majority side of the issue—and though there have been any number of occasions when we have all grown impatient on account of long speeches, Senators of the United States have so well recognized their responsibility in this body that no man can point to a really emergent piece of legislation necessary to the welfare of all the people of the country that has been defeated by what is called a filibuster. We are aware of our responsibilities here and as keenly alive to them as is any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, it is common custom in some quarters to refer to the Senators from the Southern States as "Claghorns," but I say that the Members of this body from the South, the present speaker excepted, measure up in patriotism and in ability to those from any other section of the land. We are aware of our responsibilities as Senators. But we do not propose to be kicked about as a political football in a political year if we can help it. I repeat that there has never been an important, a meritorious, an emergent piece of legislation in all the history of the Senate, with its unlimited debate, that has been killed by a filibuster. And over the years, though many hours have been sweated out here in night sessions, all necessary legislation has been enacted. This is neither an emergent or a necessary bill. The subject is shot through and through with politics and hypocrisy.

The rules of the Senate suffice when the majority is right, and when the minority has the courage of their conviction and know they are right, the rules of the Senate are broad enough to throw a protecting mantle about the minority until they have an opportunity to be heard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair begs the indulgence of the Senate to make a statement in connection with the ruling. The Chair is entirely conscious of the importance of the

decision about to be rendered, as just indicated by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. The Chair wishes to state at the outset that he is deeply conscious of the importance of preserving the integrity of congressional procedures, which, in the Chair's judgment, transcends at this critical hour in the world's history any possible transient advantages which might come from ruling of a different character.

The Chair is also conscious of a very great personal embarrassment and difficulty in rendering the decision because of his well-known prejudice in respect to the basic issues involved. He favors the anti-poll-tax legislation. He believes that debate should come to an end after a reasonable period, and he emphatically agrees that the Senate should be in ultimate control of its own destiny.

In making the ruling which the Chair will shortly announce, he hopes that it may be entirely plain that he is not only putting aside all his own personal prejudices and predilections, but that he is also not undertaking, even by indirect inference, to rule upon the merits of the pending measure. He is dealing solely with what he considers to be his responsibility under oath, as an officer of the Senate, required to deal with the Senate on the basis of his best judgment and honest reflection of what the Senate rules require.

The Chair would like to make this very brief preliminary historical observation:

The cloture rule was adopted on March 3, 1917, by an overwhelming vote of 76 yeas and 3 nays, indicating the overwhelming belief of the Senate at that time in the necessity for some adequate control by the Senate, in the final analysis, of its own operations. The term used in the rule to define the matter upon which a cloture motion may be presented is "pending measure." From the debate on the question of the adoption of the rule it would clearly appear to the Chair that it was a bill, a specific act, which was contemplated to be the "pending measure."

The then Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Boies Penrose, preliminary to making an inquiry in connection with the resolution, said:

> The resolution provides a method of cloture for closing debate, and provides that the pending bill shall be the unfinished business of the Senate to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

No reference appears anywhere in the debate that it was the intention or purpose to bring within the scope of the rule a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill.

In November 1919, while the treaty of peace with Germany was under consideration, the then Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Hitchcock, presented a cloture motion on the reservations proposed to the treaty by the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, at that time chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. A discussion immediately arose as to whether the motion was in order, and what constituted the pending measure. The then Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, in the course of the debate, made the point of order that the pending measure was the treaty itself, and not the reservations, a point of order which was sustained by the President pro tempore, Senator Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa. An appeal from the ruling was laid on the table by a vote of 44 to 36.

There has been no direct ruling upon the specific question whether a motion to take up a bill is subject to cloture. It has been recognized and understood that such is not the case, on the ground that a motion cannot reasonably be construed to be a pending measure within the meaning of the cloture rule. This is evidenced by the fact that numerous resolutions have been submitted from time to time having for their purpose an amendment of the rule so as to give a privileged status to a cloture motion, and expressly making its presentation in order at any time upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business.

As Members of the Senate are aware, there is now pending on the Senate Calendar a resolution, Senate Resolution 25, favorably reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, which is designed to bring about such an amendment of the rule.

The Senate is familiar with the fact that the precedents of the Senate clearly indicate that a motion to approve the Journal cannot be brought within the jurisdiction of cloture action, and that conclusion has been very widely and generally accepted by all Senators with whom the Presiding Officer has ever conversed on this subject.

It seems to the President pro tempore that we come down to a very simple question, which does not require consultation with Webster's dictionary in order to know the answer. The rule provides that—

> If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate—

And so forth. What is the "pending measure" at this moment? The pending measure is Senate bill 2644, a bill to provide for the development of civil-transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military services, and for other purposes. What is the purpose of the motion made by the able Senator from Nebraska, to which it is now being attempted to attach cloture? It is to create a new "pending measure." That is exactly the objective which the pending motion has in view. In the view of the Chair, in a reasonable interpretation of the English language the Chair is unable to believe otherwise than that the "pending measure" at this moment in the forum of the Senate is Senate bill 2644. It is not the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29.

The Chair notes in passing that, as the cloture petition was originally drawn, it read:

> To bring to a close the debate upon the pending motion—

Before being submitted, it was interlined to read:

> To close debate upon the pending measure, namely, the motion—

The President pro tempore finds it necessary, in conclusion, before announcing his decision, to state again that he is not passing upon the merits of the poll-tax issue, nor is he passing upon the desirability of a much stronger cloture rule in determining this point of order. The President pro tempore is not entitled to consult his own predilections or his own convictions in the use of this authority, however. He must act in his capacity as an officer of the Senate under oath to enforce its rules as he finds them to exist, whether he likes them or not, and whether he agrees with them or not. Of all the precedents necessary to preserve, this is the most important of all. Otherwise the preservation of any minority rights for any minority at any time would become impossible.

The President pro tempore is a sworn agent of the law as he finds the law to be. Only the Senate has the right to change the law. The President pro tempore feels that he is entitled particularly to underscore this axiom in the present instance, because the present circumstances themselves bring it into such bold and sharp relief.

In his capacity as a Senator, the President pro tempore favors the passage of the anti-poll-tax measure now. He has similarly voted upon numerous previous occasions. In his capacity as a Senator the President pro tempore believes that the rules of the Senate should permit cloture upon the pending motion to take up the anti-poll-tax measure; but in his capacity as President pro tempore the senior Senator from Michigan is bound to recognize what he believes to be the clear mandate of the Senate rules and the Senate precedents; namely, that no such authority presently exists.

The President pro tempore fully recognizes the implications of the resultant situation, as stated so eloquently by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. There is nothing new about those implications. They have been perfectly apparent to students of the Senate rules for many years. They mean that, in the final analysis, the Senate has no effective cloture rule at all. They mean that a small but determined minority can always prevent cloture, under the existing rules. They mean that a very few Senators have it in their power to prevent Senate action on anything. The Chair does not presume to pass upon what Senators may believe to be their justification for the use of such a power; he challenges no man's motives; he simply states the fact and what he believes to be the result of the fact.

The fact is that the existing Senate rules regarding cloture do not provide conclusive cloture. They still leave the Senate, rightly or wrongly, at the mercy of unlimited debate ad infinitum. The Chair repeats that this is no new discovery on his part. He repeats it has been frankly conceded by the Rules Committee of the Senate itself. It was conceded when this committee reported, on March 24, 1947—more than 1 year ago—Senate Resolution 25, which seeks to make the existing Senate cloture rule succeed in its purported power to permit two-thirds of the Senate to curb unlimited debate. That resolution has been on the Senate Calendar for 16 months. It has not been adopted. It is intended to prevent the precise purpose sought by

the pending point of order. Its presence on the Senate Calendar, by order of the Rules Committee, is, in the opinion of the Chair, complete proof that the Senate Rules Committee admits the validity of the pending point of order. The President pro tempore cannot be expected to cure, by an arbitrary ruling, the existing fatal defect in the cloture rule which the Senate itself has been invited, but has thus far declined, to cure.

It is the opinion of the present occupant of the chair in his capacity as senior Senator from Michigan that the Senate should adopt Senate Resolution 25, which makes the existing cloture rule mean what it purports to say, namely that, in extreme circumstances, two-thirds of the Senate can control the Senate's destiny. The Senate should not be impotent in emergency. If the Senate wishes to cure this impotence it has the authority, the power, and the means to do so. The President pro tempore of the Senate does not have the authority, the power, or the means to do so except as he arbitrarily takes the law into his own hands. This he declines to do in violation of his oath. If he did so, he would feel that what might be deemed temporary advantage by some could become a precedent which ultimately, in subsequent practice, would rightly be condemned by all.

The point of order is sustained. In making the ruling, the Chair recognizes the right of the Senate to make and interpret its own rules. The Senate has the right of appeal from the decision of the Chair. The Chair invites the Senate to exercise this right if it desires, even though the effort confronts much the same difficulties as does the present cloture petition.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I desire to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I did not yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would appreciate it if the Senator from Virginia would permit the appeal to be made, so as to complete this particular procedure, with the understanding—if it is agreeable to the Senator from Ohio—that the Senator from Virginia shall be permitted to proceed before the vote is taken.

Mr. TAFT. Certainly. Of course, the appeal is subject to debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The appeal is subject to debate.

Mr. TAFT. I would appreciate it if the Senator from Virginia——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield, for the purpose of permitting me to appeal from the decision of the Chair?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Yes, if I may have unanimous consent that in yielding to permit the Senator's appeal to be made, for later consideration, I shall not lose any of my privileges of the floor, including the right to discuss the ruling and the larger implications of what we are considering. If such consent is granted, I yield under those circumstances.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to that effect. While I am asking it, I would also ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak for not more than 2 minutes in making a very brief explanation of the purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair chiefly, of course, because it leaves the Senate in an almost impossible situation. A motion to take up is subject to debate and against it under the Chair's decision, a cloture petition cannot lie. Consequently there is no way by which this situation can be changed, except by physical exhaustion, by keeping the Senate in session day in and day out, which I hope will not be necessary, although we shall have to get to it next year unless this proposed change is made.

I appreciate the view of the President pro tempore as to what the word "measure" means—which, after all, is a very narrow question, and certainly is open to debate. I further appreciate the Chair's good faith in making the ruling. However, it is a question on which the Senate has never spoken and I believe the Senate should determine that question before forcing us into a position of having a filibuster on an attempt to change the rule, which perhaps would be even a more difficult matter, because every Senator interested in stopping any bill at all would oppose an attempt to change the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has appealed from the decision of the Chair. Therefore, the pending question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the decision of the Senate?

The Chair would like to add that he welcomes the appeal, because, as he indicated in his ruling, he feels that this is a matter on which the Senate itself must speak.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to permit me to propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do so, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I propound the following inquiry: If a motion is made to lay the appeal on the table, is that motion subject to debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No motion to table is ever subject to debate.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

If the motion to table the appeal is agreed to, then, of course, the result is to sustain the present occupant of the chair in his decision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the appeal is sustained, the Chair is overruled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the question: If the appeal is sustained, is the decision of the Chair on the point of order overruled?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The decision of the Chair is overruled, under those circumstances; and the cloture petition is valid, if the Chair is overruled on this appeal.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, would it be mandatory, 1 hour after the Senate convenes on Wednesday, that the cloture petition be voted upon?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the judgment of the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to have the Chair restate the ruling just made. I am sure several Members of the Senate did not clearly understand it. Certainly I did not.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair stated that if the appeal from the Chair's decision is sustained, the Chair is overruled, and the petition becomes valid, and the cloture procedure provided in the rule will proceed according to the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The appeal entered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio is debatable; is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is debatable.

Mr. RUSSELL. And if the appeal should be tabled, as indicated by the Senator from Nebraska, that would mean that the ruling of the Chair had been sustained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. And failure to lay the appeal on the table would in no wise preclude any Member of the Senate from debating the appeal made by the Senator from Ohio would it?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. TAFT. Under the ruling which the Chair has just made, would the Chair make the same ruling as to a cloture petition to close debate on the appeal by the Senator from Ohio from the decision of the Chair?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator restate his question?

Mr. TAFT. If a cloture petition is filed on the appeal by the Senator from Ohio from the decision of the Chair, will such cloture petition lie, under the rules of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not think so, because the same point would be involved as was involved in the original ruling.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan will state the inquiry.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it the ruling of the Chair that unlimited debate may be had on the appeal from the decision of the Chair, and that a petition for cloture to close such debate cannot be considered or voted on?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct as the Chair understands the situation.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FLANDERS. Will the Senator yield for a parliamentary question?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Am I correct in understanding that I can yield without losing the floor and without losing my rights?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can yield without losing the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I confess myself puzzled as to where we are now. In reading rule XX, I note that it says:

every appeal therefrom—

That is, from a decision of the Chair—

shall be decided at once, and without debate.

How does it come that we are not deciding at once and without debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The main appeal, which is the initial appeal made by the Senator from Ohio, is debatable. Any point of order secondary to that appeal is not debatable.

Mr. FLANDERS. Would the Chair mind referring the Senator from Vermont to the rule which gives that permission or states that condition?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair refers the Senator to rule XX, which he may read to himself, and be advised.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield under the same circumstances and assurances?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Under the same circumstances and assurances, I yield for a question, but I hope it will be brief.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one who has studied this matter, a little bit superficially, perhaps, in the past 3 years, and as one who has listened to the eloquent statement by the President pro tempore of his views as to the meaning of the term "pending measure," I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia or the Senator from Georgia a question. I personally shall vote to sustain the ruling of the Chair if the appeal comes to a vote. My question to the Senator from Virginia is, In view of the ruling by the President pro tempore, and in view of the primary need of the Senate, itself, to be able to make rule XXII effective, would the Senator from Virginia or the Senator from Georgia object to a unanimous-consent request to take up Calendar No. 85, Senate Resolution 25, at the present time?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I asked the Senator from Virginia the question, in the first instance.

Mr. EASTLAND. Whether the Senator from Virginia objects or not, I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi objects. Whether the Senator from Virginia objects is now a moot question.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senator from Mississippi has already objected, so any answer on my part would be purely a moot proceeding.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I am sorry; I cannot yield any further. I have been trying to start for nearly an hour, and I should like to get to the debate of the pending subject today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to commend the ruling of the distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate as being both correct and courageous. It was correct because it followed the plain meaning of the English language in the Senate rule relating to cloture. It was correct because it followed established decisions by previous presiding officers on the same point. It was correct because it followed the decisions of the Rules Committee of the Senate, who so recently have said that cloture cannot be invoked on a motion, and have suggested that the rule be so changed that in the future such action may be taken. The ruling was courageous because the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] made an impassioned plea to the Presiding Officer, though admitting that previous decisions had been that cloture could not be applied to a motion. He said he was under the impression that the Presiding Officer felt a proper interpretation of the rule would require him to rule against the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, but he appealed to the Presiding Officer to give power to the majority here, inferring that the sentiments of the Presiding Officer were in line with what the majority wanted to do. I naturally assume, therefore, Mr. President, that if the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, who signed the cloture petition, should succeed in getting the Congress to pass an anti-poll-tax bill, he would make the same kind of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which, on every occasion when the question has been before it, has consistently ruled that the Congress has no legal and constitutional right and power to act.

Mr. President, special sessions of the Congress are ordinarily called for the consideration of a national emergency and ordinarily limit their action to matters falling within that general category. But the first legislation proposed for consideration at this special session has been a bill to repeal the poll tax in seven States in which that qualification of voters is written into the respective State constitutions. No one has contended, and I am sure no one will care to contend, that the President of the United States would have been justified in calling a special session of the Congress to take such action on the basis of a national emergency, and no one has contended, and I am sure no one will contend, that it was a national emergency which controlled the policy of bringing up an anti-poll-tax bill as the first legislative action to be taken by the Senate at this special session.

So, at the outset of my remarks today on the subject of the anti-poll-tax bill, I wish to make it crystal clear that neither I nor any other southern Senator had any choice whatever in saying what legislation should be first considered at this special session. I also wish to make it crystal clear that every Senator from the South who shall stoutly resist the pending proposal to do an unwarranted and an unconstitutional thing to seven Southern States will promptly yield to any request from the Republican side to end debate on the anti-poll-tax bill for the consideration of legislation deemed to be either directly or indirectly related to a national emergency. What has actually occurred since we convened on last Monday is an effort to create a national emergency through an unwarranted and unconstitutional act which will affect, as so brilliantly explained last Thursday by my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], not only seven Southern States but each and every one of the 48 States of the Union whose star is so proudly proclaimed upon the blue field of our national emblem, an emblem which one of my ancestors, Col. John Armistead, of Caroline, kept flying throughout the British bombardment of Fort McHenry in the War of 1812, an action which challenges the oath that I took and which all of my distinguished colleagues took before we were permitted to qualify as a Senator of the United States from the State we so proudly represent. I know all other Senators are as familiar with that oath as I am, but for the benefit of those who may not know its solemn character I now repeat that oath:

I, A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

The portion of that oath which needs to be stressed on this historic occasion is the part which reads:

I take this obligation freely, without mental reservation or purpose of evasion.

To that I desire to add the concluding sentences of a full-page advertisement on the subject of freedom, published July 4, 1948, by John W. Anderson, of Gary, Ind.:

Why learn from alien tyranny—too late—what your departed freedom meant to you?

Why feel—some early day—the lasting scorn of children now your friends?

Would you have children know you missed your chance to pass along to them that freedom your more thoughtful fathers did not fail to pass to you?

Take one long look deep into a youngster's eager eyes, before you seal his fate.

Then pledge to him your faith, your high resolve—to live, and act, American.

Mr. President, I was deeply impressed by the remark of the President pro tempore of the Senate in ruling on the cloture issue, when he referred to the necessity of protecting the rights of minorities

and when he referred to the kind of oath he had taken and which all of us, as plain, ordinary Members of this body, have taken, to uphold the Constitution and to do what we think is right between God and our consciences. He stated that, regardless of the fact that, personally, he should like to vote for the poll-tax bill, regardless of the fact that he thought it would be a good thing to pass it, he could not bring himself to override the rights of the minorities in this body as they exist under the rules of the Senate.

That is the issue which I propose to discuss on this poll-tax question. Before I have concluded I shall quote from a brilliant speech made by a former President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in which he referred to the unique quality of our Government in its protection of minorities, saying that, through the division of powers between the Federal Government on the one hand and the States on the other hand, there were many instances in which a bare majority in the Congress could not override the minority in the States.

I am looking at this time at a distinguished friend from a Western State. I know what is in his mind regarding whether a bare majority, let us say, of this Congress shall override the wishes of his State on an economic problem which would vitally affect his State. I know that is in his heart as I speak.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the pending bill for the following reasons:

First. It is unconstitutional, as demonstrated by debates in the Constitutional Convention, by explanations of the Constitution in the Federalist papers and in State ratifying conventions, and by decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Second. It is unnecessary, because poll-tax payment as a prerequiste to voting is now imposed by only seven States where the trend is to eliminate the restriction by State action, as illustrated by the constitutional amendment which will be voted on in Virginia next year.

Third. It is undesirable, because it would create a confused situation in States which have the poll-tax requirement imbedded in their constitutions and because it would be another step in the direction of submerging the sovereignty of the States in an overpowering central government.

Let us first consider the history of the type of tax which is here involved and its association with the privilege of voting.

A point sometimes overlooked is that the poll tax came into being in this country not as a device for restricting suffrage, but as a liberalizing measure to increase the number of those eligible to vote.

When the Federal Constitution was adopted in 1789, only Vermont had universal suffrage. The general requirement for voting was ownership of property, usually real estate. The men who framed our Constitution knew that the State Constitutions adopted by Delaware, Maryland, and New Jersey in 1776, by Georgia in 1777, and by Massachusetts in 1780, all contained provisions that voters must be males, at least 20 years of age, who possessed a freehold or estate. In 1789, the year after it had ratified the Constitution, the State of Georgia liberalized its requirements by extending the vote to those who had prepaid taxes, even though they did not have the property-ownership qualification. Other States took similar action and the adoption of the poll tax was quite generally recognized as the first major step in expansion of the suffrage.

Specifically, we find the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776, section 6, limited the vote to freemen 21 years and over, resident for 1 year next before the election, and who had paid taxes during that time. This qualification as to taxes was expanded by the State's 1790 constitution.

The New York Constitution of 1777, article VII, in describing qualifications of electors, included the phrase "and been rated and actually paid taxes to this State." This was retained in the 1801 revision.

The North Carolina Constitution of 1776, article VIII, specified residence of 12 months before an election, and added, "and shall have paid public taxes."

The South Carolina Constitution of 1778 provided prepayment of taxes as an alternative to land ownership as a voting qualification.

It must be observed, too, that the men who drafted the Constitution did not overlook, but carefully considered, the various restrictions placed on voting at the time.

CONVENTION DEBATES

Thus, in the debates at the Constitutional Convention, as reported by Elliott, we find James Madison suggesting that there be a definite statement of qualifications placed in the Constitution, and expressing the opinion that the freeholders of the country—landowners—would be the safest depository of republican liberty.

It was recognized, however, that the qualifications fixed by the States were not all the same, and that a uniform rule would require changes in their basic laws which might hinder ratification of the Constitution. Consequently, the Committee of Detail, on August 6, 1787, recommended that, "The qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors of the several States, of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures"—volume 5, Elliott's Debates, page 377.

I digress, Mr. President, to comment on the question asked last Thursday by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] as to whether or not the word "same" was in the Constitution. No; the word "same" was not in the Constitution, but it was in the language of the committee which made the recommendation which was finally adopted as section 2 of article 1 of the Constitution. It is but another evidence, Mr. President, of the great wisdom and of the great skill of those who framed that instrument that not only did they set up a unique form of government, which has lasted longer than any other similar form of government in the world, and under which in a little over a century and a half we have become the most prosperous and, for the most part, the happiest people in the world, but it is also remarkable for the fact that they did not insert any unnecessary words. Gladstone knew what he was saying when he stated, in effect, that the Constitution was the greatest instrument ever struck off at a given time by the hand and purpose of man. It is simplicity itself, with no surpluses, boiled right down to the final analysis, and that is what we are coming to in this debate—what was this boiled down to and what did it mean?

The proposal of the committee on detail which I have just mentioned touched off a long debate, in which Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, advocated a uniform rule in the Constitution limiting the franchise to landowners. He objected to making the question of qualifications dependent on the will of the States, not because he thought they would unduly restrict the electorate, but because he feared they would be too generous in extending the privilege.

Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, warned, however, that the right of suffrage was a tender point, carefully guarded in the State constitutions, and that tampering with it might wreck the new National Government.

James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, also took issue with Morris. He said it would be difficult to settle on a uniform rule for all States, and he pointed in particular to the possibility that a disagreeable situation might arise if electors of the State legislature and Congress were not the same.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. For what purpose?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to make some remarks for 7 or 8 minutes in the Senator's time without his losing the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I regret very much, but the Senator from Virginia was about an hour late in starting his remarks, and he is going to run out of his own time before the shades of night fall. I regret very much that I cannot give my time to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, because I do not have enough left for myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The Senator from Virginia declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Not a 7- or 8-minute question.

Mr. LUCAS. A very short question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I shall yield if it is a very vital question. I am trying to discuss a vital issue, and I hope the Senator will not ask me a question which is not relevant to what I am discussing.

Mr. LUCAS. It is hardly relevant, and yet in a way it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Let me yield after I finish the branch of the sub-

ject I am now discussing. I do not like to have broken up my discussion of the interpretation of the provision to which I have been referring.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that all these remarks be stricken from the RECORD in order that the Senator's thoughts on this very important matter will not be disconnected.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I want the Senator to understand that I should like the best way in the world to yield, but I lost an hour and a half in getting started. I have prepared a speech which I am trying to complete today, because I hope it is a logical discussion of what is at stake.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia declines to yield. The RECORD will stand. The Senator from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. LUCAS. I desired to interrupt the Senator in order to inform him and the Senate what Governor Dewey does not propose to do in connection with what the Senator is discussing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. "It would be very hard and disagreeable," Wilson said, as reported by Madison, "for the same persons, at the same time, to vote for Representatives in the State legislature, and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislature" (5 Ell. Deb. 385).

George Mason, of Virginia, also contended for the very point I am stressing today—that a power to alter the qualifications of voters would be a dangerous power in the hands of the National Legislature. Once the principle is established that the Congress can make such changes, the power used at one time to expand the electorate may be used at another to restrict it, and, theoretically at least, the restriction could be carried so far that we would have a despotism.

Mr. Mason called attention to the fact that eight or nine States already had abolished land-holding qualifications, although most of them continued to require some material evidence of the citizen's responsible interest in his Government.

At the conclusion of this debate the Morris proposal to limit the ballot to freeholders was defeated by a vote of seven States to one and the committee plan was adopted without a dissenting vote. Its language was changed only slightly, and became that part of section 2 of article I of the Constitution which reads:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Nowhere in the original body of the original Constitution will be found a restriction on the discretion of the States in fixing the qualifications of voters. There are some restrictions in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and nineteenth amendments. But, as I shall show, these restrictions do not cover the point at issue in considering this bill. It should be noted, too, that they were made effective by amending the Constitution, which is the only proper approach that should be taken by those who seek to eliminate the poll-tax requirement, and that is the approach which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] indicated the southern Senators would not oppose if it was made at this special session.

The thinking of the men who wrote our Constitution is indicated not only by the Convention debates, but also by contemporary writings and statements.

We find, for example, that Thomas Jefferson favored payment of taxes as an alternative to holding land as a qualification for voters. In his draft for a proposed Constitution for Virginia, written in June 1776 while he was in Philadelphia as a member of the Continental Congress, Jefferson proposed:

> All male persons of full age and sane mind, having a freehold estate in (one-fourth of an acre) of land in any town or in (25) acres of land in the country, and all persons resident in the colony who shall have paid scott and lot to government the last (2 years) shall have right to give their vote in the election of their respective representatives.

In this same draft, incidentally, Jefferson proposed that—

> No person hereafter coming into this country shall be held within the same in slavery under any pretext whatever.

That, Mr. President, was proposed by Thomas Jefferson for the Virginia Constitution in 1776, and it was proposed to be written into the Federal Constitution in Philadelphia in 1787. It was primarily the State of Massachusetts and other maritime States that were bringing the slaves into the South which objected to that being written into the Constitution as proposed by the Representatives from Virginia, and they said that if that were put into the Constitution they would walk out of the convention before any constitution had been agreed to.

Jefferson gave a further exposition of his ideas on suffrage in his 1873 draft for a Constitution for Virginia in which he proposed:

> All free male citizens of full age, and sane mind, who for 1 year before shall have been resident in the county or shall through the whole of that time have possessed therein real property of the value of ——; or shall for the same time have been enrolled in the militia, and no others shall have a right to vote for delegates for the said county, and for senatorial electors for the district.

FEDERALIST INTERPRETATION

As has already been indicated, the members of the Constitutional Convention were conscious of the need to satisfy the people of the various States on this touchy subject of suffrage rights and it was one of the subjects which received attention in the Federalist papers which gave the most extensive contemporary exposition of the Constitution.

In No. 52 of the Federalist, written by either Madison or Hamilton, it was pointed out that the Constitution made the qualification for Federal electors the same as those of the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

> The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government.

The Federalist author continued:

> It was incumbent on the convention, therefore to define and establish this right in the Constitution. To have left it open for the occasional regulation of the Congress would have been improper for the reason just mentioned. To have submitted it to the legislative discretion of the States, would have been improper for the same reason; and for the additional reason that it would have rendered too dependent on the State governments that branch of the Federal Government which ought to be dependent on the people alone.

Mark the following words of the paragraph in the quotation:

> To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention.
>
> The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established by the State itself. It will be safe to the United States, because, being fixed by the State constitutions, it is not alterable by the State governments, and it cannot be feared that the people of the States will alter this part of their constitutions in such a manner as to abridge rights secured to them by the Federal Constitution.

Then, in the Fifty-fourth Federalist, which also may have been written by either Madison or Hamilton, it was remarked:

> The qualifications on which the right of suffrage depend are not, perhaps, the same in any two States. In some of the States the difference is very material. In every State, a certain proportion of inhabitants are deprived of this right by the constitution of the State, who will be included in the census by which the Federal Constitution apportions the Representatives.

Again in the Fifty-seventh Federalist the question was asked:

> Who are to be the electors of the Federal Representatives?

And the writer replied to his own question:

> Not the rich, more than the poor; nor the learned, more than the ignorant; nor the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States. They are to be the same who exercise the right in every State of electing the corresponding branch of the legislature of the State.

Discussing the subject of qualification of electors further in the Fifty-ninth Federalist, Hamilton wrote:

> It will not be alleged that an election law could have been framed and inserted in the Constitution which would have been always applicable to every probable change in the situation of the country; and it will therefore not be denied that a discretionary power over elections ought to exist somewhere. It will, I presume, be as readily conceded that there were only three ways in which this power could have been reasonably modified and disposed; that it must either have been lodged wholly in the National Legislature, or wholly in the State legislatures, or primarily in the latter and ultimately in the former. The last mode has, with reason, been preferred by the Convention. They have submitted the regulation of elections for the Federal Government, in the first instance, to the local administrations; which,

in ordinary cases, and when no improper views prevail, may be both more convenient and more satisfactory; but they have reserved to the national authority a right to interpose, whenever extraordinary circumstances might render that interposition necessary to its safety.

Note that Hamilton, always an advocate of strong central government and fearful of State encroachments, in attempting to win support for the compromise provisions of the Constitution which he had helped to frame claimed no more than that the national authority might interpose itself in the regulation of elections when "necessary to its safety."

He argued that giving the exclusive power of regulating elections for the National Government to the State legislatures would leave the existence of the Union at their mercy, since they could annihilate it simply by refusing to hold any election for national officials.

Turning then to the other side of the picture, he said:

Suppose an article had been introduced into the Constitution empowering the United States to regulate the elections for the particular States, would any man have hesitated to condemn it, both as an unwarrantable transposition of power and as a premeditated engine for the destruction of State governments?

Mind you, that is the great Alexander Hamilton, of New York, speaking. Today a cloture petition was signed by a very brilliant Member of the Senate, the political heir of Alexander Hamilton, of New York. He sent to the desk a cloture petition to shut off debate on what is involved in this question, and to bring the question to a prompt vote in the Senate. For what purpose? For the purpose of enacting a law by the Congress to regulate the qualifications of the voters in the States. Therefore I regret that this distinguished political heir of Alexander Hamilton is not at the moment in the Chamber, in order that I might bring to his attention what that master mind, that burning patriot, that architect of a great form of government, who helped to write this provision into the Constitution, said that it meant.

I continue to read from the statement of Alexander Hamilton:

The violation of principle in this case would have required no comment—

That is Alexander Hamilton, speaking about an effort of the Congress to fix the qualifications of voters.

The violation of principle, in this case, would have required no comment; and to an unbiased observer, it will not be less apparent in the project of subjecting the existence of the National Government, in a similar respect, to the pleasure of the State governments. An impartial view of the matter cannot fail to result in a conviction, that each, as far as possible, ought to depend on itself for its own preservation.

Alexander Hamilton said that the Federal Government would depend for its preservation upon section 4, by which the Congress may regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections to make sure that all the States have such elections; and that the States would preserve their integrity and sovereignty under section 2 of article I, which gives them the power of fixing the qualifications of voters, subject only to the restriction that they cannot impose on the electors or voters for Federal offices any different requirements than they impose on those who they say are qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Continuing his discussion in the Sixtieth Federalist, Hamilton said that with the House of Representatives being elected directly by the people, the Senate by the State legislatures, and the President by electors chosen for the purpose by the people, there would be little probability of a common interest to cement these different branches in a predilection for any particular class of electors.

As to the Senate he said:

It is impossible that any regulation of time and manner, which is all that is proposed to be submitted to the National Government in respect to that body, can affect the spirit which will direct the choice of its members.

Further on in the same paper, discussing fears that elections might be manipulated in the interest of the "rich and the well born," Hamilton said the only way of securing such preference would be by prescribing qualifications of property either for those who may elect or be elected.

"But," he added, "this forms no part of the power to be conferred upon the National Government."

Again I say that I am sorry that the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is not present. I am afraid that he does not know what his patron saint Alexander Hamilton has said on this subject. Who knew more about the Constitution than did Alexander Hamilton? Who would rise in the Senate and say, "Alexander Hamilton was an old fogey. He had a befuddled mind. He thought he was trying to write something in the Constitution that he understood, but he did not know what he was talking about, and when he wrote this statement in the Federalist papers he did not know what he was talking about. This has no binding effect on us now in construing language" which to most of us appears to be so plain.

For whatever it may be worth I quote again what Alexander Hamilton said:

This forms no part of the power to be conferred upon the National Government. Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, the manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution, and are unalterable by the legislature.

He was referring, of course, to this body. Alexander Hamilton wrote as clearly as English language could be expressed that the power to pass on the qualifications of voters was left expressly by the Constitution to the States, and he stated that such powers are unalterable by the legislature.

The clear distinction Hamilton made, in explaining that the Federal Government might regulate the time, the place, and the manner of holding elections but could not change the qualifications of the electors, was also recognized and emphasized by others.

RATIFYING CONVENTION DEBATES

In the Massachusetts convention, in answer to a query as to whether Congress might prescribe a property qualification for voters, Mr. Rufus King, a member of of the Federal Convention, said:

The idea of the honorable gentleman from Douglass transcends my understanding; for the power of control given by this section extends to the manner of elections, not the qualifications of the electors.

I am sorry that the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who today signed a cloture petition to bring about consideration of this very kind of bill to let the Congress pass upon qualifications of voters, is not present to hear me quote from his distinguished political ancestor, Mr. Rufus King, a member of the delegation from Massachusetts, who helped to write the language of the Constitution, and a member of the ratifying convention in Massachusetts who helped to interpret what that language meant. Are we to say that we know more than did Mr. Rufus King about what he meant in Philadelphia? Are we to say that we know more about what Mr. Rufus King meant when he urged Massachusetts to ratify this document? There were those in that convention who were fearful, just as the people of Virginia were fearful, that the Federal Government would gain too much power. They were complaining that the Federal Government should not have power to regulate the times, places, and manner of elections. Are we to assume that we know more about what he had in his mind; or are we going to go by what he himself said he had in his mind? If we are, here is what he said:

For the power of control given by this section—

He is debating how far the Federal Government could go—

extends to the manner of elections, not the qualifications of the electors.

And James Wilson, who had warned in the Federal Convention of the difficulty that might result if qualifications of State and national electors were different, had this to say in the Pennsylvania convention:

In order to know who are qualified to be electors of the House of Representatives, we are to inquire who are qualified to be electors of the legislature of each State. If there be no legislature in the States, there can be no electors of them; if there be no such electors, there is no criterion to know who are qualified to elect Members of the House of Representatives. By this short, plain deduction, the existence of State legislatures is proved to be essential to the existence of the General Government.

In the Virginia Convention, Wilson Nicholas, one of the delegates, said:

If, therefore, by the proposed plan, it is left uncertain in whom the right of suffrage is to rest, or if it has placed that right in improper hands, I shall admit that it is a radical defect; but in this plan there is a fixed rule for determining the qualifications of electors, and that rule the most judicious that could possibly have been devised, because it refers to a criterion which cannot be changed. A qualification that gives a right to elect representatives

for the State legislatures, gives also, by this Constitution, a right to choose Representatives for the General Government.

All those who are familiar with what happened in the ratifying convention at Richmond know how Patrick Henry fought the ratification of the Constitution on the ground that it gave the Federal Government too much power; and this is one of the things that the question was raised about: Can the Federal Government pass on the qualifications of the voters; or can Virginia, as in the past, fix those qualifications, and the Federal Government just determine the times, places, and manner, if it wishes to do so, of holding those elections, where those who have the right to vote under the State law can then freely participate?

Wilson Nicholas was a member of the Philadelphia Convention. He came back to Richmond and explained the meaning of what had been done at Philadelphia. He gave the members of the Richmond ratifying convention most positive assurance that the Federal Government could not and never would undertake to pass upon and fix the qualifications of voters. Even with that assurance, Mr. President, the Constitution was ratified in Virginia by a majority of only eight votes. I am very proud of the fact that I had two ancestors in that convention, Col. James Gordon, of Lancaster, and his son, James Gordon, Jr., close friends of Madison. I am proud they voted to ratify the Constitution, and I am glad to stand here and inform the Senate what the men who ratified it had in mind when they did so, and how wrong it would be to ignore the intentions of the framers of the Constitution and the intentions of those who participated in the convention and to override the States and to assume a right which they themselves have, and then take the step of pulling out one stone of the foundation of our constitutional representative democracy.

Again, in explaining the plan to the North Carolina Convention, John Steele said:

> Every man who has a right to vote for a representative to our legislature will ever have a right to vote for a Representative to the General Government. Does it not expressly provide that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors: The power over the manner of elections does not include that of saying who shall vote. The Constitution expressly says that the qualifications are those which entitle a man to vote for a State representative. It is, then, clearly and indubitably fixed and determined who shall be the electors; and the power over the manner only enables them to determine how these electors shall elect—whether by ballot, or by vote, or by any other way.

Mr. President, one would think that the Senate had just been confronted with the question as to whether we could change the qualifications of electors; but John Steele, as I recall, was a delegate from North Carolina to the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention, and he returned to his State convention to explain the meaning of what had been done at the Philadelphia Convention. The members of the State ratifying convention wished to know whether the Federal Government could change this procedure. He said to them, I repeat:

> Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors?

KEEPING FAITH WITH STATES

Mr. President, these excerpts from the debates in the ratifying conventions point to the correctness of the conclusion reached by Mr. Jesse F. Orton, New York attorney and student of constitutional law, who said in a brief on this subject prepared several years ago:

> This sentence (in article I, section 2, saying electors shall have the same qualifications as electors of the most numerous branch of State legislatures), the only one on "qualifications," was obviously a material representation and also a solemn pledge, that each ratifying State would be permitted, as in fact it was commanded, to use in electing its Representatives the same qualifications used in electing the larger branch of its legislature. * * * This provision in section 2 of article I was definitely understood by each State as such a pledge and absolute assurance. Every State ratified the Constitution upon that express condition, many times repeated during the period of ratification. The pledge was irrevocable, except by amendment, approved by three-fourths of the States. It was also considered a wise provision for the Nation. The United States has never dishonored that pledge. To dishonor it now would be an act of perfidy.

Those are not my words; those are the words of a very distinguished attorney from New York City.

He goes on to say:

> Few historical facts are more conclusively established than the fact that this pledge was made for the express and avowed purpose of obtaining the consent of the States to the adoption of the Constitution. It was repeated and emphasized in the Federalist, written chiefly by Madison and Hamilton, and in other writings and oral statements for the sole purpose of securing ratification. In the ratifying conventions it was used to satisfy any "doubting Thomas" that the States were absolutely protected in their power to control the suffrage in the election of Representatives.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of permitting me to ask unanimous consent to make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. With the understanding that I do not yield the floor or shall not lose any of my rights to the floor, I yield for the purpose of permitting a request to be made for an insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not raise any objection at this time, and I certainly do not wish to interfere with the Senator's right to the floor; but I wish to point out that the time is rapidly approaching when we may have to have a very rigid interpretation and enforcement of the Senate rules in regard to yielding, and it may also perhaps be necessary to begin to hold night sessions, so that the Senate may proceed with its business. I am not objecting at this time, though.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I shall yield this time, but from now until I conclude my remarks on this subject, I shall decline to yield any more.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the Senator's position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks the Senator from Virginia to yield for the purpose of requesting unanimous consent for the insertion in the RECORD, without prejudicing the rights on the part of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With that understanding, the insertion will be made.

(Mr. MAGNUSON's request appears elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appriate heading.)

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Continuing the quotation:

> Without this assurance, consent would have been refused by many of the States. With it, ratification was obtained in Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia by a vote of less than 53 percent of members present and voting.
>
> In section 4, after providing, "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof," it was provided that "the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators." This grant of power to set at naught the election laws passed by the States in obedience to this command in section 4 met with more violent and angry protests probably than any other provision in the Constitution. Section 4 undoubtedly lost many votes of delegates who otherwise would have voted for ratification. If Congress had been given similar power to set at naught the action of the States with respect to qualifications, there is little doubt that nine States would not have ratified and the proposed Union would not have been formed.

All that, Mr. President, was a quotation from this distinguished lawyer in New York.

Certainly there is nothing equivocal about the language of article I, section 2, which says those who vote for national officers in each State shall have the same qualifications as those who vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. And section 4 of article I is precise in limiting the control of Congress to the times, places, and manner of electing Senators and Representatives.

The significance of these limitations is reinforced by the fact that as late as 1912, when the seventeenth amendment was proposed by Congress, providing for popular election of Senators, language was used identical to that of article I, section 2. This amendment says:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

This, mind you, Mr. President, was adopted after more than a century of experience with the suffrage provisions contained in the Constitution and also after there had been ample time to observe operations of the newer poll taxes which were adopted between 1875 and 1908.

It is a matter of record, however, that when the seventeenth amendment was

debated in Congress, no issue was raised on the right of the States to determine the qualification of electors. But, on the contrary, serious consideration was given to a proposal to take away from Congress, by amendment, the authority to alter the times, places, and manner of holding elections.

Searching elsewhere than in article I for constitutional justification for abolishing the poll-tax requirement, supporters of such legislation have sometimes cited article IV, section 4, which says:

> The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

Analysis of this section as it was understood by those who wrote it tends, however, to strengthen rather than weaken the position of those who claim the States have a legitimate right to require tax payments as a prerequisite to voting.

In considering article IV, section 4, in No. 43 of the Federalist, Mr. Madison frankly raised the question whether or not the guaranty of a republican form of government might not "become a pretext for alteration in the State governments, without the concurrence of the States themselves." Answering his own question, he said:

> If the General Government should interpose by virtue of this constitutional authority, it will be, of course, bound to pursue the authority. But the authority extends no further than to a guaranty of a republican form of government, which supposes a preexisting government of the form which is to be guaranteed. So long therefore as the existing republican forms are continued by the States, they are guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. Whenever the States may choose to substitute other republican forms, they have a right to do so, and to claim the Federal guaranty for the latter. The only restriction imposed on them is, that they shall not exchange republican for antirepublican constitutions, a restriction which, it is presumed, will hardly be considered as a grievance.

Those are the words of James Madison, explaining the meaning of that section of the Constitution. It will be noted that Madison believed that the guaranty applied to the forms of government existing in the States at the time the Constitution was written, and as I already have indicated, these governments included property or tax qualifications on the right to vote.

In Willoughby's authoritative book on the Constitution (1, 2d ed. 215) we also find him saying this with respect to article IV, section 4:

> It will be noticed that the Constitution does not itself define the term "republican form of government." It has, however, always been an accepted rule of construction that the technical and special terms used in the Constitution are to be given that meaning which they had at the time that instrument was framed. This is but reasonable, for, in default of anything to the contrary, those who drafted the Constitution are to be presumed to have intended the words which they used to have that meaning they knew them to have. For a definition, then, of "republican government" we must discover what, in 1787, such a political form was considered to be. Certainly we may say that the governments of the Thirteen Original States as they existed at the time the Constitution was drafted must have been considered as illustrating the republican type. Furthermore, the constitutions of all those States which have been admitted to the Union since 1787 must be regarded as having been impliedly considered republican by Congress at the time of the giving of its assent to their entrance into the Union.

Also, discussing article I, section 4, in the Virginia ratifying convention, Mr. Madison explained:

> It was found impossible to fix the time, place, and manner of the election of Representatives in the Constitution. It was found necessary to leave the regulation of these, in the first place, to the State governments, as being best acquainted with the situation of the people, subject to the control of the General Government, in order to enable it to produce uniformity and prevent its own dissolution.
>
> And, considering the State governments and General Government as distinct bodies, acting in different and independent capacities for the people, it was thought the particular regulations should be submitted to the former and the general regulations to the latter. Were they exclusively under the control of the State governments, the General Government might easily be dissolved. But if they be regulated properly by the State legislatures, the congressional control will very probably never be exercised. The power appears to me satisfactory, and as unlikely to be abused as any part of the Constitution.

This, it will be noted, deals only with the times, places, and manner of holding elections and not with qualifications of voters since, under the provision of article I, section 2, a State could not attempt to dissolve the General Government by disqualifying voters without automatically dissolving its own government.

COURT DECISIONS

Now, let us see what our courts have had to say about the dividing line between State and Federal powers as applied to voters and elections.

After the adoption of the fourteenth amendment a woman in Missouri, where the right to vote was limited to males, sued the registrar because he refused to put her name on the list of voters. She contended she was a citizen of the United States under the amendment and that the State could not abridge her right as such a citizen to vote for Presidential electors.

In this case, reported as *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wallace 162) and decided in 1875, the Supreme Court denied her claim. The Court held that since she was a citizen, born of citizen parents before the amendment, her status with respect to voting was not changed by it, because the right to vote before the amendment was not necessarily one of the privileges or immunities of citizenship. This was demonstrated by the necessity for the fifteenth amendment, which protected the Negro from being excluded from voting because of his color but did not affect his wife, who remained debarred on account of sex. It took the later nineteenth amendment to remove that bar.

The fourteenth amendment, the Court said, "does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone."

Another issue raised in this case was whether or not the State, in refusing to allow women to vote, had failed to provide the republican form of government guaranteed by article IV, section 4.

On this point the Court said:

> The guaranty is of a republican form of government. No particular government is designated as republican, neither is the exact form to be guaranteed, in any manner especially designated. Here, as in other parts of the instrument, we are compelled to resort elsewhere to ascertain what was intended. The guaranty necessarily implies a duty on the part of the States themselves to provide such a government. All the States had governments when the Constitution was adopted. In all, the people participated to some extent, through their representatives selected in the manner specifically provided. These governments the Constitution did not change. They were accepted precisely as they were, and it is, therefore, to be presumed that they were such as it was the duty of the States to provide.
>
> Thus we have unmistakable evidence of what was republican in form within the meaning of that term as employed by the Constitution.

That is the language of the Court, Mr. President. I am still quoting from the Court's opinion:

> As has been seen (in the argument that has gone before) all the citizens of the States were not invested with the right of suffrage. In all, save perhaps New Jersey, this right was only bestowed upon men and not upon all of them. Under these circumstances, it is certainly now too late to contend that a government is not republican, within the meaning of this guaranty in the Constitution, because women are not made voters.

While the Court in this instance was considering particularly the limitations in the State governments which prevented women from voting, the opinion delivered by Chief Justice Waite cited other types of limitation as well.

The opinion, at page 172, contained this summary statement:

> When the Federal Constitution was adopted, all the States, with the exception of Rhode Island and Connecticut, had constitutions of their own. These two continued to act under their charters from the Crown. Upon an examination of these constitutions we find that in no State were all citizens permitted to vote. Each State determined for itself who should have that power.
>
> Thus in New Hampshire, "every male inhabitant of each town and parish with town privileges, and places unincorporated in the State, of 21 years of age and upwards, excepting paupers and persons excused from paying taxes at their own request," were its voters; in Massachusetts, "every male inhabitant of 21 years of age and upwards, having a freehold estate within the commonwealth of the annual income of 3 pounds, or any estate of the value of 60 pounds"; in Rhode Island, "such as are admitted free of the company and society" of the Colony; in Connecticut, such persons as had "maturity in years, quiet and peaceable behavior, a civil conversation, and 40 shillings freehold or 40 pounds personal estate," if so certified by the selectmen; in New York, "every male inhabitant of full age who shall have personally resided within one of the counties of the State for 6 months immediately preceding the day of election * * * if during the time aforesaid he shall have been a freeholder possessing a freehold of the value of 20 pounds within the county, or have rented a tenement therein of the yearly value of 40 shillings, and been rated and actually paid taxes to

the State"; in New Jersey, "all inhabitants * * * of full age who are worth 50 pounds, proclamation-money, clear estate in the same, and have resided in the county in which they claim a vote for 12 months immediately preceding the election"; in Pennsylvania, "every freeman of the age of 21 years, having resided in the State for 2 years next before the election, and within that time paid a State or county tax which shall have been assessed at least 6 months before the election"; in Delaware and Virginia, "as exercised by law at present"; in Maryland, "all freemen above 21 years of age having a freehold of 50 acres of land in the county in which they offer to vote and residing therein, and all freemen having property in the State above the value of 30 pounds current money, and having resided in the county in which they offer to vote one whole year next preceding the election"; in North Carolina, for Senators, "all freemen of the age of 21 years who have been inhabitants of any one county within the State 12 months immediately preceding the day of election, and possessed of a freehold within the same county of 50 acres of land for 6 months next before and at the day of election," and for members of the house of commons, "all freemen of the age of 21 years who have been inhabitants in any one county within the State 12 months immediately preceding the day of any election, and shall have paid public taxes"; in South Carolina, "every free white man of the age of 21 years, being a citizen of the State and having resided therein 2 years previous to the day of election and who hath a freehold of 50 acres of land, or a town lot of which he hath been legally seized and possessed for at least 6 months before such election, or (not having such freehold or town lot), hath been a resident within the election district in which he offers to give his vote 6 months before such election, and hath paid a tax the preceding year of three shillings sterling towards the support of the government"; and in Georgia, "such citizen and inhabitants of the State as shall have attained to the age of 21 years, and shall have paid tax for the year next preceding the election, and shall have resided 6 months within the county."

I am still quoting from the decision of Mr. Justice Story. The Court said:

In this condition of the law in respect to suffrage in the several States it cannot for a moment be doubted that if it had been intended to make all citizens of the United States voters the framers of the Constitution would not have left it to implication. So important a change in the condition of citizenship as it actually existed, if intended, would have been expressly declared.

That is the first case of the United States Supreme Court on this point. The decisions go right down the line, saying that if there had been anything anywhere in the Constitution that even looked in the direction of the Federal Government's having any control over qualifications in so vital a matter, as my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] said last Thursday—and I have quoted from a judge who said the same thing—in so tender a matter to the States as is the question of who shall vote, the first case said that the framers of the Constitution would not have left it to implication or guesswork; it would have been expressly written in. It was not written in, and, therefore, the first case says that it is not in there.

I ask the Senators to listen to the other cases, because I shall go down the line from the first case to the case cited by the Senator from Mississippi, which was decided in 1941, 6 months after the case was decided upon which some Members of the Senate are relying. The Supreme Court has never deviated, as I propose to show, from the first case right down to 1941, in holding in clear, express, and explicit terms, that the States have exclusive jurisdiction over fixing the qualifications of voters, and that there is nothing anywhere in the Constitution, by indirection, by implication, or in any other way, that can give this proposed power to the Federal Government.

The Court also noted that the Constitution of Rhode Island, which was adopted in 1843, contained qualifications for voting, including a property-ownership requirement.

I call attention to the fact that aside from the various property qualifications of the several States, the list of restrictions as cited in this court opinion included New Hampshire's denial of the vote to "persons excused from paying taxes at their own request"; New York's alternate requirement that voters who did not possess property must have "been rated and actually paid taxes to the State"; Pennsylvania's requirement that voters must pay a tax "assessed at least 6 months before the election" and the tax payment provisions of North Carolina, South Carolina, and of Georgia.

I hope the distinguished Senators from Connecticut will note, too, that at the time the Federal Constitution was adopted the right to vote in their State could be denied to anyone whom the selectmen refused to certify as having "quiet and peaceable behavior and civil conversation."

A little later on, Mr. President, I shall quote from the constitution of one of the great western States. It is not so far west as California, but it is near the Pacific coast. The constitution of that State provides that if anyone believes in polygamy or in anything which resembles what the Mormons used to believe in, he can never vote in that State. That provision is still in the constitution of that State. I have not heard anyone say that Idaho did not have the right to say who can vote in that State. No one has ever challenged that. I never heard anyone challenge the Constitution of Connecticut of 1803, providing that, in addition to paying taxes and residing in Connecticut, the selectmen—and I suppose that means the town council, or some such body—would have to certify that a man was quiet and peaceful in his behavior, and civil in his conversation.

Yet, after pointing out all these restrictions, Mr. Chief Justice Waite concluded that they were acceptable features of a republican form of government and were so recognized by the framers of our Constitution.

The decision of the Court in the case of Minor against Happersett, insofar as applicability of the fourteenth amendment to voting privileges was concerned, was influenced, of course, by the important slaughterhouse cases, which had been decided just 2 years earlier, in 1872.

SLAUGHTERHOUSE CASES

It was these cases which drew a clear line between national citizenship and State citizenship and established that the privileges adhering to one did not necessarily apply to the other.

The State of Louisiana had passed a law to regulate slaughterhouses near New Orleans and suit was brought on the ground that this law discriminated against certain citizens who had previously engaged in business, and that it therefore violated the fourteenth amendment.

More than a hundred pages in the reports—16 Wallace 36—were occupied by the Court's exhaustive analysis of the fourteenth amendment.

In its opinion, the Court said:

The first section of the fourteenth amendment, to which our attention is more specially invited, opens with a definition of citizenship—not only citizenship of the United States, but citizenship of the States. No such definition was previously found in the Constitution, nor had any attempt been made to define it by act of Congress. It had been the occasion of much discussion in the courts, by the executive departments, and in the public journals. It has been said by eminent judges that no man was a citizen of the United States except as he was a citizen of one of the States composing the Union. Those, therefore, who had been born and resided always in the District of Columbia or in the Territories, though within the United States, were not citizens. Whether this proposition was sound or not had never been judicially decided. But it had been held by this Court, in the celebrated Dred Scott case, only a few years before the outbreak of the Civil War, that a man of African descent, whether a slave or not, was not and could not be a citizen of a State or of the United States. This decision, while it met condemnation of some of the ablest statesmen and constitutional lawyers of the country, had never been overruled; and if it was to be accepted as a constitutional limitation of the right of citizenship, then all the Negro race who had recently been made freemen were still not only not citizens but were incapable of becoming so by anything short of an amendment to the Constitution.

To remove this difficulty primarily, and to establish a clear and comprehensive definition of citizenship which should declare what should constitute citizenship of the United States and also citizenship of a State, the first clause of the first section was framed.

That clause is the one reading—

All persons born and naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

The Court continued:

The first observation we have to make on this clause is, that it puts at rest both the questions which we stated to have been subject to differences of opinion. It declares that persons may be citizens of the United States without regard to their citizenship of a particular State, and it overturns the Dred Scott decision by making all persons born within the United States and subject to its jurisdiction citizens of the United States. That its main purpose was to establish the citizenship of the Negro there can be no doubt. The phrase "subject to its jurisdiction" was intended to exclude from its operation children of ministers, consuls, and citizens or subjects of foreign states born within the United States.

The next observation is more important in view of the arguments of counsel in the present case. It is, that the distinction between citizenship of the United States and citizenship of a State is clearly recognized and established. Not only may a man be a

citizen of the United States without being a citizen of a State, but an important element is necessary to convert the former into the latter. He must reside within the State to make him a citizen of it, but it is only necessary that he should be born or naturalized in the United States to be a citizen of the Union.

It is quite clear, then, that there is a citizenship of the United States, and a citizenship of a State, which are distinct from each other, and which depend upon different characteristics or circumstances in the individual.

We think this distinction and its explicit recognition in this amendment of great weight in this argument, because the next paragraph of this same section, which is the one mainly relied on by the plaintiffs in error, speaks only of privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, and does not speak of those of citizens of the several States. The argument, however, in favor of the plaintiffs rests wholly on the assumption that the citizenship is the same, and the privileges and immunities guaranteed by the clause are the same.

The language is: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

It is a little remarkable, if this clause was intended as a protection to the citizens of a State against the legislative power of his own State, that the words "citizen of the State" should be left out when it is so carefully used, and used in contradistinction to citizens of the United States, in the very sentence which precedes it. It is too clear for argument that the change of phraseology was adopted understandingly and with a purpose.

Of the privileges and immunities of the citizen of the United States, and of the privileges and immunities of the citizen of the State, and what they respectively are, we will presently consider; but we wish to state here that it is only the former which are placed by this clause under the protection of the Federal Constitution and that the latter, whatever they may be, are not intended to have any additional protection by this paragraph of the amendment.

If, then, there is a difference between the privileges and immunities belonging to a citizen of the United States as such, and those belonging to the citizen of the State as such, the latter must rest for their security and protection where they have heretofore rested; for they are not embraced by this paragraph of the amendment.

The first occurrence of the words "privileges and immunities" in our constitutional history is to be found in the fourth of the articles of the old Confederation.

It declares "that the better to secure and perpetuate mutual friendships and intercourse among the people of the different States of this Union, the free inhabitants of each of these States, paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives from justice excepted, shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States; and the people of each State shall have free ingress and regress to and from any other State, and shall enjoy therein all the privileges of trade and commerce, subject to the same duties, impositions, and restrictions as the inhabitants thereof respectively."

In the Constitution of the United States, which superseded the Articles of Confederation, the corresponding provision is found in section 2 of the fourth article, in the following words: "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States."

There can be but little question that the purpose of both these provisions is the same, and that the privileges and immunities intended are the same in each. In the article of the Confederation we have some of these specifically mentioned and enough perhaps to give some general idea of the class of civil rights meant by the phrase.

Fortunately, we are not without judicial instruction on this clause of the Constitution. The first and the leading case on the subject is that of Corfield against Coryell, decided by Mr. Justice Washington in the Circuit Court for the District of Pennsylvania in 1823.

"The inquiry," he says, "is, What are the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States? We feel no hesitation in confining these expressions to those privileges and immunities which are fundamental—which belong of right to the citizens of all free governments, and which have at all times been enjoyed by the citizens of the several States which compose the Union, from the time of their becoming free, independent, and sovereign. What these fundamental principles are, it would be more tedious than difficult to enumerate. They may all, however, be comprehended under the following general heads: Protection by the Government with the right to acquire and possess property of every kind and to pursue and obtain happiness and safety, subject, nevertheless, to such restraints as the Government may prescribe for the general good of the whole."

This definition of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the States is adopted in the main by this Court in the recent case of Ward against the State of Maryland, while it declines to undertake an authoritative definition beyond what was necessary to that decision. The description, when taken to include others not named but which are of the same general character, embraces nearly every civil right for the establishment and protection of which organized government is instituted. They are, in the language of Judge Washington, those rights which are fundamental. Throughout his opinion they are spoken of as rights belonging to the individual as a citizen of a State. They are so spoken of in the constitutional provision which he was construing. And they have always been held to be the class of rights which the State governments were created to establish and secure.

Please notice that last phrase used by the Court:

They have always been held to be the class of rights which the State governments were created to establish and secure.

To continue quoting from the Court's opinion in the Slaughter House cases:

In the case of Paul against Virginia, the Court, in expounding this clause of the Constitution, says that the privileges and immunities secured to citizens of each State in the several States by the provision in question are those privileges and immunities which are common to the citizens of the latter States under their constitutions and laws by virtue of their being citizens.

The constitutional provision there alluded to did not create those rights, which it calls privileges and immunities of citizens of the States. It threw around them in that clause no security for the citizen of the State in which they were claimed or exercised. Nor did it profess to control the power of the State governments over the rights of its own citizens.

Note well that last statement of the Supreme Court:

Nor did it profess to control the power of the State governments over the rights of its own citizens.

But that is what the legislation now under consideration proposes to do.

Continuing with our citation of the Court's opinion:

Its sole purpose was to declare to the several States that whatever those rights, as you grant or establish them to your own citizens, as you limit or qualify, or impose restrictions on their exercise, the same, neither more nor less, shall be the measure of the rights of citizens of other States within your jurisdiction.

It would be the vainest show of learning to attempt to prove by citations of authority that up to the adoption of the recent amendments (that is, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth) no claim or pretense was set up that those rights depended on the Federal Government for their existence or protection beyond the very few express limitations which the Federal Constitution imposed upon the States—such, for instance, as the prohibition against ex post facto laws, bills of attainder, and laws impairing the obligation of contracts. But with the exception of these and a few other restrictions, the entire domain of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the States, as above defined, lay within the constitutional and legislative power of the States, and without that of the Federal Government.

Was it the purpose of the fourteenth amendment, by the simple declaration that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the United States to transfer the security and protection of rights which we have mentioned to the Federal Government? And where it declared that Congress shall have the power to enforce that article, was it intended to bring within the power of Congress the entire domain of civil rights heretofore belonging exclusively to the States?

All this and more must follow if the proposition of the plaintiff is sound.

For not only are these rights subject to the control of Congress whenever in its discretion any of them are supposed to be abridged by State legislation but that body may also pass laws in advance limiting and restricting the exercise of power by the States in their most ordinary and usual functions, as in its judgment it may think proper on all such subjects and still further such construction would constitute this court a perpetual censor upon all legislation of the States on the civil rights of their own citizens, with authority to nullify such as it did not approve, as consistent with those rights as existed at the time of the adoption of this amendment. The argument, we admit, is not always the most conclusive which is drawn from the consequences urged against the adoption of a particular construction of an instrument. But when, as in the case before us, those consequences are so serious, so far reaching and pervading, so great a departure from the structure and spirit of our institutions, when the effect is to fetter and degrade the State governments by subjecting them to the control of Congress in the exercise of powers heretofore universally conceded to them of the most ordinary and fundamental character, when in fact it radically changes the whole theory of the relations of the State and Federal Governments to each other and of both these governments to the people, the argument has a force that is irresistible in the absence of language which expresses such a purpose too clearly to admit of doubt.

Then, after pointing out that the Federal Government does unquestionably have responsibility for protecting the privileges and immunities of citizens under certain circumstances, such as when they are on the high seas or within the jurisdiction of a foreign government, the Court said it did not see in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments "any purpose to destroy the main features of the general system" of our Government.

The opinion concluded:

Under the pressure of all the excited feeling growing out of the war, our statesmen have still believed that the existence of the States with powers for domestic and local government including the regulation of civil rights, the rights of person and of property was essential to the perfect working of our complex form of government, though they have thought proper to impose additional limitations on the States and to confer additional power on that of the Nation.

But whatever fluctuations may be seen in the history of public opinion on this subject during the period of our national existence we think it will be found that this court, so far as its functions required, has always held with a steady and an even hand the balance between State and Federal power, and we trust that such may continue to be the history of its relation to that subject so long as it shall have duties to perform which demand of it a construction of the Constitution or of any of its parts.

UNITED STATES *v.* CRUICKSHANK

In 1876, the year after the case of Minor against Happersett was decided, Chief Justice Waite again emphasized the right as well as the obligation of the States to protect the privileges of their citizens.

In giving the Court's opinion in the case of *United States* v. *Cruickshank* (92 U. S. 542) he said:

The fourteenth amendment prohibits a St. te from depriving any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or from denying to any person equal protection of the law, but this provision does not add anything to the rights of one citizen as against another. It simply furnishes an additional guaranty against any encroachment by the State upon the fundamental rights which belong to every citizen as a member of society.

The duty of protecting all its citizens in the enjoyment of an equality of rights was originally assumed by the States, and it remains there. The only obligation resting upon the United States is to see that the States do not deny the right. This the amendment guarantees and no more. The power of the National Government is limited to this guaranty.

The only question, then, would seem to be whether the right of voting without paying a poll tax, when the State requires such payment, is such a fundamental right as the Court referred to.

UNITED STATES *v.* REESE

The Court removed any doubt on this point in another opinion handed down in 1876, following the Cruickshank case, to which I have referred. In the case of *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214) the Court said:

The fifteenth amendment does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone. It prevents the States, or the United States, however, from giving preference in this particular to one citizen of the United States over another on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Before its adoption this could be done. It was as much within the power of a State to exclude citizens of the United States from voting on account of race, and so forth, as it was on account of age, property, or education. Now it is not.

Please notice closely the last part of that statement. The Court said that before adoption of the fifteenth amendment a State had as much right to exclude a citizen from voting on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, as it had—and still has since passage of the amendment—to exclude on account of age, property, or education.

Plainly if the tax payment qualification is to be removed, it must be done as the color qualification was, by amending the Constitution.

I digress at that point to make another comment on the laws of New York State, where there is no poll tax, but where one must register before every election. We have permanent registration in Virginia. Once a voter is registered he remains registered so long as he remains a citizen of the State. However, I am told that in New York State a person is not permitted to vote unless he registers before every election. I am also told that more people are denied the privilege of suffrage in New York City alone because of this registration requirement than are denied the right of suffrage because of the poll-tax requirement in any one of the Southern States.

I am also told that in order to register in New York one must pass a literacy test which is equivalent to a seventh-grade education. Suppose we were to apply that New York test to Virginia, Mississippi, and Florida. I do not like to make public confession of this, because in the district which I formerly represented in the House, known as the Shenandoah Valley, there are a great many elementary schools, high schools, preparatory schools, and colleges. As farming areas go, it is a rather prosperous section, and as people go, the people of that section are fine people, and I am very proud of them. The chief recruiting officer in that area told me 2 years ago, when I complained of the fact that the Army was taking so few boys from Virginia, that in that district 42 percent of those who volunteered were rejected because they did not have the equivalent of a seventh-grade education. I said, "Then your tests must be too exacting, and your standards must be too high. Those boys have plenty of common sense and courage. They know how to shoot, and they would make fine soldiers. The tests must be too severe." He replied, "No; the modern army has a great many newfangled scientific devices, and if the boys are not educated we cannot use them."

What would happen to us in Virginia if the New York test were applied there? The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is one of those who wants to impose this bill upon us. He signed the cloture petition. He wants to bring the bill up with one day of debate on the motion. If cloture is obtained on the motion, there will be no doubt about cloture on the main issue after the preliminary issue is disposed of. We shall be told, "You can take 1 hour. If you cannot explain the issue in that time, it is too bad, but we are going to vote. We are in the majority; and whether you like it or not, we are going to cram the bill down your throats."

There are better schools in New York because through the years we have been made to pay tribute through the nose because of a high protective tariff, and because we have been compelled to sell our products from Virginia and the rest of the South on a world market, and buy what we consume under a highly protected tariff. Other States grew rich, while we were poor. My distinguished friend from Mississippi told me yesterday that only in the last decade had Mississippi recovered from the devastating effect of the War Between the States. It is complained that we have not adequate schools. It is complained that our people are not educated. Complaint is made against the poll tax. If we were to apply the same restrictions as are applied in New York, four times as many people would be disqualified as are now disqualified because of the requirement of payment of a $1.50 poll tax as a prerequisite.

But that is not the point. The Senator from New York would not want us to say what should be the qualifications for registration in New York, in Kansas, in Oregon, or in any other State. We must not go into the question of qualifications, whether a voter has lived in the State for 6 weeks, 6 months, or a year, or whether he can pass a literacy test. Senators from other States would not want us to go into those questions, but they think it is a fine thing to enact anti-poll-tax legislation. There are now only seven States which have a poll-tax requirement.

I have run through the interpretations as to the meaning of the language of section 2 of article I. It is proposed to ignore all the decisions of the courts as to what that language means, and force down our throats something which Senators from other States think we ought to have, regardless of whether we agree with them or not. I am not through with the court decisions on that point.

EX PARTE YARBROUGH

We come next to 1884 and a case styled *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651). The unanimous opinion in this case was written by Mr. Justice Miller, the same distinguished jurist who wrote the opinion in the Slaughter House cases from which I previously quoted. This is a leading case which has been cited and relied upon by the courts in later cases involving the right to vote.

In this case Yarbrough and others were prosecuted for interfering with the exercise of the right to vote by certain qualified voters in an election of a Member of Congress from Georgia. They were charged with making violent attacks on those persons to prevent their voting. Yarbrough and the other defendants claimed they were not subject to Federal prosecution because the right to vote was conferred by the State.

In its opinion the Court said:

The States, in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualification for voters for those eo nomine. They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State.

If that language does not mean what it says, I hope my distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who I understand will follow me and undertake to

uphold the right of the Congress to legislate, will tell me what the language means. In order to be sure that he has it well fixed in his mind, I shall read it again:

> They define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State.

I continue to read:

> It adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress. It is not true, therefore, that electors for Members of Congress owe their right to vote to the State in any sense which makes the exercise of the right to depend exclusively on the law of the State.

In short, in the Yarbrough case the Court held that the State may not prescribe qualifications for Members of Congress as such, but it does automatically determine what their qualifications shall be when it fixes the qualifications for electors of the popular branch of its own legislature. It is therefore clear that until the present Constitution be amended, the Federal Government cannot in effect fix qualifications for electors for State legislatures by prescribing qualifications of those eligible to vote in national elections. Of course that is what it would amount to, and certainly under the Constitution the qualifications have to be the same. No one, either here or anywhere else, has ever challenged that fact.

Putting the matter another way, we might say that the right to vote comes from the State. Once the right is granted, the Federal Government becomes its protector.

SWAFFORD *v.* TEMPLETON

The case of *Swafford* v. *Templeton* (185 U. S. 487) involved the question of whether a person qualified to vote under State laws, who is wrongfully denied that right, has a cause of action for damages arising under the Constitution of the United States.

In answering this question in the affirmative, the Court referred to the Yarbrough case, and interpreted that opinion in this way:

> That is to say, the ruling was that the case was equally one arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or from violation of a State law which affected the exercise of the right to vote for a Member of Congress, since the Constitution of the United States had adopted, as the qualification of electors for Members of Congress, those prescribed by the State for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State.

It will be noted that the Court says the Constitution adopts the qualifications prescribed by the State—not that Congress adopts them. And, since it is the Constitution that adopts them, Congress is without power to alter this adoption.

If that is not so, I shall listen with great interest to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who says he is going to answer me. Let him explain where the power comes from, and how he can get away from the clear decision of the *Swafford case* (185 U. S. 487).

However, I am not through with the Supreme Court cases. I shall next take up the case of Gwinn and Beal against United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor by doing so?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator advise me about how much longer he will speak? The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has an adjournment resolution, which is a privileged matter. I would not wish to interrupt the Senator's speech, but I feel that if we can handle the adjournment resolution today, we really should do so.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I understand that the Senator from Nebraska wishes to have a general idea of when we are going to adjourn; is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. No. I should like to have a general idea of how long the Senator from Virginia will speak because I do not wish to break into his speech with another matter, even though it is privileged. So I should like to know the approximate length of time the Senator will speak or whether he would object to having us consider the adjournment resolution soon, after which he could continue his speech. Of course, the resolution is a privileged matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Will the distinguished acting majority leader give me until 5 o'clock, and then ask me how I am getting along at that time?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish the Senator to think for a moment that there is any desire to cut off his remarks in any way. I did not wish to break into his speech, of course. But inasmuch as he was about to make a new point, I wondered whether it would be possible to handle the adjournment resolution at the earliest possible time.

If the Senator from Virginia thinks he may conclude by 5 o'clock, I suggest that we wait until that time to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I shall do the best I can; but the distinguished acting majority leader will recall that I got started about an hour and 45 minutes after I expected to start.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly; I understand. I hope the Senator will take all the time he wishes to take.

Of course, I should like very much to have the Senate dispose of the adjournment resolution today, perhaps at 5 o'clock, if the Senator from Virginia can conclude by then. If not, he will continue tomorrow, of course.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I am taking some time on this matter because our friend the Senator from Oregon has asked that we put into the RECORD the points and cases on which we rely. I think it will be very helpful to do so; and then any Member of the Senate can read the cases in the speech as it appears in the RECORD, and can understand them, and then can say, if he so determines, as I think he should, "I misunderstood the situation; but now that I see what the framers of the Constitution had in mind and the basis on which the Constitution was adopted by the States, I must support my oath to uphold the Constitution, and there must not be any running out on that oath merely because someone begins to press me rather hard. Then I shall not say 'Yes, I took the oath, but I must change my oath at this time.'"

Of course, Mr. President, no Senator will go back on his oath. In other words, as my friend the Senator from Mississippi said last Thursday, this is a body of honorable men. So I wish to bring to their attention my viewpoint in regard to what is right, and then let them analyze it. God knows I think they love this country as much as I do. They want to see the principles of Jeffersonian democracy and constitutional liberty upheld. I do not have to indicate those matters to them. All I have to do is show the basis of the poll tax and the decisions of the courts and what the result would be if we unwittingly were led to say to the States, "We thought you had the right, but now you will fight for it successfully through the Supreme Court."

Mr. President, I was about to refer to the Gwinn and Beal case.

GWINN AND BEAL *v.* UNITED STATES

Again, in 1915 in the case of *Gwinn and Beal* v. *U. S.* (238 U. S. 347) Mr. Chief Justice White had this to say about the effect of the fifteenth amendment on State power (p. 362):

> Beyond doubt, the amendment does not take away from the State governments in a general sense the power over suffrage which had belonged to those governments from the beginning, and without the possession of which power the whole fabric upon which the division of State and National authority under the Constitution and the organization of both governments rest would be without support and both the authority of the Nation and the State would fall to the ground. In fact, the very command of the amendment recognizes the possession of the general power by the State, since the amendment seeks to regulate its exercise as to the particular subject with which it deals.

NEWBERRY *v.* UNITED STATES

The authority of the Federal Government to regulate elections under article I, section 4 was further defined in 1921 in the case of *Newberry* v. *U. S.* (256 U. S. 232). Mr. Justice Pitney, speaking on behalf of Justices Brandeis, Clark, and himself, in a concurring opinion, which dissented on one main point in the case, said that section 4—

> does not confer a general power to regulate elections, but only to regulate "the manner of holding" them. But this can mean nothing less than the entire mode of procedure—the essence, not merely the form of conducting elections.

And, in its majority opinion in this case, the Court said:

> We find no support in reason or authority for the argument that because the offices were created by the Constitution, Congress has some indefinite, undefined power over elections for Senators and Representatives not derived from section 4. The Government, then, of the United States, can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given, or given by necessary implication.

Thus Congress may enact laws to protect the right to vote of those who are

qualified by State law; but no power is expressly given, or given by necessary implication to say who shall be qualified to vote in the States.

BREEDLOVE *v.* SUTTLES

The first case directly involving poll taxes to come before the Supreme Court for decision was that of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277) decided in 1937. In that case the plaintiff, a citizen of Georgia, attempted to vote in a State election and also in a Federal election held at the same time for a Representative in Congress. He was refused the right to vote in either election because he had not paid his poll tax. He then sued, contending the privilege of voting for Federal officials was one to which he was entitled, unrestricted by a tax unreasonably imposed through State invasion of his rights as a citizen of the United States.

Mr. Justice Butler, in the unanimous opinion of the Court, stated:

Payment of the tax as a prerequisite (to voting) is not required for the purpose of denying or abridging the privilege of voting. * * * Exaction of payment before registration undoubtedly serves to aid collection from electors desiring to vote, but that use of the States' power is not prevented by the Federal Constitution. * * * To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

That is a direct quotation from the decision of the Supreme Court rendered in 1915. Arguments were had in the Senate when an effort was made to put a half-way poll-tax provision in the draft bill. The Senator from Florida said the right to vote was guaranteed by the Constitution, and that the right to vote came from the Constitution. I said, "Oh, no! The States existed before the Federal Government was created. The States gave the Federal Government all its power. It had no power other than what it received from the States. State citizenship came first. It is possible to have dual citizenship. That may exist under the Federal Government, but the right to vote arises within the State."

The Constitution says:

The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

That applies to the election of a Federal official. Senators are now elected by direct vote of the people. The provision formerly applied to Members of the House of Representatives only. That is the thing we argued. I did not have this case before me, but I knew that was bound to be the law. I am now reading the express language of the Court.

Then, after citing four leading cases, including those of Minor versus Happersett and Ex parte Yarbrough, the Court stated:

The privileges and immunities protected are only those that arise from the Constitution and laws of the United States and not those that spring from other sources.

UNITED STATES *v.* CLASSIC

We now come to the case of United States versus Classic. As the Senator from Mississippi pointed out, that is the case upon whose dictum the proponents of the pending bill place the most reliance. It was only a dictum. Six months after that, as the Senator from Mississippi pointed out, the Supreme Court, in the Pirtle case, involving the specific question with respect to which reliance is had on the dictum in the Classic case, denied a writ of certiorari, putting its final stamp of approval on the clear decisions all the way down, as I shall mention them when I come to them, that the Congress never had any right to pass on the qualifications of voters, that it was always left to the State. There would not have been a Constitution if that provision had not been in it.

An examination of the hearings before House and Senate committees on anti-poll-tax bills discloses that some witnesses, with greater zeal for Federal action than knowledge of the history of the Constitution and the court decisions on the qualifications of voters, have relied upon the case of *U. S.* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299), decided in 1941. This case is somewhat similar to the Yarbrough case, involving prosecution of Classic and others for interfering with voters in a Louisiana primary election. The main point in the case was whether the constitutional protection applied to voters in a primary as well as to a general congressional election. The Court decided that it did.

But, the Court proceeded to cite the Yarbrough case, following the ruling in that case, in holding that the right to vote in either primary or general elections of Members of Congress was given only to persons qualified under State law to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature.

Mr. Justice Stone said:

Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters to choose Members of the House of Representatives is thus to be exercised in conformity with the requirements of State law, subject to the restrictions prescribed by section 2 and the authority conferred on Congress by section 4, to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections of Representatives.

We look then to the statutes of Louisiana here involved to ascertain the nature of the right which under the constitutional mandate they define and confer on the voter.

The Court also said in this case:

The right of the people to choose, * * * is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution, and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right.

Then followed this paragraph, which mistakenly has been relied upon by advocates of Federal action:

While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (citing cases), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

In other words, the office of Representative in Congress was created by the Constitution, of course. But, the opinion still says that the States are authorized to legislate as provided by section 2, which is the only one that refers to qualifications of voters, and that this authority may be limited by the Federal authority under section 4 which covers only times, places, and manner of holding elections.

I am aware, of course, that in the cases of *Smith* v. *Allwright* (1944) (321 U. S. 649) and *Rice* v. *Elmore* (C. C. A. 4th, 1947) (165 F. (2d) 387), in which certiorari was denied in 1948 (16 L. W. 3314), the issue was raised of whether a State primary was an integral part of the State election machinery and whether denial of a right to participate in the primary was a denial of a constitutional or Federal statutory right for which redress could be sought through injunctive relief or damage.

But these cases merely emphasize the accepted fact that States may not deny the right to vote which is guaranteed by the Constitution to those who are qualified. There is nothing in either of these decisions which contradicts the position taken by the Court in other cases, that the States have the authority to determine what are the qualifications.

PIRTLE *v.* BROWN

One other case which may be mentioned is that of *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 Fed. (2d) 218). This grew out of the complaint of a citizen of Tennessee, otherwise qualified, who was refused the right to vote in a special election to fill a vacancy in the House of Representatives because he had not paid his poll tax.

If there could be a more direct issue before the court than that, I do not know what it could be. That is the very issue before us now. He wanted to vote for a Member of Congress, and he had not paid his poll tax. The State officials said, "You cannot vote." The District Court found against him. The decision was affirmed unanimously by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, whose opinion followed closely the reasoning of Mr. Justice Butler in the Breedlove case.

The Supreme Court was asked to review the case, but, on October 13, 1941, the petition was denied, without any opinion or statement.

This case is highly significant because only a special election for a Member of Congress was involved, and the refusal of the Supreme Court to review it came as a great disappointment to those who had tried to discount the Breedlove case on the ground that both a State and a Federal election were involved.

As pointed out by the Senator from Mississippi last Thursday, the Supreme Court affirmed the ruling of the circuit court of appeals 6 months after it had decided the Classic case. So there was no question regarding what was involved. There was no question in the minds of those who were relying on dictum, pure and simple, and there is no question about it in this case.

As a matter of fact, in an appearance before a Senate subcommittee on behalf of a poll-tax bill which he had introduced and which was being considered at the time the case of Pirtle against Brown was pending, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] stated that this case would present an ideal test of the constitutional question, since the election was restricted to that of a congressional Representative. The patron of the bill criticized the decision which had been handed down in the circuit court, said that a writ of certiorari from the Supreme Court would be sought, and confidently predicted that it would be granted and the case reversed.

That was the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, before the Supreme Court had acted. He said, "It is an ideal test case. Certainly the court is wrong. The Supreme Court will change all this. Pass my bill now," as he said to the Presiding Officer this morning, "Rule now so that the bill may be brought up. Do not wait. The country is clamoring for this action. Do not let the meaning of the language disturb you. Do not let the precedents of previous Presiding Officers disturb you. Act now and let the majority have its way. Why should a minority hold up the wishes of a majority?"

Inherent in our Government is the protection of minorities on certain vital issues, and this is one of them.

The Court, however, as has been noted, denied the writ and thus placed its stamp of approval on the ruling in the Breedlove case even when no State election was involved.

The clarity of this rule is indicated by the fact that in the annotated edition of American Law Reports (vol. 130, p. 572) in reporting the case of Pirtle against Brown this proposition is stated:

> The courts are unanimous in holding that failure to pay a valid poll tax imposed as a condition of voting has the effect of disqualifying the voter and rendering his vote invalid.

That was the headline not of someone running for the House or the Senate or for the Presidency. That was the headline of an experienced syllabus writer of a large lawbook publishing firm who was engaged in putting down in black and white what he, as a lawyer and a codifier, understood the decision of the court to mean. I shall read it over again:

> The courts are unanimous in holding that failure to pay a valid poll tax imposed as a condition of voting has the effect of disqualifying the voter and rendering his vote invalid.

In support of this statement the annotation cites the Breedlove case, Pirtle against Brown and State court decisions from Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. The supreme courts of all those States have rendered decisions in line with this case.

I have cited an unbroken line of cases, Federal and State, all of which clearly and unanimously hold that the right to fix qualifications is vested by the Constitution in the States. It has been argued at times that the cases are not in point because Congress has not legislated on the poll tax and when it does legislate, its regulation will be paramount. How silly, since the Congress has no power except that conferred upon it by the Constitution. In this instance the power not only is not conferred, it is expressly reserved by the States in the Constitution.

The principle which must be applied was well stated by Chief Justice Marshall in the case of *Hodgson & Thompson* v. *Bowerbank* (1809) (5 Cranch 303) when in discussing legislation dealing with judicial power he said:

> Turn to the article of the Constitution of the United States, for the statute cannot extend jurisdiction beyond the limits of the Constitution.

The framers of the Constitution familiar with the constitutions of the several States and the tax requirements they included, wrote into article I, section 2, a provision that the qualifications for electors for Members of Congress should be the same as the qualifications for the electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. Thus reserving to themselves that power, the States likewise bound the Congress, as much so as if the Constitution had expressly said: "The Congress shall pass no bill concerning the qualifications of persons voting for Representatives in Congress."

That there should be no doubt, in future years, of that fact, there was written into the tenth amendment this reminder:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

CARTER *v.* CARTER COAL CO.

The limitation on the powers of Congress was defined with clarity by the Supreme Court in the case of *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.* (298 U. S. 238) in which the Court said:

> The general rule with regard to the respective powers of the National and the State Governments under the Constitution is not in doubt. The States were before the Constitution; and, consequently, their legislative powers antedated the Constitution. Those who framed and those who adopted that instrument meant to carve from the general mass of legislative powers, then possessed by the States, only such portions as it was thought wise to confer upon the Federal Government; and in order that there should be no uncertainty in respect to what was taken and what was left the national powers of legislation were not aggregated but enumerated—with the result that what was not embraced by the enumeration remained vested in the States without change or impairment. Thus, "when it was found necessary to establish a national government for national purposes," this Court said in *Munn* v. *Illinois* (84 U. S. 113, 124), "a part of the powers of the States and the people of the States was granted to the United States and the people of the United States. This grant operated as a further limitation upon the powers of the States, so that now the governments of the States possess all the powers of the Parliament of England, except such as have been delegated to the United States or reserved by the people." While the States are not sovereign in the true sense of that term, but only quasi sovereign, yet in respect of all powers reserved to them they are supreme—"as independent of the General Government as that Government within its sphere is independent of the States." And, since every addition to the legislative power to some extent detracts from or invades the power of the States it is of vital moment that, in order to preserve the fixed balance intended by the Constitution, the powers of the General Government be not so extended as to embrace any not within the express terms of the several grants or the implications necessary to be drawn therefrom.
>
> It is no longer open to question that the General Government, unlike the States, possesses no inherent power in respect of the internal affairs of the States and emphatically not with regard to legislation. The question in respect of the inherent power of that Government as to the external affairs of the Nation and in the field of international law is a wholly different matter which it is not necessary now to discuss.

While it may be said that the value of the case I have just cited is limited as a precedent by subsequent decisions questioning the validity of the conclusion then reached by the Court, the reasoning on the particular point we have under discussion remains valid.

This was recognized by the Court when it said as late as 1945 in the case of *Screws* v. *U. S.* (325 U. S. 91):

> The fourteenth amendment did not alter the basic relations between the States and the National Government. *United States* v. *Harris* (106 U. S. 629; in re Kemmler, 136 U. S. 436, 448): Our National Government is one of delegated powers alone.

So, it seems clear that the power to fix qualifications of voters, expressly reserved to the States by the Constitution, cannot be said to be abrogated by some implied power of Congress.

It may be said that prepayment of taxes has nothing to do with the fitness or capacity of a voter, any more than race, color, sex, or previous condition of servitude. But, if this is admitted, it only follows that the same constitutional process of amendment should be used to remove tax requirements that was used to remove racial and sex barriers.

As a matter of fact, that was the process proposed by the Republican Party platform of 1944, which stated:

> The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

I have not seen the text of the poll-tax plank of the 1948 Republican platform, but I have been told that all it says is, "We favor the abolition of the poll tax."

If the Republican Party was so firmly convinced that they had the constitutional right to eliminate the poll tax by congressional action, why in 1944 did they advocate action by constitutional amendment, and why in 1948 did they not say, "and to do it by congressional action as soon as we can get to Washington?"

If the poll tax is to be abolished, the constitutional-amendment method is the only constitutional way by which to proceed. That is the only reasonable course that can be taken by those too impatient to allow the States to settle this problem in their own way. It is the course advocated by George Washington in his Farewell Address when he said that if changes in the Constitution were considered necessary, "let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation."

Now let us take a look at the pending bill in the light of the Constitution background which I have so far developed.

The first section states that—

The requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right and privilege of voting for said national officers.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi last Thursday paid his respects to those weasel words.

I should first like to call attention to the fact that the bill is made to apply to the choice of electors for President and Vice President, in the very face of the fact that the Constitution reserves to the States the exclusive power of determining the manner in which its electors shall be chosen and confers no power whatsoever on Congress to legislate on this subject.

Section 1 of article II of the Constitution provides:

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.

Under this provision, States do not have to hold elections to choose Presidential electors, and in the early days of the Nation some States had their legislatures choose electors, some chose them by districts and some by other methods, although at present the accepted method is to have the choice made by ballot of the whole electorate.

M'PHERSON *v.* BLACKER

Any doubt as to the latitude given the States in making their choice is removed by examination of the language used by the Supreme Court in the case of *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 27, 35) where Mr. Chief Justice Fuller said:

The Constitution does not provide that the appointment of electors shall be by popular vote, nor that the electors shall be voted for upon a general ticket, nor that the majority of those who exercise the elective franchise can alone choose the electors. It recognizes that the people act through their representatives in the legislature, and leaves it to the legislature exclusively, to define the method of effecting the object.

Mr. Chief Justice Fuller also said in his opinion in this case:

In short, the appointment and mode of appointment of electors belong exclusively to the States under the Constitution of the United States. They are, as remarked by Mr. Justice Gray *In re Green* (134 U. S. 377, 379 (33:951, 952)) "no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of the State legislatures when acting as electors of Federal Senators, or the people of the States when acting as the electors of Representatives in Congress." Congress is empowered to determine the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they are to give their votes, which is required to be the same day throughout the United States, but otherwise the power and jurisdiction of the State is exclusive, with the exception of the provisions as to the number of electors and the ineligibility of certain persons, so framed that congressional and Federal influence might be excluded.

In this case the Court also quoted, with approval, from a report of the Senate Privileges and Elections Committee made in 1874, in which it was stated that "it is no doubt competent for the legislature to authorize the governor, or the supreme court of the State, or any other agent of its will to appoint these electors."

The Court said further:

Whenever Presidential electors are appointed by popular election, then the right to vote cannot be denied or abridged without invoking the penalty (of having State representation reduced as provided in the fourteenth amendment), and so of the right to vote for Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of the State, or the members of the legislature thereof. The right to vote intended to be protected refers to the right to vote as established by the laws and constitution of the State. There is no color for the contention that under the amendments every male citizen of the United States has from the time of his majority a right to vote for Presidential electors.

It should be apparent, then, that even if justification could be found in the Constitution for the proposed legislation as applied to elections for Members of Congress, the same authorization could not be made to apply to the choice of electors of President and Vice President. Clearly, even the limited power given by section 4 of article I to deal with the times, places and manner of elections, cannot refer to the electors, who do not have to be chosen at an election at all, if the State should prefer some other manner of selection.

So, the ground which is attempted to be covered by this bill indicates how far the enthusiasm of its sponsors has led them astray from constitutional principles.

When the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] follows me in the debate I should like to have him discuss not only the cases I have cited concerning the interpretation of section 2 of article I of the Constitution, which provides that States shall have the right to fix the qualifications of voters, and that the only qualification required of a voter to vote for a Federal official are the qualifications required of the voter to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature, but I should like to have the Senator from Oregon discuss the provision in the bill by which it is proposed to force all the States to elect their Presidential electors in the same way. I just read to the Senate two recent decisions of the Supreme Court directly saying that the Federal Government could not move in to do such a thing. I should like to have the Senator from Oregon explain to the Senate how it is proposed to do such a thing, and how it is proposed that such action shall be made to stand up.

I now come very shortly to why I believe that, even if Congress had the power to do such a thing it would be very bad for everyone concerned if the attempt were made to exercise it.

That the departure of the authors of the bill from the intent of the framers of the Constitution is not entirely unconscious is also indicated by the clause in section 1 of the bill stating that requirement of a poll-tax payment as a prerequisite to voting—

is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors * * * within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national officers.

We have here what amounts to a confession by the authors of the bill that they cannot invade the right to fix qualifications of voters, which is so plainly given to the States by article I, section 2. So they try by a legislative declaration to remove the poll-tax requirement from the definition of the word "qualification" and then, by another declaration to brand it as "interference" with the manner of holding elections, thus bringing it under article I, section 4, where Federal authority could be asserted.

There are two questions to be considered here. First, is the poll-tax requirement such a qualification as was contemplated by the framers of the Constitution and which is permissible under article I, section 2? And second, can the Congress usurp a power which always has been conceded to belong to the courts by attempting to define and interpret the meaning of the wording of our Constitution merely to justify an extension of its own powers?

On the first point, we know that Webster defines "qualification" as "a condition precedent that must be complied with for the attainment of a status, the perfection of a right, and so forth; as the qualification of citizenship."

And "qualified voter" is defined as "one who possesses certain specific qualifications for voting, especially as to citizenship, age, and residence, and sometimes also as to literacy and ownership of property."

I can find no merit in the argument of those who attempt to say that when the authors of our Constitution wrote in the word "qualification" they had in mind only moral or intellectual qualities which would make the citizen competent to vote intelligently.

As I previously pointed out in this discussion, the possession of property or the prepayment of taxes was a prerequisite to voting in most of the States at the time the Constitution was adopted. And, in the Federalist (No. 60) Alexander Hamilton applied the word "qualification" in this connection when he spoke of "prescribing qualifications of property, either for those who may elect or be elected." Hamilton immediately added that—

This forms no part of the power to be conferred upon the National Government. Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, and the manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon another occasion, are defined and fixed in the Constitution; and are unalterable by the legislature.

The same understanding of the term "qualifications" is evident among those who participated in the constitutional convention debates. Thus (in Elliott's Debates, vol. 5, p. 385) we find that in discussion of article I, section 2, Mr. Gouverneur Morris moved to amend by striking out "beginning with the words 'qualifications of electors'," so as to "restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders." Continuing this discussion of a property ownership requirement for voters, Mr. Wilson thought it would be difficult to form any uniform rule of qualifications for all States. Mr. Mason observed that some of the States had "extended the right of suffrage beyond the freeholders," and that a power to alter the qualifications would be a dangerous power in the hands of the Legislature (Congress). James Madison was undecided whether the constitutional qualification ought to be freehold, but said the right of suffrage ought to be left to be regulated by Congress.

This interpretation of qualifications of voters has continued to be accepted to the present time. Thus in volume 29 of Corpus Juris Secundum (1941) in the article on elections there is a main heading titled "Qualifications and Disqualifications of Voters." Under this there is a subtitle "Payment of Taxes" and in this it is stated that unless required by the Constitution or statutes, payment of taxes is not a qualification for voting.

Also, in 18 American Jurisprudence—1938—in the article on elections and the subtitle "Qualifications," one of the requisites listed is "payment of taxes." In this it is stated:

> Whether the adoption of the nineteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution had the effect of rendering women subject to a poll-tax qualification theretofore applicable to men only is a question which has been answered in the affirmative in some jurisdictions and in the negative in others.

I submit, therefore, that the Congress would be violating an elementary principle of law if it undertook, as this bill proposes to do, to enlarge its own powers by changing the meaning which the word "qualification" has achieved both by popular acceptance and judicial interpretation.

This is exactly the kind of action I believe Thomas Jefferson had in mind when he said:

> In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

The bill's assertion that what the framers of the Constitution plainly recognized as a qualification for voting is not a qualification at all, is a legally unjustified twisting of language. But the following clause which says the requirement of poll-tax payment as a prerequisite to voting is a tax upon the right and privilege of voting for national officers is simply an untruth, insofar as it applies to existing State laws.

Of course, a poll tax imposed specifically on those who sought to vote in elections of Members of Congress would be an interference and a tax on the right and privilege of voting for national officers. But no State has attempted to impose such an unconstitutional tax.

What the States have done is to impose a tax which must be paid by those who wish to vote for State officers, including the most numerous branch of the legislature. When such a tax has been imposed, the Constitution of the United States makes it, under article I, section 2, a prerequisite for voting in congressional elections. So, if there is interference, it is interference by the Federal Constitution, and insofar as the tax is indirectly imposed on those who vote for national officers, it is imposed by the Constitution.

If the sponsors of anti-poll-tax bills have a legitimate grievance, it is against the Constitution of the United States and, as I previously said, they have a known and proper course of procedure. They can propose an amendment to the Constitution.

Before we take the other course proposed by this bill, it would be well for us to recall and consider carefully the words of Andrew Jackson who said in his farewell address:

> It is well known that there have been those amongst us who wish to enlarge the powers of the general Government and experience would seem to indicate that there is a tendency on the part of this Government to overstep the boundaries marked out for it by the Constitution.
>
> Its legitimate authority is abundantly sufficient for all purposes for which it was created, and its powers being expressly enumerated, there can be no justification for claiming anything beyond them.
>
> Every attempt to exercise power beyond these limits should be promptly and firmly opposed. For one evil example will lead to other measures still more mischievous; and if the principle of constructive powers, or supposed advantages, or temporary circumstances shall ever be permitted to justify the assumption of a power not given by the Constitution, the general Government will before long absorb all the powers of legislation, and you will have, in effect, but one consolidated government.

Great old Andrew Jackson was speaking there. His voice comes down to us from long ago. Perhaps it is a voice crying in the wilderness, but in my opinion, it is a voice of warning to which we should listen. The words come to us from a wisdom gained by one closer to the founding fathers than we are. His voice warns us of the need for holding to the Constitution, and cautions us against the dangers of an overpowering central government.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the men who fought the Revolution and brought our Government into being fought to overthrow the very kind of government which some would now seek to establish?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. They did absolutely. They knew the kind of government they wanted. As I have pointed out, they told us what kind of a government they fought for and what kind of a government they were forming. If we want to know what kind of government they fought for, if we want to know what kind of government they framed, all we have to do is to listen to what they have said. But, of course, if we do not have ears with which to hear and eyes with which to see, the wisdom of the ages does us no good.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the statements made by the framers of our Government make it perfectly clear that they knew what the qualifications were in the several States, and that they wanted those qualifications to be the same for Federal electors? Is it not also true that one of the main reasons they so desired was that the power might remain distributed in the hands of the people, and not be concentrated in Washington?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Absolutely; and when I get to it—I hope not too late in the evening—I shall quote from a speech by Franklin D. Roosevelt extolling that very principle of our form of government and that very means of protecting minorities from what he called the oppression of a bare majority in Congress.

UNNECESSARY

Even though no constitutional question were involved, the first section of the bill, as I already have indicated, attempts to sidestep the constitutional issue by declaring that prepayment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting is not a qualification but that it is an interference with the manner of holding elections and is a tax on the right or privilege of voting.

Then, mounting the shaky platform thus erected, the bill in its second section proclaims that it shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any persons from registering or voting in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax.

The bill asserts that when such requirement is made it shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified to vote. It also forbids a State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to levy a poll tax or any other tax on the right or privilege of voting. The third section declares that it shall be unlawful "to interfere with the manner of selecting persons for national office" by requiring payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering; and the fourth section would make it unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the authority of a State or a subdivision of a State, to require payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

In short, the bill would forbid the enforcement of any requirement that a person must pay a poll tax before he is allowed to vote in national elections.

If sustained, that would likewise outlaw the requirement of payment of a poll tax on the part of those voting for members of the lower houses of State legislatures, because the Constitution requires that the qualifications be the same.

What would be the practical effect of this and what benefit would accrue to the Nation to justify such legislation?

I have pointed out earlier in the course of this argument that at the time our Constitution was adopted most of the States restricted the electorate by requiring ownership of property or as an alternative the prepayment of taxes. Later I shall have something to say about the philosophy which led to the use of these restrictions, their gradual disappearance, and then the reappearance of poll-tax requirements, primarily in the Southern States between 1875 and 1908.

But for the moment let us see just what is the status of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in the State.

In 1920 North Carolina started the parade away from the poll-tax requirement by amending its constitution to delete a provision that before a citizen was entitled to vote he must have paid his poll tax for the previous year. That ended the poll tax in North Carolina.

In 1933 Pennsylvania struck out of its constitution the section which had required that a voter must have paid within 2 years before an election some State or county tax assessed at least 2 months and paid at least 1 month before the date of the election.

An amendment removing the poll-tax prerequisite from the Louisiana Constitution was ratified in 1934 and was reinforced in 1940 with another amendment positively asserting that "the right to vote in any election shall not be affected by any requirement for payment of poll tax or for registration in a poll book in any form."

Florida repealed its law making the poll-tax payment a prerequisite for voting in 1937, and in 1941 the legislature abolished poll taxes entirely, although the Constitution of Florida still provides authority under which the legislature can levy a tax not exceeding $1 a year and make it a prerequisite for voting.

The most recently completed action to abolish the poll-tax requirement was taken by Georgia, which in 1945 repealed the statute making the payment a prerequisite to voting.

At the present time there are only seven States in which the poll-tax prerequisite to voting applies. They are Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

So the Congress is asked to use its legislative powers ostensibly to extend the franchise to a larger number of persons in only 7 States out of the 48.

It might be noted here that in 1937 the Arkansas Legislature submitted to the people a proposed amendment to abolish the poll-tax requirement, but it was rejected by popular vote in 1938.

Also, in 1943 the Tennessee Legislature passed two bills, one repealing the levy of a poll tax and the other repealing the statute making it a prerequisite to voting. The State supreme court held, however, that these laws were invalid because they were in conflict with the requirements of the State constitution.

It may also be noted that the Virginia Legislature completed action this year—1948—on proposed constitutional amendments which will be voted on by the people next year. These amendments not only would eliminate the poll-tax requirement from the constitution but also would insert a positive statement that—

> No person shall at any time be required to pay any tax, assessment, or fee as a prerequisite to the right to register, renew his registration, or vote.

We have, then, a clearly indicated trend to abolish the poll-tax requirement by individual State action, as shown by the fact that five States have taken such action since 1920, and in three of the remaining seven the legislatures have gone on record one or more times as favoring such action.

Under these circumstances, it seems clear that the action proposed by the bill is unnecessary.

In considering the need for such legislation, I think we are justified in observing, too, that a poll-tax prerequisite for voting is more of a fancied than an actual injustice.

The registration before voting requirement in New York State disqualifies more potential voters in New York City alone than the poll tax does in the entire State of Virginia. If the larger the vote, the better the government, why place any restriction on voting? It is neither a small poll-tax payment nor registration that results in the failure of many people to vote. It is indifference to public affairs. Vast campaign funds are spent in every election in an effort to overcome that indifference.

Historically we have seen that the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting came into use in this country as a liberal alternative to the requirement that a citizen should be a landholder or property owner. It was regarded with some distrust by some of our founding fathers who feared that the colonist who owned nothing and so had little to lose might not hesitate to vote for irresponsible officials who would bankrupt the Government. It was defended, however, by those who recognized that in an undeveloped country there were those who had not had an opportunity to acquire many worldly goods but who deserved a voice in the Government. These liberals of their day were willing to trust the right of franchise to anyone who had made even a nominal contribution to the cost of maintaining his Government.

The modern trend is to substitute an educational test for a property test, and I have no quarrel with that, so long as the action is taken by the voters of the States in a constitutional manner.

But it still may be worth while for us to remember that John Stuart Mill, the English philosopher and economist, in his Considerations on Representative Government, not only recommended a direct capitation tax as a qualification for voting, but also suggested that a voter should be able to read and write and do simple problems in arithmetic.

Also, the distinguished American jurist, Judge Thomas M. Cooley, in his work on constitutional law, published in 1880, said:

> Many of the States admit no one to the privilege of suffrage unless he is a taxpayer. * * * To require the payment of a capitation (poll) tax is no denial of suffrage; it is demanding only the preliminary performance of public duty, and may be classed, as may also presence at the polls, with registration, or the observance of any other preliminary to insure fairness and protect against fraud (p. 263).

Incidentally, Judge Cooley, writing before the Yarbrough case was decided, forecast the position taken by the Supreme Court by saying in his book:

> The Constitution of the United States confers the right to vote upon no one. That right comes to the citizens of the United States, when they possess it at all, under State laws, and as a grant of State sovereignty.

Returning to the subject of how the poll-tax qualification has been viewed in the past, we may also note that an Encyclopedia Britannica article on vote and voting—eleventh edition, volume 28, 1911—mentions such qualifications of modern suffrage systems as age, periods of residence, and ability to read and write, and then says, on page 216:

> But the most universal qualification of all is some outward visible sign of a substantial interest in the State. * * * This tangible sign of interest in the State may take the form of possession of property, however small in amount, or the payment of some amount of direct taxation.

Several years ago, when this same type of bill was before the Congress, I recalled having read a book Public Finance, by the great economist, Dr. Harley L. Lutz, of Princeton University, in which he had a chapter on the poll tax.

I wrote to Dr. Lutz and asked if he had changed his views. Under date of October 5, 1942, I received a reply in which he said:

> With respect to the poll tax, I have never been able to sympathize with the usual academic position against this tax, and I tried to make that clear in the textbook to which you refer. I am still of the opinion that a poll tax is a useful feature of a revenue system, and that it is particularly so in those States which do not have great disparities of wealth and income.
>
> I think the statistics of tax collection will bear me out in saying that there are many States in which a poll tax levied at a moderate rate will produce more revenue than either a graduated tax on so-called net income or a tax on inheritances and estates.
>
> I am in complete agreement with you as to the sinister aspects of the proposal that the Congress shall assume authority to determine voting requirements in the several States. The trend toward complete Federal domination of the States and their local subdivisions must be counteracted with all the force at our command. If we add up the various manifestations of this trend, I think we have good reason to fear for the future of our Federal system, and if we permit the federalizers to destroy the basis upon which the Federal Government rests, it is my own conviction that the bulwark of our individual liberties will be destroyed also.

I pause to remind the Senate that that statement was made by Dr. Harley L. Lutz, a former professor of economics at Princeton University, who was writing to me back in 1942, urging me to stand fast to uphold the Constitution as the bulwark of all our rights.

Mr. President, it seems to me, less logical to attack the poll tax, which denies the vote to those who are financially able to make a small annual contribution to public education, but refuse to do so, than it would be to attack the restrictions which States have placed on

paupers, who might be glad to qualify if they had the money.

As compared with the 7 Southern poll-tax States, we find 13 States which deny the right to vote to paupers. These States include Louisiana, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia, from the southern group; but the list also includes Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and West Virginia. All those Northern States have a property test; and in those States, one who is a pauper cannot vote.

Perhaps it will be said that the man who has no money and is dependent on the State for his support should not be entrusted with the responsibility of choosing officials; but if so, is there not even better reason for denying the ballot to those who have the money but are too indifferent to meet the requirements set up by their State laws?

Then again, if we are to start a process of compelling States to allow persons to vote even if they have not met tax-payment requirements, should we not include, in addition to the seven poll-tax States, those eight States which do not now permit untaxed Indians to vote? If responsibility for payment of taxes is not, as the pending bill asserts, a "qualification" for voting, but involves an unjustified interference, then why not apply the same philosophy to the Indians, who at least should have no trouble meeting residence requirements?

In the Constitution of Idaho we find language denying the right to vote to anyone "who is a bigamist or polygamist, or is living in what is known as patriarchal, plural, or celestial marriage, or in violation of any law of this State, or of the United States, forbidding any such crime; or who, in any manner, teaches, advises, counsels, aids, or encourages any person to enter into bigamy, polygamy, or such patriarchal, plural, or celestial marriage, or to live in violation of any such law, or to commit any such crime; or who is a member of or contributes to the support, aid, or encouragement of any order, organization, association, corporation, or society, which teaches, advises, counsels, encourages, or aids any person to enter bigamy, polygamy, or such patriarchal or plural marriage, or which teaches or advises that the laws of this State prescribing rules of civil conduct are not the supreme law of the State."

There may have been a time when Utah did not approve these restrictions of suffrage in her sister State, but who is here to claim that the Congress has the power to intervene.

UNDESIRABLE

But, Mr. President, aside from being unconstitutional, unnecessary, and illogical, the proposed legislation is highly undesirable.

The fact must not be overlooked that in every one of the seven States in which poll-tax payment remains a prerequisite for voting, the requirement is imbedded in the State constitution.

To take Federal action, as proposed by this bill, before the people of the States have had a chance to change their constitutions can lead only to confusion; and it may be worse than confusion, because in Virginia, and no doubt in all of the seven States, it will be impossible to bring State legislation into conformity with national legislation on the subject prior to the November elections.

Under such circumstances, judges of elections could ignore the State law and follow the Federal statute, or could ignore the Federal statute and follow the State law, or could use their own discretion as to how the two could be successfully blended.

To conduct an election under such circumstances would be to invite a contest over the seating of any candidate certified by the States as having been duly elected.

We are not without precedent as to what can happen when State and Federal laws are not in harmony. During the War Between the States, the Congress declared vacant the seats of all Members of Congress who sided with the Confederacy. After the end of the war, the Southern States held elections and certified the results to Congress, but the Congress refused to seat those declared by their States to have been elected.

The issue was not settled until after adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments and all States had brought their State laws into conformity therewith. Clearly, therefore, if the Congress deems it wise and desirable to enter the field of prescribing the qualifications of voters, the action from a decent regard for orderly processes, as well as regard for the clear provisions of the Constitution as it now exists, must be taken by means of a constitutional amendment. That fact was clearly recognized, as I have previously pointed out, by the drafters of the Republican Party platform in 1944.

The undesirability of this legislation extends beyond the specific confusion it would immediately cause, however. An important side effect of the passage of this bill would be to arouse, in the States against which it is directed, resentment which would hamper the progress which has been made by liberal elements within those States. That is why we find editorial writers and others in the South who have played leading parts in promoting better racial relations and improving social conditions, condemning this bill and other elements of the so-called civil-rights program.

For example, Hodding Carter, the Greenville, Miss., editor who won a Pulitzer prize in 1945 for his editorials on racial tolerance, has said he wishes the seven Southern States would abolish the poll tax, as five already have done, but he is unalterably opposed to Federal action.

Mr. Carter recently said in one of his editorials that the greatest danger from the proposed program "is that an angry, frustrated and fearful South may forget that the South's 10,000,000 Negroes had nothing to do with it. As in reconstruction, they may again be the longest victims of a resentment that should be directed not against them but those outside the South who harry us. Our targets should be the political cynics and the unrealistic zealots above the Mason and Dixon's line and the unyielding reactionaries below it, who have jointly brought us to this tragic pass."

Similarly we find Bishop John M. Moore, of Dallas, Tex., who has been an outstanding leader in the Methodist Church for half a century, condemning this bill in a letter published in the Christian Century, an independent religious journal with national circulation. Bishop Moore quoted assertions that a moral issue was involved in the poll-tax question and that political rights were being denied, and then said:

> The absurdity of these statements glaringly appears in the fact that every citizen in these States, Negro and white, is invited and expected to pay the poll tax without embarrassment or objection from anyone.
>
> Payment cannot be refused by the tax collector when it is offered by any white or Negro citizen of voting age and a poll-tax receipt must be issued. The poll-tax receipt is a passport to the ballot box and cannot be refused in an election. To omit those facts leads to misrepresentation, and they are omitted, while the charges "disfranchised" and "political rights denied" and "restoration" are published.

He also said in his letter that he saw no moral issue, "although as a Methodist preacher for 60 years and as a bishop for nearly 30, moral issues have been my field. It is my opinion," Bishop Moore continued, "that the bill would never have seen daylight had only a moral issue been involved." He said further:

> The bill is out-and-out political. The purpose is plainly to win the votes of Negro citizens now in northern cities and States by conferring what they call a favor upon the Negroes in the South. Every well-informed white and Negro knows that. The leaders of both parties in the North support the bill because each wants to carry New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Detroit and their States.
>
> The anti-poll-tax bill is an indignity to many fine people. It is a meddling bill. It seeks to interfere with the historic rights and customs of seven fine American States. It reflects upon the intelligence, the moral sensibilities, the social consciousness and the political honesty of their best, most substantial and most responsible citizens. It seeks to reduce the electorate to the level of the indifferent and the incompetent. It is a low road to political power.

Those are the words of Bishop Moore, of Texas, a distinguished bishop of the Methodist Church. I was merely quoting his language. That is strong language from a churchman, and if a man like Bishop Moore could become so aroused over the implications of this bill I leave Senators to imagine the intensity of reaction on the part of less tolerant persons.

The Washington Post, as I need hardly remind the Members of the Senate, is far from a reactionary newspaper, and it has consistently urged broadening the base of our electorate.

Discussing the poll-tax question editorially on last March 29, however, the Post said this bill was "a bad piece of legislation."

The editorial further said:

> The bill owes its popularity to the fact that it seeks to bring about an overdue reform. We heartily agree with its sponsors that all taxes as prerequisites to voting should be abolished. The preferable method is action by the States. Since a few States are stubbornly holding out against abolition of this

undemocratic requirement upon voters, however, we should be delighted to see Congress propose and the States ratify an anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution.

But then the editorial said—and note this carefully, coming from a newspaper which is opposed to the poll-tax limitation in itself—the editorial said this bill "is an attempt to amend the constitutional requirements as to the qualifications of voters by act of Congress."

Of course, that is all it is. The Washington Post has correctly named it.

Continuing to discuss this angle, the editorial said:

The Constitution says in unmistakable terms that the voters entitled to choose Congressmen "in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." This does not give the States power to prescribe the qualifications of voters for Members of Congress as such. It simply makes use of the various yardsticks laid down by the States to serve a Federal purpose. Since that requirement of the Constitution no longer meets with public approval, it can be changed, but surely a constitutional amendment is the proper way to effect the change.

That is the opinion of this so-called liberal newspaper in the District of Columbia.

The anti-poll-tax bill attempts to effect the desired reform by changing the meaning of words in the Constitution—an underhanded and undemocratic process.

Those are not my words, Mr. President. Those are the words of the editor of the Washington Post.

It says that the requirement of paying a poll tax before voting "shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting." If this bill were law, citizens in the poll-tax States could vote for Congressmen without payment of a poll tax. But the same citizens could not vote for members of the "most numerous branch of the State legislature." The requirement of the Constitution as to who shall vote for Congressmen would thus be clearly defeated.

Concluding, the Post editorial said it recognized that it is more difficult to pass a constitutional amendment than a simple act of Congress. "But," it said, "expediency has seldom been recognized in the United States as a valid substitute for principle. At a time when we are engaged in a world-wide struggle against short cuts to power it seems especially deplorable that the Congress should be advancing so devious a scheme to accomplish a desirable reform."

Those are the words, Mr. President, of the Washington Post editorial writer.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that no one could accuse the Washington Post of having any prejudices or predilections in the matter? Is it not true that the Post has simply weighed the matter, has gone into the law and considered it, and has come to the inevitable conclusion which the Senator just read to the Senate?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There is no escape from that conclusion, it undoubtedly is the fact.

That final statement suggests what I regard as the most serious angle of the undesirability of legislation such as this bill proposes.

It is highly dangerous in principle, because it is another step in the direction of submerging the sovereignty of the States in an overpowering central government and it opens the gates for an unlimited invasion of the powers which the Constitution carefully reserved to the States.

Thus, if the Congress can say by statute that a State cannot require prepayment of a poll tax by voters, there is no logical reason why it cannot by another statute say that the voting age shall be reduced to 18 or 16 or 12. Or it can outlaw length of residence requirements and restrictions on absentee voting. It can forbid the requirement of registration. In short, it can tamper with any or all the devices which have been used to prevent corrupt elections and to limit the voting to those who have some interest in the welfare of their government and some reasonable minimum of competence to judge between issues.

Or, conversely, the Congress could by legislation narrow rather than broaden the electorate by setting up qualifications which would limit the right of voting to a chosen few who would serve the wishes of those in office and start us on our way to a dictatorship.

Before we pass this bill I think it would be well for us to recall the statement made by Thomas Jefferson:

In every government on earth is some trace of human weakness, some germ of corruption and degeneracy, which cunning will discover, and wickedness insensibly open, cultivate, and improve. Every government degenerates when trusted to the rules of the people alone. The people themselves therefore are its only safe depositaries. And to render even them safe, their minds must be improved to a certain degree. This, indeed, is not all that is necessary, though it be essentially necessary.

We should consider also the statement of Woodrow Wilson in his book on constitutional government in the United States, that "The question of the relation of the States to the Federal Government is the cardinal question of our Constitution."

There can be no doubt but that this bill strikes at the very heart of the doctrine of States' rights. In a representative democracy the most valuable, the most precious right any State can possess is the right to control its own election laws. Take that right away and they become helpless pawns in the hands of a Federal bureaucracy.

No one man was more instrumental than George Washington in bringing the 13 States together in a Federal Union. No one realized more clearly than he that such a Union would not be self-preserving and that its future would be hazarded if concessions originally made in the interest of harmony and cooperation should later be overridden. Hence his plea in his farewell address for its preservation, just as timely now as when spoken, in his admonition:

The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.

Mark this:

To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

A little later in our history——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, may I yield for a question without losing my rights on the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may yield. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the statement which the distinguished Senator has been reading. Does not the Senator agree that if this bill should be enacted and sustained by the courts it would effectively lodge in Congress the right to fix the qualifications of electors, because, if the Congress can say what is not a qualification, it can affirmatively say what is a qualification?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. There can be do doubt of that. Congress could say what could be done and what could not be done. If we can take over any part of the regulations of the States dealing with the qualifications of voters, we can go to any extreme upon which the majority in Congress at the time may decide.

Mr. EASTLAND. With respect to the statement of the great John Marshall, in his decision in the Marlyland case, a decision which has rung down through the years, would not that statement, in which the great Chief Justice said that whoever was wild enough to advocate breaking down the barriers that divide the States and compounding the American people into one common mass, apply to this bill which seeks to tear away the very vitals of State sovereignty?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. It all falls into the same general pattern which I have been quoting. I desire to quote at this time from Andrew Jackson, who gave similar advice in his farewell address as President. He said:

My experience in public concerns and the observations of a life somewhat advanced confirm opinions long since imbibed by me, that the destruction of our State governments or the annihilation of their control over the local concerns of the people would lead directly to revolution and anarchy and finally to despotism and military domination.

Jackson also said in this address:

We behold systematic efforts publicly made to sow the seeds of discord between different parts of the United States and to place party divisions directly upon geographical distinctions; to excite the South against the North, and the North against the South—

Think of it; in his farewell address Jackson was warning us against that.

I continue quoting from Andrew Jackson:

and to force into the controversy the most delicate and exciting topics upon which it is impossible that a large portion of the Union can ever speak without strong emotions. Appeals, too, are constantly made to sectional interests, in order to influence election of the Chief Magistrate, as if it were desired that he should favor a particular quarter of the country, instead of fulfilling the duties of his station with impartial justice to all.

This is the farewell address of Andrew Jackson. He was not talking about this Presidential campaign. He further said:

But the Constitution cannot be maintained, nor the Union preserved, in opposition to public feeling, by the mere exertion of the coercive powers confided to the General Government. The foundations must be laid in the affections of the people; in the security it gives to life, liberty, character, and property, in every quarter of the country; and in the fraternal attachments which the citizens of the several States bear to one another, as members of one political family, mutually contributing to promote the happiness of each other.

Hence the citizens of every State should studiously avoid everything calculated to wound the sensibility or offend the just pride of the people of the other States—

I repeat those words:

Hence the citizens of every State should studiously avoid everything calculated to wound the sensibility or offend the just pride of the people of the other States.

He said further:

And they should frown upon any proceedings within their own borders likely to disturb the tranquillity of their political brethren in other portions of the Union. In a country so extensive as the United States, and with pursuits so varied, the internal regulations of the several States must frequently differ from one another in important particulars; and this difference is unavoidably increased by the varying principles upon which the American Colonies were originally planted; principles which had taken deep root in their social relations before the Revolution, and, therefore, of necessity, influencing their policy since they became free and independent States. But each State has the unquestionable right to regulate its own internal concerns according to its own pleasure; and while it does not interfere with the rights of the people of other States, or the rights of the Union, every State must be the sole judge of the measures proper to secure the safety of its citizens and promote their happiness and all efforts on the part of the people of other States to cast odium upon their institutions, and all measures calculated to disturb their rights of property, or put in jeopardy their peace and internal tranquillity, are in direct opposition to the spirit in which the Union was formed and must endanger its safety.

Motives of philanthropy may be assigned for this unwarrantable interference; and weak men may persuade themselves for a moment that they are laboring in the cause of humanity, and asserting the rights of the human race; but everyone, upon sober reflections, will see that nothing but mischief can come from these improper assaults upon the feelings and rights of others. Rest assured that the men found busy in this work of discord are not worthy of your confidence and deserve your strongest reprobation.

Andrew Jackson called a spade a spade, and I continue his words:

It is well known that there have been those amongst us who wish to enlarge the powers of the General Government and experience would seem to indicate that there is a tendency on the part of this Government to overstep the boundaries marked out for it by the Constitution. Its legitimate authority is abundantly sufficient for all the purposes for which it was created, and its powers being expressly enumerated, there can be no justification for claiming anything beyond them.

Every attempt to exercise power beyond these limits should be promptly and firmly opposed. For one evil example will lead to other measures still more mischievous; and if the principle of constructive powers, or supposed advantages, or temporary circumstances shall ever be permitted to justify the assumption of a power not given by the Constitution, the General Government will before long absorb all the powers of legislation, and you will have in effect, but one consolidated Government.

From the extent of our country, its diversified interests, different pursuits, and different habits, it is too obvious for argument that a single consolidated Government would be wholly inadequate to watch over and protect its interests; and every friend of our free institutions should be always prepared to maintain unimpaired and in full vigor the rights and sovereignty of the States, and to confine the action of the General Government strictly to the sphere of its appropriate duties.

Referring again to Woodrow Wilson and his ideas on constitutional government, we find him saying of the relation of the States to the Federal Government:

It is difficult to discuss so critical and fundamental a question calmly and without party heat or bias when it has come once more, as it has now, to an acute stage. Just because it lies at the heart of our constitutional system to decide it wrongly is to alter the whole structure and operation of our Government, for good or for evil, and one would wish never to see the passion of party touch it to distort it. A sobering sense of responsibility should fall upon everyone who handles it. No man should argue it this way or that for party advantage. Desire to bring the impartial truth to light must, in such a case, be the first dictate alike of true statesmanship and of true patriotism. Every man should seek to think of it and to speak of it in the true spirit of the founders of the Government and of all those who have spent their lives in the effort to confirm its just principles both in counsel and in action.

Continuing his discussion, Wilson said that—

The principle of the division of powers between State and Federal Governments is a very simple one when stated in the most general terms. It is that the legislatures of the States shall have control of all the general subject matter of law, of private rights of every kind, of local interests, and of everything that directly concerns their people as communities—free choice with regard to all matters of local regulation and development, and that Congress shall have control only of such matters as concern the peace and the commerce of the country as a whole.

He said we are apt to think of our American political system as distinguished by its central structure—its President and Congress and courts which the Constitution set up—but "as a matter of fact, it is distinguished by its local structure, by the extreme vitality of its parts. It would be an impossibility without its division of powers."

From the first—

Wilson said—

America has been a nation in the making. It has come to maturity by the stimulation of no central force or guidance, but by an aboundingly self-helping, self-sufficient energy in its parts, which severally brought themselves into existence and added themselves to the Union, pleasing first of all themselves in the framing of their laws and constitutions, not asking leave to exist and constitute themselves, but existing first and asking leave afterward, self-originated, self-constituted, self-confident, self-sustaining, veritable communities, demanding only recognition. Communities develop not by external but by internal forces. Else they do not live at all. Our Commonwealths have not come into existence by invitation, like plants in a tended garden; they have sprung up of themselves, irrepressible, a sturdy spontaneous product of the nature of men nurtured in a free air.

It is this spontaneity and variety—

He continued—

this independent and irrepressible life of its communities, that has given our system its extraordinary elasticity, which has preserved it from the paralysis which has soonor or later fallen upon every people who have looked to their central government to patronize and nurture them.

Later in the same lecture Wilson said that:

The division of powers between the States and the Federal Government effected by our Federal Constitution was the normal and natural division for this purpose. Under it the States possess all the ordinary legal choices that shape a people's life. Theirs is the whole of the ordinary field of law; the regulation of domestic relations and of the relations between employer and employee, the determination of property rights and of the validity and enforcement of contracts, the definition of crimes and their punishment, the definition of the many and subtle rights and obligations which lie outside the fields of property and contract, the establishment of the laws of incorporations and of the rules governing the conduct of every kind of business. The presumption insisted upon by the courts in every argument with regard to the powers of the Federal Government is that it has no power not explicitly granted it by the Federal Constitution or reasonably to be inferred as the natural or necessary accompaniment of the powers there indisputably conveyed to it.

Woodrow Wilson was a great teacher of history and of government. When I was a young boy in the history class I was studying Woodrow Wilson's The State, and also Bryce's American Commonwealth. From those two great writers I got the impulse to devote my life to public service. I have been a follower of Woodrow Wilson ever since, and I take pleasure in quoting him here today, because I think that next to Thomas Jefferson he has been one of the greatest expounders of democracy we have ever had. He continued in his lecture:

But the presumption with regard to the powers of the States they have always held to be of exactly the opposite kind. It is

that the States of course possess every power that Government has ever anywhere exercised, except only those powers which their own constitutions or the Constitution of the United States explicitly or by plain inference withhold. They are the ordinary governments of the country; the Federal Government is its instrument only for particular purposes.

Wilson also said:

The remedy for ill-considered legislation by the States, the remedy alike for neglect and mistake on the part of their several governments, lies not outside the States, but within them. The mistakes which they themselves correct will sink deeper into the consciousness of their people than the mistakes which Congress may rush in to correct for them, thrusting upon them what they have not learned to desire. They will either themselves learn their mistakes, by such intimate and domestic processes as will penetrate very deep and abide with them in convincing force, or else they will prove that what might have been a mistake for other States or regions of the country was no mistake for them, and the country will have been saved its wholesome variety. In no case will their failure to correct their own measures prove that the Federal Government might have forced wisdom upon them. * * *

Moral and social questions originally left to the several States for settlement can be drawn into the field of Federal authority only at the expense of the self-dependence and efficiency of the several communities of which our complex body politic is made up. Paternal morals, morals enforced by the judgment and choices of the central authority at Washington, do not and cannot create vital habits or methods of life unless sustained by local opinion and purpose, local prejudice and convenience—unless supported by local convenience and interest; and only communities capable of taking care of themselves will, taken together, constitute a nation capable of vital action and control. You cannot atrophy the parts without atrophying the whole. Deliberate adding to the powers of the Federal Government by sheer judicial authority, because the Supreme Court can no longer be withstood or contradicted in the States, both saps the legal morality upon which a sound constitutional system must rest, and deprives the Federal structure as a whole of that vitality which has given the Supreme Court itself its increase of power. It is the alchemy of decay.

Wilson concluded his lecture with the assertion that—

We are certified by all political history of the fact that centralization is not vitalization. Moralization is by life, not by statute; by the interior impulse and experience of communities, not by fostering legislation which is merely the abstraction of an experience which may belong to a nation as a whole or to many parts of it without having yet touched the thought of the rest anywhere to the quick. The object of our Federal system is to bring the understandings of constitutional government home to the people of every part of the Nation to make them part of their consciousness as they go about their daily tasks. If we cannot successfully effect its adjustments by the nice local adaptations of our older practice, we have failed as constitutional statesmen.

Coming still closer to the present time, we find the Governor of a great State who later became President of the United States having this to say on the subject of States' rights—and this is the language I told the Senate at the outset I would quote from the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He said:

As a matter of fact and law, the governing rights of the States are all those which have not been surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution or its amendments. * * * The proper relations between the Government of the United States and the governments of the separate States thereof depend entirely in their legal aspects on what powers have been voluntarily ceded to the Central Government by the States themselves. What these powers of government are is contained in our Federal Constitution either by direct language, by judicial interpretation thereof during many years, or by implication so plain as to have been recognized by the people generally.

I leave the quotation from Mr. Roosevelt a moment to remind Senators of what I said in my opening remarks. I quoted the plain language of the Constitution. I quoted the interpretation of the framers of the Constitution of that plain language. I quoted a long line of court decisions on the meaning of that plain language, decisions which have never been deviated from in a single instance. I told Senators, on the basis of all of that evidence, that Congress has no power to legislate on this subject.

I read again the admonition of our former President. Some of those who now call themselves disciples of the New Deal and followers of Franklin D. Roosevelt democracy are joining here on the Senate floor in signing the cloture petition and in their efforts to force upon us something which I have told the Senate is from every standpoint unconstitutional, unwarranted, unnecessary, and violative of States' rights. This is the language of Mr. Roosevelt:

What these powers of government are is contained in our Federal Constitution either by direct language, by judicial interpretation thereof during many years, or by implication so plain as to have been recognized by the people generally.

I continue to read the language of Mr. Roosevelt:

Fortunately for the stability of our Nation, it was already apparent (when the Constitution was adopted) that the vastness of our territory presented wide geographical and and climatic differences which gave to the States wide differences in the nature of their industry, their agriculture, and their commerce. * * * Thus, already it was clear to the framers of our Constitution that the greatest possible liberty of self-government must be given to each State, and that any national administration attempting to make all laws for the whole Nation, such as was wholly practical in Great Britain, would inevitably result in some future time in a dissolution of the Union itself. * * *

The preservation of this home rule by the States is not a cry of jealous Commonwealths seeking their own aggrandizement at the expense of sister States.

That is Franklin D. Roosevelt speaking. He continues:

It is a fundamental necessity if we are to remain a truly united country.

The whole success of our democracy has not been that it is a democracy wherein the will of a bare majority of the total inhabitants is imposed upon the minority, but because it has been a democracy where through a division of government into units called States the rights and interests of the minority have been respected and have been given a voice in the control of our affairs. * * * To bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed, except in mere minor matters of legislation. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever they seem in danger.

Thus it will be seen that this home rule is a most important thing, a most vital thing, if we are to continue along the course on which we have so far progressed with such unprecedented success.

The man from whom I have been quoting is Franklin D. Roosevelt. After outlining the rights granted by the Constitution to the Federal Government in this speech he said:

As the individual is protected from possible oppression by his neighbors, so the smallest political unit—the town is in theory at least, allowed to manage its own affairs, secure from undue interference by the larger unit of the county, which in turn is protected from mischievous meddling by the State. This is what we call the doctrine of home rule, and the whole spirit and intent of the Constitution is to carry this great principle into the relations between the National Government and the governments of the States.

Let us remember that from the very beginning differences in climate, soil, conditions, habits, and modes of living in States separated by thousands of miles rendered it necessary to give the fullest individual latitude to the individual States. Remembering that the mining States of the Rockies, the fertile savannas of the South, the prairies of the West, and the rocky soil of the New England States created many problems, introduced many factors in each locality, which have no existence in others, it is obvious that almost every new or old problem of government must be solved, if it is to be solved to the satisfaction of the people of the whole country, by each State in its own way.

There are many glaring examples of where exclusive Federal control is manifestly against the scheme and intent of our Constitution. It is to me unfortunate that under a clause of our Constitution itself primarily intended for an entirely different purpose, our Federal courts have been made a refuge by those who seek to evade the mandates of the State judiciary.

That is Governor Roosevelt speaking. I continue to quote from him:

I think if we understand what I have tried to make clear tonight as to the fundamental principles on which our Government is built and what the underlying idea of the relations between individuals and States and States and the National Government should be, we can all of us reason for ourselves what should be the proper course in regard to Federal legislation on any of the questions of the day.

Thus, Mr. President, in each generation since our Constitution was adopted, warnings have been sounded of the dangers of changing it except by amendment and, in particular, of the possible consequences of upsetting the delicate balance between the States and the Federal Government, and the legislative, the judicial, and the executive branches.

Because the warnings of Andrew Jackson and others were not sufficiently heeded, we found ourselves plunged into a fratricidal war. Our Nation and our constitutional government survived that conflict but only at a terrible price. And, incidentally, the States against which the pending legislation is directed still are paying installments on that price in the form of retarded economic development.

But, we have survived to the present and we know that history records no instance of an overnight destruction from within of a form of government which has existed for more than a century and a half. The process always has been slow and it has always been insidious. The leaders advocating the change have always concealed their direct purposes and the masses have accepted the change in the mistaken belief that they were going to get in the future something better than they had in the past.

Let us not be so misled now. If the poll tax has outlived its usefulness, and if the fact that certain States will not recognize that situation is sufficiently important to our national welfare, let us resort to the constitutional method of amendment.

But let us not do something which might pull a cornerstone from the base of our constitutional liberty.

Let us heed the words of Daniel Webster, speaking on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, when he said:

> Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow green again and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which united national sovereignty with State rights, individual security and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them, than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art, for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill. The bill would pay to District of Columbia employees and officers, and members of the Metropolitan Police and United States Park Service, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the same increase which other Federal employees received from the bill passed during the last session. It also carries a $500 increase for all teachers.

The cost is to be paid by lending to the District $5,800,000, to be paid back at such time and in such manner as the Congress may hereafter direct. I hope that the Congress will not call upon the District of Columbia to pay back this money, because of the fact that in my opinion that amount and more should be paid to the District of Columbia to help bear the expenses of the District. If the District should be called upon to pay it back, I sincerely hope that the Congress will wait until we receive the money from the British loan, and then call upon the District of Columbia for repayment.

Mr. President, I introduce this bill on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from South Carolina on behalf of himself and other Senators will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2920) to require payment to certain employees of the District of Columbia of the additional compensation authorized by the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Carolina if he is about to bring up a resolution relative to adjournment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will answer the Senator from Nebraska in this way: First, I should like to make a brief statement before I submit the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. If that is the purpose of the distinguished Senator, will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum? I feel that all Senators should hear the statement and be ready to vote on the resolution if it is called up. If the Senator will yield to me, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Baldwin	Hill	Murray
Barkley	Hoey	Myers
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Butler	Jenner	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Capper	Kem	Russell
Connally	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cooper	Knowland	Smith
Cordon	Langer	Stennis
Donnell	Lodge	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Taylor
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McGrath	Thye
Feazel	McKellar	Umstead
Ferguson	McMahon	Vandenberg
Flanders	Magnuson	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Hayden	Moore	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on last Wednesday, the first day when the Senate was open to do business, I submitted a concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress. I did so after considerable thought and consideration. In the first instance, when the President of the United States announced at the Democratic convention, in his acceptance speech, that he would call the Congress into extraordinary session, I immediately, then and there, announced to the Nation that as soon as Congress met, I would submit a concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress. I did so because I was convinced, in my mind, that we could not accomplish any good results by being in session at this particular time.

The President of the United States in his message to Congress asked that two particular things be done by the Congress, as Senators will find from reading his message to the Congress; first, something about inflation; and, second, something concerning the housing shortage in America.

Let us read his message, and from it we shall find that what I have said is true:

> The urgent needs of the American people require our presence here today.
>
> Our people demand legislative action by their Government to do two things: First, to check inflation and the rising cost of living; and, second, to help in meeting the acute housing shortage.

The President continued for four pages to discuss those two things. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that his message was only six pages long. On the fourth page the President had this to say:

> I have called the Congress back primarily to deal with high prices and with the housing shortage. Delay on either of these items would be most dangerous. In addition, there are other important legislative measures on which delay would injure us at home or impair our world relations.
>
> I therefore recommend that the present session, without allowing anything to interfere with its vital work on legislation concerning high prices and housing, take action on certain other important measures.

It will be noticed that he did not want to interfere with certain other important measures.

> These measures can speedily be enacted now because of the amount of study already given to them by the Congress.

In my discussion before the Senate last Wednesday I called attention to the fact that I had already received information which convinced me the first thing to be taken up would be the anti-poll-tax bill. I do not have to tell Senators now that the bill is going to be brought up; it has already been brought up. It has been discussed since last Wednesday. In my opinion it will be discussed, the Lord knows how long, if we remain in session.

To realize our situation, it is necessary to be here and feel what is going on in this Chamber. Again, it is important to realize the feeling and condition of the

people back home and the different attitudes of the people of the Nation concerning the issues in order to realize why we are hopelessly deadlocked today and why we shall remain so, as long as we are taking up anti-poll-tax, antilynching, FEPC, and other bills of that nature.

Mr. President, if you would but go down to South Carolina today and converse with individuals in that State; if you would then go over to Georgia or to Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee, Texas, not to forget Arkansas, you would find, on the part of the people in all those States, a burning desire to protect themselves against any encroachment upon what they consider a right of the States.

What difference does it make about the poll tax? So far as the poll tax itself is concerned, it will not prevent any person in my State from voting, if he wants to vote. It is only $1 a year, and it is not cumulative. It does not affect the primary election but only the general election. The Supreme Court in a recent decision said that the primary in my State is everything. But we are here fighting the poll tax because we feel that it touches a right belonging only to the State and not to the Federal Government. That being so, we find Senators opposing the poll tax. They will continue to fight it. The result will be that the Nation will be torn asunder by this issue. No good will be accomplished by the discussion. Finally, if it is desired to pass other legislation, the bill will be laid aside. Why is it we do not have before us at the present time some of the bills concerning housing conditions or bills designed to control rising prices? We are not going to have those bills.

I believe the President, having been a Senator for many years, should have known what would happen in the extra session. Some say he called it because of politics. I fear the reason it was called was just that. I want to give credit where credit is due, but, having been a Senator, the President should have known that we would get into this deadlock and that we would accomplish nothing.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield only for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do not wish to challenge the Senator's assumption that the session may be a futility, but since the Senator has referred to the question of inflation, and since those of us who have studied that subject the most realize that about all the Congress can do to prevent still greater inflation is to control the further expansion of credit, which is itself the equivalent of putting more money into circulation, does the Senator not think that I, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is handling that problem now, should vote to remain in session, to see whether the committee will bring out a worth-while bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I see it, nothing can be accomplished here that is worth while. I further predict that what will be reported by the committee in that field will only penalize the States that need more credit now. I mean by that that whatever measure is reported will be crippling and damaging to those who really need relief, and will thereby hurt certain sections of the Nation. It will be found that, where banking facilities are great, control will be exercised over everything. I ask Senators to take note of that prediction. For that reason, I do not believe any good can come from curtailing credit, which is the only suggestion that has been made.

Since last Wednesday what have we done? We have done nothing but discuss certain subjects which the people do not understand. They think we ought to lay the pending question aside, take up the necessary legislation, and return home. The President has said that within 2 weeks we ought to do the job. Senators know that legislation passed by the Senate of the United States is far-reaching. To pass price-control legislation would take more than 2 weeks. Consider the housing situation. We have had that question before us during the last year, and we did not pass the legislation in 2 weeks. It is now bottled up. Something should be done to relieve the housing situation, but we are between the Republican Convention, the Democratic Convention, and the election in November. Did Senators come to the Senate because they played politics? Is the President of the United States to receive any votes because he plays politics? We may as well face that question. The two parties are playing for position at the present time. We might as well face it and be done with it. This is no time for representatives of any nation to be called into session. There is discontent between the two great parties of our Nation. As I said in my speech last Wednesday, it might cause such a rift between the Democrats and the Republicans that no longer would we have any bipartisan program, so far as our foreign relations and affairs are concerned. It might tear us asunder, and probably, because of such feeling in the United States, it will cause to exist a Federal bed in which communism may sprout and grow. Causing a rift between the two great parties would jeopardize permanent peace and might sprout and grow into a third world war.

Mr. President, I still feel that to be true. That being so, I have a resolution asking for the adjournment of this Congress on Wednesday, the 4th of August, 1948. The reason why I have made the date Wednesday, August 4, 1948, is because the House has already recessed and will not meet until next Wednesday. The House could not act upon it before that time. If the Senate will recall, when I submitted my resolution it was to be taken up on Friday or Saturday, but the House of Representatives recessed on Thursday to return on Monday, today. Therefore, it was impossible to consider it on Friday. Another reason I made the date July 31 in the beginning was that, in my opinion, we already have a law which adjourns the Congress on the 31st of July. We passed a law known as the Reorganization Act in 1946. It was passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the President of the United States. Let me read section 132 of that law:

> Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

No national emergency has been proclaimed by the President. The President knew that that law was on the statute books when he called us into session on the 26th day of July. The law was signed by him. Congress went into session on the 26th day of July. If Congress wants to remain in session, in my opinion, it should pass a resolution continuing the session. The Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Presiding Officer of the House have a right to call Congress back into session, according to the terms of our adjournment in June.

There is a serious question in my mind as to whether or not we have been legally in session after last Saturday. This is the first time the adjournment resolution has been called up.

Mr. President, I send to the desk my resolution, asking for only a slight modification by inserting "Wednesday, August 4" in place of "Saturday, July 31, 1948." I ask consideration of the resolution at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the resolution submitted by the Senator from South Carolina.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Con. Res. 60), as follows:

> That when the two Houses adjourn on Wednesday, August 4, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.
>
> SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is not subject to debate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the chief clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JENNER (when his name was called). I have a pair with my colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is detained from the Senate on official business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I announce that the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is necessarily absent on important public business. Prior to his departure, he arranged a live pair on this vote with the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. The senior Senator from California had expected to be

present to announce his pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee, but is unavoidably detained. In his absence I desire to state that if present and voting, the senior Senator from California would vote "nay" and the junior Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from New Jersey, and the Senator from South Dakota would each vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is necessarily absent, attending the funeral services of a close friend.

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—13

Byrd	Hill	Maybank
Eastland	Holland	Russell
Fessel	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Fulbright	McClellan	
George	McKellar	

NAYS—58

Aiken	Hoey	Pepper
Baldwin	Ives	Revercomb
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Butler	Knowland	Smith
Cain	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McGrath	Thye
Donnell	McMahon	Umstead
Dworshak	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ecton	Martin	Watkins
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Flanders	Morse	Williams
Green	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—25

Ball	Hatch	Sparkman
Brewster	Hawkes	Stewart
Bricker	Jenner	Tobey
Buck	Lucas	Tydings
Bushfield	McCarran	Wagner
Capehart	Malone	White
Chavez	O'Conor	Wilson
Downey	O'Daniel	
Gurney	Reed	

So the concurrent resolution was rejected.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the unfinished business, Senate bill 2644. The amendment is the anti-poll-tax bill, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

FIRST 1949 PRODUCTION GOAL RECOMMENDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the release from the United States Department of Agriculture respecting 1949 production goals. I call attention especially to the recommendation that the number of head of beef cows on farms and ranges be reduced by half a million head below the number on farms the 1st of last January.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST 1949 PRODUCTION GOALS RECOMMENDED BY UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

National goals for 1949 production of several important farm commodities, including a wheat-acreage-goal, while somewhat below this year's planted acreage, would at recent yields produce another crop of more than a billion bushels, are being recommended to States by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Other national goals suggested at this time are for rye, winter cover crop seeds, winter vegetables, dry edible peas, and beef cattle. The beef goal calls for careful culling of cattle numbers by January 1 in order to maintain healthy, well-balanced herds while increasing meat supplies in the months ahead.

These recommendations are being submitted to the State United States Department of Agriculture councils for local consideration and possible adjustment within the national pattern. State goals and final national goals will be announced later, following State review and recommendations.

Wheat: The suggested goal for wheat is 71,500,000 planted acres, about 8 percent less than estimates of this year's seeded acreage. With an average yield of approximately 15 bushels per acre, the 1938–47 average, production in 1949 would total 1,100,000,000 bushels. This would be in line with estimated domestic, export, and carry-over needs.

The goal seeks to bring about adjustments in areas of relatively low productivity without materially affecting total production. United States wheat acreage has increased markedly during recent years in response to war and relief needs. If farmers are to make the best use of the country's soil resources, however, a somewhat smaller acreage should be planted. Moreover, a better balance between soil-conserving and soil-depleting crops will actually assure higher productivity over a long period of years. Farmers are urged to provide for sufficient summer fallow and, in marginal areas, to begin reseeding to grass land which is not suited for sustained production of crops. The recommended wheat-acreage goal for 1949 would provide the opportunity for farmers to start the shift back to these better conservation practices.

Other considerations in arriving at the wheat goal were this year's increased carryover, prospects that the 1948 crop will be the second largest in history, and the possibility of smaller foreign demands because of improved crops in many importing countries. It is also pointed out that the wheat carryover next year may be even larger. Failure of Congress to ratify the proposed International Wheat Agreement, which would have guaranteed a substantial export market for United States wheat for 5 years, has cast doubt on our ability to maintain high-level production and exports.

Rye: The suggested goal for rye is 2,500,000 acres for harvest in 1949. This would be about 313,000 acres more than the indicated acreage this year. With average yields, production next year would be about 30,000,000 bushels. Competition from other crops for available land has caused a downward trend in the harvest acreage of rye for a number of years, but indications are that more rye would be used if larger supplies were available.

Beef cattle: The Department recommends a beef-cattle breeding-herd goal which would maintain not less than 15,500,000 head of beef cows on farms and ranches on next January 1. Achieving this goal would result in a further moderate decrease of about one-half million head below the number on farms last January 1. Better management, improved feeding practices and thorough culling are urged to put the cattle industry in better position to supply the meat requirements of an increasing population.

A slaughter goal of 32,000,000 head of all cattle and calves, for the year July 1948–June 1949 is recommended—in line with the beef cattle-breeding goal and the expected volume of cattle feeding. While this recommended slaughter would mean a further small decrease in breeding-herd numbers, it would provide a larger quantity of beef and veal than would be available if cattle numbers were held at present levels or increased. These beef and veal supplies will be needed in the months ahead, with pork production expected to be less than in the previous year and with meat demand expected to continue abnormally strong. The recommended slaughter would be about 7 percent less than the number of animals slaughtered in each of the last two similar 12-month periods, with feeding to heavier weights probably offsetting this to some extent. The goal is regarded as the most practicable one in view of the various factors which must be considered.

Winter cover crops: Harvested acreage and production goals for winter cover-crop seeds are: Austrian winter peas, 74,000 acres, 80,000,000 pounds; crimson clover, 108,000 acres, 25,000,000 pounds; hairy vetch, 129,000 acres, 30,000,000 pounds; common and willamette vetch, 103,000 acres, 50,000,000 pounds; common rye grass, 98,000 acres, 43,000,000 pounds; blue lupine, 57,000 acres, 50,000,000 pounds.

Goals represent substantial increases in production of all the seeds except rye grass. Stocks of all the others are at very low levels, and the 1948 crops are not expected to provide adequately for domestic requirements and exports. Increased production of the seeds is badly needed to restore the fertility of heavily cropped soil and to meet export demands, only partially filled in recent years.

Winter vegetables: Acreage guides for 1949 production of 15 winter vegetable crops total 281,750 acres. With average yields, this acreage would result in a production about equal to that of 1948, although it would be 3 percent less than the acreage available for harvest in 1948. Recommendations include harvested acreage increases of 5 percent for carrots and 20 percent for peppers. Suggested acreage reductions are: 10 percent for snap beans and celery: 15 percent for escarole; 5 percent for cabbage and lettuce; and 3 percent for shallots. No changes are recommended for lima beans, beets, cauliflower, kale, green peas, spinach, and tomatoes.

Dry edible peas: The recommended goal is 225,000 acres of dry edible smooth peas,

which, with normal plantings of wrinkled peas, would total 350,000 acres. With average yields, this acreage would produce about 2,500,000 100-pound bags of smooth peas. Foreign demand has slowed noticeably during the past year. Production areas are primarily in Idaho, Colorado, and Washington, with smaller acreages in California, Michigan, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, and Oregon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a comment on the insertion made in the RECORD by the Senator from Ohio. The release of the Department of Agriculture covered many commodities, including hogs, cattle, wheat, poultry, and other items. In most all of them the goal set by the Department of Agriculture represented an increase in production. We all know that the hog population at this time is below what it has ever been, or that it approximates the low ebb in the production of hogs, due largely to the shortage in the corn crop upon which hogs are fed.

It is true that the high price of cattle has induced many farmers to sell their dairy cattle, and to sell also their cows which have been used for breeding purposes, and that is a perfectly natural reaction to high prices in the field of cattle. It has been desirable and no doubt is desirable that the breeding type of cattle be preserved as much as possible on the farm because it takes from 2 to 2½ years to produce beef cattle which are marketable, unless sold as veal. So that in the goal set by the Department for cattle the question of undertaking to stabilize the production of cattle through the breeding process, which is the only way to stabilize it, has been taken into consideration in the goal set by the Department.

In the case of hogs, the Department has recommended that there be an increase of 10 percent in the hog population of the country because there is a large crop of corn this year upon which to feed them, and therefore it would be justified, and that increase in the production of hogs and the consequent increase in the production of pork would offset any apparent decrease in the production of beef cattle due to the reasons which I have suggested.

I wanted to make that comment because I think it ought to be done in explanation of at least some of the goals set by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, following my statement subsequent to the insertion by the Senator from Ohio of a release from the Department of Agriculture in regard to cattle, I wish to insert a brief memorandum with respect to various articles, including grains, livestock, poultry, dairy products, and winter vegetables.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL GOALS

The Department of Agriculture's goals constitute recommendations to farmers on the basis of which they can plan their coming year's crop operation. They are advisory to and not mandatory on farmers.

The guiding principle in formulating goals for 1949 was to start toward a postwar readjustment. It is directly related to the recent price-support legislation which contemplates lower support price on many commodities in the coming years.

GRAINS

Wheat: In the case of wheat, acreage goals contemplate some smaller demand upon American grain supplies resulting from the increased production capacities of European nations. Specifically, it is designed to encourage withdrawal from production of the marginal producing lands upon which we have placed such a serious strain in our efforts to reach maximum production of all types of grain during the world food crisis. But our goal still calls for a production at average yields of about 1,100,000 bushels—a high figure compared with most years in the past.

Rye: The Department recommended a 313,000-acre increase in rye.

Grass and cover crop seeds: It recommended substantial increases in the production of all grasses and cover-crop seeds.

ALL MEATS

Hogs: On March 15 the Department urged farmers to increase their production of fall pigs by at least 10 percent more if possible. This was reemphasized in a special plea on July 20. This request is based on the excellent prospect for a substantial corn and feed crop.

Beef: The Department's recommendations for the coming year are designed to indicate to farmers and ranchers the need for stabilizing the number of breeding cattle. The aim is to keep slaughter at a reasonably high level, while at the same time preparing the way for a swing back toward larger breeding herds and larger meat supplies for the future. The Department is also urging farmers and ranchers to take advantage of the good feed crops now in sight and feed to heavier weights in order to produce as much as possible from the numbers on hand.

Poultry: The Department now contemplates a request to farmers for an increase in poultry on farms for the coming year. This increase is justified by the anticipated expanded supplies of grain and poultry feed. The increase is also necessary to help maintain the levels of supply of meat and poultry at as high a level as possible in relation to the active demand.

Dairy: With respect to dairy, the Department has steadily encouraged farmers to maximize dairy production and will surely ask for as large an increase next year as dairy cow numbers will warrant—which is another reason for wanting to stabilize cattle numbers.

WINTER VEGETABLES

It recommended a production of approximately the same as for 1948 although expecting to reach that production with 3 percent less number of acres.

The production of dry edible peas was reduced because of the noticeable slowing down of demand. The production will be still well above prewar level.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Nebraska has kindly consented to permit me to speak for a minute or two to express a protest against the motion I understand the acting majority leader is about to make, namely, a motion to recess or adjourn until tomorrow at noon.

I appreciate that one lone voice in the Senate in opposition to a motion to recess is not going to have much effect, but I call the attention of the Senate to an opinion of mine that there are millions of people throughout the Nation who I think will share the protest I here now make about any adjournment without a night session, because I think that a great majority of the people of the United States believe that in this extraordinary emergency session of the Congress we should stay here and do the people's business.

I want the RECORD to show that I shall continue to protest these recesses at 6 o'clock, or 6:10, or any similar hour, so long as this special session continues, because I think the Republican majority should make very clear to the Democrats that we are here to do the people's business, and that we intend to hold the Senate in session each night until 11 p. m., until we transact the people's business. In view of what is perfectly obvious to us as the Democratic strategy in this session, I do not think the Republican majority can justify recessing at least before 11 p. m. each day, in its endeavor to move as rapidly as possible to transact the business which should be transacted in this special session of the Congress.

I am perfectly willing to admit that most of the speeches we have heard on the pending motion, namely, the motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill, have been speeches, up until this hour, which have been on the merits of the bill itself, and, in my judgment, they have been exceedingly able speeches. However, each and every one of them could have been made on the merits of the anti-poll-tax bill itself once we took it up. In my opinion that is when they should be delivered, rather than upon a motion to determine whether or not we should even take up for consideration the anti-poll-tax bill.

As one lone Senator on this side of the aisle, I respectfully recommend and suggest to the leadership of my party on this side of the aisle that I think the time has come when clear notice should be given to the Democratic side of the aisle that from now on until this special session adjourns we intend to hold the Senate in session every evening until such time as it becomes clearly demonstrated that it would probably be more appropriate to proceed even with 24-hour sessions, Mr. President, so that we can transact the people's business at this session of the Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to associate myself in toto with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. We are now in the second week of a special session of the Congress. Not only the Senate but the country is entitled to know something of what

the program before the special session is to be. I wanted to interrogate the acting majority leader, and the chairmen of committees who are upon the floor, so that we might be informed about what is in store for the Senate.

The first matter the President recommended dealt with high prices. May I ask the acting majority leader, or the chairman of the appropriate committee if I am correct in assuming that hearings are now being held on that proposed legislation, or at least that the subject is being considered by the proper committee?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I believe that a statement to that effect was made about as forcefully and clearly as could be made when we started the session. I know the statement I made included the fact that one piece of legislation that was recommended by the President was the so-called civil-rights legislation, and that the only legislation ready for immediate debate was one of the civil-rights bills which are now on the calendar, and that one of them would be taken up—until when? Until committees of the Senate had properly processed and reported to the Senate legislation on other subjects. I said that whenever one of the committees reports back favorably to the Senate a bill dealing with any of the proposals submitted by the President, and it came to the calendar, then we would be ready for debate. As I understand, the committees have not yet reported any legislation relative to the first category, and we are still on the civil-rights measure which was contained in the second category the President recommended.

Hearings are being held by committees. I understand that Mr. Porter, who is one of the witnesses for the administration on the so-called anti-inflation measure, appeared before a House committee. He also appeared today before the Senate committee. Other witnesses will be called, and when and if legislation is finally reported favorably it will be ready for consideration. In the meantime we expect to continue the debate on the bill, the consideration of which has been moved.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if I understand correctly, then hearings are being held before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the question of high prices?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. And hearings are also being held in the House.

Mr. PEPPER. The second question raised by the President relates to housing. I wish the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would not leave the floor, because I am going to ask whether or not the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, expects to call any committee meeting to deal with the minimum-wage law and possibly some of the other legislation the President has recommended? At least that is one subject within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. I have no intention of doing so at the present time.

Mr. PEPPER. So then we have the statement from the policy leader of the Republican side, who is also the chairman of the committee, that although there are pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare several different bills relating to the minimum wage, there is not even to be a committee meeting to consider the subject while this special session is in progress. That is the kind of clarity I wanted to get on all these subjects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has answered the questions propounded by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say relative to housing that legislation respecting it has been considered and no doubt will be considered. Whether it will be reported favorably I cannot say.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is a committee considering at this special session of the Senate any further legislation?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to supplement my statement by saying that the Senate passed the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, and that measure is now in the House. The legislation to which I had reference has to do with some corrective matters upon which I understood some evidence was being adduced.

Mr. PEPPER. There is no further consideration by any Senate committee, then, being given to legislation?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who is a member of the committee.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should merely like to say for the information of the Senator from Florida and of the Senate that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, of which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is chairman, is and has been meeting since Wednesday of last week twice daily. The subject of what further might be done in the field of housing legislation is being seriously considered by that committee, bearing in mind that the Senate itself passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill during the last session of the Congress.

In this connection, I should like to point out that one of the difficulties confronting us is that Mr. Eccles, who for 13 years has been charged with watching inflationary trends in this country, Mr. Paul Porter, who is presently the coordinator for the administration, and Mr. Snyder, who is the Secretary of the Treasury, have all, but in different degrees, called to our attention the inflationary threat involved in the proposed passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Your committee, consisting of both Democrats and Republicans, is endeavoring to determine from those qualified and conscientious witnesses to what degree the bill in question is conducive to further inflation, and whether or not the threat of such inflation offsets the virtues included in the legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. That is the kind of information I wanted to get.

Mr. CAIN. It is the hope of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, that by the end of this week an affirmative position will be taken in the field of housing and on the price question.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me——

Mr. WHERRY. I intended to make a motion to recess.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, we have already cleared up several questions. I simply wish to run briefly through the seven or eight recommendations of the President. I should like to know whether or not any Senate committee is giving consideration to these subjects. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has clarified the matter by saying that he is not going to call his committee together, and that no minimum-wage proposal is to be recommended to the Senate.

I should also like to know about social security. Is the Committee on Finance considering the President's recommendations with respect to social-security legislation?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall make a final answer to the Senator's questions, in the light of the statement which I made on Friday night. So far as I am concerned, this Congress will remain in session so long as any constructive legislation on any of the President's proposals might come from the committees for consideration by the United States Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall conclude by saying that the next question relates to displaced-persons legislation. I do not know whether any committee is considering that point, but that is one of the recommendations of the President.

The next question is the wheat agreement. That was recommended in the form of a treaty. I do not know whether the Foreign Relations Committee——

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the Senator a member of the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. PEPPER. I am not a member. I do not know whether the Foreign Relations Committee is considering the question or not.

Another question is the TVA appropriation, to build stand-by power plants. I do not know whether the Appropriations Committee of the Senate is considering that question or not, but I am trying to find out.

Another subject is the Federal pay bill. I do not know whether or not any Senate committee is considering the President's recommendation in that connection.

I thought we were entitled to know what progress, if any, was being made. Of course, the last item is the civil rights program. I believe that in due course we should be advised as to what action is being taken or is contemplated.

I thank the Senator for helping to the extent that he has helped me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. With regard to social-security legislation, I introduced a bill last week on that subject, which was referred to the Finance Committee. The Chairman of the Finance Commit-

tee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], has announced that there will be no action by that committee on that subject at this session.

Mr. PEPPER. That clarifies two of the points.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am sure that these points will be clarified as we proceed with the work of the Senate. Let me say again that so far as I am personally concerned, any legislation which is processed through the committees and receives their favorable consideration will be brought up on the floor of the Senate for discussion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that that committee is now considering, and has been considering, the wheat agreement. We held a session yesterday. We are to have another tomorrow. There appeared before us the Secretary of Agriculture and representatives of the State Department. That problem is receiving the best possible attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. I think it is generally known that I am opposed to discrimination in any form. I wish to protest against the way in which estimable Senators from the South are being discriminated against in the United States Senate. They wish to be heard on the question of bringing up the anti-poll-tax bill, and I believe that they are deserving of the same honor which I recently received when I wished to express my views on the draft. The Senate remained in session continuously to listen to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and myself. I should say that we were a team. I do not wish to say that either of us was the leader. I do not desire to take more credit than I give to the Senator from North Dakota. But certainly if the Senate can honor two Senators in that way, it should pay the same respect to a greater number of our colleagues, who happen to come from below the Mason and Dixon's line.

So, Mr. President, I believe that the proposal of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the Senate remain in session until 11 o'clock is utterly inadequate. It would be a reflection upon the oratorical ability of other Senators for us to adjourn at 11 o'clock. I am firmly convinced that the Senate should remain in session continuously until those Senators have had an opportunity to be heard, as I had an opportunity to be heard, without interruption.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that the President of the United States will send to the special session of Congress a recommendation that, with respect to western power and reclamation projects and transmission lines, the budget cuts of the last session be restored. I ask the Senator from Nebraska, who is the able chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with these matters, whether or not, if such a request is submitted, he will suggest that the Appropriations Committee hold a hearing on the subject?

Mr. WHERRY. I will answer the Senator from Washington with the observation that I believe that recommendations with respect to such projects have already been submitted to both the House and Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I had no knowledge of that fact.

Mr. WHERRY. They are now being considered by the House.

A little earlier I made the statement that if any new evidence were submitted that warranted opening up any of these recommendations, I felt that our committee, if and when the House sent the bill over, would give it consideration. The appropriations must first be processed in the House. I believe that my statement is a very fair one, and I believe the Senator from Washington will agree that appropriations for such projects will be given consideration if and when they come from the House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

NIGHT SESSIONS—RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it has been the practice not to hold night sessions until the Senate has been notified of them. For that reason it is not contemplated to have a night session tonight for any purpose. When and if we contemplate night sessions, announcement will be made so that Senators will know what the program is.

Mr. President, the majority party is doing everything within its power in this short space of time to consider the program suggested by the President. Senators may have our assurance that if and when constructive legislation is favorably reported from committees it will be considered. I hope that the questions which have been asked this evening will be clarified, and that we can proceed on that basis.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 3, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 2 (legislative day of July 28), 1948:

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

The following-named persons to be members of the Displaced Persons Commission for terms ending June 30, 1951:

Ugo Carusi, of Vermont.
Edward M. O'Connor, of New York.
Harry N. Rosenfield, of New York.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry F. Grady, of California, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Greece, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece.

H. Lawrence Groves, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
Frederick J. Cunningham, of Massachusetts.
Harrison Lewis, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 5 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

George Lybrook West, Jr., of California.
Charles Gilbert, of New York.

Don A. Gribble, of Vermont, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

James R. Riddle, of Alabama.
Ernest V. Polutnik, of Montana.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from January 1, 1947:

Donald E. Ullery

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. Howard Lambdin, pastor of St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal and everlasting Father, grant unto us Thy holy guidance as at this noon hour we turn our minds and wills toward the vital matters of our national life.

We ask Thy blessing on each and every Member of this House of Congress, for they have grave responsibilities. Give them courage to face their problems and wisdom to help solve them in the best possible manner. May they put their trust in Thee, as our fathers trusted in Thee and were not confounded. They committed their ways and hopes unto Thee, and Thou didst lead them to victory and to triumph.

So today we commit ourselves unto Thee and pray for victory in the cause of righteousness and truth. May we be faithful doers of Thy will today and every day, and thus may we help to build Thy kingdom.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 29, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2482. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; 16 U. S. C. 718b), as amended.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Central Intelligence Agency.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. National Archives.
7. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
8. Office of Selective Service Records.

SUSPENSIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to respond generally to an inquiry that a number of Members have addressed to me. They have asked me whether or not any suspensions will be called today. I now announce that there will be no suspensions today.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on House Joint Resolution 212.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, the people want something done about the ever-mounting prices for food and other necessities. The people want an end to the inflationary spiral of the cost of living.

If the present high cost of living is due to shipping our surplus farm products and other necessities out of this country to foreign lands, then let us do something to curb the excessive exports so that the supply at home will exceed the demand and thus bring prices down.

If inflation of our national debt and the currency has brought about high prices and is now blowing the top off the National Treasury, then let us do something to stop the inflation of our national debt and our currency.

If bank credits should be restrained to bring prices down, then let us do something to restrain those credits.

If Government departments and agencies are competing with private industry to boost prices for food, clothing, and other necessities higher and higher, then by all means let us pass legislation to stop all further invasion of private industry by Government departments and agencies.

With the price of wheat and corn and meat going higher and higher in the market place because of greater and greater scarcities of these products, let us stop the Agriculture Department from advocating the planting of less wheat and raising less cattle, such as they advocate in their release of July 23, 1948.

And whatever we do, let us stop trying to pass legislation at this special session that the other body in the other end of the Capitol can talk to death.

If the administration is sincere about restoration of consumer credit controls, regulation of inflationary bank credit, and control of speculation on the commodity exchanges, why was not Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Federal Reserve System Board of Governors, ready to testify on these subjects and controls before the Senate and House Banking Committees a week ago? When Mr. McCabe was asked to testify before these committees, he is reported to have told the committees that he could not possibly be ready to testify for another week.

If the administration is sincere about restoration of such controls to curb the inflationary spiral and reduce prices, why was not the Secretary of the Treasury ready to testify before these committees a week ago? Instead, Secretary Snyder is reported to have said, when asked to testify last week before the proper congressional committees, that he would not be prepared to testify until after Mr. McCabe made his appearance before the committees.

If the President has emergency powers to reimpose controls over consumer credit to be exercised by the Federal Reserve System, let us spell it out for him and demand that he exercise his powers in that respect.

But let us not adjourn this special session of Congress until we have done something to curb the inflationary spiral and to stop these ever-increasing prices that are a plague on the American people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and two tables.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Independence (Kans.) Daily Reporter.

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. SCRIVNER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each extraneous material.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MATHEWS) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an extract from a news letter and a short bill she is introducing today.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Sunday Star.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' FLIGHT TRAINING

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, it would appear from evidence presented by the operators of flight training schools in my district that the administration of veter-

ans' flight training is not functioning as was intended by the Congress.

It seems to me that the proposed screening of applicants is more severe than was intended, but even more serious than this is the fact that through administrative methods applications are piling up without action either pro or con thereon. The largest schools in my district have succeeded in getting approximately only one student each accepted during the past 2 months. Efforts should be made to correct this situation without delay as schools in my area face either voluntary closing down or bankruptcy if this situation is to continue. I quote here some telegrams covering this subject, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your cooperation in protesting the perversive prejudice shown by Veterans' Administration against flight-training applicants, namely, in interviews and screening, will be deeply appreciated.

ALBERT A. GABARDI.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *July 30, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully request that you investigate arbitrary curtailment of veterans' flight training by Veterans' Administration. Students who now apply for flight training are receiving rejection forms from Veterans' Administration, which read: "Flight training is considered avocational and recreational."

MERTON B. HASKELL,
Haskell Flying Service.

HUNTINGTON PARK, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congress should act at once to force the VA's hand to act on pending applications for flight training. My affairs have been tied up for 5 weeks awaiting their decision. Neither do they have any procedure for me to use in following up my case.

ROY GEORGE EKER.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

DOWNEY, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Is there anything you can do to promote congressional action which will cause the VA to formulate a policy and act upon my application for schooling under Public Law 346? I filed month ago for flying training. No response pro or con. Imperative I know real soon.

E. C. FLORES.
LONG BEACH, CALIF.

ANAHEIM, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Imperative you protest to the Veterans' Administration of their arbitrary attitude in screening flight applicants. Very low percentage being approved. Your immediate attention to this matter imperative.

GEORGE F. OWNS,
Cypress School of Aeronautics.

NORWALK, CALIF., *July 31, 1948.*
Hon. WILLIS W. BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It is important that something be done to bring about action from the VA in approving or disapproving flying-school applicants who apply under Public Law 346. They have no policy for screening. They have no instructions for procedure for either the school or the applicant. Their voluntary delay is costly to all involved. Veterans who acted on school's solicitations are demanding reimbursement from school for $10 physical-examination fees which VA required before their applications were filed.

SOUTHERN CAL FLYERS,
Cranford Airport.

LIBERALISM

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, when a voter takes other people's money to vote for a political candidate it is a crime called bribery, but when he votes for a candidate because that candidate promises to take other people's money and give it to him after the election, that is a virtue called liberalism. Why is this?

RESERVE REQUIREMENTS OF BANKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the leadership of the two bodies will do with respect to the request as it has been submitted to raise the reserve requirements of the banks, but we can well afford to give that some thought before we vote in favor of it, provided it is recommended. If reserve requirements are raised, the banks can call loans to get the necessary money or they can sell Governments bonds. My guess is that they will sell Government bonds by the billions, and let loans ride as long as possible and produce higher income than from bonds. The Federal Reserve will have to support the bond market, and as it buys those bonds it increases the reserves of the banks. The banks can move into a position to make further inflationary loans. That is something we had better think about before we vote in favor of the single proposition of increasing reserve requirements of the member banks.

As far as I am personally concerned, I am telling the people in my district that if they have marketable Government bonds they had better watch the bond market, and if they have to sell any pretty soon, they had better sell them now. I am here referring to marketable Government issues and not to the nonmarketable savings issues.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE MEAT SHORTAGE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD today some information relative to the Department of Agriculture. It is amazing that under the regulations and requests of the Department of Agriculture the number of cattle in this country has been reduced by 7,000,000 in the last 5 years. They are asking for a further reduction this year of 517,000 in the breeding stock in the face of a beef shortage.

The record will also show, and you can take it from the Department's own figures, that there has been a reduction of about 20,000,000 sheep in this country in the last 5 years. There has been a marked reduction in the number of hogs and cattle. I would like to know why such a program is being carried on in the face of an expanding population, which in the last 10 years has increased by about 1,500,000 each year.

There are some 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 more people in the United States today with mouths to feed, yet there seems to be a planned program in the Department of Agriculture which says that you can have prosperity with scarcity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one, to include an editorial from Iron Age, entitled "To His Fingertips," a letter from a father to his son; and, in the second, to include an editorial from the Bristol Courier entitled, "Let Us Have the Facts."

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the high cost of living can, and must, come down. It can be done by just good common-sense methods—methods of equality for all—give and take. Give advice to those who are getting too much of the world's goods, and if they do not heed, then take a little from them. This applies to business, labor, and agriculture, and any other occupation—lawyer, doctor, minister, and so forth. The law made years and years ago should apply. That law is termed the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as ye would that men should do unto you."

I shall cite just one change today. For instance, the Government guarantees that the farmer should get $2 a bushel for wheat. Well, that may not be excessive, with his high labor cost, but the great mass of American consumers should not have to pay more than $2 a bushel for wheat when he guarantees the farmer that amount by his Government, which, by the way, is the people of America. We are almost guaranteeing to feed the world. All wheat shipped out of our country is given away by ERP, or the Marshall plan, or call it ECP, if you choose. They, to me, are all the same. On the international wheat agreement, which ratification was requested in the

President's summons of the extra session of Congress, under this agreement we were pledged to export 185,000,000 bushels of wheat a year for 5 years at prices ranging from $1.10 to $2 a bushel. This subsidy was estimated to cost the United States $150,000,000 during the year ending July 1, 1948. Some subsidy for America to pay to give wheat to foreigners. If it had been to feed the starving, I would have been for it, but no such evidence was given.

The President is responsible for the head of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, being appointed. He is the right arm of the Truman administration in the Agriculture Department. Several years ago you paid 12 cents for a large loaf of bread. Today the same loaf costs 21 cents. That is the greatest item of food we have—bread, bread, bread. Everybody likes it, everybody needs it. Bread is the staff of life. That is why so much is used every day. Its cost has risen almost 100 percent in price; in some instances more than 100 percent. The President takes credit to the farmer for raising the price of wheat and wages that goes into the loaf of bread. Now he blames us Republicans for the high cost of the bread to the consumer. Is that right? Is that just? I ask you, Is that honest? You Americans who use bread ask yourselves the question, Who raises your high prices higher? Bread from 12 cents a loaf to 21 cents a loaf. But, bread eaters, that is not all; if we can give bread to foreigners, why should not we cut the cost to Americans if necessary? Is the Agriculture Department suggesting that? Oh, no. Let me show you what Mr. Truman and his Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, are proposing doing to the next year's wheat crop just because we are producing too much wheat in the United States. This is what they propose to do in regulating wheat production for 1949:

	Acres
1948 wheat acreage in United States of America	77,715,000
1949 proposed wheat acreage	71,500,000
The Department of Agriculture demands less acreage be planted	6,215,000

Why? To keep wheat scarce so the price of bread will stay up, I suppose, so that we can guarantee the farmer $2.14 to $2.20 a bushel subsidy at Philadelphia. Suppose the 6,215,000 acres taken out of cultivation would yield 30 bushels to the acre on the average. That would mean production of 186,450,000 bushels more of wheat; that should reduce the cost of wheat to the baker and, in turn, the cost of bread to the consumer.

But the administration does not want to do that. They want to make wheat more scarce. Does it make sense to you housewives who have to pay 21 cents a loaf for bread? You have the answer—no; a thousand times no. But your President Truman is running the Agriculture Department that way. I say it is time for a change.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in each, to include certain addenda.

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee I feel it a great privilege to take the floor to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our distinguished and able chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON.

While I have served on this powerful committee only during the Eightieth Congress, I feel that I have been especially favored in working with the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative KNUTSON, in his revenue program. Under his expert leadership the Congress has reduced taxes $4,800,000,000 despite three Presidential vetoes, with 71 percent of the tax relief going to those with incomes under $5,000; 7,400,000 wage earners in the lowest brackets removed from the tax roll; married couples allowed to divide their income for tax purposes, and special relief provided for persons over 65 years of age, and for the blind. A bill to extend social-security coverage has also been passed by the House and is now pending in the Senate. This record alone is a tribute to the man, and to his leadership. His name is a worthy addition to the roll of illustrious men who have attained the chairmanship of the powerful Ways and Means Committee.

Congressman KNUTSON's career as a man and as a statesman is typical of the American way of life. He emigrated to this country from Norway at an early age. His honesty, perseverance, industry, and integrity have made for him an honored place in his community and in his State. He has served his country well in the House of Representatives for 31 long years. My best wishes follow him for many more years of public service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in each, to include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I arise at this time to address the House on the subject Old-Age Pensions. In my opinion, if there is one subject that constitutes an emergency, calling for action by this special session of the Congress, it is this very subject.

I know of no greater need, Mr. Speaker, than the need for more adequate security for our deserving elder citizens. I know of no field where the need is greater and where the efforts of the Congress thus far have come so far short in meeting the need.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] and myself are extending our joint remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD today on this subject. I trust every Member of the House, and particularly the House leadership will read this extension carefully.

The people of this country are calling loudly upon the Congress for a decent American old-age pension. They are sick and tired of this meagre hodgepodge called old-age assistance. A decent old-age pension will not seriously aggravate inflation as might appear to some of us, because the small incomes of our elders, even after they receive a decent pension, will not be a serious factor in the matter of inflation. Pensions, or our excuse for pensions called assistance, have always been entirely inadequate. Now, with 58-cent dollars, they are intolerable. The need is too great to ignore. The people want action. In addition to that a majority of the Members of this House have joined together in a written friendly request for action. Mr. Speaker, if there is one piece of legislation that should have the attention of this special session of the Congress, it is this very matter. Let us enact a decent American old-age pension. Let us do it now.

PROGRESS UNDER LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Strike idleness in 1947 and 1948 was far less than in the record year of 1946, and also less than 1945. Approximately 3,700 stoppages occurred in 1947 in which 2,170,000 workers were involved as against 4,985 stoppages in 1946 in which 4,600,000 workers were involved. Idleness amounted to 34,600,000 man-days in 1947 as compared to 116,000,000 man-days in 1946. At an average daily wage of $8 American workers lost $928,000,000 due to work stoppages in 1946, in comparison to a loss of $276,800,000 in 1947.

Since the Labor-Management Relations Act became effective strikes have decreased substantially. Work stoppages under the old law average 415 per month in 1946. They have been cut to 219 under the new law.

Work stoppages

Month	1946	1947	1948
January	337	321	175
February	290	286	200
March	440	361	225
April	504	479	275
May	376	471	275
June	388	379	310
July	563	315	.....
August	560	326	.....
September	499	219	.....
October	516	219	.....
November	344	178	.....
December	168	119	.....
Total	4,985	3,683	.....

	Number of strikes	Workers involved	Man-days idle
Aug. 22 to Dec. 31, 1947	781	250,000	5,000,000
January-June 1947	1,460	1,150,000	21,800,000
July-August estimate	575	330,000	4,000,000
Total	2,81	1,730,000	31,700,000

The record shows that under the new law wages have continued to rise, more leisure time has been made available through a shorter workweek and average hourly earnings also have increased. Wages have increased 7.4 percent and prices have increased 7.1 percent since the passage of the act.

Labor is making these gains through peaceful, collective bargaining, whereas before the new labor law gains were more frequently made through costly strikes.

The President and my opponent want to repeal this act. If this act is repealed we will return to the following labor abuses. I know you would not want to see or hear of these labor abuses again.

First. Milk spoils in labor row because milkers refused to join the union.

Second. Army sergeant picketed because he did not think he had to join a union to run a one-man butcher shop.

Third. Sixty carloads of lemons dumped in citrus strike.

Fourth. Sheep must be sheared by union sheep shearers.

Fifth. Wholesaler who had been in business 50 years in Philadelphia, Pa., was given 15 minutes to get off the street unless his clerk joined the union.

Sixth. A truckload of produce was returned home because the driver would not pay the union $53 to unload—Riverside, N. J.

Seventh. Union stops the delivery of oil to two veterans unless they pay initiation fee of $37.50 on a certain date, after that date it would be $75.

Eighth. A shipyard worker in San Francisco was forced to give $1 to the Democratic Party and was discharged for saying he would give the Republican Party $2.

Ninth. Union refuses to let marines act as pallbearers for one of their own killed in line of duty when he was brought back for reburial.

Tenth. Communist labor leaders closed down Allis-Chalmers plant in Wisconsin whose employees were engaged in vital defense work for the Navy in time of war.

Eleventh. The union labor leaders on Dock Street, Philadelphia, demanded the right to tell the wholesalers when they could enter their own place of business.

Twelfth. Two hundred and forty-seven thousand five hundred pounds of oranges were dumped because of strike, which were to have been used by the Government in defense and lend-lease programs.

Thirteenth. Innocent people were injured and their property was damaged in Pittsburgh, Pa., due to open warfare between two unions.

Fourteenth. Building trades in Chicago refused to erect a building because the stone was cut by union labor in the Bloomington-Bedford limestone district of Indiana.

Fifteenth. Seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars worth of asparagus was dumped in one pile in California.

Sixteenth. Lady lost $3,000 in the turkey business because she would not hire union turkey pickers.

Seventeenth. Eighty thousand tons of spinach lost due to labor tie-up.

Eighteenth. A Richmond, Va., farmer had to pay union men $7 for 1 hour's work to unload a load of apples.

Nineteenth. Union stops sailor from going into the wholesale business because he wanted to buy his own truck and hire his own union driver.

Twentieth. Cafe employees refused to join union in Burbank, Calif., and as a result there was stench bombing, acid throwing in patrons' cars, tires and seat cushions slashed on employees' cars, roofing nails put in the streets in front of cafe and five plate windows were broken.

Twenty-first. Pigeons and mice were turned loose in New York department store, by pickets.

Twenty-second. A New York wholesaler was attacked and badly beaten by two men because he was selling to certain chain stores.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POTTS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from today's New York Herald Tribune.

SUPPORT PRICES AND INFLATION

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I have just submitted for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial appearing in this morning's New York Herald Tribune entitled "Support Prices and Inflation."

I think it would be well for all of us, particularly the Committee on Agriculture, to read that editorial. We all recall the days of the early New Deal when farmers were being paid not to grow this and not to grow that and for killing off every other head of cattle and every other hog, and so forth. Now we have a turn-about, and when we have a tremendous surplus, as for instance, of potatoes, they get paid to grow more of that particular crop. It is a vicious circle in which the housewife and the city folks get no benefit whatsoever.

I think this is a very worth-while editorial, and for that reason I have asked to insert it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address by Senator CAPPER.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include substantiating evidence.

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Grand Haven Tribune.

Mr. BUCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was granted permision to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper editorial.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after the legislative business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day and all special orders heretofore entered I may proceed for 20 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXPORTATION OF TEXTILES FROM CUBA

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks on the question of Cuba's licensing of exportation of textiles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 9 the Cuban Government passed a regulation requiring a license upon all textiles imported into Cuba. The imposition of this license or tax upon textiles is of great importance to our country as a whole, but particularly to the South and more especially to my district, the largest textile district in the world. Cuba is a great country. Relations between our two countries have been most pleasant. They might be compared to that of a larger and smaller brother. From our viewpoint the imposition of this license seems ill-advised. We have been in the textile business for generations. Spinning and weaving of cotton goods have been developed to the very highest degree. Machinery of the last word has been installed in our textile plants and those who work in them possess skill and ability, producing results almost beyond belief. While maintaining a high-wage level and providing unprecedented conveniences and advantages to textile workers, the finished products have been kept within reasonable price levels. Until comparatively recent times Cuba has not gone in for the manufacture of textiles. It is believed she does not possess sufficient spindles and looms now to supply required textiles for her people. The levying of this new license fee would work to the disadvantage of the citizens of Cuba by raising the price of textiles there and depriving the citizens of the fine textiles from the States. At the same time the market for our textiles would be seriously impaired if not altogether lost. We need the Cuban market for our textiles in order to assure uninterrupted, profitable employment for our people. Cuba needs our textiles so as to receive necessary clothing for her people at a price they are financially able to pay.

Today I conferred at length with the State Department about this grave problem and am happy to report that continuous friendly negotiations are now going on between the two governments, following the note of protest filed soon after the imposition of the import license.

We have reason to believe and sincerely hope that presently the Cuban Government will greatly modify, if not altogether repeal, the import license. The ability to negotiate with other nations and to effectuate satisfactory solutions of controverted problems without serious difficulty or even a threat of war, is the goal toward which all nations should strive.

IDLEWILD AIRPORT

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisian?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest of this Congress and the people of our country in national defense, I think it is proper that we should take notice of the dedication of the Idlewild Airport in the city of New York on last Saturday. It is one of the largest airports in the world. The Air Force sent its latest jet fighters and heavy bombers in a thundering, low-level parade during the aerial demonstration dedicating New York's new $200,000,000 international airport, and I am sure that every one who was there was greatly impressed with the magnificent demonstration by our Air Force. I was especially impressed with the skill in flight formation of the National Guard and the Naval Reserve fliers who participated in that magnificent demonstration. I am sure that those fliers will be just as successful in combat, if necessary, as they were in formation.

On that occasion the Governor of New York and the President of the United States were present. Governor Dewey said:

> The 4,900-acre Idlewild Airport, largest in the world, was a demonstration of what men of good will can do, surmounting technical obstacles, local prejudices, and even suspicion and obstruction.

President Truman said that this was a demonstration of our determination to remain strong in the cause of peace. I assume, Mr. Speaker, that there were unofficial Russian observers, and I hope that their report on this magnificent air-power demonstration has reached Moscow by this time.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the majority leader asked unanimous consent that the Rules Committee might have until tomorrow night to file a privileged report. Up to now the Rules Committee has not met and I wonder whether they are going to bring in a rule making in order a bill to bring about a reduction in the high cost of living, and also a rule on a housing bill. The ever-increasing cost of living is such that the American people cannot stand it any longer. I hope the majority leader realizes that something must be done without delay to reduce the high—yes, the criminal high cost of living and also provide real housing for the thousands upon thousands of our ex-servicemen.

Mr. Speaker, within the last few days due to the crusade of the housewives against the high prices of meats the prices of some meat cuts have been reduced, but I feel this lowering of prices is only temporary notwithstanding that the storage warehouses are jammed with meats. Despite the plentiful warehouse supply, I am satisfied that the big packers in conjunction with the National Association of Manufacturers, will not permit the majority to enact legislation which would bring about a real reduction in the cost of meats and meat products. From what I have heard and observed since Congress reconvened, I am convinced that this Republican-controlled Congress will not be permitted to enact any legislation at this special session and will force adjournment without the passage of any legislation to relieve the people from the high cost of living or to provide decent living quarters for those desperately seeking homes. If relief is not forthcoming, the consumers will be obliged to follow the suggestion of one of the Republican Presidential candidates to eat less. They have been eating less and will continue to eat less for the next 4 months when they will elect men to the Congress who will not be controlled by the avaricious, profit-greedy combines, special interests and trusts to whom you are subservient and who seem to control your action.

Mr. Speaker, if it is the purpose of the request of the majority leader to permit the Committee on Rules to file rules on these two important relief measures, naturally I am in favor of such request and I hope the Republican majority will heed the general demand and plea of the American people to be relieved from the intolerable conditions that now exist.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. If I have the time I will gladly yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has the time.

Mr. SABATH. Before I forget it, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

THE BLUE AND GRAY CRADLE ASSOCIATION

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, last week, the noted columnist, Drew Pearson, in his syndicated column, told something about the Blue and Gray Cradle Association of Montgomery, Ala., which city is in the congressional district that I have the honor to represent. He cited the progress that has been made in the South by those who are helping to bring about better relations between all sections of the Nation and between the white and colored races.

The history of the Blue and Gray Cradle Association is an interesting one. The idea was developed by Champ Pickens, who serves as general manager, and who is a great sportsman and an enthusiastic supporter of the University of Alabama football team, known throughout the Nation as the Thin Red Line, but which in more recent years has come to be known as the Red Elephants.

When Wallace Wade was coaching at the University of Alabama, Champ Pickens was instrumental in securing a bid for the University of Alabama to represent the East in the Tournament of Roses at Pasadena, Calif. Alabama was enthusiastically received on the coast and, since that time, has represented the East many times in this classic tournament. The fighting qualities and sportsmanship of these players endeared the university to the West, and the Nation, with the result that thousands of students from the East, and other sections of the Nation, enrolled at Alabama.

Realizing the good will that could be brought about by athletics, Champ Pickens sold the late William Gunter, mayor of the city of Montgomery, upon the idea of forming the Blue and Gray Cradle Association to sponsor a Blue and Gray championship football game to be known as the North versus South and to be played annually in Montgomery, the Cradle of the Confederacy. While the football game was to be the chief annual sporting event of the association, other sporting events were arranged between individuals and clubs represented by selected and outstanding players from the North and the South.

The unique feature of this football game is that none of the players are paid anything and that the entire proceeds, beyond the actual expenses, are devoted exclusively to charity. The Blue and Gray Cradle Association is a nonprofit organization and its officers and members throughout the Nation receive no benefit other than the satisfaction of doing something worth while to cement relations between the North and South and to aid charity.

After the death of Montgomery's beloved Mayor Gunter, each succeeding mayor, Cyrus B. Brown, David Earl Dunn, and John L. Goodwyn, as the representative of the city government, has taken a keen interest in this great work. At the present time Fred A. Duran is president, W. B. Paterson, Sr., vice president, Frank Rosa, treasurer, and Frank E. Boyd, secretary. All of these men give freely of their time and talents toward attaining

the objectives of the association. The programs for the big game are sold by the Lions Club, the proceeds being given to aid the blind.

This annual football game has the reputation of having, upon both the North's and South's squads, the outstanding football talent of the Nation. The selection of the players also is unique in that each player is a senior. At these games more All-American players have been seen together upon the field than at any other one football game in the Nation. During the war years it was necessary to use, in addition to seniors, other outstanding players.

Each year, two, or more often, three outstanding football coaches of the South, and an equal number from the North, are selected to coach their respective teams and they, with the players, meet in Montgomery prior to the game where both squads are received with open arms by the people of the city.

The Blue and Gray football game is played on the last Saturday of each December, in order that it may not interfere with the other bowl games. Many of the sports writers, commentators, and fans who attend the other games on the first of January make it a point to stop over in Montgomery for this classic event. There has been so much interest in the game that it has been broadcast by national hook-up for several years, and during the war was broadcast by short wave over the world.

This game is outstanding in that it is not played on a commercial basis. The players all feel that they are making a worth-while contribution to a worthy cause and give their all. While the South generally has more rooters, every good play by the northern squad receives the plaudits of the crowd. I have never heard of a northern player who did not want to return to Montgomery for another game. Oftentimes you find southern boys who are attending school in other sections of the country playing with the North squad, and northern boys for a like reason, playing on the South squad.

If we are to remain a great nation, this spirit of friendship must prevail. Somehow I think that the pattern for this spirit must have started in April 1863 when a little group of southern women visited a cemetery near Columbus, Miss., and there decorated the graves of their Confederate dead. One lady of the group, after she had decorated the graves of her two sons who had lost their lives in defense of the South's cause, was seen walking toward a corner of the cemetery where lay buried two unknown Union soldiers. One of the group asked her what she was doing: "Do you know whose graves those are?" "Yes, indeed, they are two Union soldiers—they are Yankees," said the mother of the two soldiers, "I do not forget they are nameless graves marking where two northern soldiers lie buried, but somewhere in the North, in some little city, or village, or perhaps in some lonely farmhouse, a mother, or a young wife, or a sweetheart, mourns for them, just as you and I grieve for the loss of our loved ones." She went on to the unmarked graves and stooped over and tenderly spread her flowers over them. "We bring these flowers," she said, "to express our love and devotion to our dead—our heroes of the South. These unknown soldiers of the North lying here in our churchyard are also dead, but when the war is over and peace comes again, we shall call them ours, so here are my lilacs and roses, red, white, and blue for both alike." "And mine," "and mine," "and mine, too," said the other women as they added their flowers on the unmarked graves of the northern soldiers in the corner of the little southern churchyard.

Each succeeding year the women of Columbus repeat this beautiful deed for southern and northern soldiers alike.

We members of the Blue and Gray Cradle Association thank Drew Pearson for his tribute to the spirit that prompts the creation of the Blue and Gray Cradle Association and know that in the days to come this kindness upon his part will go far toward bringing about unity for which we all hope and strive.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a newspaper article and in the other an address he delivered in Chelsea, Mass.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter he sent to some constituents.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today following the other special orders now on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SEGREGATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 7056, making it possible for persons drafted under the Selective Service Act of 1948—Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress, second session—to choose the type of units in which they serve.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that as a member of the Armed Services Committee I have found it necessary to introduce such legislation, but in my opinion it is important that such an act become the law in the interest of the very safety of our country.

For a number of years it has been popular for the leaders of both the Republican and Democratic Parties to stir up the miscalled civil-rights bills every election year. Everyone recognizes that such measures have been brought up and agitated in the past for the purpose of obtaining the vote of the Negro and other minorities in the northern cities. Such a practice is destructive to the best interests of America. It has always caused strife and ill feeling, and in my opinion has been harmful all along, and is becoming more so. In the past, however, there has been no real determined effort to force the breaking down of segregation. During the present Congress we have seen the President of the United States appear before this Congress and urge the breaking down of segregation between whites and Negroes. This was a follow-up of his written message some months ago, striking at segregation between the races. Now, as never before, it seems that the leaders of the Democratic Party are determined to strike at the system which has prevailed in my section throughout the history of this Nation. Some few may be conscientious, but I am sure that the vast majority would do this in an effort to obtain votes in the coming election. This is tragic.

Mr. Speaker, the racial question is one that has plagued nations throughout the history of the world. It is one of the prime causes of strife in many European countries today. It is the cause of much strife in northern cities today. I do not know that there is any perfect answer to the question, but I am sure that the segregation of the races, as provided by custom and by law in the Southern States, is the best method of handling this difficult problem, difficult in other regions but not in the South. We have no real problem there, and will not have, unless those who agitate this question for their own personal gain succeed in trying to upset the balance by the use of Federal force. It will be a sad mistake for this Congress ever to take such action.

Mr. Speaker, such efforts as have been made by the President of the United States to get this Congress to pass such legislation is bad enough, but on the 26th day of July, the President issued an order having to do with breaking down segregation in the armed services. He followed this Executive order with a statement in the press that the order was issued for the purpose of eventually breaking down segregation in the armed services. I say that such an order breaks faith with the conscientious Members of the Congress who regretted deeply having to vote out the Draft Act for those in charge of the armed services in the consideration of the Draft Act led members of the committee to believe that no such action would be taken. Relying upon these assurances the Draft Act was passed; it was passed because it appeared then, and it now appears, that the very safety of our Nation is dependent upon adequate armed services. Thousands of our young men have volunteered for service because of their patriotism and in their willingness to do their part. A great number of volunteers have come from the South, and they took such action, relying upon the continuation of the segregation practices of the Army. Now

we see the Commander in Chief, by Executive order, breaking down such practice, in spite of the statements of those who know, or should know, what is essential to maintaining the best Army possible.

Our military leaders recognize that we cannot destroy segregation in the services at this time. General Bradley, in a speech in New York City on the 18th of January 1948, stated as follows:

> Our free democratic traditions of equal opportunity, civil rights, and the freedom of the individual to assert himself against institutions, is too strongly implanted in our young men to warrant anything but a democratic Army. And while greater control is required in the armed forces than in other fields of employment, I believe this authority can be exercised fairly, intelligently, and judiciously without impairing a man's basic human rights.
>
> Our best chance for the realization of any army that will mirror this tradition in human rights, lies in the recruitment of officers and men whose intelligence and integrity assure respect for the dignity of the men with whom they work. Yet to attract these officers and men, we must be able to offer them the emoluments, opportunities, and privileges that they would have in civilian life.

In a statement dated June 28, 1948, Secretary Royall stated as follows:

> The question of integration involves a vital problem of social reform to be achieved first by the people of the United States and then by the United States Army.

Testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee in April, General Eisenhower described the Army as "one of the mirrors that reflect America," and said, in effect, that as long as there is race segregation in American civilian life, the Army will have to follow that pattern.

It is reported that General Bradley told a news conference at Fort Knox, Ky.:

> The Army is not out to make any social reforms. The Army will put men of different races in different companies. It will change that policy when the Nation as a whole changes it.

The bill which I have introduced attempts to give enlistees and those who subsequently volunteer the right to choose to serve with members of their own race upon their specific request. It simply preserves freedom of choice in the individual as to the race of the military unit in which he is forced to serve. The enactment of such a bill does not deprive any other individual citizen of a single right, real or imaginary. If, at the time of registration or induction, any young man declares that he prefers to serve with his own kind, this proposal assures him of that privilege. The same identical right would be allowed those of any and all races of our people, whether belonging to the majority or whether called a minority. It would not discriminate against any citizen or group of citizens. It would not take away anything from anyone. It could not harm or injure anyone. It would not deny any individual the right to serve in units composed of mixed races if he so desires and is ordered to do so. It would not change the present policy of assignments used by the Army and Air Corps.

Mr. Speaker, does the President mean that a Negro has a right to serve in a white company, and that he will see to it that he can serve in such a white unit, but that the white boy does not have the right to serve in a white unit; that the Negro has the right under the Constitution to share the association of white boys, even those who do not wish to associate with him, but that the white youth has no right to associate with whom he pleases and to be free from association with those he does not wish to associate?

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Armed Services Committee for a number of years. We, on that committee, recognize that we face a grave situation today. Now, as perhaps never before, we need to be united. Now, as never before, we do not need strife in the Nation, and certainly we do not need strife within our armed services themselves. Would it not be tragic for members of the armed services to have to spend a great deal of their time and of their force trying to maintain an unnatural system foisted upon them by the unwise decision of the President? It must not be.

Mr. Speaker, the very safety of our country demands the passage of H. R. 7056, which I have introduced. It is needed to keep faith with the Members of the Congress who supported the draft bill, because they believed it necessary to save our country. This bill must be passed to keep faith with the thousands of southern boys, and northern boys, too, for that matter, who have volunteered in the armed services, relying upon the system of segregation being maintained therein. Mr. Speaker, it is needed to keep peace within the armed services themselves.

The provisions of this bill are unfair to no one. That Negro who prefers to serve in an all-Negro unit may do so, and it is my belief that most of them would prefer an all-Negro unit, and it permits the white youths to choose companies of their own race, and then those who may want to serve in mixed units may do so. In my opinion, the all-black units and the all-white units will far excel those units that are mixed, judging by those citizens who preach amalgamation of the races that I have observed. I firmly believe that in view of the President's Executive order and his statement as to its intent, it is absolutely necessary that the Congress enact H. R. 7056, so that our armed services will not be torn by dissention in this time of great danger. I urge all to get behind this measure before our country is destroyed from within. We cannot afford to permit the armed services to be torn by dissension because of anybody's desire to win an election.

REDUCTION IN PAY FOR PERSONNEL OF ARMED SERVICES

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, is there a Member of Congress who is willing to propose a reduction in pay now for the personnel of our armed services? Obviously the answer is "No."

But, Mr. Speaker, do you know that every single person in the service, from the lowliest rank to the highest brass in the Army, in the Navy, in the Marine Corps, and in the Air Corps, will suffer a pay cut next January? It will be all-embracing. That is the law as it stands today, and I am not mistaken about it.

Mr. Speaker, what an injustice and what a shattering blow this will be to the morale of our men and women in our armed services, a blow not only to those stationed here in the United States but also to those stationed at far distant places of the globe. And what can be said to those whose terms of service are at or near the expiration point? Can you imagine that they will be receptive to pleas to reenlist, or in the case of commissioned Reserve officers, to accept a further tour of duty?

Mr. Speaker, I know of nothing that can have a more demoralizing effect than a pay reduction, which would not only be totally unexpected but absolutely unwarranted.

Mr. Speaker, serious damage to our national defense can only be averted by congressional action at this special session. A very short and simple bill, House Joint Resolution 431, which I introduced on June 16, 1948, can be passed by both Houses of Congress in less than 1 hour. This bill would only maintain the present scales of pay for all service personnel.

Mr. Speaker, let us meet our responsibility in this important matter without any delay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remark in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

AMENDMENT TO PRESENT DP BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the steering committee on the Republican side whether they are going to bring in a DP bill to offset and do away with the inequalities and the proscriptions contained in the Revercomb-Wiley bill which we passed in the previous session. It is generally accepted that the wrongs of that bill should be righted and despite the denials made on the floor and elsewhere I maintain that that bill contains some very invidious discriminations, geographic discriminations, occupational discriminations, racial-religious discriminations and particularly a calendar discrimination that relief is imperative. Because the cut-off date, for example, was set at December 22, 1945, only a few months after the shooting stopped, great

injustice was done. The International Refugee Organization and General Clay are of the opinion that the cut-off date should be as of the date when the camps were closed officially, namely, April 21, 1947. That earlier cut-off date shuts off many, many deserving DP's, DP's of the type that would make good citizens in this fair land of ours.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Would the gentleman want everybody to come over here who wants to come over from the other side?

Mr. CELLER. Of course not. I want the deserving to come in. I would welcome the DP's who suffered immeasureably at Hitler's hands. That would be a matter of humanity. But also these delayed pilgrims have the courage, the stamina, the integrity, the willingness to work, and fullest appreciation of the liberties that America accords her citizens. Their admission would be a matter of enlightened self-interest.

I remind my Republican colleagues that Governor Dewey is for all-out relief of the DP's, and I remind my Democratic colleagues that our platform contains promise of relief along the lines I suggest.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 1948, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the United States Office of Education, I received a copy of a letter written by John W. Studebaker, former Commissioner of Education, addressed to Hon. Oscar R. Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency.

The newspapers throughout the country have given much space to this letter. In order that the public and the Members of Congress may have the benefit of the information contained in this letter, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of these remarks. The letter itself is self-explanatory.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 30, 1948.*

Hon. OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: In my letter of resignation, dated June 14, 1948, addressed to the President, I stated the basic reason why it seemed inadvisable for me to remain longer in the Government service beyond July 15, namely, the impossibility of providing for the proverbial "rainy day" with the top salary allowed for the Commissioner of Education.

Now, however, I desire to supplement various communications I sent you and conversations I had with you while in office on matters having to do with your policies of organization and administration, for the purpose of pointing out again some of the implications of the program you have had under way during recent months.

In summary, it is my considered opinion that if your purposes and program are carried out you will do great harm not only to proper and adequate work of the United States Office of Education, but indeed also to the vital need for Federal participation in the support of equal educational opportunity among the States.

Before going further, I wish to say that in presenting certain facts and points of view herein, I do not feel the slightest personal animus toward you or anyone else, regardless of the extent to which I obviously share with educators and the people in general a deep anxiety concerning the functions and control of education.

While, of course, many of your policies and administrative procedures affect the other constituent or operating organizations of the Federal Security Agency—United States Public Health Service, Social Security and Welfare Administration, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Food and Drug Administration—I shall not presume to speak for them, although I know there exists great uneasiness and a markedly low morale among the personnel of all branches of the Agency. Nor do I wish here to write at length relative to the adverse effects of your program on education. I shall therefore confine my statements to some basic principles and a few illustrations.

A fundamental fault in your policies lies, it seems to me, in your failure to recognize that imaginative, competent, and productive work in any institution or agency is done by imaginative, competent, and zestful individuals who are happy in their work and who are eager to assume and carry responsibility, not by elaborate, regimental schemes of organization. Your program of administration therefore violates the great principle which has energized American life—the encouragement of personal responsibility; it violates the principle of decentralization and distribution of initiative and responsibility which results in great strength and productivity in the Nation because there is great strength and productivity among its millions of individual citizens.

Your program develops frustration and a feeling of futility among the employed personnel because individuals and units of individuals in the Agency cannot control the means to the ends for which they are responsible.

The most successful private and public enterprises are those in which to the maximum practicable extent the spheres of authority and of responsibility of individuals and of units of individuals are kept identical. Your program leaves responsibility with people "down the line" in the organization so to speak, but strips away from them the control of the essential means by which their responsibility must be executed. You vest authority in your immediate staff members, but they are not and will not be held responsible by the people for any shortcomings or failures of the operating organizations of the Agency. As frustration and futility develop, responsibility for the exercise of intiative, for the use of judgment, for securing results, also tends to move "up the line." Here we see at work what might be called "bureaucratic statism" within a government originally dedicated to the principle of individual responsibility and respect for personality. Thorough regimentation always has been and always will be destructive of individual responsibility, a quality vital to the continued progress of our country.

Let me illustrate. For many years, always I assume since the United States Office of Education was established 81 years ago, and I know during 7 (1934–41) of the 14 years while I was Commissioner of Education, the articles, bulletins, addresses on educational matters were written freely by the professional people in the Office of Education in their respective special fields and were published. Sensing their individual responsibility, these professional people sought advice from competent persons from time to time, even though they were writing in their own fields of competence. So far as I know there was never any difficulty or embarrassment experienced by the Office of Education as a result of this policy.

After Pearl Harbor and during the war, there was a willingness that the OWI should check and approve all public statements. We were at war and citizens generally accepted necessary wartime controls. We in the Office of Education naturally assumed that with the war ended, such controls of professional writing would be relinquished. They were not only continued, but they have been made more sweeping, complete, and time consuming within the Federal Security Agency. Now, any statement written by anyone in the Office of Education to be presented to any group or audience outside the Office must be submitted to someone on your immediate staff for approval. These approvals, of course, involve statements ranging all the way from articles on such technical questions as planning science classrooms to the more general problems of education.

A specific example may be cited. Last April one of the staff members of the Office of Education, a well-trained man, with excellent experience in secondary education, was invited to speak to the high-school principals of the State of Massachusetts. He was to speak on the subject Teaching Zeal for American Democracy. Under an appropriation by Congress for 1948 made to the Office of Education, specific reference was made by the Congress to the need for such a program and especially for an educational program that would make clear to our young people the nature and tactics of communism and other forms of totalitarianism.

This man in the Office of Education himself decided to read his address. He prepared it. Consequently, under your regulations the address had to be submitted to your staff for approval. A few paragraphs of the address stressed the importance of developing means of teaching high-school pupils what communism really is, how inimical it is to the free world. Your staff member in a written comment said, in part, "Much of this is very good. However, the Office of Education should, I am convinced, leave to the State Department and to the FBI the task of exposing the tactics and dangers of Russian and native Communists and travelers."

Now, in the light of the main purpose of Congress in making the afore-mentioned appropriation, an action obviously based on a clear recognition of the great need for an educational program that would adequately inform young people concerning the serious conflict between totalitarianism and freedom, is it not amazing that a leading educator in the United States Office of Education, operating under a thoroughly bipartisan mandate of Congress, should be told by one who had been put in a position to tell the Office of Education what it could and could not do, that the educational task of exposing the tactics and the dangers of Russian and native Communists and travelers should be left to the State Department and the FBI?

All of us in education fully appreciate the parts that the State Department and the FBI should play in exposing Communists. These agencies know what their parts are and they know their function is not to work with schools and colleges on the development of educational programs dealing with this problem. To accept the dictum that the educational "task of exposing communism" should be left to these agencies would be tantamount to not having this vitally important educational task done at all, at least so far as the Federal Government is concerned.

The result was that the man from the Office of Education abandoned the plan to present a written address. He had no time to try to revise it and to receive approval. He, therefore, held an "off the record" meeting with the Massachusetts high-school principals. In the meeting he said, ad libitum, all he had on his mind and heart about how education can help in the solution of a problem the magnitude of which is daily becoming more apparent to everyone. Thus the representative of the Office of Education was able to express his opinion to the principals of Massachusetts, and that's what the principals wanted. They had not requested the opinion of some one on your immediate staff not known to them.

Another illustration. I made an address at the University of California at Los Angeles last March, entitled "Education and the Fate of Democracy." Senator KNOWLAND, of California, as you know is chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Federal Security Agency and the Office of Education. The Senator, being very much interested in the whole subject, had the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the address among other things about communism, I said the following: "Whether or not the Communist Party in this country should be outlawed, I do not presume to say. But of this I am convinced: That no avowed or proven Communist is fit to be entrusted with the job of inculcating the American way of life in any school; and I make that statement on the rather obvious ground that education for American democracy cannot be entrusted to the enemies of American democracy."

Since the Office of Education has had only a relatively small appropriation for printing, every reasonable economy has been exercised in carrying out the major purpose of the Office as provided in its basic act; namely, "to diffuse information about education."

The California address was printed on one sheet of paper. I requested enough copies so that one copy could be sent to each college, one to each public and private high school, and one to each superintendent of schools. The Office of Education requisition for these copies, to be paid for by the Office (about $250), was held up by one of your staff for several days and was only approved after he and I had engaged in a vigorous discussion of the matter in which, for the most part, he was trying to convince me that such language as I used in the address should be toned down and that if the address were released (this in spite of the fact that it had already been printed in the public record), he felt sure it would bring unfavorable reaction from a large number of educators. It was released and distributed in May. I have heard no objection from anyone.

Last December, copy was ready for a special issue of the monthly periodical School Life. The issue was to be devoted entirely to contrasting totalitarianism and freedom and in pointing up various educational implications of the conflict. I was away when the manuscript, in accordance with your regulations, was submitted to your staff for approval. It was reported to me later that there was very definite resistance by another one of your staff to the entire publication. It was finally published and has been a Government "best seller" ever since.

These are only two illustrations of the way in which your policies leave the professional people in the Office of Education responsible for achieving fruitful results in helping to improve American education while transferring to your immediate staff the authority to control the means and procedures by which these professional people carry their responsibility. This divorcement of responsibility and authority with respect to the work of the Office of Education necessarily results in the same divorcement in the divisions and sections of the Office and with all of its individuals. The result is a strange feeling of uncertainty and fear among employees. The whole scheme is well designed to devitalize and demoralize the staff.

Apparently you do not feel that your present, large, immediate staff can control, to the extent you desire, the detailed activities within the Office of Education and the other constituent organizations of the agency having to do with publications, editorial work, and information services. Accordingly under date of May 26, last, you had an order issued under which you propose to centralize in your office all personnel now engaged in such services in the various constituent organizations, including the Office of Education. Under the order you propose to transfer 17 people from the supervision of the Office of Education to the administrative supervision of the Office of the Administrator, in spite of the fact that the appropriation that supports these people was made to the Office of Education.

I pointed out in my memorandum under date of June 12, 1948, the inappropriateness of the proposal and ways in which it would, if executed, work to the disadvantage of the services which the Office of Education is expected to render. My purpose here is merely to reinforce the arguments I made in that memorandum. In it I tried to make clear the intimate relationships which exist between the services of these people and the work of all other persons in the office. Verbally I had reported to you and other members of your staff that it has been the plan of the Office of Education to decentralize as much as possible among the several divisions of the Office of Education these types of services rather than to build up a large central staff even within the Office of Education. Eighty-one years of experience in the Office of Education proved the validity of the plans as formulated. Therefore it is not surprising that there should be among the personnel of the Office of Education such an unfavorable reaction to your proposal.

There can be no honest claim to economy in the transfer of administrative control which you propose. The 17 persons in the Office of Education have been working as hard and as efficiently as people could work. Besides, they have been working intelligently and enthusiastically because they were closely associated with the other people in the office to whose work their services are directly related. Merely to aggregate them with others in a centralized organization operating at a greater distance from those with whom they are expected to work and to put them under the supervision of someone on your staff who is not primarily interested in education will certainly reduce both their efficiency and enthusiasm, so far as education is concerned.

In another order issued by your office under date of June 12, entitled "Agency Office of Publications and Reports," the following statements are made:

In accordance with the Administrator's memorandum of May 26, relative to information service the following should be understood by all concerned:

1. There will be a central information office under the direction of the Director of Publications and Reports.

2. Job classification sheets which have been applicable up to this time will be used until such time as it is possible to develop new sheets consistent with the organization to be established in the office of the Administrator.

3. As indicated in the original memorandum all persons will remain on the pay rolls of the constituents for the fiscal year 1949.

4. The 1950 budget will be prepared in such a way as to show in the Administrator's budget an Office of Publications and Reports consisting of the Office of Publications and Reports, Office of the Administrator plus transfers made by the Congress from the Social Security Administration Informational Service. Other information jobs will be budgeted so that they will appear on the pay rolls of the constituents.

Apart from the gross weaknesses in the proposed arrangement which I have tried to point out in this letter and elsewhere, does it not seem even to you illogical that the constituent units of the Federal Security Agency should be expected to prepare and justify appropriation estimates to include persons to be carried on the pay rolls of the respective constituents to work in the fields under discussion, but to work "under the direction of the Director of Publications and Reports" on your staff? If it is logical and proper that these persons should be centralized into one unit for the Agency in general to be supervised administratively by your Director, would it not also seem logical and proper that they should be supported on a pay roll secured under an appropriation made in terms of the policy of administration which you propose to follow?

In other words, why do you propose to have them carried on the pay rolls supported by appropriations made by Congress to respective constituent units of the Agency, and then put them under the administrative supervision of someone on the Administrator's office staff? If they should be thus supervised (of course I do not believe they should) why are they not to be justified in the 1950 budget estimates as a part of the Administrator's office?

Under the arrangement you propose I do not see how Members of Congress can act intelligently as they consider appropriations which must of necessity be related to lines of organizational administration. Your plan seems to me to make nonsense of the serious efforts of Congressmen to consider requested appropriations in terms of the location of the direct responsibility for the administration of the functions to be supported by the appropriations.

No doubt you think of the Federal Security Agency as just one large monolithic welfare organization. Consequently, you think of education as merely one phase of welfare. When the problem is understood, very few people will agree with your conception. But if you really believe that the relationships between social security and education, health and education, and social security and health are exceedingly intimate and that education as a function in this country should be quite exclusively related to and integrated with health and welfare functions—I certainly do not—then you should ask the Congress for a single appropriation for a Federal office of welfare. But since the function of education is not a welfare function, since it necessarily represents a wide range of human interests and operates through well defined agencies and institutions, it should be supported by an appropriation made to the United States Office of Education in terms of justifications presented to Congress and break-downs therein determined.

These are some of the evidences of how your policy and program seem to obliterate the identity and the unity of action of the respective constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency; namely, the United States Public Health Service, Social Security Administration, United States Office of Education, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration. There are others. Your order requiring the elimination of the words "United States" before the term "Public Health Service" and "Office of Education" in every case where it could be appropriately done; your suggestion that you did not see the sense in having an annual report for each of the constituent units, but only one for the Federal Security Agency as a whole; your policy to have yourself quoted in public releases even on technical matters of statistics and other reports of a factual character based on research of highly professional technicians in-

stead of having these technicians and their immediate supervisors quoted exclusively, all point to a trend toward centralization which is, as I have stated above, destructive of morale, of initiative, and of the kind of productive work on the part of a large number of employees to which the taxpaying public is entitled.

Finally the capstone of the argument against the centralization of control which you are developing, at least so far as education is concerned, is to be found in the fact that you are admittedly a partisan politician. You work hard for your party. Personally I have the most wholesome respect for our party system of government in the United States. I have never met finer men and women than those elected by both major parties to membership in the National Congress. But there is a deep-rooted tradition in this country, born of the harrowing experiences of the centuries, that the function of education in a democracy should be completely removed from partisanship. Political party control of public education is destructive of democracy and has proved to be so down through the years, and especially in recent decades in Italy, Germany, Russia, and Japan.

Being a partisan, you secure to the extent possible, as your immediate associates, persons who share your partisanship. Under the direction of yourself and of these associates you move constantly to centralize all policies, all approvals, in short, all control of the activities of the constituent organizations, including education. These controls contemplate the approval of personnel, of budgets, of substantive programs, and practically all details connected therewith. I am certain that such management of education on the Federal level is not what the great rank and file of the people of this country desire. On the contrary, they want the United States Office of Education to provide an adequate staff of competent professional educators who are in their positions to carry out the nonpartisan purposes for which the Office was established; they want a continuation of the devoted and completely nonpolitical professional service to American education that characterizes the work of the superior men and women who now comprise the staff of the Office of Education.

The American people may justly be proud of the personnel of the United States Office of Education. Every person in the Office has been selected through civil service in open competition and solely on the basis of his personal and professional qualifications. In my 14 years of intimate association with the employees in the Office, I never saw the slightest indication on the part of any one of them of any political party preference. Their lives are not actuated by partisanship; their backgrounds, their professional pride, their sense of obligation to true education in a democracy guide them in an unswerving devotion to the high calling of teaching. These are the kinds of people who in the Federal Government and in the States can really help education through schools and colleges to make its unique contribution to the preservation of our American free way of life. They are giving their lives passionately to that great objective. It isn't strange then that they, together with their colleagues throughout the country and citizens in general, regardless of political affiliation, should resent any attempts to color education with partisanship and cause its policies and processes to yield advantages to a political party.

This letter has become much longer than I intended. That is because there is so much to say on the subject.

I am sending copies of this letter to Dr. Willard Givens and Dr. E. B. Norton, who are, respectively, the executive secretaries of the National Education Association and the National Council of Chief State School Officers, organizations which, among many others, always have been active in efforts to secure a more adequate United States Office of Education and to insure such policies and methods of administration of educational activities in the Federal Government as would encourage sound programs of education in the States. I am also sending copies to the two chairmen of the Subcommittees on Appropriations for the Office of Education, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND and Representative FRANK B. KEEFE.

Respectfully yours.

CONGRESS CAN PREVENT FURTHER DANGEROUS INFLATION—OR DISASTROUS DEFLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members, I was in hope this extra session of Congress would not be called.

But we are here now, and faced with one of the gravest responsibilities that has ever rested upon the American Congress.

This dilly-dallying around, trying to stir up trouble for the white people of the Southern States, instead of passing the legislation that is necessary to save this country from disaster, is like Nero's fiddling while Rome burned.

We are faced with the most dangerous economic situation that ever confronted this country, and that is disastrous inflation or the greater calamity of a precipitate deflation, such as we had in 1921 and in 1929.

There is one way, and one way only, in which both of these disasters can be prevented. Prices in a free economy are governed by two things: The volume of the nation's currency and the velocity of its circulation. Today we have the greatest volume of currency and the most rapid velocity of circulation this country has ever known.

The Constitution vests in the Congress the power to "coin money and regulate the value thereof."

The Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses can prevent unlimited inflation, or disastrous deflation, by bringing out and passing a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act by placing a floor beneath which the currency cannot be deflated and a ceiling above which it cannot be inflated, and also providing that if these reserve banks undertake to do what they did in 1921 and in 1929, deflate the currency below the danger point, then the Government can issue United States notes, just as Abraham Lincoln did during the War Between the States—except that we would put a gold reserve behind it—and guarantee to the American people that there will not be a spiraling of runaway inflation, or another disastrous depression.

This is the most serious and pressing problem with which the country is confronted.

Congress should act now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from further consideration of S. 866.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentlewoman for that purpose. The majority leader has already stated that there will be no suspensions today; and, under the practice of the House, suspensions must be cleared through the majority leader. The gentlewoman is not recognized for that purpose.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Under paragraph 1 of rule XXVII it is in order, is it not, for the Speaker to entertain a motion to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER. Yes, it is within the discretion of the Speaker, and the Speaker states that he will not recognize any Member for that purpose without clearing it through the majority leader, and using that discretion merely refuses to recognize the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Today is the first Monday in August, and under the aforementioned rule individual Members may move to suspend the rules and pass important legislation. Do I understand clearly then that the Chair is exercising his discretion in denying the House to vote on the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, even under the procedure requiring a two-thirds vote of the Members present?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the rule has existed for more than 50 years, and in accordance with the procedure which has been followed by not only the present Speaker but every other Speaker, the Chair does not recognize the gentlewoman from California for that purpose.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of S. 866.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentlewoman for that purpose.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION AT MIDYEAR 1948—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1948.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith a midyear economic report to the Congress. This is supplementary to the economic

report of the President of January 14, 1948, and is transmitted in accordance with section 3 (b) of the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, The Economic Situation at Midyear 1948, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

NEW CONSTRUCTION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I was home over the week end, to find myself confronted with a real problem. My wife had been trying to get a plumber all week. So I tried, and I tried four different plumbers, and I could not get a plumber. She tried to get an electrician, and I tried two electricians but could not get one. She wanted a carpenter, and I could not get a carpenter. I am afraid if I had called a painter or plasterer I would have had the same experience.

Will someone tell me how I can get an electrician, a plumber, or a carpenter? I need one. They are all so busy on new construction around Cleveland that they are not available for ordinary service calls.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I can tell the gentleman exactly how he can get one. Just have another Republican depression, when all the people are out of work, and we will get plenty of them.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure that the gentleman from Texas knows more about depressions than any of us Republicans. His party found a hole in the ground and by the time they finished they made it deeper than the Grand Canyon. It was deep enough to handle all the pigs and potatoes they plowed under for a dozen years.

The reason why I could not get a plumber or an electrician was just this—they were all working on private construction jobs—putting up buildings too expensive for the folks who need them most. There are 5,298 new homes going up in my community—most of them are between ten and fifteen thousand dollars. Veterans just getting started in life cannot afford these houses. The result is that we are putting up new places that folks cannot live in and you cannot get people to repair the ones that folks must live in.

INFLATION CONTROL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7062) to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that purpose.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state a pertinent parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under paragraph 1 of rule 27——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already answered that inquiry, as submitted by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the civil-rights program. Ever since I came to Congress I have been one of the most active opponents of the things included in the President's so-called civil-rights program.

While there are other points in the civil-rights program, the most controversial are: First, the enactment by Congress of an antilynching law; second, Federal legislation to abolish the poll tax; third, Federal legislation to eliminate segregation; fourth, passage of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act.

These proposals, first, violate the Consitution; second, are an encroachment on States' rights; third, are wrong in principle; and, fourth, will not work in practice.

The program was inspired by agitators who want to make the South a political whipping boy. Not all who favor the civil-rights program are Communists, but it is certainly true that all who are Communists do favor it. They have now set up Henry Wallace as their straw man spokesman. They use him to help create prejudice and confusion for their own ends.

The program seeks to establish racial and social equality where none was decreed by the laws of God. Enactment of such proposals into law would add chaos to the already existing confusion in the national picture at a time when all of our energies should be devoted to a solution of problems of the greatest magnitude, both at home and abroad. All of those proposals have a political inspiration, which seeks the votes of the minority groups in the big cities of the North and East in order to perpetuate their sponsors in office. They are an invasion of the principles of States' rights as conceived by that great Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, and followed through the years by those of us who cling to Jeffersonian principles.

There is no need for such legislation because the history of the progress of racial relationships in the South, where such problems are said to be acute, reveals that much has been done to solve them. The Negro has no better friend than the southern white man. We give him work to earn his livelihood. We feed and clothe him when he cannot provide for himself. We supply him with medical care and drugs when he is ill. We provide educational facilities for his children, contribute to the construction of his churches, advise with him when he is troubled. His progress has been remarkable in the last 80 years. All of that is contrasted with the treatment the Negro receives in the North where none save his own kind cares what becomes of him.

So much controversy has arisen over the Truman civil-rights program that it might shed some light on the subject to review its history briefly. The civil-rights doctrine originated in the minds of a few misguided zealots, whose clamorings to get political recognition from certain minority groups resulted in the establishment of a Fair Employment Practices Commission by Executive order in 1941. More will be said about that later.

The first major step in the formation of the civil-rights program occurred when President Truman appointed a Committee on Civil Rights in December 1946. After more than a year that committee submitted a 178-page document which serves as a basis for the program.

In his state-of-the-Union message delivered to Congress January 7, 1948, the President discussed, among other things, the question of so-called civil rights, and stated he would send a special message to the Congress on that subject.

On February 2, 1948, the President sent the special message.

The civil-rights program became a major point of controversy at the Democratic National Convention in July 1948, and split the Democratic Party into segments. Its submission as a subject to be considered by the Congress at this special session has resulted in a situation that has delayed consideration of important legislation in the other body.

Let me discuss each of the four mentioned proposals briefly:

First. Antilynching.

The record of lynchings in the United States during the past 50 years shows in 1900 there were 115; in 1910, 76; in 1920, 61; in 1930, 21; in 1940, 5; 1944, 2; 1945, 1; 1946, 6; 1947, again only 1 lynching. The figures show that lynching has practically disappeared in America without a Federal antilynching law. Therefore, there is no need for such a Federal statute.

On the other hand, the vociferous advocates of an antilynching law make no suggestion that there be a Federal statute enacted against murder, rape, robbery, theft, burglary, and so forth.

In New York City, where a large part of the agitation for a Federal antilynching law comes from, in 1946 there were 325 murders, 14,525 other felonies, and a total of 697,734 crimes reported to the police. That is the record of one city in 1 year. Yet among the 140,000,000 people in the entire United States there were only 6 lynchings.

Lynching is another form of murder and is prohibited by statute in every State in the United States. Why do not the advocates of an antilynching law seek Federal legislation to punish the commission of other forms of murder and other felonies? Obviously, in view of the record of New York City and other metropolitan centers in the United States, the crimes are so commonplace there is no vote-getting glamour in seeking Federal statutes for the punishment

of crimes generally. Equally obviously, the demand is raised all out of proportion to the justification, based on the record that lynching has almost entirely disappeared in this country.

Do not those victims of murder, robbery, rape, and so forth, have some civil rights? Certainly. Again, they have no spokesman for their rights seeking the enactment of Federal laws for punishment of the offenders, because there is no political benefit accruing from such a program.

Second. Abolition of the poll tax.

Only 7 States in the 48 levy a poll tax as a means of registration to establish eligibility for voting. In many of them, including Texas, most of the revenue derived is devoted to the maintenance and operation of the public schools. If the people of Texas want to abolish the poll tax and substitute some other requisite to vote, that is their business; but I am opposed to the Federal Government telling Texas how and what to do about it.

A law enacted by Congress to abolish the poll tax is unconstitutional, in my opinion. The Constitution provides in article 1, section 2:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Numerous cases have been decided sustaining my viewpoint. In Breedlove against Suttles, decided by the United States Supreme Court in 1937, Mr. Justice Butler, speaking for the Court, said:

> Payment as a prerequisite is not required for the purpose of denying or abridging the privilege of voting. It does not limit the tax to electors; aliens are not there permitted to vote, but the tax is laid upon them, if within the defined class. It is not laid upon persons 60 or more years old, whether electors or not. Exaction of payment before registration undoubtedly serves to aid collection from electors desiring to vote, but that use of the State's power is not prevented by the Federal Constitution.

Other cases have followed the principle announced in that case.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly, I yield to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. I want to pay my respects to the gentleman from Texas for the fight he has made on the floor of this House for constitutional government. I also want to congratulate the gentleman on the fine attendance record he has had in the last session of the Congress. I understand he is one of the few Members of this body who has a perfect attendance record.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman.

Enactment by Congress of a law to abolish the poll tax would be an invasion of the rights of the States to establish their own electoral systems.

The poll-tax issue is another one of those that is raised for pure vote-getting purposes by those in the North and East who are agitating for a Federal law on the subject. The issue is politically inspired to get the votes of a minority group in the big city areas in doubtful States. That is where the cry to abolish the poll tax comes from.

I could go on at length discussing this subject but to do so would unduly burden you. Let me direct your attention to the fact that I led the debate on the floor of the House in opposition to the proposal on July 21, 1947, when that subject was up for consideration. The speech I made on that occasion in opposition to the legislation contains a full analysis of my views on the subject and the law in support of my position.

Third. Federal legislation to eliminate segregation.

Segregation is not discrimination. It is a means of affording people of all races an opportunity to be and associate with their own kind. It avoids friction. It promotes harmonious relationships. It prevents discord. It eliminates opportunities for disagreement and strife.

What does elimination of segregation by law mean to the average citizen? It means that the American would be prohibited from choosing his associates in the church, in the school, in fraternal organization, in every walk of social life. It means that you and I must accept as associates in our daily lives persons of race and color other than our own regardless of our personal feelings in the matter. In order to eliminate segregation and to prevent discrimination it would result in the establishment of a Federal bureau with gestapo powers. The employees of such an agency would have a right to tell the free American citizen with whom he could associate regardless of the citizen's personal desires in the matter. Carried to its ultimate conclusion, the agents of such a bureau could require the churches to accept membership from those it did not want. It could compel us to send our children to school with companions other than their own seeking. It could require us to occupy the same travel accommodations, the same hotels, and eat at the same restaurants in company of persons we did not voluntarily choose.

All of those things could be done in the name of civil rights. To do them would be to disregard the rights of a majority of the people.

Fourth. The FEPC.

The establishment of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission by law to prohibit discrimination in private employment would be a terrible imposition on the American people. It would simply mean this: that no employer could employ or discharge persons from employment without being supervised by agents of that bureau. It would mean that the employee would be required to work side by side with individuals he would not associate with except by compulsion. Assume 75 percent of the population in a given town were white and 25 percent black. Under such a law every employer would have to accept one-fourth of his employees from among the colored race regardless of the nature and type of employment. If a merchant had four clerks, one of them would have to be a Negro. If a contractor wanted to hire four carpenters, one of them would have to be a Negro. If a board of school trustees wanted to employ four teachers, one of them would have to be a Negro.

Illustrations of this nature could be noted in countless numbers.

We have a history in the establishment of an FEPC. In 1941, by Executive order, the President of the United States established an FEPC. That organization was broadened and enlarged in scope and number of employees during the ensuing years. In 1944 it employed more Negroes than whites; had Negroes supervising white employees within the agency; paid the Negroes an aggregate salary larger than it paid the white employees; required employees of the agency to use the same rest-room facilities regardless of their race; ordered the railroads of the Nation to employ Negroes indiscriminately as engineers, firemen, and conductors regardless of qualifications. The activities of that Commission resulted in strikes, riots, and other friction between whites and Negroes of this country.

That agency existed when I took the oath of office as Congressman in 1945. One of the first things I did as a new Congressman was to call together a group of other new Members to discuss ways and means to eliminate the FEPC. As a result, we set upon a course to do everything possible to prevent further enlargement of that bureau and to eliminate it as soon as possible. Those of us who opposed the continuation of the FEPC were continually devising ways and means to destroy it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman knows something of my very high appreciation of him as a public servant and of the fine service he has rendered here as a Member of this House. May I say to the gentleman, however, that I particularly appreciate the work he has done toward stopping the FEPC, which, if it should ever become law, will paralyze the industry of this country, because the act itself is a drive against the institution of private property. I do not believe there is any Member of the House who has contributed more to the resistance of that measure than the gentleman who now addresses this body.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

The chance to kill the FEPC came during my first term in Congress. H. R. 5890, a bill to make appropriations for certain agencies of the Government, was called up on the floor of the House for consideration. The bill provided for money to continue the FEPC to the end of the fiscal year. I made the point of order that struck that sum of money from the bill and forced the agency out of existence. It has not been revived since.

My record of opposition to the proposals in the civil rights program is well known to all Members of this House and to all others who have been regular readers of the newspapers. I have helped arrange and attended many meetings in protest of specific proposals in the civil rights program. On the numerous occasions when Members of the House, such as Messrs. MARCANTONIO, ISACSON, and

POWELL, offered amendments to various bills seeking to write into those bills language in keeping with the civil rights program, I have always been on the floor and active in my opposition to their amendments. I have been instrumental in notifying other Members what was taking place and getting them to vote against those amendments. As a result of our concerted activities no such proposal has been enacted into law in the last 4 years.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. As chairman of a group of 78 southern Congressmen who have organized to fight the so-called civil rights program, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas for having helped set up our organization and for the effective service he has rendered.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

I was one of the 78 Members of the House who formed an organization to oppose actively the President's civil-rights program after he delivered his message to the Congress on February 2 of this year. I feel that our opposition in the past has been effective in preventing enactment into law of any of the legislation sought to be adopted. I expect to continue my opposition to such a program as long as I am in Congress and afterward so long as I am able to oppose it.

Let me call your attention to the slogan of those who foment this civil-rights hysteria, "equality." One of the great purposes of the Constitution was to secure the blessings of liberty so that men could be free to be different and realize their differing ambitions with their differing abilities; not to achieve an impossible equality among unequal human beings. Every proposal seeking to give a man a right to do something which as a freeman he cannot secure for himself, results in imposing burdens and restraints on the freedoms of others. We must watch and defeat every effort to create by law the right in one man to compel others to associate with him or accept obligations to him in the realm of private enterprise and private life. We must realize that freedom of association in work and in leisure is one of our most precious liberties.

Let us recall the words of the late Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Brandeis, whom no one could rightfully accuse of intolerance or prejudice. He wrote:

> The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings, and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure, and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.

To sum it up, in the name of civil rights the proponents of this program would violate the very fundamentals of the Bill of Rights and force on the individual an association with persons and conditions of living not of his own choosing. In short, it would deprive the individual of his right to live under his own vine and fig tree in his own way. These things he would have to surrender to bureaucratic control and dictation from Washington, where some Government agent could tell him whom he should employ, what he could do and with whom he must associate. Thus, in the name of civil rights they would destroy the very liberties upon which this Government was founded and under which it has grown to be the mightiest nation in the history of the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to join my distinguished colleagues in congratulating the gentleman on the splendid speech he has made and I also want to join them in saying that I know of no Member of the House who has been more diligent and more sincere in his fight for the preservation of American and southern institutions than he has been. I want to repeat what the gentleman said in the first part of his speech to the effect that the Negroes have made great progress in the South and at this time call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the progress the Negroes have made in the South has been due to the aid and understanding of the white man of the South, that it is due in no way to these paid political agitators of the North and East who are trying to destroy constitutional democratic American Government.

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I reiterate with all of the emphasis at my command, I have opposed the civil-rights program. I am now opposed to the program. I will continue my opposition to that program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles by Samuel B. Pettengill.

Mr. ARNOLD (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CURE FOR HIGH PRICES UP TO PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the great peril confronting this country is inflation; high prices follow in its wake. Inflation can be more devastating than war. This is no time for a dog fight between the President and Congress. The people are demanding that we get together. Our common enemy is inflation and economic chaos will result if we take no steps to arrest it. We faced an enemy in 1941 as a united people and achieved a great military victory. We did not consider the problem as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans. We cannot win the economic battle as partisans; it must and will be won as Americans without reference to politics.

The moment has arrived for our leaders to sit down together and make an effort to solve the problem jointly. Why jockey for political position when the economic welfare of all the people of this great Nation is at stake? And let us not be too much concerned about who is to get credit. There will be plenty of it for both political parties and you can bet that the people will know who is responsible.

There has been considerable talk in and out of Congress about high prices; many charges and countercharges have been made as to the responsibility for the present situation; there has been a lot of name calling. However, two facts stand out: One, That prices continue to rise as dollars multiply in a market where production cannot keep up with demand; and, two, that there are some areas of agreement and the people are asking the President and Congress to get together.

On the part of the Congress its responsibility is to consider the President's request in a spirit of fair play and within its jurisdiction. It is the duty of the President to represent all of the people in an effort to solve the problem on the basis of economics and not politics. There is something more important than securing political office and that is the protection and security of our people under a free economy. The whole world looks to us for assistance. If inflation destroys our economy, socialism and communism will take over.

The root cause of the continuing price rise is the inflation of money. Our money supply was greatly expanded during the war and even since the war it has continued to increase out of all proportion to production. Figures indicate that up to the first of this year the supply of money is three times that of 1939 or up 200 percent, while the supply of goods to be purchased with that money is up only 71 percent. So the immediate job before us is to cut down the accelerating supply of money. How can this be done?

Drastically reduce Government spending. The President can, on his own order, stop the flow of free and easy money that Government has been pumping into our economic system—before the war, during the war, and since the war. Last January he submitted the biggest peacetime budget in the history of this country and he was highly critical of a Republican Congress that tried to cut it.

Mr. President, here is a challenge, Congress is not interested in your recommendations that call for the spending of more billions of dollars. It is greatly concerned about the continued rise in prices and in the shortage of housing. But you, Mr. President, can immediately stabilize the price situation by:

First. Reduce the foreign aid spending program temporarily.

Second. Slow down the armaments program.

Third. Halt Government employment and reduce the pay rolls by 500,000.

Fourth. Delay enforcement of the draft law until 1949.

Fifth. Stop all Government spending except for absolute essentials.

Here are just a few of the things that you can do, Mr. President, to stop the spiral of inflation if you are sincere in your statements about reducing high prices. Free and easy money policies of the administration have brought on the present extraordinary occasion.

The President knows that while he spends billions for armaments, billions for foreign aid, increases Federal employment, and authorizes the shipment of needed commodities abroad, prices will continue to rise. We must achieve a balance between money and goods. Under existing policies it is difficult to see how this can be done. In good conscience the President cannot take credit for high wages and big profits and at the same time charge that this condition has created an "extraordinary occasion" that requires the Congress to convene in special session.

Congress, too, has some responsibility and it should act to curb credits and require that banks increase reserves. In fact it should apply brakes wherever it deems it necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week end the newspapers carried st:eamer headlines, "Treasury and Commerce Department still harboring Red spies" and "Representative REES to name U. S. workers 'who ought to be fired'" and "Two high officials accused as aides of Red spies," with their alarming revelations.

But before the Eightieth Congress adjourns, I want the Members to know that there is one department in which the known or reasonably suspected subversives, Communists, fellow travelers, sympathizers, and persons whose services are not for the best interests of the United States, have been swept out. That is the Department of State. For this job the people of the United States can thank to a great extent, in the order in which the work was done: First, Congressman BARTEL J. JONKMAN, of the Fifth District of Michigan, who on July 10, 1946, was appointed a committee of one—from the Committee on Foreign Affairs—to investigate communism in the State Department; second, the people themselves, who on November 5, 1946, elected a Republican Congress, and third, Mr. John E. Peurifoy who, after that election, was appointed to the office of Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, which includes hiring and firing of personnel, on January 23, 1947. Since the date Mr. Peurifoy took charge of that office 134 such persons were either separated from the Department or separated themselves from the Department, so that, Mr. Peurifoy tells me, the Department of State is now free from persons of whom it is known or there is reasonable cause to believe that they are security risks.

Before Mr. Peurifoy took office the previous administration had discharged only one such person and that was also after the aforesaid election, when the old administration apparently became panicky because of the oncoming Republican Congress. They had known practically all the facts on this person and his dismissal had been recommended 8 months before.

A short review of the history of this cleaning-out process, I think should be made for the record.

On July 10, 1946, when I was appointed a committee of one, I made inquiry outside of the State Department as to persons within it whose alleged affiliations or sympathies with Communists might make them a security risk. Within 24 hours I had a list of 35. I then called the State Department and made an appointment for the next day at my office.

The then Deputy Assistant Secretary Panuch told me at that meeting that 79 employees had been discharged, 26 as aliens, 13 for not having 15 years of citizenship, and 40 for being security risks or pinks and reds, as he called them. At the end of this meeting, however, on incisive questioning he admitted that some of the 40 might have been fired for mere incompetence, but he was unable to give the number of each. I requested a letter giving me a break-down which he promised. In 2 days I received his letter with a lot of unrelated, useless information, but not a word on the 40 persons discharged.

I immediately called him on the telephone, told him of the evasion and said, "I'll be in your office at 10 tomorrow morning and I want to see those files of the persons discharged." He answered they were secret, private files, and I would not be permitted to see them. I retorted, "I'll be there at 10 and will discuss that then." I was at his office at 10 and a half dozen files were lying ready for me, including one on Carl A. Marzani. All of these names I had on my list of 35. These files had been prepared by a security committee of six persons chosen for that purpose from within the Department. This committee had recommended in March—4 months before—that five be discharged and one cleared. I asked, "Why have not the five been fired?" and as to the one that was cleared I am not quarreling with the result, but you proceed on the policy that the danger of a security risk must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt. You give the employee the benefit of the doubt. That is a dangerous policy for the safety of 145,000,000 people.

In other words, your policy should be that if there is reasonable cause to believe that an employee is a security risk he should be separated at once unless the Secretary of State himself, in writing, overrides the verdict and orders his retention. That would be giving the Government the benefit of the doubt and a sound policy. But again why haven't these five been fired 4 months ago? His answer was that they were entitled to an examination by the civil-service board before they could be discharged. I answered, you have never submitted their names to the Civil Service Commission, but under the McCarran law recently passed that is unnecessary and the Secretary of State, regardless of the civil-service laws, can discharge any person in the Department whenever he deemed that such person's services are not for the best interests of the United States. He countered that this law was unconstitutional. I think I convinced him that the law was constitutional, but did convince him that it was not for him as an administrative officer to raise that question, especially when the security of 145,000,000 people might be at stake.

But, I said in the same breath, "I'll just have to report that you are ignoring the law because of its unconstitutionalty, and now I want to see the files of the 40 or those of them that you did discharge as security risks." Then the Deputy Secretary broke down completely and admitted that there was not even one that had been fired for security-risk reasons and he said, in the same breath, "but I will go along with you on the policy of giving the Government the benefit of the doubt if you will keep the list of names secret; I'll fire Carl Marzani and Mr. X tomorrow and the others in due course if you will keep the names secret so we can fire them under the provisions of the McCarran law." I at first hesitated, but finally agreed. I did examine more files and found that about 40 had been recommended for dismissal, including nearly all of the 35 on my list, but, of course, no one had actually been dismissed.

Did Deputy Administrator Panuch fire Marzani on the morrow? No; he did not.

I inquired on the third day and while I could not reach Mr. Panuch, nor his chief, Mr. Russell, I was informed nothing had been done. It later developed on the trial of Marzani, hereafter referred to, that, instead, he told Marzani that as long as he, Panuch, and Russell were in charge he, Marzani, was O. K. Be that as it may, I immediately realized that I had only a deputy assistant secretary's promises and that he might just have been playing horse with me to get out of a tight spot. So, on July 18 I addressed a letter to Secretary James F. Byrnes, stating the deplorable condition in the Department with reference to these security risks, the dire need of a policy along the lines I had indicated and requested an immediate answer as to what he was going to do about it.

His response was a long distance telephone call from, I think it was Ocean City. He said my letter had been read to him over the telephone and was an education to him and he had been in Paris and did not know of the alleged subversives in his department, or the McCarran law, but if I would hold off until Monday—this was Friday—he would be back in Washington and make this matter his first order of business. I said, "I certainly hope you will, and I'll play along, but, Mr. Secretary, the situation is terrible and I sure hope you will act on Monday without fail." He then made this revealing reply, "Well, you must know, Congressman, that it is a difficult matter to do wholesale firing of

people merely because they belong to what is here a minority party when that same party is the sole and dominant party of a great country with which I have serious and difficult diplomatic negotiations." My reply to that is immaterial. Official Washington was astounded when I publicized this statement. Suffice it to say that on Monday, Tuesday, and so forth, nothing was done.

On the 29th day of July I received a bland letter from Assistant Secretary Russell that certainly I would not want them to use gestapo methods. This was just 4 days before Congress was to adjourn. I realized that they realized that the New Deal was in control of the Congress, of the Supreme Court, as well as the executive branch. The New Dealers in the State Department were riding high and apparently laughing at a lone Republican Congressman, acting as a committee of one, worrying about the security of the country. When I reported to the Committee on Foreign Affairs a high-ranking member said, "Congressman JONKMAN has done more effective work in 3 weeks without a dollar of expense money than some large committees with substantial appropriations have accomplished in 3 years."

But, my friends, while I had succeeded in exposing a deplorable condition, I had failed to eliminate a single person, even Carl Marzani, from the Department. After this report, realizing that vital statements such as of Secretary Byrnes, above, and a few others, should have more proof than my word against his, I, on August 2, wrote a letter to the Department saying that such statements had been made and were probably the cause of nonaction, to see if they would deny them. But the answer came back baldly, without denial of such statements, that upon sufficient proof they would take action, but certainly I would not want them to use gestapo methods. This was on August 9, after Congress had adjourned, and about the same time I read in the newspapers that the Department had fired the Americans on guard, the Security Committee, instead of firing a single Red.

Now comes the second act in the drama. On November 5 the people of the United States elected a Republican Congress. Immediately there was consternation and hysteria among the New Dealers in the Department. Marzani was called in by Panuch and asked to resign. But Marzani would not resign. He was told, "We've got this d—n congressional pressure on us," and "it's just this congressional pressure," and "with a Republican Congress there's going to be trouble." But Marzani would not resign. So on December 20, just before the Republican Eightieth Congress convened, he was not only fired under the McCarran Act, but indicted for having falsely sworn that he was not a Communist, and later was duly convicted. All the facts of his conviction were there or deducible from the report I had read in July and which, as I said before, was 4 months old. If the people had not elected a Republican Congress, the State Department would probably still be giving me the horse laugh. When action to serve the people and our security was needed in March and July there was no response, but in December there was plenty of action for their own security. In fact, they overdid it, but in just one spot.

It is significant that when Secretary Byrnes was replaced by General Marshall as Secretary of State the following January, Russell and Panuch resigned with Byrnes.

Immediately upon the appointment of Secretary Marshall, or to be exact, 2 days later upon the appointment of John E. Peurifoy as Acting Assistant Secretary—he was later made Assistant Secretary—I went to see General Marshall with Congressman MUNDT, of South Dakota, and asked him what the policy would be and started to give Secretary Marshall the history. Mr. Peurifoy was there. Soon Marshall said, "I'm familiar with these facts, Mr. JONKMAN, and I am going to give Mr. Peurifoy instructions in your presence that I am in favor of the policy you have advocated. I am giving him instructions in your presence that if there is reasonable cause to believe that anybody in the State Department is a security risk I want the Government to have the benefit of the doubt and have such person discharged and he does not have to come back to me for further instructions. It is his responsibility from now on."

So John Peurifoy took on the third act in the drama on January 23 and he has done a grand job. I know that he has the respect and confidence on both sides of the aisle. There may have been an occasional difference with his judgment. After all his is a most difficult task. He cannot proceed on suspicion, rumor, hearsay, or innuendo. On the other hand he must act on reasonable cause for belief. On this minds may differ. I have found him to use sound discretion and judgment. Most of the persons I had on that original list have been eliminated. A few have been retained. But, as I said in the beginning, in all he has patiently but persistently cleaned 134 security risks out of the Department. In addition to that many new applicants constituting security risks have been kept from getting into the Department. Mr. Peurifoy informed me last week that the Department is now free from known or reasonably suspected risks. I wish we had a John Peurifoy in every branch and agency of the Government with delegated powers such as Secretary Marshall gave him. Then we would see a far more thorough house cleaning than will come from the President's $25,000,000 loyalty program.

I want to say that I go home from the Eightieth Congress with far more confidence in the personnel of the State Department than I did from the Seventy-ninth Congress 2 years ago. About the only bad taste I have is a libel suit for a half a million dollars started by Mr. Panuch against the Times-Herald and myself. That does not worry me except that it costs money to hire defense lawyers. But even that is a trifle to the pleasure of writing finis to the job assigned to me as a committee of one over 2 years ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CONGRESS CAN DO SOMETHING ABOUT INFLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in the lack of action taken by the Congress in relation to the needs of the American people. There has been too much hysteria, personal recriminations, and politics and not enough effort to try and do something tangible about the high cost of living.

With steel, paper, meat, cement, cigarettes, and many other prices going up we do nothing but talk and blame one another for the present precarious situation. Talk and inaction have never yet solved a problem. The time for positive action is now and the people are looking to us as their duly-elected Representatives to help them in their distress.

I do not know the complete answer to the problem of inflation but there are two steps which I think this special session should consider. One is to restore regulation W to curb consumer credit and to cut down the tremendous and dangerous overexpansion in this field.

As everyone here will recall regulation W was abolished by an act of Congress and signed by the President under Public Law 386 on August 8, 1947. Since then, the Senate of the United States has passed in renewed form regulation W and it is now—and has been for some time—in the House Banking and Currency Committee. I think it imperative that this measure be considered and I call upon the Banking and Currency Committee to report it out to us at the earliest moment.

The other step is to hold hearings on the O'Mahoney-Mansfield measure which has been introduced in the Senate and House and is known as H. R. 7076 in this body. Under this bill, a cooling-off period of 30 days would become mandatory for the large corporations before they could raise prices. In this period, the corporations would have to appear publicly before the Federal Trade Commission and prove that the contemplated price raises are necessary. As everyone knows, the steel industry recently raised its price on steel over $9 a ton. This, in turn, will be reflected in increased prices for cars, refrigerators, building materials, and many other items and the net result will be to further boost the spiral of inflation.

These are extraordinary times. With the United States Government spending billions on an armaments program, more billions for foreign aid, thus draining goods out of this country, there is little opportunity for the operation of a free law of supply and demand. Such a situation calls for governmental assistance at this time so that scarce materials can be allocated and so that continual and unnecessary price raises by big corporations can be stopped.

It does not make any difference now who, if anybody, is responsible for higher prices for the farmer, higher wages for some of the workers, or higher profits for the large corporations. Calling each other names and blaming the other political party does no one any good but only helps to make a bad situation worse. It is time for this Congress to forget party labels and to bend its collective ability to the task of tackling an onerous job and to stay in session until we come up with a workable solution to the high-cost-of-living problem.

By our actions to date and the talk of an adjournment by August 7 this Congress is making a sorry spectacle of itself. The people will not be fooled by the play acting we are going through nor will they be happy over the carefully arranged, predetermined anti-poll-tax show being put on by the actors in the other body.

The people of the United States know what is going on and this Congress in trying to fool them is only fooling itself. The people know what they are paying for meat, milk, cars, cigarettes, canned goods, refrigerators, and all the other things they must have to live. They hear the Congress talk, talk, and talk and they feel their pockets, look at their shrinking bank accounts, notice how their bonds are being cashed in, and ponder over their bills as they become due. Then there are the people whose incomes are below a livable minimum and the people living on fixed incomes, annuities, and pensions. What are they saying, what are they contemplating doing, what are they thinking?

The people know all the facts about the high cost of living because they cannot escape them. All our double talk about stabilizing the debt and the dollar, trade balances and export controls, and raising the bank reserves and rediscount rates means nothing to the people who are trying desperately to make both ends meet. What does mean something to them is meat at $1 a pound, cigarettes at 20 cents, $5,000 houses at $11,000 or more, and all the other items they must or should have. These people, our constituents, are watching to see what we will do in their behalf. They are watching this Congress as they never have watched another one. They know—if some Members of this body do not—that their responsibility for what we do or do not do begins on our adjournment and their decision will be made on November 2, 1948. A do-nothing Congress will then get what it deserves and a do-something Congress will get what it merits.

Both the Congress and the President are partially to blame for the present inflation—but only partially. The real cause of our present difficulty lies in the cost of financing a world war. We increased our debt during the war from approximately $40,000,000,000 to approximately $300,000,000,000. This was necessary to buy the material to support our armies, navies, and air force all over the world. The colossal sums needed could not be raised by taxation. Had that been possible, there would be no inflation today. If the bonds could have been sold directly to the people inflation probably could have been avoided but that, too, was impossible. Most of the money was raised by selling bonds to our banks and the result was a flood of printing-press money. We paid huge sums to keep our war economy going but we manufactured a bare minimum of civilian consumer goods. With the great money supply and a lack of civilian goods to spend it on the result was a mild inflation which only controls kept in line.

When controls were abandoned—and both the President and the Congress were to blame—inflation really set in and has been traveling upward at a dizzy pace since. The same thing happened, to a lesser degree, after World War I and was eventually followed by deflation. The pattern, after both World Wars, is essentially the same, but the effects this time are far greater and potentially more destructive.

The fate of our own country, as well as the world, may lie in the balance. Economic stability here will be of tremendous value to the rest of the globe in its efforts to achieve a sound economic base which will give strength to governments and security to their peoples. If inflation really develops into a "bust" here—as Marriner Eccles has stated it would—we will, in an era of full employment, have laid the ground work for conditions far worse than they were in the 1930's.

Mr. Speaker, the facts pertaining to our economy today are startling. According to the July 1948 issue of "Economic Indicators" published by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report it is stated that:

First. In 1939, corporate profits after taxes, were $5,000,000,000, in the first quarter of this year at an annual rate of $19,700,000,000, an increase of $14,700,000,000 or 294 percent. In 1939 compensation of employees was $47,800,000,000, and in the second quarter of this year at an annual rate of $134,500,000,000 or 181.4 percent increase.

Second. Corporate dividend payments were in 1939, $3,800,000,000 and the first quarter of this year, at a rate of $7,500,000,000, or nearly twice as much, but in 1939, undistributed profits were only $1,200,000,000, and in the first quarter this year, at the rate of $12,200,000,000 or more than 10 times as large as in 1939.

Third. In 1939 employees' compensation was 66 percent of national income; in 1947, 63 percent, and in the second quarter of this year at the annual rate of only 61.7 percent.

Fourth. Consumer credit outstanding was in May this year 6.3 percent of national income compared with 5.7 percent in 1946. Consumer credit outstanding, increased $3,600,000,000 from December 1946 to $13,800,000,000 in May 1948, and is rapidly mounting.

Fifth. Proprietors' and rental income jumped from $14,700,000,000 in 1939 to an annual rate of $53,600,000,000 in the second quarter of this year, an increase of $38,900,000,000 or almost 265 percent.

Sixth. Taking consumers' prices from 1935–39 as 100, in May this year, prices of all items compiled by the Department of Labor for moderate income families in large cities, were 170.5; for food 210.9; for clothing 197.5 and rents were 116.7.

Seventh. In 1946 average family money income before taxes was: Lowest income fifth, $835, second fifth, $2,023, third fifth, $3,050, fourth fifth, $4,201, highest fifth, $8,921.

Eighth. Average weekly earnings in May of this year were $51.98 in manufacturing, while in April they were $38.40 in retail trade; $49.33 in bituminous coal mining, and $67.58 in private building construction.

The Federal Reserve Board reports that about 3,000,000 spending units who had savings January 1, 1947, had none by New Year's this year, and a quarter of consumers spent more than their income last year.

In addition to the facts and figures already given I should like to call attention to a survey made by United Industrial Associates, Inc., of Washington, D. C. This survey was undertaken by a private firm of consulting engineers and was published in the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press under date of July 26, 1948. With building costs increasing, with veterans in Montana and elsewhere finding it extremely difficult to get GI loans—which the Government guarantees up to $4,000—from the banks, this survey presents a startling picture. There are too many veterans and too many low-income families affected by the housing shortage and it is necessary, in my opinion, that the Congress consider this question quickly and objectively. We all know what the effects of living in overcrowded, unhealthy, and limited quarters will be. We all know what tensions can arise from living with relatives. We all know that if housing conditions and shortages are not corrected that crime, juvenile delinquency, disease, and broken families will result. The future of America lies in our homes and there is no reason why Government and business, working together, cannot arrive at a sensible solution to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, the survey referred to follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of July 26, 1948]

HOME PRICES AT NEW HIGH: $4,599 HOUSE IN 1939 NOW $11,094

WASHINGTON.—The price of homes in the United States reached a new high in June, a survey by a private firm of consulting engineers showed Sunday night.

United Industrial Associates, Inc., of Washington, revealed the results of what it said was the latest in a series of surveys it has made on housing prices.

These figures show that the price tag on the average house and lot in June was $11,094, compared with $9,749 a year ago and $4,599 in 1939.

The firm emphasized that its figures were the prices of homes, not construction costs.

"New houses represent only a fraction of the total houses sold in the market, and builders sell their new houses at the market price rather than the cost of construction," the firm said.

In June, the firm said, housing prices were highest in Los Angeles, Calif., Chicago, New York, and Boston, where the average is now $13,000.

"Kansas City, Mo., is the only remaining city where an average house can be bought for less than $7,000," the firm said. The firm gave these figures on its survey:

City	June 1939	June 1947	June 1948	Percent increase since June 1947
Boston	$5,558	$12,300	$13,612	10.7
Chicago	5,232	11,350	13,114	15.5
Cincinnati	5,037	9,527	10,120	6.2
Detroit	4,445	7,549	8,393	11.2
Indianapolis	3,110	6,236	7,684	23.2
Kansas City, Mo.	2,511	5,648	6,505	15.2
Milwaukee	4,373	8,763	10,157	15.9
St. Paul-Minneapolis	3,526	7,918	9,036	14.1
New York City	6,000	11,479	13,391	16.7
St. Louis	2,942	5,780	7,752	34.1
San Francisco	4,210	9,579	10,928	9.5
Washington	5,835	11,357	12,352	8.8
National average	4,599	9,749	11,094	14.5

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting at this point in my remarks an article entitled "About Terms for GI Home Loans" taken from the United States News and World Report of August 6, 1948:

ABOUT TERMS FOR GI HOME LOANS

Tightening of mortgage credit is making it harder for veterans to get loans for buying or building homes. Banks and other lending institutions are making fewer insured or guaranteed loans to veterans. In addition, larger down payments are being demanded. This is partly because of relatively low interest rates involved, and partly because of the difficulty of disposing of these mortgages through secondary mortgage markets.

A number of veterans, however, are still succeeding in financing homes. Some of these are financed under the GI bill of rights, others through mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration. The Veterans' Administration is approving GI home loans at a rate of nearly 30,000 a month. This compares with a rate a year ago of about 51,000 a month. In addition, many veterans are getting homes entirely through private financing channels, without any assistance from the Government. These private lenders include savings and loan associations, insurance companies, banks, and other institutions.

IS CONGRESS MAKING IT EASIER FOR VETERANS TO GET LOANS?

Not at this time. In fact, Congress has made it harder in some ways for veterans to get home loans, by dropping title 6 of the National Housing Act. Under that title, no longer in effect, Government insurance of mortgages could be obtained under more favorable terms and up to 90 percent of the cost of homes.

WHAT HAS CONGRESS DONE TO EASE HOME-LOAN CREDIT?

Congress recently passed legislation designed to provide more financing for veterans' homes by restoring in the Government a secondary mortgage market for VA- and FHA-supported mortgages. This authorizes the Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to buy some of these mortgages. But a number of restrictions are written around such purchases.

For one thing, a lending institution can sell to FNMA only 25 percent of its mortgages insured by VA or FHA since April 30, 1948. Thus, large amounts of old mortgages cannot be turned into cash to provide new loans. Big mortgages for apartments and rental developments cannot qualify for sale. And the mortgage holder must certify that each mortgage sold to FNMA covers houses that meet FHA building standards. Because of these and other restrictions, many lenders and veterans' groups say that this secondary market will be of little value in providing more credit for veterans' homes.

EVEN SO, CAN VETERANS GET HOME LOANS NOW?

Yes, if they can meet certain requirements. But veterans must show that they have wages or other income to enable them to meet monthly payments on loans.

WHERE DO VETERANS APPLY FOR LOANS?

A veteran wanting a home loan does not go directly to the Government. Instead, he goes to a bank, a savings and loan association, an insurance company, or some other lender. In some cases, the lender will agree to put up the money without Government backing. But, if not, two types of Government financing are available to qualified veterans who can get loans. One is a VA guaranty under the GI bill of rights, available only to veterans of World War II, and the other is FHA mortgage insurance, available to both veterans and nonveterans.

In many cases, lenders now are unwilling to make loans entirely under VA backing. Instead, they are demanding that part of veterans' mortgages be insured by FHA and the rest of it guaranteed by VA, with its lower interest rates.

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN INSURED AND GUARANTEED LOANS?

FHA operates a system under which it backs up a home loan through a mutual insurance system. That is, the borrower pays 4½ percent interest on the loan plus one-half of 1 percent as a mortgage-insurance premium. Any losses through defaults are paid off from this insurance fund, with no cost to the Government. But VA makes an outright guaranty of a certain share of a home loan that it backs. The borrower pays only 4 percent interest on this loan. Any loss resulting for the Government is paid out of the United States Treasury.

IS A DOWN PAYMENT ALWAYS REQUIRED?

The down payment is a matter that is worked out by the lender and the borrower. A year ago, it often was possible for a veteran to buy a home without any down payment. This usually involved the combined financing of VA and FHA. But, today, lenders almost invariably require veterans to make down payments.

UP TO HOW MUCH CAN BE BORROWED?

This varies in individual cases, and is decided by the lender. On a GI home loan, VA will guarantee up to 50 percent of the loan, with a limit of $4,000 to its guaranty. That is, it will back $3,500 of a $7,000 loan, but no more than $4,000 of a loan for more than $8,000.

FHA now will insure up to 80 percent of its valuation of a home, based upon long-term values instead of current costs. That means a limit of $8,000 on a house valued at $10,000 by FHA appraisers. Slightly larger insurance sometimes can be obtained on a new home approved by FHA before construction starts.

HOW LONG A TIME IS GIVEN TO REPAY?

In the majority of cases, VA and FHA loans must be repaid in full in 20 years, through fixed amounts of monthly payments. Some of these loans, however, can run for as long as 25 years.

HOW LARGE ARE MONTHLY PAYMENTS?

The payments, of course, vary according to the amount of the loan and the number of years that it runs. Take, for example, the case of a veteran buying a $12,000 home, with a $2,000 down payment. That would leave a mortgage of $10,000, to be paid off in, say, 20 years, on which the Veterans' Administration would place a guaranty of $4,000. The monthly payments of interest and repayment of principal would come to about $59 a month. This would not cover such things as insurance and taxes. If this same mortgage were insured in part or in full by FHA, the monthly carrying charge would be higher.

ON WHAT BASIS ARE APPRAISALS MADE?

For GI home loans guaranteed under the GI bill, appraisals must be made by persons approved by VA. These appraisers check to see that the costs of houses do not exceed what is considered their "reasonable value." Present high costs are taken into consideration in determining reasonable values.

FHA appraisers follow a different method when determining the amount of this agency's mortgage insurance. Until recently, FHA appraisals could take into consideration necessary current costs. But the authority to approve this type of loan, under title 6 of the National Housing Act, was not extended by Congress. So present appraisals must be based upon long-term values. This formula, however, has been eased somewhat to meet present conditions. FHA's appraisals put emphasis on economic soundness. And valuation is based on prices that typical buyers would be warranted in paying for homes for long-time use or long-term investments.

In concluding, I appeal to the Congress for action on these vitally important questions of today. We should not adjourn until we have faced up to our responsibilities.

The times are perilous and the days for decision are limited.

(Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain excerpts and extraneous matter.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WANTED: HOMES FOR THE HOMELESS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, not on Shangri-La or Mars but here in the United States and particularly for the 1,307 people of Chelsea, Mass., who are being kicked out of their lodgings to make way for a bridge.

Homes for the dispossessed, not in 1848, or 1958, but now.

Unless we put roofs over the heads of these men, women, and children, the Nation will be forced to the lamentable conclusion that the organized minority which puts property rights above human rights has seized power again.

A mass eviction of 1,307 people in a city of 42,000, people who are working not only to make a living for themselves but to provide assistance to the people of many other nations. Is it not incongruous that our people are asked to do so much with so little regard for their elementary needs?

I am amazed and angered that the desperate problem of housing in the United States is considered with such indifference by the majority party in Congress whose sworn duty it is to work for the common welfare. It is with serious misgivings that I view their claims that they should be entrusted with the responsibility of governing our people.

This is not an academic problem which faces us. It will not be solved by statistics. The real-estate lobby, powerful as it is, cannot make the sun and rain and cold and snow stand by while it has its way. It cannot avert, even if it were so minded, the social frictions, the deterioration of morale, the danger to

health and life itself, which are inherent in the stubborn refusal to recognize that we are dealing with human beings and their imperative needs.

Our great and powerful democracy stands challenged on many fronts, but no one of these threats is more serious than the question of its will to do right by its own people.

It is not a question of means, but of purpose. By concentrating on the tree instead of the forest, special interests are even unwittingly undermining the confidence of the people in their Government. I say that those responsible have much to answer for, unless they face up squarely and sincerely to the realities of life in the United States in this year of 1948.

The crisis in housing cannot be postponed.

It is here.

It must be met.

I cite you the predicament of Chelsea, Mass. It is of an emergency nature which no one in his right mind could deny. Maybe it is a special case, but it is symptomatic of the dark and festering sore which is breeding much danger for our society. Perhaps there are some who will refuse to look at the facts and by not seeing them pretend that they do not exist.

The plight of Chelsea brings these bleak facts into sharp and anguished focus.

I wish that you could see pictures of the women with children in their arms who stormed the city hall at Chelsea, waving 113 eviction notices, which give them only until September 1 to move. These are but the vanguard of the 1,307 people who will be dispossessed.

Most of these women were sobbing, some in grief, some in anger. Some were expectant mothers, some have invalids in their families, but all were women, their protective instincts aroused by that which they feared and could not understand. These lives, this true wealth of our Nation, forced to get out to make way for a bridge, with no substitute accommodations available for them.

If you saw this sight I am certain that most of you would forget pride and prejudice and preferment and move swiftly to meet the challenge. Fixed and rigid attitudes would melt and the Members of this House, by whatever compromise or adjustment might be necessary, would provide adequate housing for our displaced fellow Americans.

This House cannot adjourn and close the door to mercy.

In Chelsea it all began with a bridge, authorized by the Legislature of Massachusetts, to cross the Mystic River, connecting Chelsea with Charlestown, Mass. The bridge is necessary to relieve a traffic bottleneck. It is a high-level bridge. Many, many homes must be razed to clear the long approaches to the bridge.

Sounds simple in terms of engineering.

As a preliminary, the bridge authority issued pieces of paper called eviction notices, and the victims were left to shift for themselves.

Of course, there is a chance that an injunction may stave off these evictions. But an injunction is hardly calculated to provide homes.

This is where the Federal Government has the opportunity and the duty to step in and help before the winter comes.

White House, War Assets Administration, War Department, Navy Department, Federal Housing Administration, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and many other agencies—out of these many resources there must be some response to this urgent call for help for the evacuees of Chelsea, Mass., and through this Congress for the millions of Americans who are worried about the housing shortage, in the name of a Government which is representative of the people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Southern Agriculturalist entitled "Life on the Farm," written by one of his constituents.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in six separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MY RECORD IN CONGRESS

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, this is the last time that I shall have the opportunity to address this House, for I am a candidate for United States Senator from Louisiana, for the next regular term of office, in the Democratic primary to be held on August 31, 1948.

For the past 8 years I have represented the Third Louisiana District in Congress excepting the time I served in the United States Army as a private after having resigned my membership from Congress. My record will show, I believe, that I have been diligent, competent, energetic, and faithful in my duties. While naturally my work has been primarily concerned with matters pertaining to my congressional district, I have devoted much time and attention to subjects of interest and importance to the welfare of Louisiana as a whole. I am proud of our great State which offers such great promise of future development. To the residents of my district, and to those living in other congressional districts of Louisiana who may not know me nor my record, I wish to take this occasion to acquaint them with my work in Congress, which I hope may be the means of causing them to favor my candidacy for the United States Senate.

AGRICULTURE

The people of the Third Congressional District are to a large extent dependent upon agriculture for a livelihood. Our rich lands, fertilized by the accumulation of the soils of the Mississippi Valley, are most adaptable to the production of sugarcane, rice, cotton, sweetpotatoes, truck crops, and numerous other agricultural products. Realizing the importance of agriculture, I am constantly devoting attention to the best development of our farm resources, as well as the expansion and development of our livestock and dairy industries. I believe that my record in behalf of agriculture is well known and that I have the good will and confidence of the farmers of my district.

SUGAR

Those connected with the sugar industry, which means so much to the economic welfare of Louisiana, are familiar with my work in its behalf. They know of my leadership in the adoption of necessary legislation, particularly the recent Sugar Act passed by Congress. This act brought more stability and security to the sugar industry than at any time in its history and will be in effect until December 31, 1952. It allows Louisiana and Florida a production quota of 500,000 tons of sugar annually, providing the largest percentage quota increase of any of the domestic areas and permits Louisiana to grow practically all the sugarcane it is now capable of producing, at the same time continuing benefit payments. It was through my efforts that the fair wage and fair price determination provisions of the former sugar act were retained, in keeping with the wishes of the industry.

AID FOR SMALL FARMERS

I have been especially sympathetic to the cause of the small sugar farmers. Through my efforts it was possible to have all sugarcane growers share for the first time in payments on blackstrap molasses and as a result they are enjoying an additional revenue of around 60 cents per ton for sugarcane, which they never received before.

During the labor shortage World War II occasioned I was instrumental in obtaining the service of thousands of prisoners of war for farm work in Louisiana. Without this labor it would have been impossible to harvest our cane crop. During the war I gave much attention to the shortage of farm equipment confronting the farmer and was able to secure for them necessary machinery, trucks, tires, and other items they required for the cultivation and harvesting of the cane crop.

More recently I assisted in obtaining fertilizer for the 1948 cane crop. A serious shortage developed, but through contacts with the Department of Agriculture officials and manufacturers, we were able to relieve the situation.

The sugar industry throughout the years has been unsettled because of its position in international trade; it has frequently been used as a political football. Sugar legislation is the most complicated of all agricultural legislation in Washington. It is only through constant study and experience that one becomes competent in the handling of the various complex problems. I am glad of the knowledge that I have gained in this connection which enables me to be of the greatest possible service.

RICE

Louisiana produces over one-third of the rice that is grown in the United States. Vermilion Parish, in my district,

is the largest rice-producing parish in the country, and rice is also produced in every other parish in the Third Congressional District. The rice farmers and the industry in general have enjoyed prosperity during the last few years. Many of our citizens are engaged in the farming, milling, and marketing of rice. They are aware that I have been active and successful in looking after their interests.

The rice industry has been confronted with many problems during and since World War II, and I have given much attention to these matters. My efforts have been directed toward seeing that adequate markets are made available and fair prices maintained. I have fought the efforts of the Government to assist the production of rice in other countries in competition to our own industry. I opposed the unreasonable Government set-aside policy of allocating American rice to other nations on a basis which greatly limited our domestic supply. This was a blow to the movement to increase the per capita consumption of rice in this country. I have repeatedly pointed out that the per capita consumption must be raised and new uses found for rice if we are to avoid surplus rice production in normal periods.

Last year when the rough-rice market was paralyzed, due to harvesting difficulties and lack of adequate storage space, and the situation was steadily growing worse, I flew to Washington from Louisiana, as Congress was then in recess. After conferences with officials of the Department of Agriculture, a program was worked out by which the Government agreed to purchase a large quantity of rice for foreign relief. This action accelerated the market for rough rice, the mills began to buy, and the Louisiana rice growers were saved from a ruinous loss. Only recently, together with other Members of Congress from rice areas, I headed the movement to prevent the Government from arbitrarily reducing the price to be paid for export rice to foreign countries. If this had occurred it would have resulted in a break in the rice market, and our farmers, as well as millers, would have suffered a great loss this season.

COTTON

The cotton growers will have the benefit of support prices for 1948 of 92½ percent of parity price. Since the indications are of a large crop of cotton this year, this support price may prove valuable in preventing a break in the prices. I worked to help bring about this support price.

SWEETPOTATOES AND SIRUP SURPLUS

The sweetpotato industry in south Louisiana has made great strides. The sirup industry has been in existence since sugarcane was first produced in this country. The war brought about a dislocation in these two industries, placing them in danger of having to curtail operations or stop them altogether. I assisted, with other interested Congressmen, in helping to remove the surplus on sweetpotatoes. We are now assisting the sirup producers to sell the large surplus they have on hand to the Economic Cooperation Administration. I am confident we will be successful.

FARM LEGISLATION

I have advocated and worked for:

First. Support price for cotton.

Second. Parity income for farmers.

Third. Scientific research to discover new uses for farm products.

Fourth. Low interest rate on farm loans.

Fifth. Better farm-tenant program.

Sixth. More stability for family sized farms.

Seventh. Soil-conservation program.

Eighth. Long-range agriculture program.

Ninth. Inclusion of farm wages in determining price of agricultural commodities.

And all other legislation beneficial to the interest of the farmer.

COMMENDED BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Some time ago a constituent of mine wrote the Secretary of Agriculture about my activities in Congress on agricultural matters and I am very glad to produce the Secretary's letter in reply:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 1, 1948.

Mr. RAY BREAUX,
Lafayette Parish Farm Bureau,
Carencro, La.

MY DEAR MR. BREAUX: I received your inquiry in behalf of farmers of your section, relative to the activities of Congressman JAMES DOMENGEAUX in agricultural matters.

I have had occasion to observe Congressman DOMENGEAUX'S work on many occasions and I can say with the utmost sincerity that he is most energetic, progressive, and effective in representing the farming interests of the Nation and particularly those of the Third Congressional District of Louisiana.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX was very active and forceful in adoption of the present Sugar Act. He is especially helpful to the small farmers. Through his efforts these farmers were able for the first time to share in payments on blackstrap molasses and now enjoy an additional revenue of around 60 cents a ton on sugarcane.

We have felt that in rice matters Congressman DOMENGEAUX has constantly protected the best interests of the farmers, millers, and distributors. When the rice industry faced a crisis last year, due to a paralyzed market for rough rice in the face of an approaching new crop, Congressman DOMENGEAUX, then in Louisiana during the recess of Congress, flew to Washington and conferred with Department of Agriculture officials. Out of these conferences grew a program by which the Department was able to arrange for the purchase of rice for relief purposes abroad.

The sweetpotato people also have a real friend in Congressman DOMENGEAUX, who has likewise faithfully looked after the interests of the cotton industry, the truck farmers, and others engaged in agricultural endeavors.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX has frequently conferred with me and it has been a pleasure to cooperate with him.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

When I first came to Congress 8 years ago, REA was an infant. Notwithstanding the shortage of materials resulting from the war, this program has developed to the extent that thousands of farms in my congressional district and numerous thousands elsewhere are now serviced with electricity. I hope to see the day when every farm in Louisiana and throughout the Nation will be able to obtain electric service. Farm life must be made easier so as to encourage more people to stay on the farms. Just as soon as it is humanly possible to do so, those living on farms everywhere in the United States should be able to enjoy the same electrical conveniences as those in the towns and cities. I have always supported adequate appropriations to maintain and develop this service and will continue to do so.

SEA-FOOD INDUSTRY

Louisiana is widely famed for its delicious sea foods. Much of the commercial fishing centers in my congressional district, which borders on the Gulf of Mexico, and its numerous bays, lakes, and bayous. Thousands of our people make a livelihood from the production and marketing of shrimp, oysters, and other sea food. This brings to them and to our State many millions of dollars annually.

Throughout my service in Congress I have constantly devoted time to looking after the welfare and development of the steadily growing sea-food industry. I have done this because I realize the Gulf of Mexico offers to our people an inexhaustible means of wealth. No one knows how great the possibilities are. I am confident, however, that the income of our citizens can be increased many millions of dollars a year through scientific and intelligent approach to the various problems confronting the fishing industry. We must determine with accuracy just what these resources are and how best to utilize them. I have recently proposed legislation that I have every reason to believe can be passed at the next session of Congress, which will provide an appropriation of $500,000 for the purpose of providing the necessary research work in behalf of the fishing industry of the Gulf coast. Due to wartime activities and shortage of personnel it has been difficult to collect fishery statistics in that area.

The oyster industry can be greatly expanded. At the present time we do not use more than 10 percent of potential tidal bottoms which could be utilized for oyster production. The Louisiana oyster industry has expanded in the past few years, but mass mortality of oysters has seriously threatened the continued existence of that industry.

CRABS

Louisiana could produce more crab meat than any other State, yet it falls much below Maryland and Virginia in this respect. We could increase our crab production tremendously. No study of a biological nature has been made of the menhaden; still there was a greater poundage of menhaden produced in the United States in 1946 and 1947 than any other species of fish. Only a small percentage of this came from the Gulf, although it is well known that menhaden are abundant in these waters.

This may be a critical period in the shrimp fishery. The shrimp catch has

remained about the same, notwithstanding the fact there have been many new boats added for shrimp fishing. We have not learned sufficient about the biology of the shrimp, and it is estimated that an annual production valued at $100,000,000 is in prospect if properly developed.

Very little is known of the life history of such valuable sport and commercial fishes as speckled trout, redfish, croakers, sheephead, mullet, and tarpon. The passage of this bill that I have introduced, together with an appropriation, will make it possible to increase our sea-food production many millions of dollars. I pledge myself to work untiringly to secure the passage of this legislation.

MEXICO SHRIMP IMPORTATIONS

Louisiana shrimp interests are being menaced by the increasing importation of Mexican shrimp. Mexico enjoys an advantage because of cheap labor. To protect the many producers and packers in Louisiana and other Gulf States, I have introduced legislation providing that the total importation from Mexico of fresh, iced, canned, and processed shrimp into the United States in any one calendar year shall not exceed the largest total quantity of such importations during any calendar year between January 1, 1942, and December 31, 1945. Imports restricted to this period would be relatively small.

OYSTER REHABILITATION

The Louisiana oyster industry sustained heavy losses in the Mississippi River flood of 1945. I succeeded in having a bill enacted for an appropriation of $50,000 for a survey to be made by the Fish and Wildlife Service to determine the extent of this damage and method of rehabilitating the beds. After this survey is completed I will endeavor to secure additional funds so as to reimburse those oyster producers who suffered this loss.

I am particularly gratified by the passage of this legislation because it establishes a precedent that the Government must be responsible for damages that may be sustained through the use of flood-control projects, such as the Atchafalaya-Morganza-Bonne Carre spillway.

The sea-food industry in Louisiana has enjoyed much prosperity during the last few years. I am glad that I have been able to contribute in many ways to the welfare and development of this great industry, and I pledge my continued efforts in this direction.

WATERWAY AND FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control and improvement of our waterways are most important to the safety and success of our people. Louisiana, particularly the Third Congressional District, until recent years has suffered from disastrous inundation, and flood control is a subject close to all of us. The Mississippi River and its tributaries drain approximately one-third of the United States, and much of these waters eventually descend on Louisiana. Much progress in protecting our area against floods has been made, but much remains to be done.

ATCHAFALAYA BASIN—MORGANZA SPILLWAY

Of foremost importance to flood control in our area is the need for completing work on the Atchafalaya spillway. Congress recently appropriated some $6,000,000 toward completing the project.

PROJECTS AIDED

I have constantly devoted my efforts in behalf of flood control, improvement of waterways, and establishment of new facilities. In this connection I might refer to the Bayou Carlin-Delcambre Canal; Bayou Lafourche; Bayou Boeuf; Bayous Little Caillou, Grand Caillou, Dularge, and Terrebonne; Bayou L'Eau Bleu; Teche-Vermilion program which recently received an additional appropriation of $600,000; Schooner Bayou, and other necessary projects.

I opposed, together with the people of the Morgan City-Berwick area, the inadequate floodgate proposed by the United States engineers in Bayou Boeuf. I will continue my efforts to have an adequate lock constructed instead.

Our people are seriously dependent upon our networks of bayous and other streams not only for adequate drainage but in their everyday pursuits. It is my plan and purpose to eventually secure an authorization and appropriation for the dredging of our many streams that flow into the Gulf, so as to afford our people the opportunity for full utilization of these waterways.

For quite some time I have been working with the people of the parishes of Assumption and Terrebonne to assist them in securing fresh waters in Bayou Lafourche at Napoleonville. The United States engineers are now studying this proposal and as soon as it is recommended I will continue my efforts toward securing the necessary funds to complete this project.

WATER HYACINTH AND ALLIGATOR GRASS ERADICATION

The problem of the water hyacinths and alligator grass which congest so many streams in Louisiana and other States is a matter of much concern. These water plants interfere with our drainage, obstruct navigation, menace health, and are killing our fish and wildlife. They cause many millions of dollars of damage to the State. I have realized this problem and in February of 1945 I secured an appropriation of $78,000 to make it possible for the United States engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the United States Public Health Service, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife of the Interior Department to conduct a comprehensive study and survey of the problem in order to find means of eradicating this menace once and for all. This scientific study and survey are now being made. Experimentation in the use of chemicals is under way, and I hope that within a short time an economical and practical method may be found, through these agencies, to do the job of extermination. I have a bill pending to appropriate $25,000,000 over a period of years for this purpose. The reports from the departments will be in shortly, and in the next Congress it is my plan to secure at least $5,000,000 to start the program of killing the water lily and alligator grass in all of our streams.

VETERANS

I am particularly happy to be of assistance to veterans and their dependents. I feel that the veterans, who made great sacrifices, are entitled to every consideration that the Federal Government is able to give them. I have always given close attention to their needs and have been able to help thousands of ex-servicemen who have written to me about their problems.

I had the privilege of serving as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which afforded me the opportunity of taking part in the preparation and enactment of much veteran legislation, including the GI bill of rights.

VETERAN BONUS

I advocate a veteran bonus; the payment of which is a direct responsibility of the Federal Government. My plan would pay the veteran $3 for every day spent while in the service in this country, and $5 for every day spent while in foreign service. In other words the veteran who served 3 years in any branch of the armed forces, two of which were overseas would receive $4,745.

WHAT VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS SAY

The best evidence of my service and achievements in behalf of the veterans and their dependents is contained in the following letters from national representative of major veterans' organizations:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1948.

Mr. J. ELLIOTT CADE,
Past Vice Commander, the American Legion, Department of Louisiana, Abbeville, La.

DEAR MR. CADE: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 6, asking for the legislative record of Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, the Congressman from the Third Louisiana District.

As you know, he is a World War II veteran and a member of the American Legion.

In addition to the voting record, which I am attaching hereto, I might add that he has taken a very active interest in legislation affecting veterans, and in particular bills which we have requested him to introduce on our behalf. During the Eightieth Congress he introduced for us H. R. 1342, exempting from income tax individual income up to $5,000 earned in certain taxable years following discharge; and H. R. 3691, providing for the continuance of compensation of pension payments and subsistence allowance for certain children of deceased veterans of World War I and World War II during education and training.

When he was a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee he visited a number of veterans' hospitals in connection with the inspection program authorized by that committee and as a result of which there was a complete reorganization of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration.

I trust this is the information which you desire.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1948.

Mr. SIDNEY DAIGLE,
Past Commander DAV,
Lafayette, La.

DEAR MR. DAIGLE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 1, requesting information as to the legislative record of the Honorable JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Representative of the Third Louisiana District. In reply please be advised that so far as veterans' legislation is concerned, we of the DAV have found Congressman DOMENGEAUX most helpful and cooperative.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX has always taken special interest in the welfare of veterans and has sponsored much legislation in their behalf. This included the increase granted in the rates of compensation, pension, and retirement pay of veterans of both World Wars and their dependents. He is author of a bill to extend to children of men who died in World War II the educational benefits of the GI bill of rights. He has sought tax relief for veterans of World War II, and the enactment of a measure which he introduced in Congress has made it possible for veterans to have priority in purchasing surplus boats, 65 feet in length or under, from the Government.

Congressman DOMENGEAUX was formerly a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in which connection he was particularly active. He took a prominent part in adoption of the GI bill of rights and as a one-man subcommittee inspected various veterans' hospitals. His recommendations for improved conditions undoubtedly influenced to a considerable extent the reorganization of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration. His record as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was excellent from the viewpoint of veteran organizations. He is now a member of another committee, but has retained his great interest in veterans' legislation.

I hope this information will be of assistance to you in your chapter.

Yours very sincerely,
FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Director for National Legislation.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES
OFFICE OF DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 23, 1948.

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to advise that to the best of my knowledge and belief Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX, of Louisiana, has a most favorable record in the Congress of the United States with respect to legislation affecting veterans and dependents of veterans. This office, as legislative spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, has always found Mr. DOMENGEAUX sympathetic and cooperative to our legislative program.

No effort has been made by this office to appraise Mr. DOMENGEAUX's record on legislation other than that which affects veterans and their dependents because it is not within the province or jurisdiction of this office to judge a Member of Congress except on his record dealing with veteran affairs. Mr. DOMENGEAUX was at one time a member of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation which handled the bulk of veteran legislation in the House of Representatives and his record as a member of that committee was excellent from the viewpoint of veteran organizations.

Very truly yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM, *Director.*

AMVETS,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1948.

MY DEAR MR. DOMENGEAUX: In behalf of the American Veterans of World War II, better known as the AMVETS, I wish to take this means of expressing the appreciation of our organization for your efforts in Congress in behalf of the veterans and their dependents. We have observed your outstanding record in veterans' legislation matters and we are also familiar with the assistance you have given so many veterans with their individual problems. As you are yourself a veteran you are in an excellent position to best understand our views and our needs.

We are particularly grateful for your work in sponsoring legislation increasing the rates of compensation, pension, and retirement pay for veterans of both world wars and their dependents. You are also to be commended for the introduction of a bill to provide income tax relief for veterans of World War II.

You recognized a duty the Nation owes to the memory of the men who died in World War II, by introducing legislation to extend to their children the educational benefits of the GI bill of rights.

You made it possible, through another measure in Congress, for veterans of World War II to have priority in the purchase of surplus boats of 65 feet in length or under, and you took a very active part in the enactment of legislation enabling veterans to convert their terminal leave bonds into cash.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs you had a prominent part in the preparation and adoption of the GI bill of rights. Also as a member of the committee your energetic and thorough inspection of veterans' hospitals and your recommendations in this connection were followed by the reorganization of the medical service of the Veterans' Administration, a step which had long been necessary.

We are very glad to take this opportunity to express our thanks.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT E. MCLAUGHLIN,
National Legislative Director.

I took an active part in the enactment of legislation to provide housing facilities for veterans. I was also active in the movement to provide terminal leave payments and to convert these bonds into cash. Through my efforts several additional offices of the Veterans' Administration were established in Louisiana to better meet local requirements.

MUSKRAT INDUSTRY

Large numbers of our citizens depend upon the fur industry for their livelihood. Muskrat fur trapping is a very important one in the Third Louisiana District. I have looked after the interests of the trappers at all times, particularly in the matter of a just return for their labor and securing for them fair prices for their skins. During OPA days I made a determined fight for lifting the ceiling price on muskrat fur, as the ceiling that had been established was creating a black market and working hardships on those engaged in trapping.

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

I consider that it is necessary for the Federal Government to assist our schools. I recognize that our teachers throughout the Nation are underpaid for the great work and responsibility that they shoulder. The problem involved in providing proper educational facilities and adequate salaries for teachers has become too extensive for the States to bear alone. There is no good reason why the Federal Government should not help in this matter. It is a national problem like health or safety or highways. It is a matter of national interest and national responsibility. Of course, we must guard against Federal control of schools. Bills that Congress considered during this session provide this safeguard. I regret that Congress did not enact these bills into law. I pledge and promise myself to see that this legislation is reintroduced in the next Congress and will work untiringly for its successful enactment.

FREE SCHOOL LUNCHES

Without the aid of the Federal Government, Louisiana and other States, would not be able to give free school lunches to our school children. The Federal Government has contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars yearly to the State of Louisiana for this purpose and you may be assured that I will continue my efforts in seeing that these appropriations are continued so that school children of our State may be assured of appetizing and nutritious school lunches.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

It is the duty of the Federal Government to look after the welfare of our old people who need help. Surely they should not be forced to face privation and disaster after they have worked hard all of their lives. The Government can and should give them the assurance of security in their last years.

The Federal Government now contributes up to $25 per month payment for the old folks and the blind and up to $13.50 per month for dependent children. I am glad to state that only a few days ago Congress adopted legislation which will increase Federal payments to the old folks and the blind $5 a month and to dependent children $3 a month.

Our State has long struggled with the problem to furnish aid to the aged, the blind, and dependent children. Without Federal cooperation State aid would amount to comparatively little. If increases are to be granted, as have been planned in Louisiana, and elsewhere, it is necessary that the Federal Government offer additional benefits. The action of Congress makes this possible.

AUTHOR OF OLD-AGE PENSION BILL

When I first came to Congress in 1940 I introduced an old-age pension bill which would have provided at least $30 per month. This represented a substantial sum at that time, but because of the high cost of living today this amount is not adequate. For that reason I have introduced another bill known as H. R. 6638 which would provide direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month to citizens 60 years of age or over.

I am sure that you realize that in Louisiana today over half of the money that goes toward paying an old-age pension is paid by the Federal Government. I am glad to state that I have voted and advocated these payments and will continue my efforts toward assisting the old people of the State.

TIDELANDS

The protection of the rights of the States to submerged lands within their respective boundaries is of vast importance to Louisiana. The income from these lands, through oil leases and otherwise, go to the State and parishes and make many public improvements possible, as well as contributing greatly to the financial support of our schools. Re-

cently the United States Supreme Court held that these tidelands belonged to the United States instead of to the respective States. Louisiana stands to lose over one billion dollars by this decision.

LEADS FIGHT

Shortly after the United States Supreme Court decision I introduced legislation in the House of Representatives for the purpose of having the Congress declare these lands belong to the States. The House of Representatives recently passed a measure which included the provisions of the bill I introduced. Unfortunately the Senate failed to vote on this legislation. As this is so important to the State of Louisiana, and since we stand to lose over $1,000,000,000, which is ten hundred thousand million, I, in the new Congress next year, will do everything in my power to reenact this legislation with the hope that it will successfully pass the Congress.

TAX REDUCTION

Tax reduction is necessary for the health of the American economic system and as a precaution against depression periods.

I voted for the income-tax reduction bill in Congress this year because it was greatly needed for relief of the American taxpayer from an excessive tax burden. I will continue to vote for tax reduction at every opportunity, providing it does not impair our national security and stability.

American business should be granted every opportunity to exercise free enterprise and initiative, with the least possible Government interference. Small business should be especially protected. There has been entirely too much Government regulation of business, even in time of war. I have consistently opposed moves toward business regimentation by the Federal Government, and have opposed legislation that would endanger small business because of monopolistic policies.

I have frequently criticized bureaucratic government and warned against increasing Federal control. The Government is intended to be the servant of the people, not the people the servants of the Government. States' rights must be respected and the principle of local government recognized to the fullest extent. The Federal pay roll should be watched carefully and all possible reductions made, consistent with good public service.

THE SOUTH AND CIVIL RIGHTS

I have fought at every opportunity the so-called civil-rights program recently advocated by the President at the expense of the South. I will continue to do so, for this is a matter that strikes at those natural rights which we in the South enjoy as a heritage from our forefathers, who established the principles of States' rights and self-government.

Prominent in the civil-rights program is the proposal for Fair Employment Practices Committee. This would mean Federal control over private business; the right to say whom a businessman should employ, regardless of race or color. The FEPC would destroy initiative and free enterprise.

The civil-rights program is opposed to segregation of the white and Negro races. If this idea was put into effect it would be a body blow to the South and to her people who know best how to handle the Negro situation.

Those who argue for antilynching legislation and an anti-poll-tax law, the abolishment of segregation, or for the FEPC disregard the fact that the first three would be an illegal invasion of States' rights and the latter an encroachment upon the fundamental conception of free enterprise.

The whole South must join in this fight, for those things which the South hold sacred are in danger of being destroyed. You can depend upon me to make this fight to the bitter end.

MY SERVICES APPRECIATED

I am very much gratified over the numerous expressions of appreciation regarding the services I render. The following extracts are taken from some of the many letters, telegrams, and other communications addressed to me by my constituents and others from my district:

It is with pleasure I write to express my gratitude for your approval of the Federal aid to education bills. We of Terrebonne Parish hope that no complications will arise to prevent you from giving them your continued support.

MRS. ODESSA BABIN,
Schriever Route, Box 126.

Be it resolved, That the teachers of Terrebonne Parish commend Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX and express their appreciation to him for the interest that he has taken in the affairs of the teachers and children of the State and Nation. (From resolution adopted by Terrebonne Parish Teachers Association, Marguerite E. Watkins, chairman.)

GERMANY, *January 2, 1945.*

I really admired your action in resigning from Congress to join the Army as a private. I'm sorry you had to get out on a medical discharge, but I feel that a guy like you can do us more good in Washington than as a private anyway.

Lt. WILLIAM J. DODD
(Now Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana.)

Thank you and your office for the splendid cooperation in getting adequate housing here for veterans. With the completion of the apartments at the airport and the 118 which were recently constructed on the campus, I feel that the problem is well on the way toward being solved. We deeply appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

JOEL L. FLETCHER,
President of Southwestern Louisiana Institute.

My people join with me in expressing their appreciation and thanks for the fine cooperation given to the town of Thibodaux in getting planning money from the Federal Works Agency for our city projects. Accept personal thanks from me.

CHAS. E. DELAS, *Mayor.*

I received a copy of your remarks on increased pay for servicemen. I am proud to know that you are still fighting for us and for our people at home. I am one of the happiest soldiers in the service to know that I have not been forgotten by our Congressman.

Pvt. PAUL J. BREAUX.

It is with pleasure I write to thank and congratulate you for your good work and your support as a Member of Congress from Louisiana in increasing the pay for men in our armed forces. I felt proud to show all the boys in our company how you have done your part in passing the bill we have been waiting for so long. You will never be forgotten.

Pvt. CLAUDE JUDICE.

I wish to thank you for the help you gave me in obtaining for my son, Charles L. Broussard, his subsistence pay while attending the Acme Neon Institute in Chicago. Charles is very appreciative also of your kindness in this matter and sends his best regards.

Mrs. J. L. BROUSSARD,
New Iberia, La.

The Lafayette Parish World War II Veterans' Association extends its thanks and appreciation for the assistance and splendid cooperation which you have rendered in our campaign for veterans' housing and fair rent rates.

CHARLES PERILLOUX,
President.

Your efforts to secure an effective priority rating for the owners of power boats in the fishing industry is very much appreciated by the owners and operators of such boats.

C. E. KING,
THE MORGAN CITY REVIEW,
Morgan City, La.

The Jeanerette Chamber of Commerce wishes to express its thanks for your prompt efforts in helping us to maintain the dairy at the Iberia Live Stock Experiment Farm. It is our hope that the experimental farm will be allotted sufficient funds for continuation.

L. C. LAMPO, Jr.,
Secretary-Manager, Jeanerette Chamber of Commerce.

I want to thank you for your interest and good work in behalf of the United States postal employees' H. R. 5050. This increase in pay is much needed by all. We know we can always count on you for a helping hand.

JOSEPH E. BLANCHARD,
Postmaster, Raceland, La.

Thanks for everything, and if I can ever repay you in any way for the interest you are taking in me, all you have to do is tell me what I can do for you.

RUFUS W. FONTENOT,
New Orleans.

I wish to thank you for your telegram received today about my son, Wilson M. O'Niell, who is in England in a hospital. Your news was very welcome, and I assure you Anne and I both appreciate your efforts in the matter.

W. MCKERALL O'NIELL,
Franklin, La.

At our recent Louisiana parent-teacher convention in Lafayette, our organization reaffirmed its belief in the urgent need of Federal aid to education. We appreciate all your efforts in helping to secure this legislation.

Mrs. W. S. VINCENT,
President.

I really believe this editorial represents the opinion of a great majority of the people of this section. (Editorial referred to appeared in Lafayette Daily Advertiser of June 18, 1946,

commending Members of Louisiana delegation in the House of Representatives for voting to override the Presidential veto of tax-reduction bill. It stated in part: "Congressman JAMES DOMENGEAUX was lined up with the Louisiana delegation and the Democrats who crossed the party line in the effort to save some money for the overburdened taxpayer. The Third District is to be congratulated that its Congressman had the welfare of the people at heart and that he was not concerned in the expediency of politics.")

A. P. ELLIOTT,
Lafayette, La.

You have read my wishes in your demands on President Truman regarding rice and sugar. I am as yet wondering why the unadulterated discrimination against southern farmers. Glory to you.

Dr. A. A. COMEAUX,
Abbeville, La.

I wish to take this means to tell you that your vote on matters of importance have coincided with my views most of the time and have met with my hearty approval.

G. O. PHARR,
New Iberia, La.

I want to take this means of thanking you for all that you have done for me in settling a travel claim. Final payments have been received.

JOHN R. REAUX, *Veteran,*
Lafayette, La.

With reference to our phone conversation and the wires we exchanged, I wish to express my appreciation for the efforts you put forth and the manner in which you kept us posted on developments. Your bill on the oyster situation is causing much favorable comment from the oyster people around here, and it is another act for which you are being highly commended.

DONALD BOLLINGER,
Lockport, La.

I was very much interested and impressed by the speech you delivered in Congress and wish to tell you that this country needs your type of Representative in Congress who is not afraid to express his beliefs. Keep up the good work. We are with you.

GUST CATSULIS,
New Iberia, La.

Just to let you know I deeply appreciated your prompt attention and answer to my inquiry. Mrs. Duhon and I both thank you for your kind and courteous service.

J. O. DUHON, M. D.,
Lafayette, La.

At a recent meeting of our organization we discussed with elation the manner in which you supported the passage of our retirement bill. We unanimously resolved to take the pleasure and the privilege of thanking you for your interest in our legislation.

ABRAHAM KOKOCINSKI,
President,
CLARENCE O. LEBLANC,
Secretary,
Branch 1760, National Association of Letter Carriers.

The board of directors of the Lafayette Chamber of Commerce unanimously endorse your splendid effort to have flood-control appropriations restored by President. Activation and completion of these important works are economically justified and should provide beneficial returns to State and Nation. We commend your action and offer our continued help to further this cause.

LAFAYETTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
LEE G. LAFOSSE,
Secretary-Manager.

We want to thank you for the special effort and attention you have shown in behalf of the sirup manufacturers of Louisiana. We will be glad to furnish any information you may need.

C. S. STEEN SYRUP MILL, INC.,
J. WESLEY STEEN,
Abbeville.

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the work you have been doing in behalf of the Louisiana sirup manufacturers. The situation is very serious with quite a number of us, and unless we get some relief through the Government purchasing a large quantity of the 1947 crop it is going to be tough sledding. Please keep up the good work; I am sure you will do all that you can to help out.

HALL GRAIN & SYRUP CO.,
H. T. HALL,
Manager, New Iberia.

I want to let you know that the people around here are for you. They appreciate the things you have done for us in Congress.

LYDIA COMEAUX,
Milton, La.

I want to thank you on behalf of the Vermilion Parish Teachers' Association for your support.

NOAH LANGLINAIS,
President, Indian Bayou, La.

I want to commend you on the stand you took relative to increasing the pay of men in the armed forces. I have two sons in the country's service. Needless to say I am proud of them, but I too think the boys who have had to give up their home life deserve an increase in pay. So again I congratulate you on your noble stand.

Mrs. LLOYD B. MILLER,
Abbeville, La.

This is to express the sincere appreciation of the large segment of the rice industry which we represent, for your untiring efforts and the splendid contribution which you made in having the administrative agencies of the Government provide an export allocation for rice, principally for shipment to Cuba. This allocation, although long and unnecessarily delayed, will permit millers and exporters to dispose of the surplus from the 1947 crop, and enable producers to prepare for the 1948 crop with some assurance of being able to obtain a fair price.

THE RICE MILLER'S ASSOCIATION,
W. M. REID,
Executive Vice President.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the favor rendered my son, Edward, and myself. It is nice to have friends that you can depend on when you are in trouble and that is exactly what you have done for us. Edward was in the Marines and wounded three times, and is still a little nervous. Not receiving his pay did not help matters at all. Through your kind efforts the check has been received.

LARRY LOGAN, *Lafayette, La.*

I was fortunate enough to read a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which you put up a fight for the soldiers' increase in pay. May I congratulate you for the work and effort put forth on that bill. I hope every father and soldier in the Third District realize the good work you have done.

J. J. PRINCE,
Lafayette, La.

Thanks for your vote and support of farm bloc bill regarding new formula for parity price. Keep up the fight we know you can put up and will. We appreciate your work.

LAFAYETTE PARISH FARM BUREAU,
S. A. CALLAHAN,
President, Lafayette, La.

Your brilliant work played an important part in winning the game. Congratulations. We are solid behind you.

A. O. RAPPELET,
Houma, La.

I want to thank you for your efforts in the matter of automobile deal discounts before the House Small Business Committee. Your interest and efforts in this matter are very much appreciated and I hope you will continue them toward a just settlement.

JOS. A. DAIGRE,
President, New Iberial Austo Co., New Iberia.

I want to sincerely thank you for your wholehearted efforts which resulted in the announcement of decontrol of all types of shrimp. In behalf of the industry and your many friends here, and for myself, please accept sincere thanks.

JULIAN MCPHILLIPS,
Chairman, Shrimp Industry Advisory Committee.

Moved by Mr. Howard Olivier, seconded by Mr. Roy LaBauve, that the police jury of Iberia Parish extends its expression of gratitude to United States Representative JAMES DOMENGEAUX for his good work in trying to have Government controls removed from sugar and rice. Motion carried. (From minutes of meeting of police jury of Iberia Parish, November 14, and submitted by Marcui Deblanc, secretary and treasurer.)

It is with gratitude that I express my sincere appreciation for your continued and successful effort concerning the dredging of the mouth of Bayou Lafourche. I cannot overemphasize the value of this project and what it means to our industry and I take pleasure in assuring you that I and the community will be ever grateful.

E. MILTON EGLE,
Golden Meadow, La.

OFFICE POLICY

Since I have been in Congress I have followed certain policies which have enabled me to render careful and able service to my constituents:

First. Answer mail promptly.

Second. I never ask "For whom did you vote in the last election?" I ask, "What can I do to help you?"

Third. Always remember that each day is a day closer to the next election when an accounting must be made.

Fourth. There is no unimportant problem to the constituent who seeks the aid of his Congressman, and if it is important to my constituent it is important to me.

Fifth. There are no factions or political lines after the vote is counted. A good Congressman is everybody's Congressman.

Sixth. It does not matter who you are, what you are or where you came from. If you think enough of me to ask my help, I think enough of you to do all I can to help.

Seventh. I cannot do everything, but I do everything I can.

Eighth. A direct question justifies a direct answer. It must either be "Yes" or "No."

Ninth. You may not agree with me but you will always know where I stand.

Tenth. I am hired by the people of the Third District to represent them. It is a 24-hour job. I have no other business or interest, except that of being a good Congressman—and being a good Congressman takes undivided attention and time. I will carry on these same policies should I be elected to the Senate.

THANK YOU

Louisiana has been good to me—I was born a poor boy and worked my way through school. I have had some little measure of success. My people who are of French and Irish blood have lived in Lafayette Parish for over 200 years; they joined with the Anglo-Saxons of north Louisiana to fight for the South—a close blood relative, Gen. Alfred Mouton, gave his life to the cause at the battle of Mansfield.

I present this record as proof of my ability to fill a higher public office. I greatly appreciate the honor the people of the Third Louisiana Congressional District conferred upon me when they elected me to represent them in Congress, and the approval of my work as expressed by my overwhelming re-election for the past three terms to office. I hope that I have the opportunity of rendering still more service to the State and Nation as a Member of the United States Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EVINS, for 3 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. COOPER, for 3 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. PRIEST, for remainder of week, on account of important business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2482. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451, U. S. C., 718b), as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), under previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 4, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1705. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of pig iron for certain industries requiring cast iron for the manufacture of products for residential housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1706. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the tenth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1707. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the progress report for the second quarter of 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1708. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the sixteenth quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period April 1 through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1709. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report including the name of each claimant, a statement of the amount claimed and the amount awarded, and a brief description of the claims against the Central Intelligence Agency during the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1710. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certified copies of acts of the Sixth Special Session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, May 14 to 21, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1711. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 totaling $11,305,800 (H. Doc. No. 736); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1712. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Navy Department under the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 7088. A bill to extend the benefits of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 to certain employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia not covered by that act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7089. A bill for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a post office at Winchester, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 7090. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Iuka, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 7091. A bill to provide certain equitable adjustments in disability compensation and pension to meet the rise in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7092. A bill for the relief of Claire M. Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 7093. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stamatia Lymberopoulos and Leonidas Stavrou Limperopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7094. A bill for the relief of 29 Latvians who entered the United States on July 22, 1948, at Provincetown, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 7095. A bill to record the lawful admission of Ibrahim Wadie Harb to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 7096. A bill for the relief of George N. Weaver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7097. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2139. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Genevieve Hartig Toth and others, of Osceola, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to building a lasting peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal God, who art the light of all that is true, the strength of all that is good, and the inspiration of all that is beautiful, we thank Thee for the joys which cheer us and for the trials which teach us to put our trust in Thee.

Help us to discipline ourselves to obey Thy will more perfectly, for in the doing of Thy will is our peace. Make us victorious over those despondent and cynical tempers of mind which at times eclipse our faith.

May we accept the Master's overtures of counsel and companionship in order that we may carry on courageously. Grant that His principles of righteousness and justice may be the foundation on which we are seeking to build a more glorious nation and a better world.

In His name we bring our petitions. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 2, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AS TO NIGHT SESSION, ETC.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make one or two announcements for the benefit of Members of the Senate. In view of the fact that we are still on the motion to take up House bill 29, on which motion a cloture petition to limit debate was filed, and since several speeches are to be made, including at least one or this side of the aisle, to be delivered by the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], running to the constitutionality of the bill—and I know of two or three Senators on the other side of the aisle who would like to speak on that point—we will endeavor to keep the Senate in session, if it meets with the approval of the Members of the Senate, until 10 o'clock tonight. Announcement about night sessions after that will be made tomorrow. So I trust all Senators will take notice and will be on the floor listening to the constitutional arguments, which I think should

be made on the subject matter of the bill rather than on the motion to proceed to its consideration, but, because of the parliamentary situation, the speeches will have to be made on the motion.

I should also like to state to Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle that it is expected that a conference will be called tomorrow by our chairman, and for that reason, and the additional reason that a night session will be had tonight, if our plans are carried out, the Senate will convene tomorrow at 1 o'clock p. m., instead of 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. President, I should also like to make a statement relative to the cloture petition and the signatures attached thereto. At the time the petition was presented yesterday I thought that all Senators on either side of the aisle who wanted to join in it might go to the desk and have their names attached, but a strict interpretation of the rule foreclosed that. Therefore, I should like to say that several other Senators who would have liked to sign the petition did not have an opportunity to affix their signatures to it, one of whom is the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and others no doubt could be mentioned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the other Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] also desired and asked to sign the petition, but was foreclosed for the reason stated by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to be perfectly fair about it. It was my intention that all Senators who desired to do so might sign the petition, but, as I have said, under a strict interpretation of the rule, that could not be done. A number of Senators who would have liked to have signed the petition did not have an opportunity to affix their signanatures to it.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TUMON BAY AREA (GUAM)—RESOLUTION OF GUAM CONGRESS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted by the Guam Congress protesting against the acquisition of the Tumon Bay area, Guam, for military purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims for damage caused by naval vessels which have been settled by the Navy Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT ON SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE CAUSED TO UNITED STATES NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the settlement of claims for damage caused to United States naval vessels by the Navy Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents in the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Claude A. Blair, of Springfield, Mass., relating to old-age assistance, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROTEST AGAINST FURTHER ENCROACHMENT OF GOVERNMENT IN HOUSING BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Oregon State Medical Society protesting against any further encroachment of the Federal Government in the housing business.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the health and medical care of the indigent and semi-indigent have been and continue to be a major concern of the medical profession; and

Whereas the housing of the individual is one of the important factors in the preservation of health and the prevention of disease; and

Whereas the advocates of Federal paternalism are proposing, on the basis of sentimental appeal and play upon humanitarian emotions, a vast program of public housing ostensibly to meet the needs of the indigent and semi-indigent; and

Whereas this program is deceptive in that it does not provide housing for the chronically ill, the indigent, the unemployable, the casual worker, or the very low wage earner, since they cannot make the regular payments required by the contract, even with exemption from State and local taxes; and

Whereas the proponents of this legislation openly admit that this program will put the Federal Government permanently into the business and control of all housing, with the elimination of private housing; and

Whereas similar public housing programs have been disastrous failures throughout Europe, in that they did not produce more houses, they did not produce houses for the poor, they did not remove slums, and they did not reduce the prevalence of disease, but did become dangerous drains on the national treasuries; and

Whereas these European government housing programs were one of the principal means by which socialistic cabinets and parliaments captured control; and

Whereas similar tendencies have already appeared in the propaganda machines of many housing authorities in this country, in the political corruption involved in the placement of housing projects, and in the selection of tenants: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this body record its unqualified opposition to any further encroachment of the Federal Government in the housing business.

BLACK CANYON PROJECT OF BOISE-PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, when the Department of Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949 was considered during the second session of the Eightieth Congress, a cut of $175,000 was made in budget requests for the Black Canyon project of the Boise-Payette division in Idaho. Commissioner Straus and Regional Director Newell of the Bureau of Reclamation have advised settlers on this project that unless this money is appropriated, 6,000 acres will not get water this coming year.

I urge the President and Budget Bureau to resubmit and the Appropriation Committees to approve this small but vital appropriation request during this special session, so that we may fulfill our portion of the contract made with these Idaho farmers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, an article from the Boise Valley Herald on July 29, 1948, entitled "Project Settlers Hold Remonstrance Meet," a letter from A. Cornell, which is typical of the many I have received from people in the Middleton area, and a resolution from the Black Canyon Settlers' Organization.

There being no objection, the editorial, letter, and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boise Valley Herald, Middleton, Canyon County, Idaho, July 29, 1948]

PROJECT SETTLERS HOLD REMONSTRANCE MEET

A hundred and twenty-five Black Canyon settlers filled the Sand Hollow community hall last night to remonstrate with Congress over the delay in providing the final $175,000 for the completion of their already much too long delayed irrigation project. The part of the project affected by this spirit of congressional crawfishin' economy lies north and northeast of Middleton. It comprises 100 farm units. The trunk-line ditches are ready for the water; and provisions have already been made for financing the construction of the wasteways, and the contract has been let, we understand, for this construction.

Unless the $175,000 is allowed on or before August 5, the very vital lateral-system part of the project will be in default and the long-awaiting settlers will not be able to proceed with their work for next year's crops.

The last night meeting passed a resolution petitioning Congress to correct its error it made in its effort to economize, and replace the amount once promised, but now held in abeyance, so that the settlers can go forward with their work.

BOISE VALLEY HERALD,
Middleton, Idaho, July 30, 1948.

Senators DWORSHAK and TAYLOR.

MY DEAR SENATORS: I asume you are aware that the United States Government entered into a contract with what we know locally as the Black Canyon irrigation district to construct its project for the purpose of supplying water for crop growing within the limits of its metes and bounds. I assume you are aware that settlers, as their part of fulfilling that contract, have had to plan

ahead (for years ahead) and be in readiness to apply themselves and their working resources to the limit of their economic ability as well as their physical ability, and that by far the major part of that planning—which in most cases is for the balance of their life expectancy—is predicated on that contract in which the United States Government pledges its honor and its credit to fulfill.

I assume, Senators, that you accept the premise that when a contract is entered into relative to any project, that the obligations apply to the project as a whole, a unit, and not merely to a part or fraction of it.

Whether or not there was a time limit set for the completion of the project, it was a reasonable and prudent assumption that the completion of the secondary or minor part of the work would proceed with the same directness that had been given to its primary or trunk-line part, and that it devolved upon the settlers to lay their plans and order their work accordingly.

The above observations being obvious, it seems to me equally clear that it is the duty of every Congressman to do all he can do to see to it that the Government proceeds to fulfill its part of the Black Canyon project contract.

Respectfully,

A. CORNELL.

BLACK CANYON SETTLERS' ORGANIZATION

We, the members of this organization, being assembled in special session on this 28th day of July 1948, and being each personally and vitally interested in the prompt completion of the construction of the lateral system of the Black Canyon irrigation district, hereby adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation requested a rock-bottom amount of $1,725,000 to continue in an orderly fashion the construction program in the Payette division of the Boise project; and

"Whereas $1,263,625 of the requested amount was for features which were contract obligations of previous date, or which would necessarily have to be constructed or expended ahead of the remaining lateral system, or in conjunction with work already under construction; and

"Whereas the estimated cost of the remaining lateral system is $450,000 and under the existing appropriation there will be only $261,375 available for expenditure for these laterals, and because of this, schedule 2, which includes the laterals north of Middleton, Idaho, will not be contracted and built; and

"Whereas by not building schedule 2 of the fourth unit laterals, 6,000 acres of very fine land will be forced to remain idle, dry, and dusty sagebrush area, and approximately 100 farm families will be deprived of the living which they so fully expect in 1949; and many of these families, being already residents of the area, will be subjected to extremely hard times and undue hardships; and

"Whereas the Bureau of the Budget approved $1,700,000 for the 1949 fiscal year construction program of the Payette Division, the Senate made an earnest effort to restore $250,000 of the $300,000 which the House had cut from the proposed amount, and the conference (for reasons unbeknown to us) compromised on $1,525,000; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation proposes to open bids on August 5, 1948, for these laterals, but will not award contracts except for schedule 1 unless the $175,000 is restored to our appropriation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Congress be urged to set precedent aside, and during this special session and not later than August 5, 1948, restore the $175,000 so desperately needed; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to each of the Idaho Members of Congress to impress them of the urgency and importance of this matter and to request that they leave nothing undone which might aid in favorable congressional action in our behalf. Also, copies shall be forwarded to the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Idaho; commissioner of reclamation, State of Idaho; secretary-manager, State Reclamation Association; director, Bureau of Reclamation, Region 1; manager, Bureau of Reclamation, Central Snake River district; and to chambers of commerce and various individuals who have shown much interest in this project."

C. E. FRIESEN,
Chairman, Caldwell, Idaho.

Attest:

H. W. VAN SLYKE,
Secretary.

CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of the declaration of 19 national civil-rights, labor, church, Negro, Jewish, professional, and trade organizations meeting in Washington, D. C., July 22, 1948, on call of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. I send it to the desk and request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

I trust the declaration will have the support and approval of the Senate, and I call the attention of the Senate to the statement made by Walter White, secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in his letter of transmittal to me:

We submit this declaration to you in the hope that you will give it your careful attention and support the efforts to extend democratic rights to all American citizens, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. Such action by the Congress following the issuance of the Executive orders by President Truman in this area would do much to restore faith in the democratic process at home and to rebuild and firmly establish American prestige abroad.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACT NOW ON CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION—DECLARATION OF 19 NATIONAL CIVIL-RIGHTS, LABOR, CHURCH, NEGRO, JEWISH, PROFESSIONAL, AND TRADE ORGANIZATIONS MEETING IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY 22, 1948, ON CALL OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

The special session gives the Eightieth Congress a third chance to fulfill the urgent needs of the American people. The Congress can now complete the business left unfinished on its calendar and make a genuine contribution to the freedom and equality of all Americans by enacting the pending civil-rights legislation. At the same time, the Congress can demonstrate to the American people that the civil-rights pledges in the 1948 platforms, as well as the 1944 platforms, are not empty phrases and mere campaign promises.

Almost a year has passed since the historic report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights exposed the many areas of American life where the rights guaranteed by our Constitution are being flagrantly denied to millions of Americans. The President's Committee called for a program of legislative action "to secure these rights."

The national conventions of the major parties to which the Members of the Congress owe political allegiance have committed themselves to the passage of the civil-rights bills. The major parties now have an opportunity to demonstrate to the American people the sincerity and integrity of their campaign pledges.

The organizations joining in this statement represent outstanding church, labor, Negro, Jewish, veterans, and other civic organizations. We are mindful that the special session will be limited in duration but we are completely convinced that the legislative program we urge upon the Congress is a wholly reasonable and practical program capable of enactment now. Neither a filibuster nor any other legislative device can prevent enactment of this program if the Members of Congress are determined to carry out their convention promises.

We are mindful also that other important gains for civil rights can be made by the President acting under his constitutional authority. We are confident that President Truman will fulfill his promise to the Congress by issuing forthwith the Executive order providing for the abolition of segregation and discrimination in all Federal agencies, including the armed services of the United States, and thus give unmistakable leadership to the civil-rights program in the Congress. Specifically we urge:

1. FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE LEGISLATION

S. 984, a national act against discrimination in employment, which was sponsored in the Eightieth Congress by four Democratic and four Republican Senators, and has bipartisan sponsorship in the House. In a democracy the right to earn a living without racial or religious discrimination is a prime essential.

2. POLL TAX

As a nation, we have urged citizens in other countries to vote in national elections. Yet, here at home we have denied to 10,000,000 of our own citizens—6,000,000 whites and 4,000,000 Negroes—the right to exercise their franchise. Therefore, we strongly urge the Senate to pass the anti-poll-tax bill, H. R. 29, which has already been passed by the House.

3. SEGREGATION IN INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION

The Powell bill to end segregation in interstate transportation has been introduced in the House. Americans must be able to travel anywhere in their country without humiliation.

4. LYNCHING

More than 5,000 persons have been lynched by mobs in America. Certain States have been neither willing nor able to punish lynchers. Federal action is imperative. We reject the Ferguson bill reported out by the Senate Judiciary Committee. We call upon the special session to enact an antilynching bill embodying the features included in the Case bill, now on the House Calendar.

5. DISPLACED PERSONS

We call for the passage of remedial amendments to the Displaced Persons Act that will increase the number of admissible DP's to 400,000, will eliminate the provisions that discriminate against Jews and Catholics, and strike out conditions that are administratively unworkable.

We call upon President Harry S. Truman and upon the titular head and Presidential candidate of the Republican Party, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, to exert to the utmost their influence upon their parties to prevent any parliamentary or political trickery designed to sidetrack these guaranties of basic human rights and to see to it that these measures are enacted at this session of the Congress.

The following organizations and delegates participated in the conference and approved the above statement: National Council of Negro Women, Mrs. Jeanetta Brown; CIO, George L-P Weaver; Odd Fellows, Henry P. Slaughter; Beauty Culture League, Cordelia G. Johnson; United Automobile Workers, CIO, William Oliver and Paul Sifton; Alpha

Kappa Alpha Sorority, Norma Boyd and Mrs. Elsie Rumford; American Jewish Committee, Alex Brooks; National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses, Mrs. Lotis C. Campbell; Friends Committee on National Legislation, C. Lloyd Bailey; American Veterans Committee, Robert L. Carter; American Civil Liberties Union, Mary Baldinger; National Council for Permanent FEPC, Roy Wilkins; Anti-Defamation League, B'nai B'rith, Herman Edelsberg; National Association Negro Milliners, Hair Stylists, and Dress Designers, Mabel Lewis; National Alliance Postal Employees, William C. Jason, Jr.; National Medical Association, C. Herbert Marshall; International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL, Charles Zimmerman; American Jewish Congress, Sanford Bolz; NAACP, Henry Lee Moon, Walter White, Jesse Dedmon, Edward R. Dudley, Leslie Ferry.

Attending as observers also were Walter J. Mason of the American Federation of Labor and Miss Margaret Garrity of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATING TO PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures relating to Federal personnel.

I call attention to the fact that the civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government totaled 2,092,301 for the month of June. This was a net increase of 26,004 over the number of employees in May. The increase averaged 866 a day.

This increase was the largest for any month since January 1945 in the midst of the war. It was exceeded in only five scattered months during the depression years 1930–37 inclusive, when public pay rolls were used to absorb unemployment. It was the sixth consecutive monthly increase in the current calendar year. It was the fourth consecutive month in which the increase averaged more than 500 per day. It brought the total increase for the first half of the current calendar year to 96,913 for an average daily increase since December 31, 1947, to more than 530.

The June figure closed the Government's fiscal year 1948 with a civilian employment average in the executive branch of 2,032,600 for the entire year. This annual average was nearly 60 percent of the 3,465,420 average in the war peak year of 1945. It was approximately 95 percent of the annual average requested by the President for fiscal year 1948.

These statements are based upon figures in the monthly report on Federal civilian personnel in the executive branch for June 1948 published today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. The report shows that employment inside continental United States increased 29,143 during June, and outside the continent it decreased 3,139. It shows that of the net increase 5,487 were so-called industrial employees. It shows that of the net increase 16,313 were in the civilian agencies of the Government, and that 9,691 were additions to the civilian pay rolls of the Military Establishment.

In response to numerous requests for historical information on the growth of Federal employment the committee in this report publishes the best information available to it for the years since 1884. In that year according to the Civil Service Commission total civilian employment of the Government was 131,308. June 1948 employment in the Post Office Department alone was more than three times this figure.

There being no objection, the additional report was ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, JUNE 1948, AND COMPARISON WITH MAY 1948

(The following report is compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments for the Federal Government. Table I of the report shows personnel employed inside continental United States, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table III shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns. Table V is an additional chart inserted in the report for June for information. It shows civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government from 1884 to 1948. See chart for explanation of figures and for sources.)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures the total Federal personnel for the month of June increased 26,004 from the May total of 2,066,297 to the June total of 2,092,301. (See table III.)

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was an increase of 16,313 from the May total of 1,204,242 to the June total of 1,220,555.

Total employment for the National Military Establishment showed an increase of 9,691 from the May figure of 862,055 to the June figure of 871,746.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 109 from the May figure of 875 to the June figure of 984.

The Department of the Army reported an increase of 2,999 from the May figure of 398,973 to the June figure of 401,972. Inside continental United States the Army increased its civilian personnel 6,337; outside continental United States it decreased 3,338.

The Department of the Air Force increased civilian employment 2,251 from the May figure of 118,852 to the June figure of 121,103. Department of the Air Force figures are for civilian personnel inside continental United States only; the Department of the Army reports Air Force civilian personnel outside continental United States.

The Department of the Navy reported an increase of 4,332 civilian employees from the May figure of 343,355 to the June figure of 347,687.

INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Federal personnel within the United States increased 29,143 from the May total of 1,836,406 to the June total of 1,865,549. (See table I.)

Excluding the National Military Establishment, personnel inside continental United States increased 16,107 from the May total of 1,148,489 to the June total of 1,164,596.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for June was 700,953, an increase of 13,036 over the May total of 687,917.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 109 from the May figure of 875 to the June figure of 984.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States increased 6,337 from the May figure of 268,902 to the June figure of 275,239.

The Department of the Air Force within continental United States increased 2,251 from the May figure of 118,852 to the June figure of 121,103.

The Department of the Navy within the United States increased its civilian employment 4,339 from the May figure of 299,288 to the June figure of 303,627.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Outside continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 3,139 from the May total of 229,891 to the June total of 226,752. (See table II.)

An increase of 206 was reported in the overseas civilian employment of the departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment, from the May total of 55,753 to the June total of 55,959.

Total overseas civilian employment for the National Military Establishment decreased 3,345 from the May total of 174,138 to the June total of 170,793.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 3,338 civilian employees overseas, from the May figure of 130,071 to the June figure of 126,733.

The Department of the Navy decreased its overseas employment 7, to the present total of 44,060.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

Total industrial employment during the month of June increased 5,487 from the May total of 571,095 to the June total of 576,582. (See table IV.)

The departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment increased their industrial employment by 1,283 from the May figure of 22,765 to the June figure of 24,048.

The National Military Establishment increased its total industrial employment 4,204 from the May figure of 548,330 to the June figure of 552,534.

The Department of the Army increased its industrial employment 296 during the month of June from the May figure of 238,594 to the June figure of 238,890. Of this net increase 3,884 was within continental United States, while outside the United States industrial employment of the Army Department decreased 3,588.

The Department of the Air Force industrial personnel inside the United States increased 1,297 from the May figure of 69,789 to the June figure of 71,086.

The Department of the Navy increased its industrial employment 2,611 from the May figure of 239,947 to the June figure of 242,558.

The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	77,399	83,249	+5,850
Commerce	37,467	37,953	+486
Interior	46,323	50,310	+3,987
Justice	25,837	25,852	+15
Labor	4,450	4,431	−19
Post Office	488,965	496,822	+7,857
State	7,576	7,685	+109
Treasury	89,002	88,730	−272

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	221	214	−7
Bureau of the Budget	593	582	−11
Executive Mansion and Grounds	96	60	−36
National Security Council [1]	19	22	+3
National Security Resources Board	176	232	+56
Council of Economic Advisers	45	44	−1
Office of Government Reports	17	17	
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	50	54	+4
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration	273	492	+219
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,565	4,542	−23
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	
Philippine War Damage Commission	10	7	−3
War Assets Administration	22,266	16,772	−5,494
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	4	+1
Atomic Energy Commission	5,028	5,027	−1
Civil Aeronautics Board	602	612	+10
Civil Service Commission	4,120	4,101	−19
Export-Import Bank of Washington	121	123	+2
Federal Communications Commission	1,328	1,341	+13
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,111	1,092	−19
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	378	383	+5
Federal Power Commission	792	809	+17
Federal Security Agency [2]	33,292	33,215	−77
Federal Trade Commission	554	574	+20
Federal Works Agency	21,981	22,112	+131
General Accounting Office	9,232	9,170	−62
Government Printing Office	7,114	7,074	−40
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,714	11,691	−23
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,292	2,301	+9
Maritime Commission	7,332	7,128	−204
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,169	6,279	+110
National Archives	344	341	−3
National Capital Housing Authority	286	282	−4
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	21	8	−13
National Gallery of Art	317	322	+5
National Labor Relations Board	1,780	1,983	+203
National Mediation Board	111	109	−2
Office of Selective Service Records	721	742	+21
Panama Canal	535	643	+108
Railroad Retirement Board	2,656	2,599	−57
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,550	5,366	−184
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,123	1,149	+26
Smithsonian Institution	507	510	+3
Tariff Commission	218	219	+1
Tax Court of the United States	126	126	
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,054	15,223	+169
Veterans' Administration	200,594	203,855	+3,261
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,148,489	1,164,596	+22,681 −6,574
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+16,107

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	875	984	+109
Department of the Army	268,902	275,239	+6,337
Department of the Air Force	118,852	121,103	+2,251
Department of the Navy	299,288	303,627	+4,339
Total, including National Military Establishment	1,836,406	1,865,549	+35,717 −6,574
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+29,143

[1] Exclusive of personnel of Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Includes 1,008 employees of Howard University and 87 employees of Columbia Institute for the Deaf.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	1,836	1,854	+18
Commerce	2,903	2,982	+79
Interior	5,367	6,028	+661
Justice	435	436	+1
Labor	82	83	+1
Post Office	1,611	1,593	−18
State	14,314	14,234	−80
Treasury	642	656	+14
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration		79	+79
Office of the Housing Expediter	26	26	
Philippine Alien Property Administration	132	140	+8
Philippine War Damage Commission	820	901	+81
War Assets Administration	397	357	−40
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	114	117	+3
Atomic Energy Commission	3	3	
Civil Aeronautics Board	20	20	
Civil Service Commission	5	5	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	
Federal Communications Commission	38	39	+1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3	
Federal Security Agency	1,341	1,337	−4
Federal Works Agency	428	453	+25
Housing and Home Finance Agency	39	43	+4
Maritime Commission	92	91	−1
National Labor Relations Board	8	9	+1
Office of Selective Service Records	16	16	
Panama Canal	23,467	22,834	−633
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	17	16	−1
Smithsonian Institution	6	6	
Veterans' Administration	1,589	1,596	+7
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	55,753	55,959	+983 −777
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+206

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army	130,071	126,733	−3,338
Department of the Navy	44,067	44,060	−7
Total, including National Military Establishment	229,891	226,752	−4,122 +983
Net decrease, including National Military Establishment			−3,139

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Agriculture	79,235	85,103	+5,868
Commerce	40,370	40,935	+565
Interior	51,690	56,338	+4,648
Justice	26,272	26,288	+16
Labor	4,532	4,514	−18
Post Office	490,596	498,415	+7,819
State	21,890	21,919	+29
Treasury	89,644	89,386	−258
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
White House Office	221	214	−7
Bureau of the Budget	593	582	−11
Executive Mansion and Grounds	96	60	−36
National Security Council [1]	19	22	+3
National Security Resources Board	176	232	+56
Council of Economic Advisers	45	44	−1
Office of Government Reports	17	17	
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	50	54	+4
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Economic Cooperation Administration	273	571	+298
Office of the Housing Expediter	4,591	4,568	−23
Philippine Alien Property Administration	134	142	+8
Philippine War Damage Commission	830	908	+78
War Assets Administration	22,663	17,129	−5,534
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	117	121	+4
Atomic Energy Commission	5,031	5,030	−1
Civil Aeronautics Board	622	632	+10
Civil Service Commission	4,125	4,106	−19
Export-Import Bank of Washington	123	125	+2
Federal Communications Commission	1,366	1,380	+14
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,114	1,095	−19
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	378	383	+5
Federal Power Commission	792	809	+17
Federal Security Agency [2]	34,633	34,552	−81
Federal Trade Commission	554	574	+20

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Federal Works Agency	22,409	22,565	+156
General Accounting Office	9,232	9,170	−62
Government Printing Office	7,114	7,074	−40
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,753	11,734	−19
Indian Claims Commission	11	11	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,292	2,301	+9
Maritime Commission	7,424	7,219	−205
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,169	6,279	+110
National Archives	344	341	−3
National Capital Housing Authority	286	282	−4
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	21	8	−13
National Gallery of Art	317	322	+5
National Labor Relations Board	1,788	1,992	+204
National Mediation Board	111	109	−2
Office of Selective Service Records	737	758	+21
Panama Canal	24,002	23,477	−525
Railroad Retirement Board	2,656	2,599	−57
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	5,567	5,382	−185
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,123	1,149	+26
Smithsonian Institution	513	516	+3
Tariff Commission	218	219	+1
Tax Court of the United States	126	126	
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,054	15,223	+169
Veterans' Administration	202,183	205,451	+3,268
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,204,242	1,220,555	+23,436 −7,123
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+16,313
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Office of the Secretary of Defense	875	984	+109
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	268,902	275,239	+6,337
Outside continental United States	130,071	126,733	−3,338
Department of the Air Force	118,852	121,103	+2,251
Department of the Navy	343,355	347,687	+4,332
Total, including National Military Establishment	2,066,297	2,092,301	+36,465 −10,461
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+26,004

[1] Exclusive of personnel of Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Includes 1,008 employees of Howard University and 87 employees of Columbia Institute for the Deaf.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)			
Commerce	1,565	1,605	+40
Interior	6,628	7,770	+1,142
State	374	380	+6
Treasury	3,654	3,630	−24

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1948, and comparison with May 1948*—Continued

Department or agency	May	June	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
Atomic Energy Commission	226	217	−9
Housing and Home Finance Agency	2	2	
Panama Canal	2,053	2,007	−46
Tennessee Valley Authority	8,263	8,437	+174
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	22,765	24,048	+1,362 −79
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			+1,283
NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT			
Department of the Army: Inside continental United States	140,619	144,503	+3,884
Outside continental United States	97,975	94,387	−3,588
Department of the Air Force	69,789	71,086	+1,297
Department of the Navy	239,947	242,558	+2,611
Total, including National Military Establishment	571,095	576,582	+9,154 −3,667
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			+5,487

TABLE V.—*Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, 1884–1948*

(This table of Federal employment by years represents the best and most complete figures on this subject available to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. It is included in this report, the final monthly report on Federal personnel by the joint committee for fiscal year 1948, in response to numerous requests for historical information on the growth of Federal employment. It will be noted that the earliest year included is 1884. The Civil Service Commission advises that Federal employment information prior to this date cannot be calculated accurately from its records, which were established as of this date. It should be noted further that the basis for calculations has been changed from time to time. For this reason those making use of the table should check the footnotes closely.)

EMPLOYMENT BY YEARS, 1884–1929, AS OF THE END OF THE FISCAL YEAR, JUNE 30 (EXCEPTIONS NOTED)

Year:	*Employees*
1884	131,303
1891	[1] 166,000
1892	[1] 171,000
1893	[1] 176,000
1894	[1] 180,000
1895	[1] 189,000
1897	[1] 192,000
1899	[1] 208,000
1901	[1] 256,000
1903	[1] 301,000
1904	298,858
1905	300,615
1906	326,855
1907	337,751
1908	352,104
1909	367,794
1910	384,088
1911	391,350
1912	395,460
1913	409,879
1914	432,721
1915	476,363
1916	480,327
1917	517,805
1918	[2] 917,760
1919	842,214
1920	[3] 691,116
1921	[3] 562,252
1922	527,517
1923	515,772
1924	521,641
1925	532,798
1926	528,542
1927	527,228
1928	540,867
1929	557,169

AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT BY FISCAL YEARS, 1930–48

Year:	*Employees*
1930	[4] 583,066
1931	594,305
1932	583,919
1933	575,128
1934	625,226
1935	715,981
1936	825,063
1937	859,668
1938	[5] 834,022
1939	884,556
1940	953,895
1941	[6] 1,164,463
1942	1,723,459
1943	2,795,608
1944	[7] 3,121,153
1945	3,465,420
1946	3,110,989
1947	2,334,208
1948	2,032,600

[1] Approximate.
[2] Nov. 11, 1919; partially estimated.
[3] As of July 31.
[4] Basis of compilation (fiscal years 1930–37): Number of persons having Federal appointments in the last day of each month (revised).
[5] Basis of compilation (fiscal year 1938 to January 1941): Number of civilian employees actually receiving pay on the last pay roll of each month (revised).
[6] Basis of compilation (January 1941 to September 1943): CSC Form 3257, number of paid civilian employees as of last day of each month.
[7] Basis of compilation (September 1943 to fiscal year 1948): Monthly personnel report to Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures; number of civilian employees as of the last day of each month.

Sources: 1884–1929: U. S. Civil Service Commission employment figures as of the last of the fiscal year. (See footnotes for exceptions.)

1930–43: U. S. Civil Service Commission average employment figures, compiled from monthly personnel reports as of the end of each month (revised).

1944–48: Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures average employment figures, compiled from monthly personnel reports as of the last day of each month.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2923. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ilan Zac; and

S. 2924. A bill for the relief of Cesare Buia, Gabriela Buia, and Daniela Buia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2925. A bill for the relief of Alfred Fulga, his mother, Aurelia Filipescu, and the lat-

ter's nurse, Staliana Istrate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2926. A bill for the relief of Helena Vieira de Sa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF BOEING AIRPLANE CO. CONTRACTS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, a strike is going on at Seattle, Wash., at the Boeing Airplane Co. The labor conciliator has found in favor of the employees, but the company refuses to settle. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution calling for the cancellation of contracts with the Boeing Airplane Co. until such time as that company lives up to the recommendations of the Labor Board.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61), was received, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas a labor dispute now exists between the Boeing Airplane Co. and Aeronautical Industrial District Lodge 751, chartered by the International Association of Machinists as exclusive representative of all its employees in this plant; and

Whereas the National Labor Relations Board Trial Examiner has fully investigated this dispute and has issued his decision calling upon the Boeing Airplane Co. to immediately bargain collectively and to reinstate all striking employees without prejudice or discrimination; and

Whereas in spite of the recommendations of the National Labor Relations Board Trial Examiner the Boeing Airplane Co. not only refuses to bargain collectively but has locked out the union members and is using every possible device to destroy this union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the Department of the Air Force cancel all contracts with the Boeing Airplane Co. until said company ceases its antilabor policies and complies with the NLRB trial examiner's decision.

UNIFICATION OF WESTERN EUROPE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from Life magazine and a statement by Paul G. Hoffman regarding unification of western Europe, which appear in the Appendix.]

KEYNOTE SPEECH OF GOVERNOR GREEN, OF ILLINOIS, AT REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the keynote speech delivered by the Honorable Dwight H. Green, Governor of the State of Illinois, while acting as temporary chairman of the Republican National Convention, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECLARATION OF STATES' RIGHTS BY SOUTHERN DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a declaration on States' rights adopted at the Southern Democratic Convention at Birmingham, Ala., July 17, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATES' RIGHTS AND CIVIL RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY RALPH T. CATTERALL

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "States' Rights and Civil Rights," by Ralph T. Catterall, of Richmond, Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

DOLLARS, PRICES, AND YOU—STATEMENT BY EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Dollars, Prices, and You," issued by the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SPECIAL SESSION—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman Tries To Debauch Congress," published in the New Hampshire Morning Union of July 17, 1948, and an editorial entitled "A Desperate Device, published in the Concord (N. H.) Monitor of July 16, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

A HISTORY OF PROGRESSIVISM—ARTICLE BY W. K. KELSEY

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A History of Progressivism," written by W. K. Kelsey and published in the Detroit News of July 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION IN WISCONSIN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the agricultural and industrial position of Wisconsin, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials endorsing the equal-rights amendment, which appear in the Appendix.]

WAGES AND SALARY INCREASES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a full and understandable measure of concern is evident throughout the District of Columbia because wages and salary increases were not approved when the Federal Pay Act was passed in June by the Congress.

Most people are in agreement that District employees were and are entitled to the increases. I share that sentiment. Some people feel so keenly about the matter that they think the increases should be granted by reducing needed services, or by a reduction in the personnel force, or through a loan from the Federal Treasury. I am quite properly in strong opposition to any of these approaches.

During the session of yesterday the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], for himself, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], introduced S. 2920, a bill to authorize a loan from the Federal Treasury to the District of Columbia in the sum of $5,800,000, to be used in providing wage and salary increases to approximately 17,000 District employees. This loan would bear no interest, and would be repaid on terms and dates to be determined by some future Congress.

Senate bill 2920 is a companion bill to a measure introduced recently in the House. These measures have been thoughtfully considered by the Fiscal Subcommittee of the Senate District Committee, and its considered opinion is that an attempt to increase the salaries and wages of District employees through a non-interest-bearing loan from the Federal Treasury is undeserving of favorable consideration or action, and would result in serious and inexcusable injury to the District and its employees if enacted into law.

Mr. President, on Saturday last the press requested my opinion concerning the proposal just offered in the House, in answer to which I issued a brief statement, which I should like to have unanimous consent to have included in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This proposal would only establish a precedent which can't be justified. A way must be found through which to provide satisfactory salary and wage rates through tax-revenue sources. If we were to grant increases now through a Federal loan, it could be done again in the future and such action would obviously result in curtailing or eliminating needed public services or by reductions in personnel. It would be a disservice to workers to raise their pay now and dismiss them a short time later.

The District Committees of the House and Senate, have recommended legislation which would increase the salaries and wages of all District employees, while providing tax revenues with which to meet a very large obligation. The revenue legislation has been temporarily defeated in the Senate. Until this or similar legislation is approved, there is no reason to hope that desired and legitimate pay increases can be granted. The Nation's Capital City simply can't expect to get something out of nothing. No other city should be so careful to pay its own way.

I think and hope that Senate and House committees will begin early in the next session to concentrate on the involved financial problem which confronts the District. I have every reason to believe that the Congress will set sufficient time aside through which to publicly debate the issue. If it does, I shall take for granted that the Congress will provide and authorize revenues which are sufficient to meet the needed current operational requirements of the District.

Whenever adequate revenue is available, I feel strongly that approved salary and wage increases should be made retroactive to the date of passage of the 1948 Federal Pay Act. Until revenue is available I must oppose any proposal which is certain to offset its purely temporary good through long range and lasting harm.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the appeal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] from the decision of the Chair holding that the cloture motion on the motion to take up House bill 29 was not in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is ready to proceed, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McFarland	Thye
Ecton	McGrath	Tobey
Ellender	McKellar	Tydings
Feazel	McMahon	Umstead
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

PHILADELPHIA: CORRUPT AND NOT CONTENTED—ARTICLE BY DICKSON HARTWELL

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my rights to the floor will not be interfered with in any way and that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a very brief statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Alabama yields to the Senator from Connecticut under the conditions stated by him.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I noticed in Collier's magazine under date of August 7, 1948, a most interesting article entitled "Philadelphia: Corrupt and Not Contented." The article is by Mr. Dickson Hartwell. The subtitle is:

After 81 years of graft and corruption, the good people of Philadelphia are beginning to ask pertinent questions about their city government. The answers are not calculated to please anybody.

I read in the press recently that the Republican candidate for the Presidency is to make a trip to Kansas City some time during the campaign to discuss the subject of bosses. I think that is a fine subject, and I hope he takes a refresher course by stopping off in Philadelphia on his way West.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA: CORRUPT AND NOT CONTENTED

(By Dickson Hartwell)

AFTER 81 YEARS OF GRAFT AND CORRUPTION, THE GOOD PEOPLE OF PHILADELPHIA ARE BEGINNING TO ASK PERTINENT QUESTIONS ABOUT THEIR CITY GOVERNMENT—THE ANSWERS ARE NOT CALCULATED TO PLEASE ANYBODY

The sickest city in the land is Philadelphia. It is suffering from the longest case on record—81 years—of the dread malady known as machine politics.

Philadelphia has every known symptom of the ailment and some that are brand new. It has a self-sustaining political machine that would be the envy of old Tammany—and a freshly uncovered financial shortage estimated at $300,000 to $1,000,000. It is run in secret by a one-party city council that holds two sessions—a private one at which some of the councilmen are advised to vote a certain way, and another one in public, when they follow the advice.

In Philadelphia motorists in restricted parking zones pay off many of the cops with a quarter, or even use old parking tickets as camouflage tags on their cars. Summonses are ignored (in one recent month there were 2,989 such cases in traffic court) or handed to a district committeeman to fix. In one court 9 of every 10 summonses were fixed before they ever got to the court. It is a city of petty crimes, small-time gamblers, and five-and-dime shakedowns, where too often a citizen's first protection is not the law, the courts, or the police, but his ward leader.

Philadelphia's political machine is simple enough. It is called Republican, but this is only a label. It has no political philosophy except to win elections with whatever promise, slogan, or chicanery it believes will succeed. Its guiding principle: Do a man a favor and you've got his friendship; do two favors, and you've got his vote.

To this principle, the cornerstone of power, the machine is dedicated. Most public officials and even many of the janitors hold their jobs because they can do favors or get out the vote. "A magistrate who doesn't play ball with the machine," a Philadelphia judge said recently, "can count on 5,000 votes, and that's all. Without 350,000 you can't win." Playing ball means refraining from carefully investigating certain cases; fixing tickets for ward leaders; springing Saturday-night drunks from jail; and tipping the scales of justice just very lightly for certain gamblers, tavern keepers, and miscellaneous miscreants who, as registered voters, become first citizens on election day.

The average Philadelphia citizen soon grows to believe that the only man who can get things done is the ward leader. Citizens who vote right, contribute right, and don't complain are seldom troubled by government inefficiency. Yet most Philadelphians haven't known the satisfaction of clean streets, unbroken pavements, unpolluted air and water, alert, impartial police, and a rigidly enforced sanitary code.

Without political influence the ordinary citizen is helpless. In 1946 a maiden lady living on Master Street despaired of persuading her landlord to repair a leaking roof and appealed to the city in writing. Nothing happened. The following year she wrote the mayor begging him to please do something. What the city did was to condemn the property, and the nonpolitical maiden lady was requested to vacate it forthwith. Because of Philadelphia's acute housing shortage this shut-up-or-get-out technique is most effective. That request was issued a year ago. The roof still leaks. But the spinster hasn't peeped since.

This kind of treatment develops in Philadelphians a stoic patience. One citizen in the summer of 1939 installed an oil burner and requested the fire marshal's inspection, which is required by law. He received a card stating the inspection would be made on a certain day. He waited at home but was stood up. Another card came, with the same result. His vacation came and went and fall arrived. There were more cards, but no official. In desperation he turned on the furnace without an O. K. That was in 1939. The furnace inspection still has not been made. But every few weeks for the past 9 years this good citizen has received a post card notifying him that the arrival of the inspector is imminent.

At the moment, though, the under dog is having his day. One of the most interesting political experiments in the history of American municipalites has been the Committee of Fifteen, which was appointed by Philadelphia's Mayor Bernard Samuel. Before the elections last fall city employees, restive for wage increases, were held in line by fulsome promises. When the city machine was reelected the demands became insistent. With the treasury empty and borrowing capacity vanishing, the mayor had to take the heat off. He handed the problem to a committee composed mainly of business and civic leaders.

This Committee of Fifteen, headed by Arthur Binns, top Philadelphia realtor, had two jobs: (1) To determine who should get a raise and how much, and (2) to find the money. Given less than 3 months to make a report, the committee was expected to suggest a face-saving compromise and fade out. But the 15 had other ideas. On March 1 they filed a revolutionary report showing how the city could add $5,000,000 to its income in 1948, mainly by aggressive, efficient collection of wage taxes and water rents. They showed how fire and police department streamlining alone might save $2,000,000 in 1949, and recommended a thorough efficiency check on all departments.

By way of padded pay rolls, the 15 reported city employment of approximately $150,000 worth of matrons to make beds in fire houses for many firemen who sleep at home. They found 211 janitors on the pay roll at city hall annex, one-third more than required in comparable commercial buildings. They discovered policemen working as typists, messengers, cleaners, and clerks—and some not working at all—and about 100 firemen assigned to the fire marshal's office, a spot generally regarded as among the city's less serious fire hazards. These and other revelations brought a clamor for the committee to continue, though its work was officially ended.

An even stronger impetus was the go-ahead signal from County Sheriff Austin (Aus) Meehan. Gargantuan, 300 pounds, and bald, Meehan became topman in Philadelphia politics last election when he defeated Dave Harris for control of the Republican city committee, which runs the town.

Meehan is simon-pure honest himself, and he finds it hard to believe that people he knows and likes will actually steal. As a contractor, he does little business in Philadelphia but a great deal elsewhere. He gives away his salary as sheriff, $15,000 a year, every payday to the first people who touch him.

When the question of continuing the 15 arose, he realized that two vulnerable spots in city government might be the office

of the receiver of taxes, which collects the city's money, and the department of supplies and purchases, which lets contracts.

The 15 quickly showed that the department of supplies and purchases was operating on a 6-hour workday; that the annual report required by the city charter had not been made in nearly 7 years with no accounting for some $40,000,000 spent; that it took an average of 31 days to place an order, and longer—from 60 to 90 days—to pay for it, causing the city to lose up to $30,000 a year in cash discounts. There were no trained buyers, purchases being made by bookkeepers and clerks.

Nowhere in Philadelphia is intimacy with petty theft and light larceny more evident than in the magistrates' courts. Top magistrates' pay is only $5,500 annually. But some stretch-a-penny Philadelphia magistrates manage on such a salary to maintain homes which at first squint resemble the palace of a movie queen.

How this financial necromancy is accomplished is indicated in the story of a certain Philadelphia magistrate.

This magistrate, it appears, sees gamblers through slightly rose-colored glasses. He could not find it in his heart to think ill of horse players and numbers operators—especially when they were so grateful for kind treatment. When they were brought before him he discharged them in droves. In more serious offenses, where required by law to hold them for a higher court, he imposed instead a fine of, say, $100. Then after witnesses and prosecutor had left the courtroom he would, in direct violation of the law, secretly reduce the fine or let the offender go scot-free.

Not all Philadelphia judges are dishonest, but some who are not are strangely careless. Among the more odious local rackets was one involving the solicitation of advertising for the convention program of a so-called firemen's organization. It was a smooth deal, engineered by a notorious promoter who had a Better Business Bureau record dating back to 1921. He collected $34,292 in a year for a program never published, and he used for a mailing address and phone calls the city hall officers of a respected municipal court judge.

PETTY CRIME IN THE SUBWAY

Small crime thrives in Philadelphia like weeds in an untended cabbage patch. In the cavernous, ill-lighted subway system, a check-up showed 69 crimes in 6 months. Almost all of them were against lone women and most of them were committed practically under City Hall. Newspaper typesetters were constantly setting the same headlines: War on Crime, Crush Numbers Racket, New Crime Drive, Crime Crack-Down, Clean-Up Drive.

A typical crime drive is the 7 years' war against the world's largest outdoor crap game on the Philadelphia docks. It once earned its operators $10,000 a month. This game rented out a soft-drink concession and ran an extension cord to a city lamp post for free electricity. On January 31, 1940, police started a concentrated effort to break it up. By July 13, last year, 19 raids and 358 arrests later, police admitted that the racket had not yet been cleaned up.

To every rookie on the Philadelphia police force it must be apparent that "enterprise" pays off. Although illegal, business side lines are not uncommon. One cop has a jewelry business and carries a small case of samples with him while on duty. Another has contracted carpenter jobs. Another operates an automobile agency in a suburb, although recently he cautiously transferred title to his son. Still another serves as bouncer in his brother's saloon, even while on duty.

Most erring police enter less formal avenues of trade, however. At a busy midtown corner one police official collected 25 cents from a store for every customer he permitted to park illegally. Other cops deal directly with the consumer. All-day parking in some half-hour central city zones can often be arranged for a flat $1 a week. Obviously a cop with 10 or 15 such steady customers has a happier financial outlook.

Some Philadelphia police are above pecuniary considerations. Pleasant associations and freedom from onerous routine are often preferred, like teaching ceramics on city time to neighborhood children, chauffeuring the wife of a prominent business executive or guarding the home of a local Philadelphia judge, a personage worth the full-time services of six policemen working around the clock in three shifts. Since the judge's protectors would be bored if they had to stand constantly with guns at the ready, they are said to be relieved by such light housekeeping duties as cooking, chauffeuring, butlering, and lawn cutting.

To get ahead in the department, it is quite helpful for a Philadelphia cop to have the support of his ward leader. In some precincts he can get the best details. No patrolman desiring a transfer can feel certain of getting it through police channels. If he's smart he may go to his ward leader. His assignments are usually considered to be an accurate barometer of his political influence. The special plain-clothes details are regarded as the aristocracy; the peasants are the district cops. Promotions are sometimes given on merit, but today there are very strong indications that the going price is $500.

The third largest city in the country has an airport but very poor hangar facilities. There is not even an adequate shop where an engine can be repaired. The runways are too short for some of the big modern planes. Philadelphians have no adequate air service to many important cities. Air time to many others, like Boston and Chicago, is snail-slow. From Philadelphia to Miami it is 10½ hours, while the time from nearby Washington to Miami is 3½ hours by air.

One reason for such retarded growth was an early effort to get graft from the construction of two airports, on opposite sides of the city, instead of merely from one. And one result of this has been that neither port has had enough money to operate efficiently. A second is the machine's deep suspicion of Democratic money which is regarded as tainted even when it comes from such an obviously unselfish enterprise of the Federal Government as an airport.

This distrust of Federal funds has had a profound effect on Philadelphia's housing shortage (there are 112 families for every 100 dwellings). In an unguarded prewar moment, Federal funds were accepted for a Philadelphia housing project. The project embraced several square blocks, and when the ward leader stopped one morning to watch demolition begin he became suddenly aware that several thousand voters he had been nursing for years had been forced to move out of his district. His screaming could be heard in Camden.

Another Federal offer of $19,000,000 was made for 3,500 homes. The city turned it down.

It isn't that Philadelphia doesn't want improvement. The city boasts many commendable projects which, unfortunately, were never finished. The Locust Street subway, begun 20 years ago, is still boarded up. Under the Schuylkill River there is a four-track tunnel built 15 years ago for $6,500,000, to relieve congested traffic. The tunnel has never been opened. Razing of the Chinese Wall, the horrendous structure for railroad tracks running to the center of the city, has been periodically announced for more than 22 years. The Delaware River Bridge was built a generation ago without proper approaches and stands today as a monumental answer to the question, How careless can you get?

WATER POLLUTED WITH CHEMICALS

The port of Philadelphia, for 133 years the greatest in the United States, is slipping rapidly with a postwar drop from second to fourth place. The water is fetid with gases and chemicals, and the floating matter in it is bad for ships' condensers. Among the wastes sometimes dumped into the river is a highly inflammable substance, a gas that is readily ignited and burns upon the surfaces at docking spaces. Some Philadelphians drink this water; shipowners and captains hate it.

The machine has kept Philadelphia broke. Despite Nation-wide skyrocketing of property values, the city's assessed real-estate valuation dropped $700,000,000 between the depression of 1932 and the boom of 1948.

The hodgepodge of assessments is unbelievable. In some districts the poor have been soaked so heavily that assessments have been more than 150 percent of sales prices, while higher-priced homes are assessed as low as 40 percent of sales price.

Nor do all assessors make an effort, as required by law, to keep the assessments near actual value. One tenement assessed at $4,500 earns its owner $2,700 rents annually. In the twenty-sixth ward a typical house assessed for $4,200 10 years ago sold for $3,250. Recently this house was resold for $8,600 but its assessment was unchanged. In the thirty-fifth ward a check of 181 homes shows that 10 years ago their assessment represented 97 percent of their sales value. When resold recently the average assessment was only 54 percent of sale price. Students of municipal government regard this as unsound.

Contented Philadelphians seldom live in the city; they reside and vote in lovely, well-run suburbs. The Philadelphians most concerned with the present state of the city are the vast and impotent middle class and the poor who are awed by power. They don't want any trouble.

But neither do they want a city where so many bars and restaurants are without adequate fire extinguishers; where cops shake down auto-parked spooners; where some of the county detectives are machine committeemen; where one hospital is so crowded with mental and tubercular patients who don't belong there that its facilities are limited by 40 percent, while another hospital operates at only 10 to 30 percent of capacity; where statistical evidence of crime is confused by records listing snatched purses and picked wallets as lost, and thug-beaten citizens as accidents; where an unheeded garbage scow sinks slowly into the Schuylkill; where an occasional fire inspector takes $10 to $65 to pass an oil or gasoline tank installation, and where some inspectors' agents of the bureau of buildings ask $5 to $50 to approve business signs.

They don't want city employees to hold two city jobs, as some do, and work at neither. They don't want to pay $153,000 a year unnecessarily because the council refuses to refund airport bonds. They don't want an annual $600,000 expenditure for police stations, unless they get a reasonable benefit from it.

The people of Philadelphia are not contented with these affairs. They have merely suffered them. How long they will continue to suffer is a question that not even the politicians can answer.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN AT THE ANNUAL REUNION OF TENTH PENNSYLVANIA VOLUNTEER INFANTRY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my rights to the floor will not be interfered with in any way, and that I may be permitted to yield to

the Senator from Pennsylvania for a very brief statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I rise to call briefly to the attention of my colleagues the ceremonies held by the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry in Pittsburgh last Saturday, the 31st of July, in commemoration of its baptism of fire.

That was an event of historic importance. It was not only a great milestone in the record of a celebrated military outfit but it also marked the beginning of the fighting that gave the United States control of the Philippines. It will be recalled that Admiral Dewey's victory at Manila started the course of the United States to leadership as a world power.

Great volunteer units fought side by side with famous Regular Army outfits in the Philippine campaigns. Such brilliant military leaders as Pershing, Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Krueger, Bradley, and hundreds of others gained their first experience in the art of handling troops under fire in those faraway islands.

The old Eighth Army Corps, of which the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry was a part, had some outstanding commanders: Merritt, Anderson, Otis, the elder MacArthur, and many others. Under their leadership American ingenuity and courage was displayed at its best. Victory was attained on every front.

The roll of the various outfits of the old Eighth Army Corps in the Philippines is most interesting. It is as follows: Astor Battery of New York, First California, California Heavy Artillery, First Colorado, First Idaho, Fifty-first Iowa, Twentieth Kansas, Thirteenth Minnesota, First Montana, First Nebraska, Nevada Cavalry, First North Dakota, Second Oregon, Tenth Pennsylvania, First South Dakota, First Tennessee, Utah Light Artillery, First Washington, and First Wyoming.

With the exception of the Astor Battery they came from the National Guard and all were volunteers—real, stalwart Americans.

I shall close with a short statement by Colonel Hawkins, commander of the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteers, concerning the transportation of his regiment in its Malolos campaign. He said:

> It was necessary to stop the advance long enough to get the wagon trains through to the various organizations. As far as the transportation facilities of the Tenth Regiment were concerned, while not extensive, they were found to be fairly satisfactory. Two four-mule teams sufficed to carry the reserve ammunition, amounting to 200 rounds per man, each soldier carrying 150 rounds in his belt and on his person. Eleven caribou carts and a few pony carts, carrying 3 days' subsistence, the necessary cooking utensils for the companies and a small amount of extra baggage, were also furnished.

Fifty years have brought an enormous difference in military operations. Transportation is faster and fire power more deadly.

Thinking the Members of the Senate might be interested in further comment on this subject and, in order to save their time, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a speech which I delivered to the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteers at Pittsburgh on Saturday, July 31, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL REUNION OF THE TENTH PENNSYLVANIA VOLUNTEER INFANTRY, PITTSBURGH, PA., SATURDAY MORNING, JULY 31, 1948

This is a great day for the men of the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry.

It is the fiftieth anniversary of a brilliant exploit in the glorious annals of American valor. It is a memorable date in the military history of the United States. It marks an important milestone in the progress of freedom and civilization.

Fifty years ago tonight the world was startled by news of a battle that was fought 12,000 miles from here—between Spanish regulars and American volunteers.

A little-known and untried regiment—the Tenth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry—had received its baptism of fire, and to their everlasting glory these boys from the cities, towns, and farms of southwestern Pennsylvania had stood their ground.

In a raging Philippine typhoon they had met and repulsed a terrific attack launched by a superior force of veteran soldiers with years of battle experience.

The enemy was better trained and better equipped. But there was a difference between the two forces that decided the issue. The Americans were superior in spirit, courage, and loyalty. They were fighting for an ideal. They offered their lives in defense of honor, justice, and freedom.

After that victory at Malate—which we commemorate today—the regiment was acclaimed by the proud title of "the Fighting Tenth."

It is appropriate on occasions such as this to turn back the pages of history. Let us go back for a moment to America of 50 years ago.

At that time the United States had enjoyed peace for more than a third of a century. Its Army was small; its Navy was scattered. It had no supply or transportation system. Staff exercises and troop maneuvers were unknown.

The United States had no ambitions beyond its own borders. We were truly at peace with all the world.

Our people were content in the pursuit of happiness. They sought to attain security through self-reliance, hard work, and thrift. They reached for higher cultural and spiritual standards by practicing the virtues of right living and devotion to religion.

Near our shores there was conflict in Cuba where the people were in revolt against the cruel tyranny of their Spanish rulers. Liberty-loving Americans were indignant over the inhuman treatment of the Cubans by the Spanish. However, regardless of our sympathies, no official protest was made. No action was imminent.

Thus, February 15, 1898, dawned as another peaceful American day. No war clouds darkened the sky. Then during the night America was shocked by the news that the battleship *Maine* had been destroyed in Habana Harbor. It was there on a peaceful mission. In its destruction, 266 brave American sailors lost their lives. The American people were outraged. They demanded an explanation.

Days that made history moved on with giant strides.

Diplomatic relations with Spain were broken. On April 21, Congress passed a resolution that the people of the island of Cuba "are and of right ought to be free and independent."

War was declared against Spain. The President asked for 125,000 volunteers. Young Americans everywhere sprang to the colors. The National Guard was activated. On the morning of April 28, 1898, the Tenth Pennsylvania, together with other units of the Pennsylvania Guard, were mobilized in sleet, snow, and ice at Mount Gretna. They started to equip, drill, and train.

On May 1, 1898, the Nation and the world were electrified by word flashed from the Pacific. Admiral Dewey had met the Spanish Fleet in Manila Bay and had completely destroyed it. The American Republic was now a world power. It had gained new prestige among the great powers of the world. It had assumed new obligations.

Time moves on—

May 18 was a day of intense excitement at Mount Gretna when it became known that the Tenth Regiment had been ordered to San Francisco, and then to the Philippines to join Maj. Gen. Wesley Merritt's army. The whole camp turned out to wish them Godspeed.

At Harrisburg they were greeted by the Governor, his wife, and practically all of the population of the capital city. The trip across the continent took 8 days and nights. The men traveled in day coaches without a hot meal during the entire trip.

In every State through which they passed thousands of enthusiastic people turned out to greet the Pennsylvania boys. The regiment reached San Francisco May 25 and marched to Camp Merritt through streets jammed with cheering thousands. There equipping and training continued.

Time moves on at a rapid pace.

June 14 the boys of the Tenth boarded the *Zealandia* for the Philippines. Stopping at Honolulu they were enthusiastically greeted by the people of the newest American Territory. Passing historic Corregidor, they arrived in the Philippines July 17. Four days later men waded ashore and training continued in that far-off tropical jungle.

On July 31, while the Tenth was on outpost duty in front of Manila, came that bloody battle in which the American volunteer wrote his name indelibly upon the pages of military history. In the fiery heat of battle lasting friendships were created with the Utah Battery and the Third United States Heavy Artillery, which supported us so magnificently.

Then came historic August 13 when Manila fell to the United States. That ended 300 years of Spanish rule in the Philippines.

The drudgery of occupation duty followed. Manila was unsanitary. There was malaria and typhoid fever. Dysentery and other tropical diseases exacted their toll.

Peace with Spain was established but there was dissatisfaction among our former comrades of the Philippine Army. They rebelled against occupation by the United States. On the night of February 4, 1899, they made an attack upon Manila along a 17-mile front. For about 2 months the Tenth and other units fought and marched forward. It rained every day. There were rivers to cross and towns to conquer. The Filipinos were well equipped and held on stubbornly, but this great army of veterans could not be stopped.

Malolos, the native Philippine capital, fell on March 31.

The attack was made in a blinding rainstorm. But the Americans attained their objective. April 14, the Tenth was moved to Cavite.

Again, time moves on—and on July 1 the Fighting Tenth boarded the steamship *Senator*, homeward bound. It had covered itself with glory. It had always taken its objective. It had received the highest commendation of its commanders, and the finest tribute from its fighting companions of other units. It had been cited in orders.

There were great outfits in the old Eighth Army Corps. Let us refresh our memories by calling the roll of the volunteer units fighting with us in the Philippines: Astor Battery, First California, California Heavy Artillery, First Colorado, First Idaho, Fifty-first Iowa, Twentieth Kansas, Thirteenth Minnesota, First Montana, First Nebraska, Nevada Cavalry, First North Dakota, Second Oregon, First South Dakota, First Tennessee, Utah Light Artillery, First Washington, and First Wyoming.

With the exception of the Astor Battery they came from the National Guard and all were volunteers.

They were all stalwart Americans. They were unselfish soldiers. They were the proper men to establish the peace and dignity of America.

We were on the *Senator*, in mid-Pacific, when on July 18, the sad news was received that our beloved and gallant leader, Col. Alexander Leroy Hawkins, had answered the last great roll call.

We knew that he was a sick man when he led us in battle, but his leadership meant so much to us, and he knew it. He sacrificed himself for those of his command and his country.

It was a real inspiration to see Colonel Hawkins at the head of an advancing line. His coolness under fire; his friendly advice; his fine discipline; his love of country and his devotion to duty all endeared him to his men. He will always be remembered as our hero and our inspiration.

Arriving in San Francisco we were met by a delegation from western Pennsylvania. We were mustered out of the service August 22 and then made another memorable trip across the continent. Thousands greeted us.

In Pittsburgh, August 29, 1899, we were welcomed by the President of the United States and other distinguished statesmen and soldiers of that period, and by our friends and loved ones.

The Tenth was truly a cross section of America. Rich and poor; rural and city; educated and noneducated; farmer, laborer, skilled artisans, and professional men were all found in the ranks. They went back into their old places in civilian life, and they have made good. They served in peace as they fought in war. All have taken an active part in making America the greatest nation in the history of the world.

We have not forgotten our military duty. Veterans of the old Tenth served in the Mexican border campaign and World Wars I and II.

During World War I, at one time, a former member of the old Tenth of Philippine days was in command of a port and seven others were in command of regiments. A total of 47 were in the service. Three served in World War II. Five had served in the Civil War. No other American outfit has such a thrilling record.

The regiment has been promptly reorganized after each war. It is now the One Hundred and Tenth Infantry, which took a glorious part on the battlefields of France in both world wars. It is again in the National Guard of Pennsylvania. Many of the sons and grandsons of the old outfit are now carrying on in the fine and patriotic traditions of the old Fighting Tenth.

The Spanish-American War veteran asked little from his Government. His pay was small. He was handicapped by poor equipment and lack of supplies. It was 20 years before any of them received a pension or any governmental help. It was 25 years before the promised travel pay was received.

It is most proper that we meet here today to honor our old colonel and the members of our regiment who have passed to their reward. We honor their memories. Their record is their greatest monument.

But if these records are to endure for all time, our country, as they knew it and loved it, must be preserved.

That calls for a rededication of our lives to the principles in which they believed accompanied by work and sacrifice.

Now as to the future. To keep America as our buddies knew it, certain duties and obligations must have our attention.

I would like to suggest the following:

1. The country must be kept solvent and financially solid. The people of a country cannot long be free and independent if they are debt ridden and heavily taxed. We must curtail government in America. It now costs us too much. We spend more for government than we do for food.

2. Our people must know their obligations to the Nation. As Americans we have obligations as well as rights. We must always realize that the Government is the servant of the people and not their master. To keep it that way we must ask less from the Government and do more for ourselves.

3. We must remember always that it is the American way for a man to be rewarded for his ability, persistence and initiative. That has made America a land of opportunity. Government must keep out of business because that deprives Americans of opportunity.

4. The freedom of the individual has made the American the superior workman, the greatest inventor, the most skilled manager, the foremost in culture and religion and the bravest soldier of the world. Freedom is a sacred thing. It is founded on the teachings of the Bible. Freedom cannot be limited to one class, one religion, one color or one section. It must belong to all or none will have it long.

5. America is a big country. We require large organizations, but we must not let them become so strong and powerful that they may destroy the sacred liberty and independence of the individual. This applies to government, business, and labor organizations. Local government is self rule. Small business is the strength of the American economy. Local labor organizations know the needs of their membership. All in their respective fields, local government, little business and the small labor organizations, must be protected.

6. Our houses of worship should be filled because it is there we are taught the virtues upon which our Government rests. Our form of government cannot live without the church. A totalitarian government cannot prevail if the church is strong and militant. Tolerant religion is our strength.

7. There must be a crusade against the law evader, the chiseler, and the racketeer. Crime now costs us more than all our contributions to the church, education, and welfare. If we are to take our proper place in world leadership we must put our house in order.

8. America can only be strong if our people are imbued with American ideals. These include tolerance, obedience to the law, and hard work at the job of our choice. No one has the right to the protection of America if he is not imbued with American ideals. Those who would destroy America should be sent elsewhere. Our country is only for those believing in America. Above all else, America must be first in our hearts.

Lastly, let us dedicate the remainder of our days to building a stronger and better America through advocating peace, good will, tolerance, thrift, courage, hard work, and the love of God.

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES OF THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. With the understanding that it will not interfere with my right to the floor, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, am today addressing to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] as chairman of the Subcommittee on Senate Special Investigations relative to the rather startling information which has been brought out relative to the action of one Oscar R. Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, in imposing censorship on Dr. Studebaker, who was then Commissioner of Education.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 3, 1948.

Senator HOMER FERGUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Senate Special Investigations, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor-Federal Security of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, has brought to my attention a letter written to Oscar R. Ewing, administrator of the Federal Security Agency, by Dr. John W. Studebaker, recently Commissioner of Education. In his letter to Mr. Ewing, Dr. Studebaker makes very serious and startling statements concerning the administrative policies of the Federal Security Agency. Dr. Studebaker also lists grave charges that top-level censorship within the agency has restricted the Office of Education in its legitimate and proper efforts to proclaim the hostility of the Communist Party to the concepts of American education in which our free and democratic institutions are rooted.

I do not need to tell you that in recommending an appropriation for the Federal Security Agency it never was intended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations that funds should be used to pay the salaries of a supervisory staff which might frustrate the Office of Education in its honest attempt to combat Communist philosophy through the public schools of the Nation. If Dr. Studebaker's charges are true, there has been a breach of trust tantamount to betrayal within the Federal Security Agency. Immediate and drastic action is called for if any officials within the agency are thwarting the efforts of the Office of Education to foster through public education a decent respect for the American way of life and an honest antagonism to the totalitarian forces that threaten the free peoples of the world.

Senator KNOWLAND and I have conferred on the Studebaker letter, a copy of which was forwarded to the Appropriations Subcommittee for appropriate action. It is our desire that you use the good offices of your committee to explore the soundness of the charges which have been made concerning high-policy decisions of the Federal Security Administrator. We believe that you and the members of your committee can render valuable service to the American people by making a fair appraisal of the charges which Dr. Studebaker has uttered and which Mr. Ewing is reported to have denied.

The Senate Appropriations Committee will undertake at once a study of the budgeting practices of the Federal Security Agency to determine if hidden transfers of funds within the Agency are weakening the effectiveness of the Office of Education and other constituent parts, as Dr. Studebaker's letter alleges. Such transfers of funds within departments and agencies of government have been practiced frequently in recent years to provide money for unwholesome, centralized bureaucracy which Congress would not support by direct appropriation and which could

not exist under responsible administration of government.

Very truly yours,

STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is very startling and very serious to hear the charges made against Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, who is the pet of the White House. From reports, I gather that he is now one of the principal individuals conducting the President's campaign. It is a most serious thing for him to attempt to stifle any criticism of the infiltration of communism in the schools of the country, and to place a man like Dr. Studebaker under wraps. That was one of the reasons why Dr. Studebaker resigned as United States Commissioner of Education. My hat goes off to Dr. Studebaker.

Some day some one will have to answer for the infiltration of communism into some of our schools and colleges. No. 1 on the list should be Oscar R. Ewing. If the President of the United States means what he says about communism as a whole, then he should today demand the resignation of Oscar R. Ewing as Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, because any man who in an official position such as his, who tries to prevent sunlight from reaching the nooks and corners of communism is not worthy of the post he holds. What Mr. Ewing has done in this instance calls for immediate and drastic action by the President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall be glad to yield if I can.

Mr. HILL. With the understanding that it does not interfere with my right to the floor, I shall be glad to have the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator seen the letter which Dr. Studebaker has written to Mr. Truman?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has it been placed in the RECORD? If not, I hope the Senator will place it in the RECORD. I think it should go into the RECORD by all means.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand that it was placed in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I have yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire. I do not believe he has finished. Does the Senator from New Hampshire desire to yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree entirely with what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire said about Mr. Ewing. I believe that Mr. Ewing should by all means be forced to resign. But let me ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. What can Congress do in the matter? What steps can we take?

Mr. BRIDGES. The only step I know of is to change the administration.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what I am getting at. After January 20, Hon. J. Strom Thurmond will be President of the United States, and we are going to clear men like Oscar Ewing out of the Government.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad that the objective of the Senator from Mississippi is to clear out of the Government men like Ewing. I do not agree with him as to who will be President of the United States after January. I might have rather definite ideas on that subject.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator will not agree with me, but the American people will. The American people are for preserving the integrity of their State institutions and their system of government. For that reason Governor Thurmond will sweep the country.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the Senator as to the need for a change. I do not agree with him as to who is to be President of the United States after January 20, but I do agree that there will be a change. I think probably it will be a gentleman from New York who will be President of the United States at that time. Nevertheless, we can agree on a common objective of ridding some of the governmental departments of certain individuals who now head them. When we think of the present communistic threat in the world, when we see communism creeping into our school systems and into some of our colleges, and when we see what has been brought out by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in the very far-reaching investigation which he is conducting, and then see someone who is the pet of the White House, and who, as I read the other day, is one of the two brain powers Mr. Truman is employing to conduct his campaign——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from New Hampshire certainly does not believe that the Governor of New York would clean Communists out of the Government service, when New York, for all practical purposes, is a Communist State. Communists control the politics of the State of New York. We should not go to New York to get Communists cleaned out of the Government. In fact, most of the Communists we now have here are from the State of New York. If the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire will follow to its logical conclusion the very able argument which he is making, he will take the stump for Governor Thurmond.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that so far as I know there are no Communists in the State administration in New York. I think Governor Dewey has a very outstanding record in that connection. I admit that there are a great many Communists in New York, and that too many of them have wormed their way into governmental departments in Washington.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is certainly mistaken about there being no Communists in the government of the State of New York. The Senator well knows that a high appointee of Governor Dewey came before the Senator's committee, the Committee on Armed Services, and advocated what another Republican Senator said was treason. The Governor of New York has never taken any action against him.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not countenance Communists in Government service, whether in the government of the State of New York or elsewhere. I say that certainly, so far as I know, in the State government of New York there are none.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, inasmuch as the distinguished Senator has made that statement—and I know he is sincere in making it—he has just one course open to him; there is just one thing he can do to serve his country well, and that is to join the great States' rights movement and elect J. Strom Thurmond President of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have seen some queer things happen, so far as consistency is concerned. I remember the day when, before the Senate Appropriations Committee, the State Department, representing the administration, asked for $400,000,000 to fight communism in Turkey and Greece. I supported it, and I am glad I did. But let me say that on the same day, before the same committee, the same State Department and the same witnesses asked for $26,500,000 to continue the shipment of lend-lease to Russia. There are some queer things going on here in Washington and in this country. When we have a very able United States Commissioner of Education who has enough American blood in his system to wish to caution the educators of the country against the infiltration of communism in our school systems and our colleges, and when one Oscar Ewing, the pet of the President of the United States, puts the quietus on it, it is time Mr. Ewing was disposed of and went back home, where he belongs, or some place where he can do no harm. [Manifestations of applause by the occupants of the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must remind the occupants of the galleries that no demonstrations are allowed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. Yes, if I may have unanimous consent to do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee which is conducting the investigation of communistic activities may be permitted to hold hearings during the meetings of the Senate for the remainder of the present session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Next, Mr. President, I wish to advise the Senate and the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], that I have just received his letter in relation to the investigation of Mr. Oscar R. Ewing and the Federal Security Agency or anyone connected with it. I wish to assure the Senate that immediately we shall proceed with that investigation, so that we may advise the Senate and the public of the facts. I think it is exactly in line

with what we are doing today in relation to how the Government is conducted so far as Communists and communistic activities are concerned.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Michigan on the fine job he is doing as chairman of the committee investigating communism. Some of the things that are being brought out in that connection are really startling. Every American, regardless of party or who he is or where he comes from, every American who has any real American blood in his system, should offer up a prayer of thanks to the Senator from Michigan and his committee for the splendid job they are doing in bringing out these facts in regard to influences which are attempting to undermine the very foundations of the American Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee thanks the Senator from New Hampshire for his kind remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield to me, with the same understanding as to his right to the floor, let me state that I have kept up with what the distinguished Senator from Michigan has been doing in regard to the committee of which he is the chairman, and I desire to state that he is to be very greatly congratulated on the fine work he is doing. He is doing a splendid job. It is good American work; it is carrying out the American doctrine of government; it is against the foolish "isms" in which of late so many persons in this country have been indulging. I wish to congratulate him as strongly as I know how on the splendid work he is doing, and I wish him every success. Let me say that I shall undertake to give him any aid it is possible for me to give.

I congratulate both the Senator from Michigan and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], with whom I have served so long. I congratulate him on the splendid work he is doing and especially on the work done this morning. I congratulate both Senators.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Small Business Committee and the Senate Investigating Committee which are conducting these hearings, I thank the Senator for his remarks. We hope these committees will be able to carry through, so that they may advise the Senate and the public just what the conditions are.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know they will.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the appeal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] from the decision of the Chair holding that the cloture motion on the motion to take up House bill 29 was not in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am unalterably opposed to the bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers. I am one of the Members of this body who have banded themselves together to use every parliamentary means and every power at their command to prevent the passage of this bill.

Mr. President, this bill seeks by statute to modify, to amend, and to change a clear, definite, and positive provision of the Constitution of the United States. This bill would, by means of legislative fiat, change the Constitution of the United States. The Congress has no power under the Constitution to pass such a bill. To do so would be to rape the Constitution of the United States; and if the Congress should once commit this rape, it would be opening wide the door; no one could foretell how many other illegitimate interferences there might be by the Congress with the fundamental law as embodied in the Constitution, how many rapes there might be of the rights of the States as safeguarded and protected by the Constitution, how many rapes there might be of the rights of minorities as guarded and protected in the Constitution.

Mr. President, I do not believe a poll tax should be a prerequisite for voting. In my State of Alabama, I have long advocated repeal of the poll tax as such prerequisite by the State. But this is a matter that belongs to the State. Action can be taken and should be taken only by the State. We know that in the early days and for many years in the history of our country, many of the States required the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting in those States. Practically all the States have had some such qualification, and some of the States have had a more stringent, a more burdensome qualification, namely, the ownership or the holding of property.

Great progress has been made in the removal of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. In 1901 the State of Massachusetts repealed the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. I notice the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is now sitting as the acting majority leader of the Senate. He doubtless recalls that for over a hundred years, down to as late as 1901, his State had a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting. It was only under the leadership of the then Governor, William Russell, that in the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts the fight was made and the poll tax as such prerequisite was repealed.

Today in the State of Vermont the payment of a poll tax is still a prerequisite for voting in town elections, but most of the States, as I have said, have removed this prerequisite. In the South, very definite progress has been made in the removal of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

In recent years, as we know, North Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, and Georgia have removed the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Some 2 or 3 years ago the Legislature of Tennessee sought to remove the poll tax, and passed a statute to that effect. It happened, however, that the Supreme Court of Tennessee held the statute unconstitutional and therefore ineffective. But it showed that in Tennessee efforts were being made to remove the poll tax.

As we know, in the State of Virginia, a constitutional amendment has been submitted to the voters to remove the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

In my State of Alabama all veterans, and there are thousands of them, are today exempted from payment of any poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

So a great advance has been made in the elimination of the poll tax as such prerequisite.

As the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in his fine speech on Thursday, brought to the attention of the Senate, article I of section 2 of the Constitution of the United States declares as follows:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

How could any language be clearer? How could any prescriptions be more definitely or more unequivocally stated than are the prescriptions in section 2 of article I? It would seem as we read the section that even a fourth-grade child in school could have no trouble in ascertaining the clear intent and the clear meaning of the words of the section. "He who runs may read" the section without experiencing any difficulty as to the clarity of its meaning. The section simply, clearly, definitely, positively, absolutely says—what? That the electors who shall vote for Members of the House of Representatives of the Federal Congress in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. President, it would seem that nothing could be clearer than the language in this section of the Constitution. We must recall that in 1787 when the language was written the States were absolute sovereigns. They had joined in the Declaration of Independence. They had proclaimed their independence of the British Crown. They had fought through eight long, terrible, and bloody years to win their independence, and they stood absolutely independent and free from any other sovereignty on this earth. Their own sovereignty was full, complete, and absolute.

So they gathered in Philadelphia in their sovereign capacities, through their delegates to write the Constitution of the United States. The question was, How much of their sovereignty would they yield to the Federal Government? The Federal Government was not in being; it had no existence; it had no sovereignty. The only sovereignty it could have would be such sovereignty as was granted by the sovereign States of that time. Anyone who is at all familiar with the history of the writing of the Constitution knows how jealous were the several States of their sovereignty and how reluctant they were to yield very much of their sovereignty to any Federal government. Mindful of their sovereignty, zestful and

determined insofar as possible to keep within their own hands as much of that sovereignty as they could, and still have a Federal Government to meet the problems which had to be met by a central Federal Government, what did they do? They provided that every State should have two Senators; two Members in this body, no matter how large or how small the State might be, no matter what the population of the State might be, no matter what the economic power of the State might be, what its industrial development or its financial development or its agricultural development might be. No matter what might be the status of a State in its power, its influence, its ability to influence other States and other persons in other States, every State in the United States should have equal representation in the Senate, should have two Senators. Then, as Senators will recall, they went one further step, and provided that no State should have its representation in this body reduced or taken away from it without the consent of that State. This meant that no matter how small the State might be, how weak, how ineffective, how uninfluential it might be, it would have equal representation in this body; it would have two Senators along with the two Senators of the most powerful, the wealthiest, and the greatest State in the United States.

Mr. President, they did not stop there. The sovereign States, in their resolve and their determination to make secure the primary authority of the States, provided in the Constitution, before they yielded any sovereignty to the Federal Government, that State legislatures could originate amendments to the Constitution. That was one more step taken by the sovereign States to insure the primary authority of the States. They did not stop there. They went even further and provided that before the Constitution of the United States could be changed in any way whatever, before there could be one iota of alteration, before one single word could be taken out of that instrument, it had to be done by amendment, and that the amendment had to be ratified by three-fourths of the States of the Union. As we know, ratification by three-fourths of the States means that it must be by both houses of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

Then, Mr. President, after the delegates representing the sovereign States had finished their work of writing the Constitution, putting in all the safeguards to insure the primary authority of the States, they closed the Constitution by writing into it the declaration that the Constitutional Convention acted "by the unanimous consent of the States" present. They wanted the people to know at that time, and wanted all succeeding generations to know, including the Senators sitting here in the year of our Lord 1948, some 160 years after the Constitution was drafted, that it was these sovereign States which had drafted and formulated the Constitution.

Furthermore, Mr. President, even after the sovereign States, through their delegates at Philadelphia in the Constitutional Convention, had written into the Constitution all these safeguards, all these protecting clauses to insure the primary authority of the States, the people themselves—the people back home, who had the final say, who held the final authority in the matter, and without whose voting consent there could be no Constitution—were not quite satisfied. They could look down the years, and they could see that there might be some trick of legerdemain, some resort to parliamentary tactics, whereby someone wishing to rush through some proposal, unwilling to go through the lawful and orderly processes set out and ordained in the Constitution for its amendment, would seek to read into the Constitution powers for the Federal Government which the framers of the Constitution and which the sovereign States never intended the Federal Government should have, which the framers and the sovereign States never intended should be yielded by the sovereign States to the Federal Government.

So, before the people in their State conventions were willing to ratify the Constitution, to make it effective, and bring into being the Federal Government, they said, "We must have the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights," and, as we know, when the Constitution was finally ratified it was well and thoroughly understood that the first 10 amendments to it would be adopted. Let me read the ninth amendment. It specifically declares:

> The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights—

That means the enumeration of certain rights in the Federal Constitution for the Federal Government—

> The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

The people insisted that, as a condition of their ratification, the Constitution should contain the ninth amendment, absolutely retaining in them the rights not specifically enumerated as rights of the Federal Government.

But the people did not stop with the ninth amendment, as Senators know. They insisted also on the adoption of the tenth amendment, and the tenth amendment was put in as a result of their insistence on a general safety clause for the rights of the State and the people. I am sure the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who has thoroughly studied this matter, will agree with me that we might call this amendment the great safety clause of the Constitution. What does the tenth amendment provide? It declares:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Could any language be stronger or more definite in absolutely safeguarding and protecting the rights of the States and the people from encroachments by the Congress of the United States or the Federal Government, on those rights?

We recall, Mr. President, that even with all these safeguards in the Constitution itself to which I have called attention, and even with the agreement to adopt the ninth and tenth amendments, there was a great battle in most of the States over the ratification of the Constitution. At that time, the three most powerful and the three most influential States were Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia. In their State conventions, because of the fear that the sovereign States might be giving up too much sovereignty, that they might be putting too much power in the hands of the Federal Government, only 53 percent of the votes were for ratification.

As we recall, two of the foremost patriots of the Revolution, Patrick Henry, who sounded the tocsin of war and gave us the battle cry of the Revolution, and George Mason, who wrote the Virginia bill of rights, which gave us our Federal Bill of Rights, and the bill of rights in every State constitution—both these great patriots who had done so much to win our independence from the British Crown, to win our freedom, opposed the ratification of the Constitution. They felt as did many of their compatriots, that there might be too great a surrender of sovereignty on the part of the States, that there might be too much yielding of power to the Federal Government.

I emphasize these points because the history of the ratification of the Constitution shows clearly that if the sovereignty of the States and the rights of the States had not been positively recognized in the Constitution, if all these safeguards and protections for their sovereignty and their rights had not been put into the Constitution, the Constitution would never have been ratified, and we would never have had a Federal Government.

Mr. President, as we know, mankind had struggled through the centuries to break arbitrary power in the hands of a king. The high-water mark of this struggle to break down this arbitrary power and to bring about the distribution of this power into the hands of the people was reached when we fought the American Revolution.

The framers of the Constitution knew that the States, with their State governments, county governments, city governments, and town governments, were the citadels of local self-government. They knew that their concept of government by the people required full and plenary recognition of the rights of the States. If the people were to hold and exercise the power of government there had to be this recognition of the sovereignty of the States.

They were fighting against a pool of centralized arbitrary power at the seat of government. They were fighting to keep the well springs of our system of Government in the hands of the people, in the local communities, at the crossroads, in the hamlets, the towns, and the cities. What would it have availed the people to break the tyranny of the British Crown had they themselves then set up here in Washington a government with central arbitrary power? They were determined, after all the long sacrifice they had made and all their bitter suffering, to reserve the power in their own hands. To do this, I repeat, they knew that they had to maintain the rights of the States, because within the States are

the citadels of this power. It is in the States that this power must reside. It is in the States that this power can function. And it is only in the States that this power can be preserved.

Mr. President, for 150 years, in fact not until this anti-poll-tax bill first appeared, no record can be found that anyone ever questioned the provisions of article I, section 2 of the Constitution that the electors who vote for Members of Congress shall have the qualifications of the electors who vote for the most numerous branch of the several State legislatures.

When the fourteenth amendment was submitted by Congress there was no thought, no suggestion that the Congress could step in and by legislative enactment fix or modify or change or prescribe the qualifications of the electors for Members of Congress or the qualifications of the electors for President and Vice President.

Mr. President, in order that we may understand and fully appreciate how fixed and set was this acceptance of the fact that Congress had no power to legislate as to the qualifications of these electors, I call to the attention of the Senate that when Congress met in December 1865, the then leader of the House of Representatives was Mr. Thaddeus Stevens of the State of Pennsylvania. Perhaps in all the history of the House of Representatives it has never had a more complete master than was Thaddeus Stevens. When the House met Thaddeus Stevens outlined the program with reference to the Southern States, as to what should be done to them, as to what should be done about the situation that grew out of the War Between the States. Among other things Mr. Stevens said:

> The future condition of the conquered power depends upon the will of the conqueror.

He said further that the conquered provinces were to be admitted as States—

> Only when the Constitution has been amended so as to secure the perpetual ascendancy of the party of the Union.

That, of course, meant the Republican Party. He continued, and this is the gist of his feelings at that time as the leader in the program of dealing with the Southern States:

> Every government is a despotism. • • • The Constitution has nothing to do with it.

That is the program for the Southern States.

> I propose to deal with you—

That is, the South—

> entirely by the laws of war. The conquered people have no right to appeal to the courts to test the constitutionality of the law. The Constitution has nothing to do with them or they with it.

In other words, Mr. Stevens said that so far as the Southern States were concerned they were out from under any protection of the Constitution; they held no rights given by the Constitution. All the safeguards, all the guaranties accorded to the other States, he said, then were denied to the States of the South. He said they had no standing whatever under the Constitution; that they had no right to go into court to raise any constitutional question.

Mr. Stevens said that the Southern States were but conquered provinces. But when he came to the question of suffrage what did he do? Did he introduce a bill to prescribe the qualifications of the electors for the Congress of the United States? Did he seek to resort to statutory enactment? No. He recognized, that although the Southern States, according to his view and his version, might not have rights under the Constitution, every other State in the United States had rights under it, and that he could not do violence to the Constitution without doing violence to rights of the States of the North, the States of the East, and the States of the West. He recognized the clear language of the Constitution that the qualifications of electors for Members of Congress were the qualifications fixed by the States for the electors for the most numerous branch of the legislature. He did not dare propose that the Congress seek to set aside the Constitution, or seek to change the Constitution, or amend or modify or rape the Constitution by any legislative act.

So Mr. Stevens and his lieutenants in the Congress, even though they were seeking changes respecting suffrage to apply primarily and almost wholly to the South, did not dare ignore the Constitution of the United States and seek to reach their ends by a statute to be passed by Congress. He and the other leaders of the Congress at that time submitted the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States. They changed the Constitution in the one way that the Constitution can be changed, in the only lawful, orderly, and constitutional way, and that is by constitutional amendment. That is why the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States were submitted.

Mr. Stevens and the other leaders recognized that, no matter what the difficulties might be about a change in the Constitution, no matter what delays there might be, or what question there might be as to whether or not such amendments might be ratified, the only way the Constitution could be changed was by constitutional amendment; and that was the course and the procedure that they followed.

So, Mr. President, as I have said, for more than 160 years we have lived under the express language of the Constitution. I might say 160 glorious years, because in all the annals of human history there is no story quite so glorious as that of the progress, advancement, and happiness of the American people under the Constitution of the United States. There is nothing to surpass the freedom which our people have enjoyed to seek their own pursuits, to follow the dictates of their own minds, to advance their own interests and bring about their own development, to acquire and hold whatever their capacity, their genius, and the sweat of their toil might entitle them to.

Mr. President, it is a grave thing when it is proposed to open the door to rape the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Alabama is making a very able argument, to which I am listening with considerable interest. There is no doubt in the Senator's mind, is there, that prior to the adoption of the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution it was admitted on every hand that the States could place any limitation on suffrage that they desired to place? They could require a property qualification, or a qualification as to race, as did New York and some of the other States.

Mr. HILL. Some States had a religious qualification.

Mr. EASTLAND. There was a religious qualification in certain States.

The fifteenth amendment provides that a person shall not be disqualified because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. We later adopted the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits disqualification because of sex. It permitted women to vote. If Congress has the right to enact an anti-poll-tax bill and say that a poll tax shall not be a qualification, why was it necessary to amend the Constitution of the United States in those two instances, by adopting the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. If Congress could have said by a simple act that race should not be a qualification for voting, and that sex should not be a qualification for voting, it was a futile thing to amend the Constitution, as was done when the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments were adopted. Does the distinguished Senator agree with me?

Mr. HILL. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. While the Senator was necessarily absent from the Chamber, I commented on the situation in Congress at the time the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments were submitted. I quoted certain language of Thaddeus Stevens, who, the Senator will recall, was the master of the situation in the House of Representatives. Thaddeus Stevens had said that so far as the Southern States were concerned they had no rights under the Constitution, that the Constitution had nothing to do with them. He said that all the safeguards in the Constitution, all the protections and guarantees for the States, were null and void so far as the Southern States were concerned. Yet in spite of Thaddeus Stevens' feeling with respect to the Southern States, and although he was seeking to take an action in connection with suffrage which was largely confined to the South, he did not even suggest that that action be by legislative statute. He recognized that the Constitution was a protection of the rights of the States of the North, the East, and the West and even if his views were to be accepted—that the South had no rights under the Constitution—he did not attempt to violate the Constitution. He and the other

leaders submitted the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Section 1 of article II of the Constitution provides that Presidential electors shall be chosen by the State "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct." The bill provides that a poll tax shall not be a qualification for a voter for President or Vice President. To begin with, we do not have candidates on the ballot for President or Vice President. The bill also provides that a poll tax shall not be a qualification for a voter for candidates for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors. Does not the Senator agree that it is the plain meaning of the Constitution that the legislature of a State may determine the terms and conditions for choosing the State's Presidential electors?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is again correct. In fact, in our early history the legislature itself, in some of the States, chose the electors.

Mr. EASTLAND. The legislature has that right today. If it is done by suffrage, the only limitation on the power of the States to fix the qualifications of electors are the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments. If the bill were constitutional, the Federal Government would have the authority to go into the State, to go behind the State legislature and engraft terms on the power of the State legislature to choose Presidential electors.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. Of course, the Congress has no such power.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is unheard of under the American system.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. But the bill goes much further than purely Federal elections. It says it is limited to the election of Representatives in the Federal Congress or of Senators in the Federal Congress, or of candidates for President or Vice President, or candidates for electors for President or Vice President; but the Constitution says that the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures must be the identical qualifications of voters for members of the Federal House of Representatives, and under the seventeenth amendment, for United States Senators.

Mr. HILL. I was coming to that in a moment. I will say to the Senator——

Mr. EASTLAND. Those qualifications must be identical. If Congress can engraft qualifications there, then the Congress of the United States would be fixing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi is exactly right; and then the Congress would, by legislative act, amend, change, and modify the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. If this bill is enacted, we are bound to have to come to the conclusion that when the States adopted the Constitution, they surrendered to the Congress of the United States the power to choose State officials who exercise State prerogatives exclusively.

Mr. HILL. Yes; and they have nothing whatever to do with the Federal Government.

Mr. EASTLAND. The mere statement of that premise shows the patent unconstitutionality of this measure; does not the distinguished Senator from Alabama agree as to that?

Mr. HILL. I agree 100 percent with the distinguished Senator. The unconstitutionality of the measure is patent on the face of it.

Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi referred to the seventeenth amendment. We recall that that amendment to the Constitution was adopted in 1913. That was 126 years after the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. After 126 years, when the people of the United States saw fit to change their method of electing United States Senators, when they desired to have their Senators elected, not by the legislatures, as provided in the original Constitution, but directly by the people themselves, what did they provide? They provided, in the seventeenth amendment, as follows:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

Then there is this language:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

The people adopted the same, the identical language for the qualification of electors for the United States Senate that was adopted for electors for Members of the House of Representatives at the very beginning. In other words, they ratified and reaffirmed the wisdom of the founding fathers and of the Original States in providing that the qualifications of the electors for Members of the Congress should be the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. I think it can be said here that had the seventeenth amendment made any change in the fixing or determination of those qualifications, it would never have been ratified by the people of the United States. The people were determined that these qualifications should remain, to be fixed by the States, and not by either the Federal Constitution or the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, as we know, for half a century some of the finest, most patriotic, and noblest women in our country, joined by splendid, outstanding, patriotic men, carried on the campaign for the removal of sex as a qualification for voting; they carried on the campaign to have women given an equal right to vote with men. But if we examine the record we do not find anywhere that any leader in that great cause for woman suffrage ever suggested that women could by legislative enactment be granted the right to vote. That campaign, which was carried on for over half a century, recognized at all times the Constitution of the United States and particularly section 2 of article I of the Constitution in its full purport and its full integrity; and that campaign, from the day of its beginning until its successful conclusion, was always a campaign for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. As we know, when the nineteenth amendment was ratified and became a part of the Constitution, women were put upon an equal basis with men so far as sex is concerned in the matter of the qualifications for voting.

So, Mr. President, as I have said, when the fourteenth amendment was submitted and ratified, when the fifteenth amendment was submitted and ratified, when the seventeenth amendment was submitted and ratified, and when the nineteenth amendment was submitted and ratified, the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States ratified and reaffirmed the integrity of section 2 of article I of the Constitution of the United States and the integrity of section 1 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States.

They ratified and reaffirmed the fact that Congress has no power in any way to legislate with reference to the qualifications of the electors. Congress cannot subtract from those qualifications, Congress cannot add to those qualifications. Congress can do absolutely nothing so far as those qualifications are concerned. The Constitution of the United States, in clear and positive language, makes it definite and certain that those qualifications shall be fixed by the States.

Mr. President, in opposing the anti-poll-tax bill, we who oppose it, we who fight so bitterly against it are not only fighting for the protection of the rights of the States, but we are also fighting to save our dual form of government—to save the American Republic.

In the very beginning, article I, section 2, vested in the State governments the power over suffrage. Without the possession of this power in the States, the whole structure upon which the division of state and national authority under the Constitution and the organization of both governments rests would be without support, and the authority of both State and Nation would fall to the ground. Surely, after 160 years of the tried and proven wisdom, of the tried and proven effectiveness of this section, it is most unfortunate that now, in the heat, passion, and confusion of an election campaign, when a President of the United States is to be elected, when a third of the Members of this body are to be elected, when all the Members of the House of Representatives are to be elected, and when State officials are to be elected, this question, which strikes at the very foundation-stones of our dual system of government and which would tear down the very structure of our Government, should be injected into the Senate of the United States. It is no time for the consideration of a matter so serious, so important, so fundamental to the lives, the liberties, and the rights of the people of the United States. The matter should be laid aside and no further consideration given under the temper and heat of this hour, to such a fundamental proposal striking at

the very base of the temple of American rights and American freedom.

Mr. President, there appeared before the Senate committee when it was considering the anti-poll-tax bill one of the ablest constitutional lawyers I have ever known, Mr. Charles Warren, of this city. He made one of the clearest, one of the most erudite and profound analyses of section 2 of article I I have ever read. At this time I want to call that analysis to the attention of the Senate. Before doing so, I shall read a very brief biographical sketch of Judge Warren, in order that we may know who he is and by what authority he speaks. I read:

Judge Warren is a graduate of the Harvard law school. He has a doctor of laws degree from Columbia University. He was a former associate of Moorfield Storey, whom many of us will recall as an eminent lawyer in Boston, Mass. He has been in Washington since 1914 and was, from 1914 to 1918, an Assistant Attorney General of the United States. He has been a lecturer at Princeton, Cornell, the University of Illinois, the University of Rochester, Boston University, the University of Virginia, William and Mary, Northwestern University, and the University of Chicago. He has been an overseer of Harvard College, a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society and of the American Society of International Law, and he is at present an honorary vice president of that society. He is a member of the Academy of Arts and Letters.

I may say Judge Warren makes clear that he is opposed to a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting and that he thinks the States should remove the poll tax as such prerequisite. In fact, he told the committee he was the private secretary to Gov. William E. Russell, of Massachusetts, in 1901 when the Governor waged the fight in that State for the repeal of the poll tax. Judge Warren, as a very young man, as private secretary to Governor Russell, took an active part in that fight to have Massachusetts repeal her poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Judge Warren, testifying before the committee, quoted section 2 of article I. I think the section is like the words of Scripture. It will stand quoting and requoting, and then perhaps quoting again; so that if the Senate will bear with me, before I proceed to discuss Judge Warren's analysis of the section, I shall read it:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Judge Warren then goes on to say:

You notice that that is not a grant of power specifically to the Congress of the United States. In fact, it is not a grant of power to anyone. It is a requirement of the Constitution for the formation of the new Government. The first part of it is a requirement that the people of the several States shall choose Members of the House of Representatives every second year. That was no relinquishment or delegation of power from the States. That was a constituent part of the formation of the new Government, and was a command—

A command. Later in my remarks I shall call attention to the Classic case in which Mr. Justice Stone, afterward Mr. Chief Justice Stone, used that exact word and this exact expression—

and was a command to the States to elect their Members of Congress every second year.

That, as Judge Warren said, was a command.

It was neither a delegation of power nor was it a prohibition. It was a command and is so referred to in recent cases in the Supreme Court.

That includes the Classic case to which I shall refer.

Then Judge Warren goes on as follows:

The second thing that section 2 did was: It vested a right in the electors in each State who have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature—a right in those persons in the State and those only who were entitled to vote for Members of Congress.

In other words, as Judge Warren makes clear, it vested this right in the electors in the States to vote for Members of Congress. Judge Warren continues:

That was not a delegation of power by the State, because the State never had the power to vote, the State inhabitants never had that power to vote for Members of Congress, because there were no such things.

There was no delegation of power. A State could not delegate a power which it did not possess. Certainly a State did not have any power to elect Members of Congress, because, until the formation of the Federal Government, there was no such thing as a Congress of the United States, and, of course, there were no Members of Congress.

Judge Warren continues:

That was a direct provision in the establishment of the new Government, and it did vest a right, but it vested a right in only certain people to vote for Members of Congress.

Now, the third thing that that section 2 contains is this: It contains undoubtedly an implied prohibition on the States against fixing for electors of the Members of Congress any different requirements for suffrage from those which they fixed for the electors of their own most numerous branch of their legislature, i. e., any qualifications which were not those requisite for it to render an inhabitant of their own State eligible to vote.

That is an implied prohibition. The State was prohibited from establishing any kind of a qualification for electors for Members of Congress different from the qualifications of electors for the most numerous branch of the legislatures.

Judge Warren continues:

Let me repeat that. There is undoubtedly an implied prohibition that the States cannot establish qualifications for electors of members of their own legislature which shall be different from those which they establish for electors of Members of Congress. That is neither a delegation nor a grant of power; that is an implied restriction, undoubtedly.

Now, is there in that section 2 any grant of power whatever? Not specifically, of course. I suppose there is, under the necessary and proper clause of section 8 of article I, an implied power to Congress to do certain things, but what is the extent of those implied powers? It is to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper "for carrying into execution" the above provisions of article I, section 2.

What are the provisions? I go back again. First, Congress undoubtedly has power to legislate so as to see to it that the States do elect Members of Congress every second year. Congress undoubtedly has the power to protect the right which the Constitution vested in such persons in the States as had the qualifications requisite to vote for members of the State legislature. Congress undoubtedly has that power; and I think Congress has, under the necessary and proper clause, power to legislate so as to see that the States make the same provisions for qualifications of electors of Members of Congress as they do for electors of their own legislature.

Those are the only three things that can be done under article I, section 2, and those are the only three things on which Congress can act under the necessary and proper clause, and "carry into execution" under that clause.

Mr. President, let us go a little further into section 2. I think no one will contend—surely I have never found anyone who has ever contended—that Congress has any power to prescribe for the States whom they shall qualify to vote. Certainly no one has ever contended that Congress has any power to prescribe the qualifications for the electors who vote for members of the State legislature or other State officers or officials. As I said earlier in my remarks, before 1787 the States had absolutely full and unlimited power to establish any requirements which the people of the States, through their constitutions or legislatures, in their absolute discretion and judgment, desired in order to qualify any one of their inhabitants to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. There was no limitation whatever upon the State, because, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, the State was absolutely sovereign, it had full and plenary sovereignty, it was subject to no other sovereignty, no other power, it was the complete master of itself, of its own actions, of its own constitution, of its own laws, of its own electors, of its own legislature, of its own officials.

As we know, at the time the Constitution was being written, back in 1787, most of the States, at least nine of them, had spoken and fixed by their own constitutions the qualifications of those who should vote for the members of their own legislatures. We cannot forget, Mr. President, in considering this matter, that the delegates from these States knew exactly what those qualifications were in their States. They knew exactly what they were doing when they prescribed that those qualifications fixed by the States should be the qualifications for the electors for Members of the House of Representatives. It was with knowledge of these qualifications that the delegates acted in the drafting and the formation of the Constitution in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia.

What were these qualifications? A list of the States with their qualifications is given. The list is taken from volume I, pages 93–971, of the Constitutional History of the American People, 1776–1850, by Francis Newton Thorpe, published by Harper Brothers, New York. What were the qualifications these delegates adopted and which they ratified

when they put this provision in the Constitution? I think my distinguished friend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in his able speech set out the table of these qualifications, but Senators are very busy, and some of them may not have had a chance to look at the RECORD, so I am going to take a few minutes to go over these qualifications at this time.

The first State is the great little State of New Hampshire, from which some of the Minute Men came in the early days, the men who fought the battles of the Revolution in order that the Constitution might be born, the rights of the States safeguarded, and, most of all, that the power might reside in the hands of the people, and not in a central, arbitrary government here in Washington. That is what those Minute Men died for, those boys from up in the hills and mountains of New Hampshire.

What were the qualifications in New Hampshire? A voter had to have the privilege of the town, and had to be a freeholder. He had to own property; he had to own real estate. But the qualifications in New Hampshire did not stop there. They went further, and what do Senators suppose a voter had to do? He had to pay a poll tax, the very tax we are discussing now. Voters in New Hampshire had to pay a poll tax when this provision was written into the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to his colleague?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my colleague for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask my very able colleague if it is not a fact that in New Hampshire even at this date there is a poll-tax charge, and that the person who fails to pay that tax is ineligible to vote?

Mr. HILL. I had the Library of Congress prepare for me a summary of the poll-tax laws of the States of New England, and my colleague's statement certainly applies to town elections in Vermont. I am not sure, however, from this compilation, that it applies in the State of New Hampshire. It is necessary to pay a poll tax in New Hampshire, as I recall, in order to get a driver's license, in order to run an automobile, and to do other things in that State. But according to this compilation prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, I am not sure that the payment of a poll tax is absolutely a prerequisite to voting in New Hampshire. I am going to ask my colleague from Alabama, while I continue with the qualifications of the other States, to look through this memorandum and check carefully on New Hampshire and the requirements for voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to insert the memorandum in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. HILL. No, I do not ask that now. I am willing to have my colleague check on the State of New Hampshire.

The next State in the list is the State of the granite hills, the beautiful little State of Vermont, from which we get wonderful maple sugar, a State whose sons also played a heroic part in the War of the Revolution. When the Constitution of the United States was being drafted, in order to vote in Vermont a man otherwise eligible to vote—of course no women could vote—in order to meet the prerequisite, had to be a freeholder, he had to own property, and today, as I have said, even at the present moment, in the State of Vermont, in order to vote in a town election one has to pay a poll tax; the payment of a poll tax is a prerequisite to voting.

The next State is the great old Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the State of Samuel Adams, John Hancock, John Adams, John Quincy Adams, Dr. Warren, and the other great heroes of the Revolution. In order to vote in Massachusetts the requirement was that one must own a freehold with an annual income of £3, or an estate of £60. One had to be a property owner in order to vote in Massachusetts. They did not let one off with paying a poll tax of a dollar or a dollar and a half; a voter had to be a property owner.

In the State of New York the voter had to be a freeholder of £20, paying rent of 40 shillings. He had to have a freehold of £100 in order to vote for State senator. They seemed to prescribe a greater prerequisite for voting for State senator than for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature, which meant they prescribed a greater prerequisite for voting for State senator than was required for voting for a Member of the Federal Congress.

In New Jersey one had to own an estate of £50; he had to be a property owner.

In Pennsylvania the voter had to be a State or county taxpayer.

In Delaware the citizen in order to exercise the right to vote also had to be a State or county taxpayer.

In Maryland the voter had to be a freeholder of 50 acres, or have property worth £30 pounds.

We come now to Virginia, a State which did not have any kind of property or tax-payment qualification.

In North Carolina the voter had to own a freehold of 50 acres in a county, and must have owned it for 6 months before the election. It was also a requirement that the voter had paid his public taxes. If the citizen had not paid his public taxes he could not vote.

In South Carolina the voter had to be a freeholder of 50 acres or a town lot, or he had to pay taxes equal to the tax on 50 acres. That is, if the voter did not own 50 acres, he must, as a requirement for voting, have paid a tax equal to the tax on 50 acres.

In Georgia the voter had to own property in an amount of £10, or have a trade as a mechanic, or be a taxpayer.

The State of Kentucky was not one of the 13 original States, but it is included in the list, so I shall refer to it. In order to be a voter in Kentucky a citizen had to be a taxpayer. Kentucky came into the union in 1792, only 3 years after the formation of the Federal Government.

In Tennessee, which was admitted shortly thereafter, a voter had to be a freeholder.

Mr. President, these were the qualifications the States imposed respecting their electors when the Constitution was being drafted, when the delegates from the States were busy writing that document at the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia. They knew what these qualifications were, and therefore when they wrote into the Constitution that the qualifications for electors for Members of the House of Representatives should be the qualifications for the electors for the the most numerous branch of the State legislatures, they knew exactly what they were doing. They knew exactly that as of that moment they were writing those qualifications into the Constitution as the qualifications for electors for Members of the House of Representatives. There can be no doubt that it was clear to them exactly what their actions meant.

When we consult Madison's notes we find that there were three schools of thought in the Constitutional Convention with reference to the matter of qualifications of electors to vote for Members of Congress. Of course, we know that Mr. Madison took the most voluminous notes of any member of the historic convention which gave us the Federal Constitution. Those notes have been compiled for us by Jonathan Elliot, and were published by J. B. Lippincott in Philadelphia in 1907. I have before me volume V of Elliot's Debates on the Federal Constitution, and in a moment I shall read from page 385.

One school of thought felt that the qualifications should be prescribed in the Constitution itself.

The second school of thought felt that the qualifications should be left to Congress; that the Constitution should provide that the Congress should have the power to prescribe the qualifications.

The third school of thought, which as we know prevailed in the Constitutional Convention, was that the qualifications for the electors should be those fixed by the States for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

We turn to Mr. Madison's notes, as compiled by Mr. Jonathan Elliot, and, reading from volume V, page 385, we find this:

Mr. Gouverneur Morris—

From New York, as we recall—

moved to strike out the last member of the section, beginning with the words, "qualifications of electors," in order that some other provision might be substituted which would restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders.

In other words, Gouverneur Morris not only wanted the Constitution to fix the qualifications for the electors but he wanted at least one of those qualifications to be that the elector should be a freeholder, that he should own property. So Gouverneur Morris moved to amend the proposal to write in the qualification that the electors should be freeholders.

Mr. Fitzsimons seconded the motion.

Mr. Williamson was opposed to the motion.

Mr. Wilson—

One of the ablest men in the Constitutional Convention, then spoke. In

that connection, Mr. President, and before I read what these men said, I think I shall call to the attention of the Senate the committee which brought in the provision in section 2 of Article I. It was termed, in the language of the Constitutional Convention, "The Committee of Detail."

The Committee of Detail was composed of Mr. Rutledge, of South Carolina; Edmund Randolph, of Virginia; Nathaniel Gorham, of Massachusetts, who was chairman of the Committee of the Whole; Oliver Ellsworth, and James Wilson, of Pennsylvania. John Rutledge, as we recall, was offered a place on the first United States Supreme Court, and was afterward appointed Chief Justice of the United States. Edmund Randolph, we recall, was George Washington's first Attorney General. Later Oliver Ellsworth was Chief Justice of the United States, and James Wilson was a member of the President's Cabinet.

Where could there have been found at that time in all the world, or where could there be found today in all the world, a committee of abler or more distinguished lawyers and students of government, or more capable political draftsmen than the men who constituted the committee which wrote section 2 of article I? Where could a more brilliant galaxy of stars in the field of statesmanship be found than these great lawyers, students of the philosophy of government, students of human nature, men of common sense and wisdom, who constituted the committee which wrote section 2 of article I?

I was about to read that after Gouverneur Morris moved to amend the committee provision leaving to the States the fixing of the qualifications for electors of Members of Congress, so as to require that the electors be freeholders, or so as to make sure that they were property owners before they could vote for Members of the House, Mr. Fitzsimons seconded the motion. Mr. Williamson opposed it. Then Mr. Wilson, of Pennsylvania, one of the ablest men who sat in that Convention rose and made this observation, according to Madison's notes:

> This part of the report was well considered by the committee, and he (Mr. Wilson) did not think it could be changed for the better. It was difficult to form any uniform rule of qualifications for all the States. Unnecessary innovations, he thought, too, should be avoided.

When I quote that language about unnecessary innovations, I come back to my statement of a few minutes ago, that Mr. Wilson and the other delegates gathered there to write the Constitution knew exactly what the qualifications were as fixed by their own State constitutions. So when Mr. Wilson was speaking about no innovations, he was impliedly, at least, making a plea for the qualifications fixed in his own State of Pennsylvania, and fixed by the constitutions of the other original States.

Mr. Wilson went on to say:

> It would be very hard and disagreeable for the same persons, at the same time, to vote for representatives in the State legislature, and to be excluded from a vote for those in the national legislature.

All of us have many times been in polling booths to vote. We know that the words spoken by Mr. Wilson were not only true in 1787, but that they are just as true today. Can Senators imagine the disorder, the confusion, the uncertainty that would be thrown around the exercise of a right which is the most sacred right, perhaps, possessed by any American citizen, the right to the ballot, if there were one set of qualifications for electors for Members of Congress, President, and Vice President, and another set of qualifications for electors of State legislatures and State officers?

While I do not believe that the very practical question raised by Mr. Wilson was the controlling one in the drafting of article 1, section 2, those men, being men of common sense, men with a keen, profound knowledge of human nature and the ways of people and of events, were undoubtedly persuaded by the consideration of how impractical it would be to have varying qualifications for the different electors.

Mr. Wilson having made his statement, Gouverneur Morris, the author of the motion, rose. I read further from Madison's notes:

> Such a hardship—

That is, being a freeholder or the owner of property, because that is what his motion provided as a qualification—

> would be neither great nor novel. The people are accustomed to it, and not dissatisfied with it, in several of the States. In some, the qualifications are different for the choice of the governor and of the representatives; in others, for different houses of the legislature. Another objection against the clause as it stands is that it makes the qualifications of the national legislature depend on the will of the States, which he thought not proper.

He was unwilling to recognize this right in the State. Mr. Morris was unwilling that this power should continue to be vested in the State. He wanted it in the Federal Government.

Then Mr. Ellsworth, of Massachusetts, rose and said that he thought the qualifications of electors stood on the most proper footing. Note this language:

> The right of sovereignty was a tender point and strongly guarded by most of the State constitutions. The people will not readily subscribe to the National Constitution if it should subject them to be disfranchised.

He was arguing against Mr. Morris' motion to make the ownership of a freehold a qualification.

> The States are the best judges of the circumstances and temper of their own people.

Notice that language. The States—the people back home, the people who gather in the State capitols, the people who go to the ballot boxes back in the hamlets, the communities, and the crossroads—"are the best judges of the circumstances and temper of their own people." Would anyone dispute that today?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend the Senator from Maryland for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama whether the asking of a question or two at this point would divert him from the very able argument he is making?

Mr. HILL. To be frank with the Senator, it might depend on what the question is, and the line of thought the question relates to.

Mr. TYDINGS. It would be along the same line.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has quoted section 2 of article I of the Constitution, which provides that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors to the most numerous branch of the State legislature. I wish to ask the Senator whether he has heard any person advance the thought that the Federal Government has the power or the legal right, if you please, to tell the States what shall be the qualifications of the electors in each State, for its own State officers.

Mr. HILL. In answer to the Senator's question, I shall say that shortly before the Senator was able to reach the floor of the Senate today, I made the flat, categorical statement that if anyone had ever, anywhere, claimed that power for the Congress of the Federal Government, I had never been able to find it or to hear of it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask another question. If no one has advocated that the Federal Government has the power to fix the qualifications of the electors in the separate States in voting for their own State legislatures, then how can it be contended, from a strictly constitutional standpoint, that the electors in each State can, even in voting for Federal officers, under the wording of the Constitution, be other than those persons who are qualified by State law to vote for their State legislatures?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland, who is one of the ablest and best lawyers in this body, has put his finger on the heart of this whole matter. Of course the Senator by his very question implies the answer. Since the Federal Constitution says that the qualifications shall be those fixed by the States, and since the Congress cannot fix the qualifications for the electors in the States, the Congress has no power to fix the qualifications of electors for the Members of Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. Therefore I should like to ask the Senator whether all wise men—and I use the term "wise" in its broadest sense—must approach this question as we must, in acting in accordance with our duty, approach all questions, namely, not from the standpoint of what we would like the Constitution to be or what we would like the system of elections to be or what improvements we might make in it if we were writing it over again; but in the absence of any amendment to the contrary, from the standpoint of voting on this and all other propositions which come before the Congress in strict accordance with the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator from Maryland is absolutely correct. It is not only our duty, but we took an oath to fulfill and meet that duty; and on this proposition we are in the same position in which the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], found himself yesterday in connection with his ruling. He, as a Senator, as an individual, and as a citizen holds one view of the matter; but the Senate rule takes an entirely different view. So he, under his oath as the President pro tempore of the Senate, maintained the integrity of the Senate rules, and handed down his decision, not according to his wishes, not according to what he wished to see done or what he would have done, but according to what the law of the Senate is.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the able Senator from Alabama whether, quite aside from the necessity of checks and balances in the Constitution, he recognizes from a purely abstract point of view based on the premise of justice and equality alone, if we were without the Constitution, we could justify the fact that Delaware, one of the smallest States in population in the country, has two United States Senators; and New York, the largest State in the country in population, has two United States Senators, thereby making the vote of one man or woman in Delaware equal to the votes of 45 men or women living in New York State, for the same high elective Federal officers?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. I may say to him that earlier in my remarks I discussed that very proposition—in other words, how the States, in their jealous regard for their rights and in their determination to secure the primary authority of the States in the Government, wrote into the Constitution the provision that every State should have equal representation in the Senate of the United States, and that no State should be denied its representation without its consent. I discussed that point. The Senator from Maryland is exactly correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator, therefore, if what we are dealing with here primarily is not what we might consider if we were not bound by any constitutional restrictions—in which event the Senator from Maryland would favor the abolition of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting, for I am opposed to them as a matter of principle, but I do not have the right, under the Constitution, do I, I ask the Senator from Alabama, to go into other States and say, "If you want that system of government, I, as a Senator representing a State in the United States Senate, have the power under the Constitution to define the qualifications the electors must have in your State to elect persons either to the Federal House of Representatives or the Senate"—either in the State of Alabama or in any other State of the Union?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct; the Congress does not have that power, and, as I said, for Congress to try to assert that power is to rape the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend the Senator from Tennessee for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask a question. The Senator has been examining this matter very extensively, as shown by his speech. I wish to ask him whether he has ever known a Federal court of any kind to hold that under the Federal Constitution there exists in Congress a power to legislate by implication?

Mr. HILL. Not only have I not known any court to render such a ruling, but I may say to the Senator that a little later in my remarks I hope to come to the question of court decisions, and discuss the decisions of the courts, all of which affirm and ratify the proposition that Congress has no power to fix these qualifications, but that they are fixed by the Constitution, which prescribes that they shall be the qualifications fixed by the States for their electors for the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

Mr. McKELLAR. My investigation of the matter was made some time ago; but, so far as I recall, I have never seen a district court decision, a circuit court decision, or a Supreme Court decision in which a judge has ever indicated that there was any ground on which he could base a decision that there were in the Constitution implied powers under which Congress could legislate. I have never seen a decision of any kind—not even a decision by a judge who might be called "off" in his mind—in which it was held that there was sufficient ground for such a contention. I would challenge any Senator who believes there is an implied power of action in the Federal Constitution. Only such powers are granted as are provided in definite words and very plain and clear language. So I would challenge any Senator to point to a single decision of that sort by any judge, whether a judge who was perfectly himself, or even imperfectly himself. I certainly have not seen such a decision; and I do not believe any other Senator can say he has ever seen such a decision holding that there is any implied authority to act under the Federal Government. Such implied authority simply does not exist in the Constitution.

Mr. HILL. The decision is not in the books, I may say.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not in the books.

Mr. HILL. It is not to be found. It does not exist.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask one question to lay a foundation so I may ask the Senator another question. If the anti-poll-tax bill should be passed, would it not be a patent attempt on the part of the Government of the United States to define the qualification in a certain respect of electors in the States of the Union?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. If that be so, and if the Federal Government can fix the qualifications of electors in the separate States in this one regard, what is there in the Constitution—in or out of it, for that matter—by express or implied statement, to prohibit the Congress from fixing all the qualifications of all the electors in every State in the Union, and eliminating completely the right of the States in that particular field of endeavor?

Mr. HILL. The Senator's question is so well stated by him that it answers itself. Once the Congress enters into this field by fixing any qualification, adding to or subtracting from any qualification fixed by the States, then there is no limit at all on the Congress; the Congress can go into the whole field with reference to all qualifications of electors.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it is a well-settled policy of law that what a government can give, a government can take away. Therefore, if the Congress has the right to fix the qualifications of electors in the individual States, then it has the right to take away the qualifications. Just as it may add a new qualification, so it may subtract one.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under that authority, if carried far enough, it would be possible to discriminate not only against a certain race or color, but to discriminate upon a property basis or on almost any other basis. The logic is inescapable that once the right of the Federal Government to fix qualifications of the electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature is acknowledged in one respect, there is nothing that I know of in the Constitution, if that be good law, that prohibits the Federal Government from fixing the qualifications in every respect; and no man knows how strict as well as how liberal ultimately the qualifications might be.

Mr. HILL. The men who wrote the Constitution 160 years ago fully recognized the proposition so ably stated by the Senator from Maryland. That is one reason why they wrote article I, section 2, as they did. The Senator from Maryland referred to the fact that what a government can give, it can also take away. As I stated earlier in my remarks, there was no Federal Government in 1787. Whatever sovereignty the Federal Government now has, whatever sovereignty the Federal Government obtained under the Constitution, was given it by the States. The States were the supreme sovereignties.

Mr. TYDINGS. They were the mother and father.

Mr. HILL. In that convention, as the Senator from Maryland suggests, they were the mother and the father. They were the creators of the Federal Government. The history of the drafting of the Constitution shows clearly the States did not intend to give to the Congress or to the Federal Government either by constitution or by legislative enactment any power to fix the qualifications, but

they, the sovereign States, the creators, intended to keep that power in their own hands.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator first for yielding to me, and I shall make one observation, which is, that in this particular regard the creators of the Federal Government, the States, attempted to make certain in two express provisions that what we are now considering could never be done by the Federal Government. In the first place, it said——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend for a moment, the Chair wants to caution the Senator from Alabama that he is limited to yielding for a question, and for a question only, not for an observation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am asking a question.

Mr. HILL. I yield only for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am asking the question of the Senator from Alabama if it is not so that in two respects the States made it doubly certain that the particular provision which we are now considering would not be good law if passed by the Federal Congress, and if those two respects are not as follows: First, in section 2 of article I, it was expressly provided that the State should be the judge of the qualifications of electors to the most numerous branch of the legislature, and therefore of the officials of the Federal Government; secondly, after having done that expressly, is it not so that in the tenth amendment the States made it doubly sure that there was no power to do this conferred on this child which the States themselves had created? They said, "Not only have we put it in expressly, but we say in addition that all the powers not herewith expressly given to the Federal Government are reserved to the States and to the people thereof." So, if there was any question on the one hand that there had been a hiatus in the powers which the States kept for themselves, they put it in express language so there would be the clincher, as it were, to remove it from the realm of speculation.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. I called attention earlier in my remarks to the fact that the founding fathers had written into the Constitution safeguards to protect the States, such as the one that every State should have equal representation and should not have that representation taken away from it without its consent; the one that the States have the power to originate amendments to the Constitution; the one that no amendment can become a part of the Constitution until at least three-fourths of the States, meaning both houses of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, have ratified it. In spite of those safeguards, the Senator knows, that even then the people would not ratify the Constitution until there was, so to speak, a gentlemen's agreement that the first 10 amendments to the Constitution would be adopted, including not only the tenth amendment to which the Senator has referred, but also, as the Senator knows, the ninth amendment, making the right of the States doubly sure. I referred earlier in my remarks to the tenth amendment, so far as the States are concerned, as the great safety clause of the Constitution. As the Senator has said or implied by his question, the States were insistent that that great safety clause be written into the Constitution in order to protect their rights.

In connection with the questions which the Senator from Maryland has asked me, it is interesting that the next member of the Convention to whose remarks I find my attention called is Col. George Mason, of Virginia. As I said earlier, he was the author of the Virginia bill of rights from which came the Federal Bill of Rights and the bill of rights in the State constitutions of every State in the Union. As I recall, Woodrow Wilson, who was no mean draftsman himself, declared that he would rather have had the honor of penning the Virginia bill of rights than any document ever penned by the hand of man.

Here is what Col. George Mason, of Virginia, had to say in connection with what the Senator from Maryland and I have been discussing:

> The power to alter the qualifications would be a dangerous power in the hands of the Legislature.

Of course George Mason was speaking of the National Legislature. He was speaking of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The founding fathers knew what they were doing when they wrote the Constitution. They did not want the Congress to have this power. George Mason said it would be a dangerous power for the Congress to have. So they wrote, in clear, explicit, positive, and definite language that the power should reside in the States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I shall yield in a moment. In that connection I should like to read another sentence, and then I shall yield to the Senator for a question. The Chair seems to be very much perturbed for fear that the Senator from Maryland might not ask me a question, that his remarks might be in the form of an observation rather than an inquiry.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I make the parliamentary inquiry, if the Senator from Maryland wishes to elicit information from the Senator from Alabama and propound a question, has the Senator from Maryland the right to rise and perform that humble role as often as he shall see fit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present Presiding Officer wishes to assure the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Alabama that so long as he is in the chair he will carry out the rules of the Senate as they exist. He wants all Senators to have their rights. The Senator from Maryland is privileged to rise at any time to ask the Senator from Alabama a question, a question only, unless he receives unanimous consent to make other remarks, without jeopardizing the rights of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Chair for his ruling, and I assure him that all the statements which the Senator from Maryland will make will be in the form of interrogatories.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has it ever occurred to the Senator from Alabama that if the Federal Government had the right to fix the qualifications of electors in the separate States of the Union, with public antipathies in certain parts of the country being what they were at the close of the Civil War, the probabilities are that by legislative fiat all of the South would have been deprived of any vote at all to elect persons to represent them in the Congress of the United States?

Mr. HILL. I discussed that question a little earlier in my remarks. I want to say that there is much merit in the purport of the Senator's question.

Mr. President, to continue, Mr. Butler, a delegate to the Constitutional Convention, made this significant statement:

> There is no right of which the people are more jealous than that of suffrage.

Thus emphasizing, fortifying, and reaffirming the idea that the determination of the qualifications of electors should remain in the hands of the people of the States and that the Congress should have no power over the qualifications of such electors.

Mr. President, I shall read from the statement of Mr. Dickinson. He was a gentleman of rather reactionary views, but I think we should have his views, since we are studying this whole subject. Mr. Dickinson had a very different idea with regard to the tendency toward vesting the right of suffrage in the freeholders of the country. He considered them as the best guardians of liberty and the restriction of the right to them "as a necessary defense against the dangerous influence of those multitudes, without property, and without principle, with which our country, like all others, will in time abound." He very strongly favored the writing in of a qualification that electors must be property owners.

In reply to Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Ellsworth had this to say:

> How shall the freehold be defined? Ought not every man who pays a tax vote for the representative who is to levy and dispose of his money? Shall the wealthy merchants and manufacturers who will bear full share of the public burden be not allowed a voice in the imposition of them? Taxation and representation ought to go together.

Then we come to the man who is known as the father of the Constitution, James Madison. Mr. Madison said:

> The right of suffrage is certainly one of the fundamental requirements of republican government and ought not to be left to be regulated by the legislature.

Of course, when Mr. Madison used the term "legislature," he was speaking of

the National Legislature; he was speaking of the Federal Congress. Then he continued:

The gradual abridgment of this right has been the mode in which aristocracies have been built on the ruins of popular forms. Whether a constitutional qualification ought to be a freehold would depend much upon the probable reception such a change would meet in the States where the right was exercised by every description of people, and in several of the States a freehold was now a qualification.

There was Mr. Madison saying that the Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives, certainly should not have any power to fix, prescribe, or determine the qualifications of electors for Federal officers. On the question as to whether a freehold or property ownership should be prescribed as a qualification, Mr. Madison, being a very wise and very practical man, expressed the view that that might well be determined upon the question as to how such a qualification would be received back in the States. In other words, Mr. Madison, the father of the Constitution, who had done so much in the drafting of the Constitution, and bringing it into being, was thinking as any other wise and practical man would have done in the same circumstances in terms of securing the ratification of the Constitution. He made it very clear that the Congress should have no power to prescribe or fix the qualifications of electors.

It is interesting to note that when the vote came on Gouverneur Morris' motion to prescribe in the Constitution the qualification of possessing a freehold, the motion was voted down, and it was voted down by a vote of 7 to 1. One State only voted for it, the little State of Delaware. Delaware voted aye. New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina voted no. Maryland was divided, and Georgia was not present and voting.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Alabama whether, since his arguments, as I assume they do, go primarily to the passing of a statute by the Congress, he would be prepared to join in support of a constitutional amendment which would be directed to the States for the purpose of abolishing the poll tax as a qualification for voting.

Mr. HILL. At the present time I cannot assure the Senator that I would join him in submitting a constitutional amendment to the States, but I will say to him that the constitutional amendment method is the only way by which this question can be constitutionally and lawfully handled. The only way, under the Constitution, in which this step can be taken is by a constitutional amendment.

The Senator was not able to be on the floor during the whole of my remarks, but I brought to the attention of the Senate earlier in my remarks the fact that there was a campaign in this country for half a century, led by some of the finest and most patriotic and noblest women of the Nation, joined by some of the most outstanding and patriotic men, to give to women an equal right with men to vote, and in all the more than half a century of that campaign it was never suggested that the Congress should try to amend the Constitution by legislative fiat so as to give the women the right to vote. The whole campaign was based on and in behalf of an amendment to the Constitution, and, as we know, that campaign finally culminated in success when the nineteenth amendment was ratified and became a part of the Constitution of the United States, providing that the right of citizens to vote should not be denied on account of sex.

So, without committing myself at this particular time to a constitutional amendment, as I have said to the Senator, it is the only way, unless we rape the Constitution or attempt to rape it, by which this step can be taken.

Mr. SPARKMAN Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my colleague from Alabama for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Regardless of the Senator's own personal views with reference to amendment of the Constitution, is it not true that the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], speaking in behalf of the southern bloc of Senators, did propose one day last week that, in the event the majority should agree to proceed by the amendment route and would assure that the Senate would stand by such a proposed amendment in conference, not only would there not be any prolonged discussion of such a proposal, but that he had assurance that a great number of the southern Senators, I believe he said half or more, would actually vote for the submission of such a constitutional amendment?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct, and speaking for myself, if such a proposition shall be submitted in a sincere, bona fide fashion, I shall give the matter my most earnest and careful consideration.

Mr. President, as we know, Mr. Rufus King, who was a member of the Constitutional Convention, kept notes of the proceedings of the Convention. His notes were nothing like as voluminous or complete as were the notes of James Madison, but they do throw much light on many different questions which came before the Constitutional Convention. The notes of Rufus King are to be found in the volume entitled "Formation of the Union," which, incidentally, was authorized to be printed by the Congress of the United States back in 1926, and which contains the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the resolutions of ratification of the conventions of the different States, Mr. Madison's notes, Mr. King's notes, and other notes and commentaries and data with reference to the Constitution. I turn to page 873 of that volume, and I find this quotation from the notes of Rufus King dated August 7, 1787, when the phrase "electors to be the same as those of the most numerous branch of the State legislature" came before the Convention, Mr. Morris offered an amendment.

Having been voted down on his first amendment, he did what Senators sometimes do when they lose on a first amendment. Mr. Morris exercised his right and offered a second amendment, and the second amendment provided for adding a clause to article I of section 2, giving to the National Legislature, that is, to the Congress, power to alter the qualifications.

There we had by this amendment of Gouverneur Morris, of New York, the issue squarely presented to the Constitutional Convention, to give to the Congress, the National Legislature, the power to alter the qualifications as fixed by the States.

When Mr. Morris offered his amendment, Mr. Ellsworth, of Massachusetts, according to Mr. Rufus King's notes, arose and said:

If the Legislature—

That is the Congress; he was speaking, of course, of the National Legislature—

can alter the qualifications they may disqualify three-fourths, or a greater portion, of the electors. This would go far to create aristocracy—the States have staked their liberties on the qualifications which we have proposed to confirm.

Could anything be clearer than those words of Mr. Ellsworth in showing the intent and the purpose of the framers of the Constitution not to lodge in the Federal Congress the power to fix these qualifications. As Madison said, they thought that would be a dangerous power; they were afraid of such power being put in the hands of the Congress, and they were resolved that the power should remain back in the States, in the hands of the people of the States. So Mr. Morris' amendment went the way of his first amendment, which means that the amendment was overwhelmingly rejected, as Mr. Rufus King advises us.

Mr. President, as we know, one of the greatest minds of that period, beginning with the War of the Revolution and coming on down through the Articles of Confederation, and the drafting of the Federal Constitution, and even in the administration of our Federal Government in the early days of George Washington, was the brilliant, profound, magnificent mind of Alexander Hamilton. Perhaps this country has never known a more penetrating or more incisive mind than that of Alexander Hamilton. As we know, Hamilton was not a democrat, and I am using the word with a little "d." He did not believe in, he did not have faith in, the capacity of the people to govern themselves. He believed in a strong central government. He thought it was necessary to have central, arbitrary power concentrated in the Government in Washington. He went so far that many speak of him as a monarchist. And surely we know that in the plan which he submitted to the Constitutional Convention he provided for life tenure for the Chief Executive, the President of the United States. As I recall, he provided for certain hereditary rights; for many things that were to be found under the arbitrary central power of the governments of the kings and the monarchies of the nations of Europe.

Mr. Hamilton, writing about the Constitution—and we must remember what his feelings and his views were—had this to say in chapter 52 of the Federalist:

I shall begin with the House of Representatives. * * * The first view to be taken of this part of the Government, relates to the qualifications of the electors and the elected.

"The qualifications of electors." He went straight to the very question we are discussing here today, because he knew what the whole question involved, so far as determining what our Government was, and what it would be down through the years. He knew it went to the whole question of our dual system of government, the whole question of the structure of our Government, of a divided authority between the Federal Government and the State governments. The brilliant mind of Hamilton knew what he was talking about. He goes on to say:

Those of the former—

That is, of the House of Representatives—

are to be the same—

That is, the qualifications are to be the same—

with those of the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government. It was incumbent on the convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the Constitution.

In other words, the Constitution had to say what these qualifications were, and by whom they would be prescribed. Hamilton then continues:

To have left it open for the occasional regulation of the Congress would have been improper for the reason just mentioned. * * * The provision made by the Convention—

That is the provision now written into section 2 of article I—

The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State—

He said—

because it is conformable to the standard already established or which may be established by the State itself.

There was the leading Federalist, there was the outstanding Nationalist in the days of the beginning of our Government, proclaiming in his writings in the Federalist that this method must be satisfactory to the States, because under the Constitution as written it was left to the States.

Again Mr. Hamilton said, speaking about the Constitution:

Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, and the manner of elections.

He was referring there, of course, to section 4 of article I, which is entirely different from section 2 of article I, section 4 of article I has nothing whatever to do with the qualifications of electors, as I shall hope to point out a little later in my remarks. Then Mr. Hamilton proceeds to say:

The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon on other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution and—

Senators, in the words of Mr. Hamilton—

are unalterable by the legislature.

What Mr. Hamilton was saying to the Congress, to the United States Senate, was, "Thou canst not pass such a bill as that which is now proposed to the Senate for consideration, making unlawful the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting." That was what Mr. Hamilton was saying.

One of the greatest authorities in this country on the Constitution, and one whose viewpoint and feelings were definitely always toward the nationalistic theory, toward the idea of the centralization of power in Washington, whose views and feelings were always in favor of a centralized power of government, was Judge Story. Let me give the Senate his words, written in his commentaries. I quote from volume I, section 820, of Story's Commentaries. Judge Story declared:

There is no pretense to say that the power of the National Government can be used so as to exclude any State from its share in the representation in Congress.

That was written before the fourteenth amendment. It was true when Judge Story wrote it, because it was before the adoption of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution.

Judge Story goes on to make this categorical statement:

Nor can it be said with correctness that Congress can in any way alter the right or qualification of voters.

Mr. President, I could go on indefinitely citing other great authorities. All of them hold fast without deviation to the proposition that the Congress has no power whatever in any way to alter, fix, prescribe, add to, or subtract from any qualification for any elector. The Constitution itself commanded that those qualifications should be the qualifications prerequisite for voting for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

It is interesting to note that when the Constitution went back to the States for ratification by the State conventions, certain questions were asked in some of the States about article I, section 2. The Constitution had to be ratified by at least nine of the States. In the Massachusetts convention there was a doubting Thomas by the name of Dr. John Taylor, from the town of Douglass, Mass. He wanted to be very sure about this thing. He wanted to make certain. He was fearful that section 4, the section with reference to the times, places, and manner of holding elections, not the section with reference to qualifications, might give Congress the power to prescribe a property qualification for voters in the sum, as he said, of 100 pounds. He inquired of Mr. Rufus King, who, it will be recalled, was a member of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia and also a member of the Massachusetts convention, whether or not under section 4 Congress could in any way go into the question of qualifications. Mr. King, one of the leading members of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, had this to say:

The idea of the honorable gentleman from Douglass transcends my understanding, for the power of control given by this section extends to the manner of election, not to the qualifications of the electors.

We find that quotation from Mr. King in volume II of Elliot's Debates, pages 49 to 51.

In the Pennsylvania convention, James Wilson who had been one of the outstanding men in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, made this statement:

In order to know who are qualified to be electors of the House of Representatives—

That is, the Federal House of Representatives. They were considering the Federal Constitution, which was to bring into being the Federal House of Representatives—

In order to know who are qualified to be electors of the House of Representatives, we are to inquire who are qualified to be electors of the legislature of each State. If there be no legislature in the States there can be no electors of them. If there be no such electors, there is no criterion to know who are qualified to elect Members of the House of Representatives. By this short, plain deduction the existence of State legislatures is proved to be essential to the existence of the general government.

Could anything be clearer, more positive, or definite than that?

Mr. Wilson went on with reference to section 4, the section with reference to times, places, and manner, not the section as to qualifications:

If the Congress had it not in their power to make regulations, what might be the consequences? Some States might make no regulations at all on the subject; and so the existence of the House of Representatives, the immediate representation of the people in Congress, depends upon the will and pleasure of the State governments. We find upon examining this paragraph that it contains nothing more than the maxim of self-preservation.

In the Virginia convention the question arose, and Mr. William Nicholas, one of the delegates, had something to say. As I recall, Mr. Nicholas was not a member of the Philadelphia convention which wrote the Constitution, but he was a member of the State convention. Mr. Nicholas said:

If, therefore, by the proposed plan, it is left uncertain in whom the right of suffrage is to rest, or if it has placed that right in improper hands, I shall admit that it has a radical defect. But in this plan—

That is, the Constitution, because that was the plan before them—

there is a fixed rule for determining the qualification of electors, and that rule, the most judicious that could possibly have been devised, because it refers to a criterion which cannot be changed—

When he said "a criterion which cannot be changed" he meant that in this year of our Lord 1948 it could not be changed by the Congress of the United States; that it stood unless the Constitution itself were amended.

Mr. Nicholas went on to say:

A qualification that gives a right to elect representatives for the State legislatures gives also, by this Constitution, a right to

choose Representatives for the General Government.

In North Carolina, Mr. John Steele, who was a member of the ratification convention, wished to make this matter absolutely clear, so there could never be any question in anyone's mind about what North Carolina was doing when it ratified the Constitution. Here is what Mr. Steele said:

Who are to vote for them?

Of course, he was referring to the Members of the House of Representatives. Then he said:

Every man who has a right to vote for a representative to our legislature will ever have a right to vote for a Representative to the General Government. Does it not expressly provide—

By the word "it," he means the Constitution, of course—

that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? Can they, without a most manifest violation of the Constitution, alter the qualifications of the electors?

When he says "they," he means the Congress. One hundred and sixty years ago, John Steele, a member of the convention in North Carolina considering the ratification of the Federal Constitution, was saying to us, "You gentlemen of the Senate, you gentlemen of the Congress of the United States, cannot touch these qualifications of the electors without a most manifest violation of the Federal Constitution."

Mr. Steele went on to say:

The power over the manner of elections does not include that of saying who shall vote.

Of course, all of us should understand that. Section 2 of article I deals with the "who" of the electors. Section 4 of article I deals with the "how" of the elections.

Mr. Steele went on to say:

The Constitution—

Speaking of the Federal Constitution, of course—

expressly says that the qualifications are those which entitle a man to vote for a State Representative. It is, then, clearly and indubitably fixed and determined who shall be the electors; and the power over the manner only enables them to determine how these electors shall elect—whether by ballot, or by vote, or by any other way.

The view expressed by Delegate John Steele, in the North Carolina convention, was confirmed by Delegate William R. Davie, who also had been a delegate to the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia.

The meaning of section 2 of article I was so clear, that the question was not even raised in the conventions of Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware, and Georgia; and so far as the reports show, in New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Maryland no question was raised about the section. As I have previously said, it was so clear that even a fourth-grade school child on reading it would know what it meant.

Mr. President, as to the resolutions passed by the several States in ratifying the Federal Constitution, we find that in none of those resolutions was any question raised about section 2 of article I. It was so clear that there was no question to be raised. It was ipse dixit; it spoke for itself.

However, it is interesting to note that in referring to section 4 of article I, by which certain powers are given to the Congress with reference to the fixing of the times, places, and manner of holding elections, some of the ratifying resolutions did raise questions; and it is interesting to note that in each case where such questions were raised, those States in their resolutions ratifying the Constitution wished to make certain that Congress knew that they felt that Congress should never exercise the power given under section 4 of article I unless the States had failed to function in prescribing the times, places, and manner of holding elections.

Mr. President, we find that on February 7, 1788, the State of Massachusetts, when it ratified the Constitution, recommended, in its resolution of ratification, that Congress do not exercise the power vested in it by the fourth section of the first article; but in cases where a State shall neglect or refuse to make the regulations therein mentioned or shall make regulations subversive of the rights of the people to a free and equal representation ir. Congress agreeably to the Constitution. Massachusetts was saying to Congress, "Keep your hands off this matter unless the States fail to function in this connection; keep your hands off it unless necessity requires you to act."

South Carolina, in its resolution of May 27, 1788, declared:

And whereas it is essential to the preservation of the rights reserved to the several States and the freedom of the people under the operations of the general government that the right of prescribing the manner, time, and places of holding elections to the Federal legislature should be forever annexed to the sovereignty of the several States, this convention does declare that the same ought to remain, to all posterity, a perpetual and fundamental right in the local government, exclusive of the interference of the General Government—

That is, the Federal Government—

except in cases where the legislatures of the States shall refuse or neglect to perform and fulfill the same, according to the tenor of the said Constitution.

Then the great State of New York embodied a recommendation in its resolution of ratification. What did that recommendation say? What did it say, Mr. President, to you and me? Remember, they were talking to us. It said they ratified the Constitution "in full confidence that the Congress will not make or alter any regulation in this State respecting the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators or Representatives, unless the legislature of this State shall neglect or refuse to make laws or regulations for the purpose or from any circumstances be incapable of making the same."

The historic State of religious freedom, the little State of Rhode Island, ratifying the Constitution on May 29, 1789, copied without change the New York declaration, and added, after the final word of it, a comma and the words "and that in those cases such power will only be exercised until the legislature of this State shall make provision in the premises." They took the entire New York resolution, strong as it was, and then added the clause, "If we should neglect or fail to do our part to make these regulations with reference to the times, places, and manner, you can do it; but you can do it only up to the time we shall function, and ourselves make the regulations."

All this shows how jealous the States were, how jealous the people were to preserve to the States and to the people their rights.

Mr. President, I spoke earlier in the day in the course of my remarks of the submission, ratification, and adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. When those amendments were submitted none of those who were in control of the Congress, no authoritative voice in this body with but one lone exception expressed the view that Congress had a right in any way to alter or fix or add to or subtract from the qualifications of electors as prescribed by the States.

I have the floor, Mr. President. The distinguished acting majority leader wished to ask me a question that dealt with the proceedings of the Senate. I was very happy to answer that question of the acting majority leader, but I have not yielded the floor. This matter is of such importance that I am loath to yield the floor until I have tried to fully state the case.

I said earlier, speaking of Thaddeus Stevens and other leaders in the House, that no leader there suggested that Congress had any right to alter or fix in any way the qualifications of electors. Therefore, in performing their duty as Members of Congress, true to their oaths as Members of Congress, they had submitted the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution. There was in the Senate, however, one exception. That exception was the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Charles Sumner. So far as I have found, he at no time gave any substantial reason for his position, but he took the position that Congress had power to regulate suffrage so far as the one proposition of denying suffrage to the colored man was concerned. He admitted that the States had exclusive power so far as any qualifications with reference to age, residence, character, education, property, the payment of a poll tax, the payment of any other tax, or with reference to the ownership of property or a freehold, or any qualification of that kind were concerned. Senator Sumner admitted that Congress had no power in any way to alter or add to or subtract from or in any way whatever deal with those qualifications except as to the one qualification of race.

Mr. President, Senator Sumner, taking that position, we can imagine that when the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments were under consideration in the Senate, and when these amendments were under consideration in the House of Representatives, there was much debate, there was much discussion, there were many exchanges of views by the different Senators and the different Members of the House on the question as to whether Congress has any power

so far as fixing or altering the qualifications of electors is concerned.

A joint committee was created to draft the fourteenth amendment. The committee was composed of Members of both the House and the Senate. All the members of the committee came from either the North, the East, or the West, for at that time the South had no representation, no voice, in the Congress of the United States, and, therefore, had no representation on the committee. The chairman of the committee, which was composed of 15 Members of both the House and Senate, was Senator William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine. We recall that Senator Fessenden was later Secretary of the Treasury under Abraham Lincoln. The ranking member of the committee, on the Senate side, who took Senator Fessenden's place at various times, due to the fact that Senator Fessenden was in ill health and was not always able to be present, was Senator Jacob M. Howard, of Michigan. Other members of the committee were Senator John Harris, of New York; Senator James W. Grimes, of Iowa; Senator Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland; and Senator George H. Williams, of Oregon.

Among members of the joint committee, on the House side, were Roscoe Conkling, of New York, George M. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, Henry T. Blow, of Missouri, and John A. Bingham, of Ohio. Mr. Bingham, I believe, is credited with being the actual draftsman or author of the first section of the fourteenth amendment. Other members from the House were Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, and E. B. Washburne, of Illinois. I believe the record discloses that Kentucky had representation in the person of Representative Grider.

The amendment came up for consideration on the floor of the Senate and, of the House. Turning to page 2542 of the Congressional Globe, which, at that time, was the authentic publication of the debates of the Senate and the House, we find this statement by Representative John A. Bingham which he made on the floor of the House of Representatives with reference to the fourteenth amendment:

> This amendment takes from no State any right that ever pertained to it. The amendment does not give, as the section shows, the power to Congress of regulating suffrage in the several States.

Mr. Bingham then referred particularly to the second section of the proposed amendment. Senators will recall that the second section does not attempt in any way to prescribe qualifications; it does not in any way attempt to fix qualifications for electors; it does not give to Congress any power to legislate with reference to qualifications, but simply, solely, and only provides that where suffrage is denied to certain citizens the States may be penalized for such denial by having their representation in the House of Representatives reduced.

Referring to the second section, Mr. Bingham said:

> The second section excludes the conclusion that by the first section suffrage is subjected to congressional law.

In the Senate the first section was discussed by Senator Howard, acting chairman of the joint committee. On May 23, 1865, he had this to say:

> The first section of the proposed amendment does not give to either of these classes the privilege of voting. The right of suffrage is not, in law, one of the privileges or immunities thus secured by the Constitution. It is merely the creature of law. It has always been regarded in this country as a result of positive local law.

In other words, where the section speaks of guaranteeing certain privileges and immunities, Senator Howard made it clear that those privileges and immunities did not apply to, had no reference to, and did not in any way include any right of suffrage.

This indicates that in 1865, when the Senate was considering the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, the men who were its authors, proponents, and advocates held fast to the same proposition in the matter of qualifications of electors which had been expressed and had been so stoutly proclaimed in 1787 by the framers and authors of the Constitution of the United States.

As to section 2, Senator Howard said—and I am reading now from page 2766 of the Congressional Globe:

> This section does not recognize the authority of the United States over the question of suffrage in the several States at all. Nor does it recognize much less secure the right of suffrage to the colored race. It leaves the right to regulate the elective franchise still with the States and does not meddle with that right.

In closing the debate, on June 8, and just before the joint resolution was passed upon by the Senate, Senator Howard said, at page 3039 of the Congressional Globe:

> We know very well that the States retain the power which they have always possessed of regulating the right of suffrage.

Remember, Mr. President, I am quoting the words of the man who, on this floor, was charged with the responsibility of piloting through the Senate the fourteenth amendment. In speaking, he was not only speaking for himself, but for the entire committee of 15 members who had worked with him and had jointly with him drafted the fourteenth amendment.

He proceeded to say:

> We know very well that the States retain the power which they have always possessed of regulating the right of suffrage. It is the theory of the Constitution.

Says Senator Howard, speaking for the committee—

> That right—

That is, the right of suffrage—

> has never been taken from them; no endeavor has ever been made to take it from them, and the theory of this whole amendment is to leave the power of regulating the suffrage with the people or legislatures of the States and not to assume to regulate it by any clause of the Constitution of the United States.

Could any language be stronger than these words I have quoted from Senator Howard, spoken some 77 years after our Government came into being.

What did Senator Fessenden have to say about this matter? He was the chairman, and Senator Howard was the acting chairman during Senator Fessenden's illness. He confirmed exactly what Senator Howard had said. He stated:

> The power exists now at the present time in all these States to make just such class or caste distinctions as they please.

He was referring, of course, to Senator Sumner's position that the Congress could legislate if suffrage were denied to a Negro because he was a Negro.

> The power exists now at the present time in all these States to make just such class or caste distinctions as they please. The Constitution does not limit them. The Constitution, in terms, gives us no power.

Whom did he mean by "us?" He meant the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Congress. He said:

> It leaves to the States, as everybody knows, the perfect authority to regulate this matter of suffrage to suit themselves.

Then he went on to say, in speaking of section 2:

> It says to all the people of the United States you shall be represented in Congress, but, as we fear you may be governed by narrow views, as we fear you will do injustice to a portion of the people under your charge * * * we say to you that you shall not have political power any further than you show by your actions that you are disposed to let your charges participate in it.

That is referring to section 2 of the fourteenth amendment that there could be this penalty in the amendment, but that it stopped at that penalty, and did not give to the Congress any power to exercise any jurisdiction over the qualifications of electors.

On this committee of 15 there was one Democratic Senator, who happened to be the Senator from Maryland, Senator Reverdy Johnson. He said:

> I suppose that even the honorable Member from Massachusetts (Senator Sumner) will not deny that it was for Massachusetts to regulate her suffrage before 1789, and if it was, she has the power still unless she has agreed to part with it by devolving it upon the General Government. Is there a word in the Constitution that intimates such a purpose?

That is, the purpose of giving such a power to the Federal Government.

> Who at that time, in 1787, denied that the State was clothed with the power of prescribing the qualifications for the most numerous branch of the State legislature? * * * The State and nobody else.
>
> The right of choosing the allotted number in each State is to be exercised by such part of the inhabitants as the State itself may designate. Words could not have been adopted more obviously leading to the conclusion that, in the opinion of the writers of the Federalist—

And here the Senator was quoting from the Federalist, as I should have said—

> the States were to have the sole right of regulating the suffrage. There is nothing innate in the right of suffrage. It depends wholly upon government regulation.

As we know, up until the adoption of the nineteenth amendment, in 1920, in a majority of the States of the United States no woman, no matter how brilliant, or how able, or how well educated, or how devoted, or how patriotic she might be, no matter what her contributions to the public welfare might have been, could vote.

Senator Hendricks, of Indiana, said:

I ask the Senators the question: Have the States, under the Constitution, the right to control the elective franchise? Does any Senator question that? The Senator from Massachusetts does.

That was Senator Sumner, as I have said.

He thinks that Congress may control the right of suffrage in the State, but it has not been a question of dispute whether the State had control of elective franchise. It is absolute and perfect.

Here are the words of Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts. He was a colleague of Senator Sumner, both were from the same State. This is what he said:

The men who framed the Constitution made those State constitutions; they well knew what the qualifications were.

I think that is the exact language I used earlier in my remarks. I am quoting now from Senator Wilson:

Every State constitution provides for electors, prescribes the qualification for suffrage. The laws of the States provided for qualifications of electors. Every State, from the adoption of the State constitution to this hour, has claimed the authority and exercised it to settle the questions pertaining to suffrage. They never supposed that the Federal Government had the power to change it. They never gave that power, and they never intended to give that power.

In closing his speech in the debate Senator Fessenden, the chairman of the committee, said, speaking directly of section 2 of article I, the very one we have been discussing this afternoon:

If I understand the Constitution at all, it has always been considered that the clause which I have read—

That is, the second section of article I of the Constitution—

acknowledged the right of the States to regulate the question of suffrage. I do not think it has ever been disputed. * * * The States have a perfect right today and they may exercise it as they see fit to make such rules as suit them with regard to the qualifications of electors.

Yet, Mr. President, despite all this history, despite all the undisputed, unquestioned facts in this matter, and although for 150 years no one ever questioned the fact that the fixing of the qualification of the electors was in the hands of the States, we are confronted today with the proposition of having the Congress forget, ignore, disdain all the history, all the facts, all the laws, and the Constitution itself, and by legislative fiat seek to deal with the question of the qualification of the electors.

Congress has no power to pass an act to define the Constitution, or to define any section of the Constitution. Congress can no more pass a law to define any provision or clause or section of the Constitution than it can pass a law to insert a word or words or a clause, or language of any kind in the Constitution. Surely no Senator would arise on this floor and contend that Congress had a right by legislative enactment to insert any words, any language, into the Constitution of the United States. Yet that is exactly what Congress would try to do if it sought by legislative enactment to define by a bill such as this anti-poll-tax bill a section, clause, or provision of the Constitution. It has no more right to define than it has the right to insert.

I have previously referred to the fact that citizenship in itself does not carry with it the right of suffrage. As I said, for nearly 130 years after the foundation of our Government, in the majority of the States of the United States women were denied the right of suffrage simply because of their sex. They were citizens of the United States. They were just as much citizens as were the men of the United States. Minors and infants and children are citizens of the United States. Unfortunate people who have had their seats of reason dethroned, who no longer possess their minds, are citizens of the United States. Felons in penitentiaries are citizens of the United States. Citizenship does not in and of itself confer any right of suffrage. Certainly suffrage is not a natural right. The caveman did not have any right of suffrage. He did not have anyone for whom to vote. It was not until governments were organized among men that there could be any right of suffrage. Suffrage is a right conferred by government, and it happened that when the framers of the Constitution conferred that right on certain persons, and only on certain persons, those certain persons were the ones on whom the States had conferred the right to vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. That is this whole proposition.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my colleague from Alabama for a question only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The Senator from Alabama yields to his colleague for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before my colleague gets away from the fourteenth amendment, with respect to which he has so ably presented the debate which took place at the time the amendment was pending in Congress, I wish to ask him if it is not fact that section 2 of the fourteenth amendment very clearly shows that the States have the right within themselves to exclude certain persons from voting, or at least to prescribe certain qualifications which, if not met, exclude such persons, because the first section provides that no law shall be passed, but the second section provides that if the States exclude these persons from voting, then they shall be penalized by having their representation reduced.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. The section not only says that the right is in the State to deny the suffrage to certain persons, to give it only to the people to whom the State in its wisdom sees fit to give it, but the fourteenth amendment ratified and reaffirmed in its very words that very right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to his colleague?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question only.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My question relates to the point the Senator has just been making respecting the privileges or immunities of citizenship. Again, is it not true that the first section of the fourteenth amendment provides that any law passed by any State denying the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States is void and of no effect, and yet, after so providing, section 2 of the amendment recognizes the right of the States to keep away from the polls persons who do not meet certain qualifications?

Mr. HILL. Thus making it clear that the privileges or immunities provided for in section 1 of the amendment do not in any way include or encompass the right of sovereignty. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. President, just a word about section 4 of article I. I shall not dwell on this provision, because the Supreme Court has made very clear that this section, dealing with the times, places, and manner of elections and giving Congress the power to act with reference to times, places, and manner, has nothing whatever to do and is in no way whatever germane or relevant to section 2 of article I, which deals with the question of qualifications. The Supreme Court has made section 4 clear, and I do wish to call attention to the decisions of the Court, because I think any discussion of this subject should have some reference to that section.

In 1931, in *Smiley* v. *Holm* (285 U. S., 355, p. 366), the Court spoke through its Chief Justice, Charles Evans Hughes. I think no one will dispute that Charles Evans Hughes will stand in the front rank among the great Chief Justices of the United States. I shall never forget the last appearance of Chief Justice Hughes before a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives. I can never forget the drama of that moment—the spontaneous, overwhelming outpouring of tribute by all the Members of both the Senate and the House, irrespective of party lines, irrespective of whether they were Democrats or Republicans. They paid a wonderful, heartfelt, heart-stirring tribute to this great Chief Justice.

It has been my good fortune in the days I have been in Washington to know some of the members of the Supreme Court. I know the high regard in which they hold Charles Evans Hughes. I know their estimate of the greatness of the man, the power, magnitude, and profundity of his intellect, his great capacity for the dispatch of business, for orderly procedure, for making certain that the Supreme Court of the United States carried on its high functions in the best of American traditions.

The Supreme Court spoke through Chief Justice Hughes in 1931. That was not too long ago to refer to the case as a recent case. The Court had this to say about section 4 of article I, the section dealing with the times, places, and manner of elections:

The subject matter is the "times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives." It cannot be doubted that these comprehensive words embrace authority to provide a complete code for congressional elections, not only as to times and places, but in relation to notices, registrations, protection of voters, prevention of fraud and corrupt practices, counting of votes, duties of inspectors and canvassers,

and making and publication of election returns; in short, to enact the numerous requirements as to the procedure and safeguards which experience shows are necessary in order to enforce the fundamental right involved. * * * All this is comprised in the subject of "times, places, and manner of holding elections," and involves lawmaking in its essential features and most important aspect.

In this case Chief Justice Hughes had made clear that we can have our Federal Corrupt Practices Act; that we can make sure that the times, places, and manner be provided, so that the electors may duly and lawfully, and in an orderly manner, cast their ballots. That, however, has absolutely nothing whatever to do with the question of who the electors shall be, or the question of prescribing the qualification of the electors.

In other words, as Chief Justice Hughes makes clear, section 4 of article I simply prescribes the power of Congress to set forth, if necessary, the mechanism of the election. But that does not deal at all with the question of who shall be the electors. The section deals only with the orderly procedure, and the properly protected mechanism for the elector who is provided for in article I, section 2, to perform his duty of casting his ballot for a Member of the House of Representatives or a Member of the Senate.

As I stated earlier, section 4 of article I deals with the "how" of the election. It has nothing whatever to do with section 2 of article I, which deals with the "who" of the elector. They are two entirely different subjects.

Mr. President, I have quoted from the framers of the Constitution, showing how clearly and definitely they understood section 2 of article I to mean that the qualifications should be prescribed by the States and not by the Congress. I have quoted from the debates on the fourteenth amendment, showing that the authors and the advocates and proponents of that amendment held fast to the views of the framers and founders of the Constitution, that the Federal Government could not fix, prescribe, or alter the qualifications, and that the whole question of qualifications was left solely and entirely in the hands of the States.

Now I wish to turn for a moment to the decisions of the courts of the United States, because we shall find that the court decisions emphasize and confirm and ratify the clear language of section II of article I and the views of the framers of the Constitution, as well as the position taken by the authors of the fourteenth amendment.

There are many cases from which I could quote, all of which in sum and substance clearly hold to the proposition that the qualifications shall be prescribed by the States, and that the Congress cannot alter or change those qualifications.

Perhaps the first case to which I shall call attention will be the case of *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. 162), decided on March 21, 1875. In that case the extent of the distinction between the rights of a citizen of the United States and the rights of a citizen of a State with regard to voting was laid down and explained.

Chief Justice Waite of the Supreme Court declared that the fact that the right of voting could not grow out of citizenship alone was clear when one considered who was a citizen of the United States. He said that everyone born here is a citizen of the United States; and therefore if voting depended on citizenship, every child, every woman, every pauper, every criminal, every person born here would have the right to vote. Mr. President, I call this case to the particular attention of my colleague from Alabama, because it deals with the very question which he and I were discussing a few moments ago.

Chief Justice Waite concluded as follows:

> Certainly if the courts can consider any question settled, this is one. For nearly 90 years the people have acted upon the idea that the Constitution, when it conferred citizenship, did not confer the right of suffrage.

The next case to which I shall refer—and it is one of the best known cases—is that of *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 56), decided in 1894. The decision was handed down by Mr. Justice Miller. He said:

> The States in prescribing the qualifications of voters for the most numerous branch of their own legislatures, do not do this with reference to the election for Members of Congress. Nor can they prescribe the qualifications for voters for those eo nomine. They (the States) define who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature, and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It—

Meaning, of course, the Constitution of the United States—

> adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

Mr. President, there are many of these cases, and I shall not cite all of them. Let me come now to the case of *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58), decided in 1900, so it may be called a twentieth century case. In discussing the right to vote for Members of Congress, Mr. Justice Gray said:

> They define—

He had been referring to the States, and he means the States—

> who are to vote for the popular branch of their own legislature and the Constitution of the United States says the same persons shall vote for Members of Congress in that State. It—

Meaning the Constitution of the United States, of course—

> adopts the qualification thus furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

Then in the case of *Pope* v. *Williams* (193 U. S. 621), decided in 1904, we find that Mr. Justice Peckham, in speaking for the Court, said:

> A State, so far as the Federal Constitution is concerned, might provide by its own constitution and laws that no one but native-born citizens shall be permitted to vote, as the Federal Constitution does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone, and the conditions under which that right is to be exercised are matters for the States alone to prescribe, subject to the conditions of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. President, let me call the attention of the Senate at this point to these words from the decision by Mr. Justice Peckham:

> The question whether the conditions prescribed by the State might be regarded by others as reasonable or unreasonable is not a Federal one. * * * The right of a State to legislate upon the subject of the elective franchise, we believe, to be unassailable.

Then in the case of *Gwinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347), decided in 1915, a case which is known as the Oklahoma Constitution case, we find that the decision was handed down by Mr. Chief Justice White. It will be recalled that at one time he was a distinguished Member of the United States Senate, representing the great State of Louisiana in this body. While a Member of the Senate, he was named Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. In the case of Gwinn against United States, in referring to the fifteenth amendment, Mr. Chief Justice White declared:

> It is true also that the amendment does not change, modify, or deprive the States of their full power as to suffrage, except, of course, as to the subject with which the amendment deals.

Of course, Mr. President, the amendment dealt with the one subject of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

So the Court said that all of this reservoir of rights remained in the States, except as to the one proposition covered by the fifteenth amendment, which was, just as it says, an amendment to the Constitution, and not a legislative fiat of the Congress of the United States.

I am delighted to see that the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], whom I hold in such high esteem, has been able to leave his committee and come to the floor of the Senate. He, as a profound student of the Constitution, has from the very beginning taken the position that the Congress had no power to act so far as the qualification of electors is concerned, and that the only way Congress can bring about any change in the matter of the qualification of electors is by the submission and ratification of an amendment to the Constitution, in the manner and according to the procedure provided in the Constitution. That has been the position of the Senator from Arizona from the very beginning. As a member of the committee considering the legislation, he ably and indefatigably held fast to that position, presenting to the committee what to me were absolutely conclusive arguments showing that it had no power to report to the Senate the so-called anti-poll-tax bill, and showing that the only thing the committee could do under the Constitution of the United States, acting as the agent of the Senate, was to submit to the Senate a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am sure the distinguished Senator is acquainted with the system followed in the State of New Hampshire. The question is whether, in

promoting the anti-poll-tax bill, its sponsors are guilty of sectionalism. The bill would not touch the situation in New Hampshire. It is aimed exclusively at the Southern States. The law in New Hampshire, as the Senator knows, provides that the payment of a poll tax shall not be made a prerequisite for voting, but when a voter presents himself to register, in order to become entitled to vote, if he has no property, he must be assessed a poll tax. If he has property he must first be assessed for his property, plus a poll tax. While he need not pay the poll tax in order to vote, it must be assessed, and if he does not pay it he is liable to a jail sentence. I am sure the distinguished Senator brought out the fact that in the State of Alabama, as in my State, there are no criminal penalties for nonpayment of the poll tax.

Mr. HILL. Nor are there, I may say to the Senator from Mississippi, in any of the other Southern States.

Mr. EASTLAND. I think the great State of New Hampshire uses a very unique system. It says in effect, "We have no poll tax; we would not be guilty of such a thing, for which we condemn the Southern States"; yet in that State, before a man is qualified to vote, he must be assessed with a tax, and if he does not pay it he is liable to prosecution.

Mr. HILL. He is liable to go to jail, to be placed behind the iron bars.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator know that the State of New Hampshire publishes a handbook on tax collection, in which it is stated that when a voter fails to pay his poll tax, and incites other people not to pay a poll tax, he shall be arrested and prosecuted criminally as a public example, so that others will be constrained to pay their taxes?

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator that I had the Library of Congress check that matter for me a day or two ago. What the Senator has said about the State of New Hampshire and its requirements with reference to the poll tax seems correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a manifestation of sectionalism that a bill such as the anti-poll-tax bill should be brought before the Senate?

Mr. HILL. New Hampshire does not make the payment of a poll tax a prerequisite for voting but does seem to require the assessment as a prerequisite.

Mr. EASTLAND. The State of New Hampshire requires the assessment of the tax as a prerequisite for voting. If the Senator will permit me——

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statutes and the constitution of the State of New Hampshire. Does not the Senator believe we are dealing in the rankest kind of sectionalism, something that should be beneath the dignity of the Senate of the United States, in bringing forward a bill aimed at the legal provisions of certain States of the Union, while similar provisions, worded only slightly differently, as in the case of the State of New Hampshire, exist, to which the anti-poll-tax bill would not apply? Exemptions are made in such States which point with scorn at my State. It is the rankest kind of sectionalism and partisanship.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator, as I said earlier in my remarks today, certainly at this time, when parties and factions and groups and individuals are engaged in a heated political campaign and are struggling for votes, no such measure as this should be before the Senate.

Mr. President, I had just quoted the language of Chief Justice White in the case of Gwinn against United States. It is interesting to note that Chief Justice White in his decision referred to a statement in the argument made at the time by the Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. John W. Davis. We recall that Mr. John W. Davis, while a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, was also an outstanding member of the Judiciary Committee of the House. He was later appointed by President Woodrow Wilson to be Solicitor General of the United States. He is one of the great lawyers of the country, one of its outstanding constitutional lawyers. Chief Justice White embodies the statement by Mr. John W. Davis, submitted by him as Solicitor General of the United States, for the Government of the United States, in these words:

The United States—

The United States Government is speaking through its Solicitor General—

The United States says that State power to provide for suffrage is not disputed, although, of course, the authority of the fifteenth amendment and the limit on their power is insisted on—hence no assertion denying the right of a State to exert judgment and discretion in fixing the qualification of suffrage is advanced.

If Mr. Davis were speaking today he would include the nineteenth amendment.

Speaking for the Government of the United States, he was saying that the Government advanced no assertion that in any way denied to the States the right to exercise their judgment and discretion in fixing the qualifications of suffrage.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], in his presentation on Thursday, referred to the Breedlove case. He stated that the suggestion that a poll-tax payment as a qualification for voting in a State or Federal election is unlawful appears to be of recent origin. He further said:

Probably the first case to reach the United States Supreme Court is *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 227), decided in December 1947. The plaintiff, a citizen of Georgia, attempted to vote in a State election and also in the Federal election held at the same time, for a Representative in Congress. He was excluded from both elections, having failed to pay the poll tax.

Mr. Justice Butler rendered the unanimous decision of the Court, and here is what the Court unanimously declared:

To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

Approximately 2 years after the Breedlove decision came the Pirtle case, which arose in the State of Tennessee out of an election held in that State on the 13th day of September 1939 for a Member of Congress. There was no State election at all, as I recall; it was a special election for a Member of Congress. The plaintiff in that case was fully qualified, except for one thing: He had not paid his poll tax. He came to the polls, although he had not paid his poll tax, and demanded the right to vote, but was excluded by the election officers and denied the right to vote on the ground of such nonpayment. He brought suit in the Federal court. The suit finally went to the Circuit Court of Appeals of the Sixth Circuit, in which judgment against the plaintiff was rendered in a unanimous decision of the three sitting judges, affirming the judgment against the plaintiff as rendered by the lower court. The opinion of the court of appeals follows the opinion of Justice Butler in the Breedlove case to which I have referred.

When the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit rendered a decision against the plaintiff in the Pirtle case the plaintiff asked for a writ of certiorari from the Supreme Court of the United States. That court, without any opinion—it did not even dignify the petition for a writ of certiorari by an opinion or by a statement of any kind—forthwith proceeded to deny the petition for the writ of certiorari, which of course confirmed the decision of the circuit court and the decision of the lower court.

Mr. President, there is one other case to which I wish to call attention, and that is the so-called Classic case, which is to be found in volume 313, United States reports at page 307. The decision was rendered by Mr. Justice Stone, later Chief Justice Stone, of the Supreme Court of the United States. The decision was rendered before the decision in the Pirtle case. Justice Stone, stating the opinion of the Court, said:

Two counts of an indictment found in a Federal district court charged that appellees, commissioners of elections, conducting a primary election under Louisiana law, to nominate a candidate of the Democratic Party for representative in Congress, willfully altered and falsely counted and certified the ballots of voters cast in the primary election. The questions for decision are whether the right of qualified voters—

I emphasize the words "qualified voters," showing clearly that the case did not go into the question of who was qualified to vote; it did not go into the question of the qualifications of voters, but dealt with qualified voters as such, with no question as to their qualifications.

The questions for decision are whether the right of qualified voters to vote in the Louisiana primary and to have their ballots counted is a right "secured * * * by the Constitution," within the meaning of sections 19 and 20 of the criminal code, and whether the acts of appellees charged in the indictment violate those sections.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Qualified by whom? By the States or the National Government?

Mr. HILL. By the States, of course.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is the test.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. Justice Stone makes that clear. He goes on to say:

The charge based on these allegations was that the appellees conspired with each other and with others unknown to injure and oppress citizens in the free exercise and enjoyment of rights and privileges secured to them by the Constitution and laws of the United States, namely (1) the right of qualified voters—

The Court uses those words again—

who cast their ballots in the primary election to have their ballots counted as cast for the candidate of their choice.

He proceeds and quotes directly from article I of section 2 of the Constitution. I shall not reiterate it; I have quoted it several times. He states further, and I ask Senators to listen to this, because this is the gravamen of the case:

Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters—

That is, the right of qualified voters to have their votes honestly counted. It is said that what was involved in this case was the right of voters who were qualified by the States to have their votes honestly counted. That is what the case involved.

Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters to choose Members of the House of Representatives is thus to be exercised in conformity to the requirements of State law subject to the restrictions prescribed by section 2—

That, of course, is section 2 of article I, about which we have been talking, and which Justice Stone sets out on the same page just ahead of these words—

and to the authority conferred on Congress by section 4—

That is, section 4 of article I—

to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Representatives.

Justice Stone further said:

The right of qualified voters to vote at the congressional primary in Louisiana and have their ballots counted is thus the right to participate in that choice.

We come then to the question whether that right is the one secured by the Constitution. Section 2 of article I commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes.

The qualifications prescribed by the Constitution are those prescribed by the States for the electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

There can be no question, Mr. President, that the reading of the Classic case shows clearly and without basis for any dispute that the court was not dealing with the question of qualifications, but, on the contrary, the Court, not once but several different times, reiterated that the qualifications were to be fixed by the States, and that the question was the right of the qualified voters to have their ballots honestly counted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he proceeds to another subject?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my colleague. He and I had some discussion earlier in my remarks about the State of New Hampshire, and I submitted to him a digest prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress with reference to qualifications in the New England States, particularly with reference to the question of the poll tax. I shall be very happy to yield to my colleague for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask a kind of two-headed question. First, whether in the Senator's opinion the tax as imposed by the State of New Hampshire is not a burden upon voting; and, second, if it is, whether or not the proposed anti-poll-tax legislation goes to that tax.

I understand that my colleague asked me to check the digest as to New Hampshire. Briefly, if I may say so, the tax is levied upon every inhabitant of the State of New Hampshire from 21 to 70 years of age, whether he is a citizen of the United States or an alien. The husband is made liable for the payment of the wife's poll tax if, when it was assessed, they were living together as man and wife. Certain individuals can get exemptions, such as insane persons, paupers, or the widow of any soldier, sailor, or marine who served in time of war, but in the event such person does ask for an exemption and it is granted, then he becomes ineligible to vote.

Furthermore, in the event the person does not pay the tax, he may be imprisoned and made to work at 50 cents a day, paying $2.50 a week to the jailer for his keep, which would leave him, if he works a 6-day week, 50 cents a week. In other words, he would have to work 4 weeks for $2, to pay off the tax.

Now, I ask the Senator whether in his opinion that does impose upon the people of New Hampshire a burden upon their right to vote, even though it is indirect, so far as the poll tax is concerned?

Mr. HILL. I think it undoubtedly imposes a burden, and it goes much further than any Southern State, as the Senator knows, because no Southern State would send a man to jail, or put him behind bars, for not paying a poll tax. New Hampshire puts him to work in jail for nonpayment of the poll tax.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question. I want to be protected in my rights, and I yield only for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator know that the case is stronger than the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has indicated. Take the case of a farmer with property in New Hampshire. He is not only assessed for the amount of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, but he is assessed with the taxes for his property. That is the price of suffrage.

Mr. HILL. In other words, as the Senator from Mississippi well states, it not only includes the assessment for the poll tax; it includes assessments for all other taxes—State, county, town, local subdivision, and all other taxes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator notes that the amount is $2, assessed on every person from 21 to 70 years of age, and a married man has to pay his wife's tax. I wonder if the Senator would compare the burdensomeness of that tax, levied on every person, alien or citizen, from 21 to 70 years of age, $2 a year, for which he can be imprisoned, with the poll tax in our own State of Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that in our own State of Alabama the poll tax is levied only on those from 21 to 45 years of age, and a person reaching the age of 45 is then and there, for the rest of his or her life, exempted from the payment of any poll tax. So of course the imposition by the State of New Hampshire is far more burdensome than any poll tax that I know of in any Southern State.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. War veterans in New Hampshire may apply for exemption from the payment of poll tax. But if they make such application and are given the exemption, then they are not eligible to vote. How does that compare with the situation in Alabama?

Mr. HILL. The situation in Alabama is exactly the contrary. The State of Alabama has expressly exempted the veterans from the payment of any poll tax. As the Senator well says, in New Hampshire a veteran may have his tax deferred or be exempted from it, but if that happens, he does not have the right to vote, whereas in Alabama the veteran is expressly exempted from payment of the poll tax so far as his right to vote is concerned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask the Senator if that applies to the veterans of all wars.

Mr. HILL. It applies to all the veterans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the Spanish-American War?

Mr. HILL. And the Spanish-American War. It applies to that war and to World War I and to World War II. It applies to all the wars, in fact.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And to the Civil War?

Mr. HILL. Yes; and the War Between the States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I stand corrected. I wonder if my colleague would yield for another question concerning the State of our colleague the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] with reference to its poll-tax requirement.

Mr. HILL. I shall be delighted to yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I notice that in Massachusetts a poll tax is required of every male inhabitant above the age of 20—and there is no upper limit at all—so long as he shall live, whether he is a citizen or an alien——

Mr. HILL. They do not live very long up there, do they?

Mr. SPARKMAN. And in the collection of such poll taxes the local assessors and the registrars for voting exchange lists one with the other.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for about 2 minutes so I

may have the opportunity to correct a manifest error?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield with the understanding that I do not lose the floor by doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama yields to the Senator from New Hampshire with the understanding that he does not lose the floor by doing so.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I was in the District Committee room and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] came in. I asked him who was talking. He said, "Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN are just talking about the New Hampshire poll-tax law." And I ran in here quickly to put out the fire.

Now, anticipating that at some time this question would come up, due to the fact that my very highly esteemed and loved friend, JIM EASTLAND, had talked to me about it off the record, and believing that he would try to bring that subject into the discussion, without any malice aforethought, without any premeditation, I called on the telephone Mr. George Duncan, one of our tax commissioners, one of the best tax men of the country, and he sent me the letter which I hold in my hand, which came in an hour ago. I just want to read it, and I hope it will settle for all time the misinformation given out by the suggestion of the two Senators from Alabama who have just now been speaking.

The letter is from Jaffrey, N. H., dated July 31, 1948, and is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: It has been called to my attention that in the course of the current debate on the abolition of the poll tax as a prerequisite of voting, it has been stated that payment of a poll tax is a necessary qualification for voting in New Hampshire. This is not true.

New Hampshire imposes a poll tax on all persons between the ages of 21 and 70, with some exceptions, but that imposition and payment of the tax have no connection with the right to vote, except that, when a new voter is establishing his right, the fact that a poll tax has been assessed against him is important evidence of residence.

The right to vote is stated in article 28, part I, of the New Hampshire Constitution, in pertinent part as follows: "Every male inhabitant of each town, and parish with town privileges, and places unincorporated, in this State, of 21 years of age and upwards, excepting paupers and persons excused from paying taxes at their own request, shall have a right, at the biennial or other meetings of the inhabitants of said towns and parishes, to be duly warned and holden biennially forever in the month of November, to vote in the town or parish wherein he dwells."

That is the end of the quotation of the statute.

Of course, the amendment to the Federal Constitution granting women the right to vote in effect has eliminated the word "male" above; but the word never has been removed by amendment.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE H. DUNCAN,
Commissioner.

I hope that my friend and fellow traveler sitting before me—and when I say "fellow traveler" I refer to our trip to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco—will accept that letter as a full explanation, and that it will settle for all time, to his satisfaction, that by no stretch of the imagination does New Hampshire make the paying of a poll tax a prerequisite to voting in the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. If the Senate will be indulgent with us, so that we may clear up this matter, and with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor by doing so, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. For myself I will say that I am very generous with somebody else's time, and shall be happy to give my consent.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to yield with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor by doing so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the Senator who now is occupying the seat of the majority leader, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Alabama has the floor, and I ask whether I am correct in understanding that he cannot continue to make his speech if he yields to permit other Senators to make speeches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Therefore I would most respectfully object to any other speech on the part of the Senator from New Hampshire. I happen to know Mr. Duncan. He runs a very good drug store.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, one minute. That is a libel on Mr. Duncan. He owns a good drug store, and it is a community asset. But far more, he is probably the best posted authority in our State on the statutes pertaining to taxation and the constitution, and widely recognized as such.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] may yield to me for a few moments so I may reply to what my able and warm friend, the Senator from New Hampshire has just said. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama not lose the floor by so yielding, or that he will not be prejudicing his rights in any way by doing so.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi if by doing so I will not lose any of my rights.

Mr. EASTLAND. And I should also like to ask unanimous consent that what I now propose to say will not be considered to be my first speech on the matter of the anti-poll-tax legislation.

Mr. HILL. Of course, Mr. President, this is a matter which lies entirely in the hands of the Senate. But it would seem to me that in view of the fact that the Senate permitted me to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire in order that he might make a statement in reply to what had previously been said, and in view of the fact that the Senator from New Hampshire referred very directly to the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], in fact I think he even referred to him as a "fellow traveler" referring to the trip which the two Senators took together to the United Nations Conference, it would seem entirely fair and proper that the Senator from Mississippi should have the right to make a statement in reply to the Senator from New Hampshire. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that without in any way interfering with my right to hold the floor, the Senator from Mississippi may be allowed to speak.

Mr. EASTLAND. And I also ask unanimous consent that what I have to say now will not count as being my first speech on the subject of the matter under discussion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Mississippi reply briefly, or does he intend to make a speech?

Mr. EASTLAND. I am not going to make a speech. I am going to reply for a moment or two to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall make no objection.

Mr. EASTLAND. I make the request with the understanding that what I say shall not count as my first speech on the appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is recognized under the conditions he has stated.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, my distinguished friend from New Hampshire said that the statement had been made on the floor of the Senate that the payment of a poll tax was a prerequisite to voting in the State of New Hampshire. That statement has not been made. It was not made by the Senator from Mississippi, and it was not made by the Senator from Alabama. What we did say—and I say that it is not covered in the letter that the Senator from New Hampshire received from his State—is that the assessment of the tax is a prerequisite for voting in the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. It is not by any stretch of the imagination.

Mr. EASTLAND. Now, Mr. President, here is an article which appeared in the Washington Star of Sunday, June 13, 1948, written by a very distinguished writer, in which he discusses the poll tax in the State of New Hampshire. He discusses the system that is used there.

Mr. TOBEY. What is his name?

Mr. EASTLAND. He discusses the system which is used there.

Mr. TOBEY. What is his name?

Mr. EASTLAND. Fletcher F. Isbell.

Mr. TOBEY. Did the Senator supply him with the information?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I did not supply him with the information. However, the Senator will remember that I talked to him on the telephone, and he placed on the telephone a very distinguished lawyer from his State, a gentleman who the Senator from New Hampshire said was a very distinguished lawyer, and I am sure he is. I asked him that question, and he agreed that the assessment of the tax is a prerequisite to vote in that State, but that the statute says that the payment of the tax is not a qualification, which we have made plain in every word that has been said.

This is what the gentleman says:

An irritated resident of Lyme, N. H., in 1944 wrote a New York newspaper: "In all the talk about poll-tax States, I don't believe New Hampshire was ever mentioned. In New Hampshire the tax in the past has been $2 per voter, but now (this year) they

have added a $3 soldiers-bonus tax. Many can't vote for $5. Many who can are not going to vote because they can't consider a vote being worth a full $5.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the Senator that that is entirely erroneous. It is a figment of the imagination, and nothing else.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to read the article. I do not take issue with what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire says, but this gentleman quotes the statutes of his State and the constitution of his State.

Mr. TOBEY. But he is an ignoramus.

Mr. EASTLAND. If he is, the statutes are certainly not misquoted.

Mr. TOBEY. He has misquoted the statute. There is nothing in the statute that says that.

Mr. EASTLAND. In a few minutes I shall read the provisions. I continue reading from the article:

The vexed New Hampshireman voiced an impression common to many in his and other New England States. They know that, in actual practice, they have to pay poll taxes to vote. They never hear their States mentioned in demands for Federal anti-poll-tax legislation. New Hampshire officials deny any specific statute requires payment of their poll tax as a voting qualification—and they are correct to the letter. But:

1. No rural resident without property may vote in New Hampshire without having paid his poll tax.

2. No rural resident, with property or not, may vote without being assessed for his poll tax. He might possibly make payment after the election, but, once assessed, he must pay or suffer penalties.

Let me read that again:

No rural resident, with property or not, may vote without being assessed for his poll tax. He might possibly make payment after the election, but, once assessed, he must pay or suffer penalties.

The article further states:

These situations are accomplished not by one law, but by several which interlock. They produce the effect while enabling the statement that poll-tax payment is not a voting requisite. This situation apparently is what the State attorney general's office means when it says, "It is generally understood that the current tax should be paid before a person may vote, but it is not a specific requirement."

Mr. TOBEY. That is exactly right.

Mr. EASTLAND. I continue reading from the article:

JAIL TERM PROVIDED

The basic law is article 31 of the State constitution. It provides that rural citizens must be either assessed or taxed in order to vote. In the case of a farmer with property this means that the cost of his vote is the amount of his assessment. When the assessor comes to a man with no property above the statutory exemption, however, the citizen may remark that it seems he cannot qualify as an elector, as he owes no taxes.

"Not at all," the assessor may reply. "You are between the ages of 21 and 70. Under the law I must assess you for a head or poll tax of $2. That qualifies you." (Although New Hampshire was the highest poll-tax State in the Union in 1944 and 1945, when the levy was the $5 complained of by the Lyme resident, the tax has since been lowered to its prewar $2.)

The tax is payable on demand, without notice, if the collector chooses. He may seize and sell a delinquent's property to get the money.

Under the Constitution the assessment must be made. It is not a qualification, but the tax must be assessed, and the assessment is a prerequisite to vote under section 31.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is wrong in his interpretation; the correspondent is wrong; and the newspaper is wrong. The whole thing is wrong.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not intend to argue with the written word of the constitution of the State of New Hampshire. I read on:

If there is no property he can arrest the citizen and throw him into the county jail or house of correction, where he has to work out the tax at the rate of 50 cents a day, while paying $2.50 a week board. On a 6-day week a citizen thus can be jailed and worked 4 weeks in order to pay his poll tax.

As a matter of fact, I know that they do not arrest people in New Hampshire for nonpayment of the poll tax, any more than they arrested and prosecuted people in my State for nonpayment of the road tax when we had a road tax in my State.

I continue reading:

These are revised 1942 statutes. Tax Collecting in New Hampshire, an instruction book for the State's collectors written in 1941 by William F. Howes, makes no bones about the course of action expected toward subversive anti-poll-tax characters: "An arrest should be the last resort, but sometimes—as in a case where a person who has refused to pay is inciting others to do likewise—it is not only justifiable but commendable as a salutary lesson to others in law enforcement."

I know that regardless of the statement in that book, no one is prosecuted in the State of New Hampshire for nonpayment of the poll tax, but the law authorizes it. The law in my State does not authorize, but specifically forbids, criminal prosecution for nonpayment of the poll tax.

I continue reading:

With this sort of backing, collectors in some of the smaller towns accompany selectmen when they make their annual inventories of polls and property, and collect on the spot. Mr. Howes says this practice has been especially popular in lumber towns, where the woodsmen, living in company quarters, have no chance to avoid listing or payment.

Such drumhead collection is optional with the official, however. In such a case a propertyless rural resident, assessed in the early part of the year, may fancy he is going to vote in November before he pays the $2. He reckons without another law. It orders each assessor to compile by June 1 a list of all poll taxes he has levied against persons having no property, and the collector to collect these taxes at once.

Taxpayers with property wait until fall, when they may pay their poll taxes with their property levies. Even the stern Mr. Howes has a qualm about this. He remarks of the spring immediate-payment list, "It would seem advisable to include all poll-tax payers in such a list, instead of discriminating between the have's and the have-not's."

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

There is only one way a nonexempt inhabitant of New Hampshire may avoid paying a poll tax. If he really is almost penniless, he may ask abatement. The instant he does, he really loses his right to vote. Still another law specifically bars him.

New Hampshire is not the only northern poll-tax State, and there are others elsewhere, such as Nevada, with its $2 levy.

Then he discusses the poll tax in other New England States—Connecticut, $3; Maine, $3; Massachusetts, $3; New Hampshire, $3; Rhode Island, $1; and Vermont, $1. I judge those are not qualifications for voting, and that their assessment is not a prerequisite to voting.

The writer continues:

There is no doubt that New Hampshire likes its poll tax. Except for occasional grumblings such as those from Lyme or the lumber camps, it is supported by the bulk of the citizenry. Mr. Howes puts the reasons: "Without doubt, it is the fairest and most equitable levy that can be made."

In that statement I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

I read further:

"It is the only contribution that many residents are called upon to make toward the running expenses of their home town—and there is no $2 investment that brings so much in return."

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say there is the whole thing in a nutshell. It is a head contribution, to pay the expenses of running the town. The lumberjacks are there for perhaps 60 or 90 days, and the tax grabs them before they move to the next town or State; that is all.

Mr. EASTLAND. But section 31 of the Constitution of New Hampshire, as quoted by the article—if the article is in error, I do not know, of course——

Mr. TOBEY. It quotes both the law and the constitution.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have the floor. The article states that the payment of the poll tax is not a prerequisite to voting. That is absolutely true; in New Hampshire it is not a prerequisite to voting. The article did not say that the assessment and payment of the tax was a prerequisite to voting.

Mr. TOBEY. And it is not.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is a statement which I made on the basis of the article and the statutes as compiled by the Library of Congress, and the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama referred to that compilation a few moments ago. That states that the assessment of the tax is a prerequisite. If we are wrong about that, then this gentleman has misquoted the law and the Constitution of New Hampshire. He purports to quote the New Hampshire Constitution and the New Hampshire statutes. I do not know whether he has correctly quoted them. Of course, I have not read those statutes. I know that he represents them to be as he has set them forth in the article.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, Shakespeare once wrote a play, Much Ado About Nothing——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have the floor.

I could not take issue with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire as to whether the article is correct, but I know this gentleman quotes the statutes of New Hampshire, and I know it is verified by the Library of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of June 13, 1948]

NEW ENGLAND STATE TAXES VOTERS BUT ESCAPES CRITICISM

(By Fletcher F. Isbell)

An irritated resident of Lyme, N. H., in 1944 wrote a New York newspaper: "In all the talk about poll tax States, I don't believe New Hampshire was ever mentioned. In New Hampshire the tax in the past has been $2 per voter, but now (this year) they have added a $3 soldier's bonus tax. Many can't vote for $5. Many who can are not going to vote because they can't consider a vote being worth a full $5. Of course, it's worth more, but why should one have to purchase it?"

The vexed New Hampshireman voiced an impression common to many in his and other New England States. They know that, in actual practice, they have to pay poll taxes to vote. They never hear their States mentioned in demands for Federal anti-poll-tax legislation. New Hampshire officials deny any specific statute requires payment of their poll tax as a voting qualification—and they are correct to the letter. But:

1. No rural resident without property may vote in New Hampshire without having paid his poll tax.

2. No rural resident, with property or not, may vote without being assessed for his poll tax. He might possibly make payment after the election, but, once assessed, he must pay or suffer penalties.

These situations are accomplished not by one law, but by several which interlock. They produce the effect while enabling the statement the poll-tax payment is not a voting requisite. This situation apparently is what the State attorney general's office means when it says, "It is generally understood that the current tax should be paid before a person may vote, but it is not a specific requirement."

JAIL TERM PROVIDED

The basic law is article 31 of the State constitution. It provides that rural citizens must be either assessed or taxed in order to vote. In the case of a farmer with property this means that the cost of his vote is the amount of his assessment. When the assessor comes to a man with no property above the statutory exemption, however, the citizen may remark that it seems he cannot qualify as an elector, as he owes no taxes.

"Not at all," the assessor may reply. "You are between the ages of 21 and 70. Under the law I must assess you for a head or poll tax of $2. That qualifies you." (Although New Hampshire was the highest poll-tax State in the Union in 1944 and 1945, when the levy was the $5 complained of by the Lyme resident, the tax has since been lowered to its prewar $2.)

The tax is payable on demand, without notice, if the collector chooses. He may seize and sell a delinquent's property to get the money. If there is no property he can arrest the citizen and throw him into the county jail or house of correction, where he has to work out the tax at the rate of 50 cents a day, while paying $2.50 a week board. On a 6-day week a citizen thus can be jailed and worked 4 weeks in order to pay his poll tax.

HANDBOOK ADVICE

These are revised 1942 statutes. Tax Collecting in New Hampshire, an instruction book for the State's collectors written in 1941 by William F. Howes, makes no bones about the course of action expected toward subversive anti-poll-tax characters: "An arrest should be the last resort, but sometimes—as in a case where a person who has refused to pay is inciting others to do likewise—it is not only justifiable but commendable as a salutory lesson to others in law enforcement."

With this sort of backing collectors in some of the smaller towns accompany selectmen when they make their annual inventories of polls and property, and collect on the spot. Mr. Howes says this practice has been especially popular in lumber towns, where the woodsmen, living in company quarters, have no chance to avoid listing or payment.

Such drumhead collection is optional with the official, however. In such a case a propertyless rural resident, assessed in the early part of the year, may fancy he is going to vote in November before he pays the $2. He reckons without another law. It orders each assessor to compile by June 1 a list of all poll taxes he has levied against persons having no property, and the collector to collect these taxes at once.

Taxpayers with property wait until fall, when they may pay their poll taxes with their property levies. Even the stern Mr. Howes has a qualm about this. He remarks of the spring immediate-payment list, "It would seem advisable to include all poll-tax payers in such a list, instead of discriminating between the 'have's' and the 'have-not's.'"

ONLY ONE WAY OUT

There is only one way a nonexempt inhabitant of New Hampshire may avoid paying a poll tax. If he really is almost penniless, he may ask abatement. The instant he does, he really loses his right to vote. Still another law specifically bars him.

New Hampshire is not the only northern poll-tax State, and there are others elsewhere, such as Nevada, with its $2 levy. But the Federal bill to abolish the tax as a voting requirement is a current issue, and since it is so worded that New Hampshire's interlocking statutes are untouched, they become of special interest.

The complete poll-tax line-up in New England as of a fairly recent period was:

State and date assessed	*Amount*
Connecticut, Oct. 1	$3
Maine, Apr. 1	$3
Massachusetts, Jan. 1	$3
New Hampshire, Apr. 1	$2
Rhode Island, June 15	$1
Vermont, Apr. 1	$1 plus

In Vermont each town adds to the levy of $1 by imposing a poll tax of its own. Indignant denials sometimes issue from Hartford that the Connecticut levy is a poll tax, because it is known there as an old-age assistance tax, from the use made of the revenue. It is, however, a true poll tax, being levied on every poll or head in the State between 21 and 60. The denials are recognition of the undesirable connotations that have built up around the phrase "poll tax," plus possibly some confusion of the word "poll," meaning head.

These undesirable connotations illustrate, incidentally southern indifference to psychological warfare until an explosive point is reached. Southern States could have given check to their poll-tax opponents years ago merely by following Connecticut's example and changing the name of tax to its revenue use. In all Southern States the money goes entirely or partially for public support, and the levy could as correctly be called a school tax. The explanatory difficulties of a committee to abolish the school tax would be considerable.

There is no doubt that New Hampshire likes its poll tax. Except for occasional grumblings such as those from Lyme or the lumber camps, it is supported by the bulk of the citizenry. Mr. Howes puts the reasons: "Without doubt, it is the fairest and most equitable levy that can be made. It is the only contribution that many residents are called upon to make toward the running expenses of their own home town, and there is no $2 investment that brings so much in return."

Both New England and Southern States thus seem in agreement on the fair nature of the tax, its use as a prerequisite to other privileges being the only argument. New Hampshire requires poll-tax payments directly before a citizen can get an automobile driving license, register a car, or get a hunting or fishing license; and indirectly before a farmer or lumberman may vote. It collects strictly, under threat of debtor's prison.

SOME DON'T ENFORCE IT

Six Southern States do not touch sports or livelihoods with it, but make it a prerequisite to Democratic primary and general election voting. South Carolina requires it only in the formality of the general election. The tax is not charged for voting, but for school and sometimes other revenue and all affected citizens owe it whether they vote or not, or even if they have lost the privilege of voting by a felony conviction. No State, however, forces payment. The voting attraction is the only incentive to collection.

In the past, few realists have had much doubt that the anti-poll-tax bill, already passed by the House, would fail to pass the Senate on a show-down vote. Its opponents place heavy reliance on constitutional arguments. It is true the bill's constitutionality is so doubtful, at charitable best, that the Supreme Court could sustain it only by the unlikely procedure of reversing itself in the 1884 case of ex parte Yarbrough, a landmark decision for State control of the franchise. But some supporters of the bill want a law regardless of its constitutionality or lack of it and they probably have the votes.

If the bill is enacted, some of the seven affected States probably would accept the statute without contest. Repeal movements have made headway in some, notably Tennessee, Virginia, and Arkansas.

COURT REVERSAL POSSIBLE

But the people of some States may object to being told what their voting requirements must be. This is reaction or American independence, depending on the point of view. If these States do go to the Supreme Court, past decisions of that body indicate their chances of invalidating the act are better than even.

But they do not have to. Regardless of the way these events may transpire, the present bill is an open sieve. Language more watertight than now used must be found if it is to achieve the effect desired by proponents. For any recalcitrant State that wants to take advantage of it has the New Hampshire example.

The present bill would prohibit payment, not assessment, of a poll tax as a voting requirement. It thus does not touch New Hampshire, even if it is enacted and sustained by the Supreme Court.

Neither would it touch any State which:

1. Repealed its poll tax voting requirement.

2. Made tax assessment, in general, a qualification instead, as does New Hampshire for its rural citizens.

3. By another statute levied a per capita tax without reference to voting, as do all the New England States.

4. By still another statute made the tax payable on demand at time of assessment, at option of the collector, as does New Hampshire.

The difficulty faced by the bill's backers is that they cannot amend the bill now to stop this route of egress, or later try to invalidate it in the Supreme Court, without snarling the constitution of at least one Northern State, perhaps a half dozen.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I asked the Library of Congress to compile for me data and information with reference to poll taxes as levied in the six New England States. The information compiled for me by the Library of Congress is dated April 8, 1948, and is signed by Mr. Norman J. Small, State law section; in other words, he is head of the sec-

tion of the Library of Congress which has jurisdiction over questions arising under State laws. In reference to that data, compiled by the Library of Congress, I must say that in my long experience with the Library of Congress I have found it to be a most thorough and accurate institution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from Oregon that if New Hampshire has a poll tax—and I am inclined to believe, on the basis of the representations made here this afternoon, that New Hampshire does have a poll tax—and if some other States north of the Mason and Dixon's line have a poll tax—and I am inclined to assume, at least for the time being, on the basis of the representations made here this afternoon, that they have—then the argument of some of the opponents of the anti-poll-tax measure that those of us who favor it seek to discriminate against the South, falls to the ground?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think this bill is so written and so drafted and its wording is such that it is aimed directly at the poll tax in Southern States; and I do not think that the language of this bill would cover or affect the poll tax which has been referred to in the other States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Alabama disagree with the Senator from Oregon that the purpose of the pending bill is to eliminate the poll tax as an inhibition upon a voting privilege; and if what the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] have just said is true in regard to the New Hampshire requirement—namely, that it does affect the right to vote—the bill automatically would eliminate any restriction in New Hampshire on the right to vote, so far as a poll tax is concerned?

Mr. HILL. Although that may be the intent and purpose of the bill, it does not follow that the language would cover the poll tax in the other States. It does not follow that the language—and, of course, the Court would be guided by the clear language of the bill—would cover the other States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now that it has been rather well established, I think, that perhaps the heaviest poll tax levied in the entire Union is levied by the State of New Hampshire, followed rather closely by the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts——

Mr. HILL. And I hope my colleague will not forget Vermont.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; Vermont also; and West Virginia also levies a poll tax, so I am informed, and imprisons those who do not pay it, I believe—inasmuch as those States have been shown to have the burdensome poll tax, even though they get around it by imprisoning people, rather than by making the payment of it a prerequisite to voting, will this language of the bill reach those States:

That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering—

And so forth and so on. Will that language reach a single one of those States?

Mr. HILL. That language will not reach those States.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. How could there be any doubt about it? How could it possibly reach New Hampshire, when the bill states that it relates to the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting, whereas New Hampshire requires that the tax must be assessed, and the assessment is a prerequisite to voting. We are dealing with sectionalism of the rankest kind, Mr. President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the observation which has been made by the Senator from Mississippi—and I agree with his observation—that the bill would not reach the New Hampshire poll tax, does the Senator from Alabama have any objection to broadening the pending measure, if it does not cover the other poll tax, so as to make it cover it?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the truth is that the measure is not the pending business. The Senator from Alabama states again, as he did at the beginning that he is unalterably opposed to the measure and any part or parcel of it.

With reference to the question as to the New Hampshire situation, let me say I have referred to the brief prepared for me by the Library of Congress. I think at this time I should call attention to one or two sections of it relative to New Hampshire:

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Upon whom levied: On every inhabitant of the State, from 21 to 70 years of age, whether a citizen of the United States or an alien. A husband shall be liable for the payment of his wife's poll tax if, when it was assessed, they were living together as man and wife (Rev. Laws (1942), ch. 73, pars. 1, 6. Laws 1944. Ex. ch. 5).

Then it goes into the question of exemptions:

Exemptions: Paupers, insane persons, the widow of any soldier, sailor, or marine who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in any war in which the United States was engaged, veterans of any war in which the United States has been engaged who record with the selectmen or assessors of the town in which they live their pension certificates or their certificates of honorable discharge, and veterans disabled in consequence of service in such wars whom the town assessors or selectmen, in their discretion, exempt. The term "veteran" includes members of any woman's auxiliary service which was subject to and under military law (Rev. Laws (1942), ch. 73, secs. 1–2, 4; Laws 1943, ch. 173; 1944 Ex. ch. 5).

Rate: $2 (Rev. Laws (1942 ch. 73, sec. 1)).

Collection: Poll taxes are assessed on April 1 by town selectmen or city assessors and are payable to the collector on demand and without previous notice. Interest at 10 percent is charged on all taxes not paid on or before December 1 after assessment. The proceeds of such taxes are retained by the respective towns, cities, or counties. Remedies for collection include the seizure and sale of personal property sufficient to pay said taxes, or, if no personal property can be found, the arrest and commitment of the delinquent taxpayer to the county jail or house of correction. When any person is so committed to the county jail or house of correction where there is a workshop connected, he shall be credited for his labor therein at the rate of 50 cents per day, to be applied on the amount of his tax and costs of commitment. He shall be required to pay the jailer of the institution board at the rate of $2.50 per week, the same to be earned in the employ of said institution. Suit may also be instituted against a delinquent taxpayer for the amount of any taxes owed; and wages may be attached for payment. (Rev. Laws (1942) ch. 31, sec. 6; ch. 74, sec. 1; ch. 75, sec. 1; ch. 77, secs. 1, 10–12; ch. 80, secs. 1–2, 10–11, 43.)

It seems clear from that language that a man may be put in jail in New Hampshire for not paying his poll tax, just as he may be put in jail for not paying his other taxes. Certainly, unless that statute has been changed or modified—and there is absolutely no evidence to the effect that it has been changed or modified—if he does not pay his poll tax or other taxes in New Hampshire, either one or the other, he goes to jail.

Now:

Payment a prerequisite: (1) Every applicant for a permit to register a motor vehicle shall furnish to the issuing officer a tax collector's receipt for the payment of any poll tax for which he is liable for the preceding year, or make oath that he has paid said taxes or has been relieved from such payment because of exemption or abatement; provided that a permit may be issued if the selectmen or assessors certify that in their opinion the applicant should be granted such permit even though he has not paid said taxes (Rev. Laws (1942) ch. 116, sec. 63; Laws 1947 ch. 105).

Then, under "Payment a prerequisite," there is a second section:

(2) Every applicant for a resident hunting, fishing, or trapping license shall furnish to the issuing officer a tax collector's receipt for the payment of a poll tax for the preceding year, or make oath that he has either paid said tax or has been relieved from such payment because of exemption or abatement. However, a license may be issued if the selectmen or assessors certify that in their opinion the applicant should be granted such license even though he has not paid the tax (Rev. Laws (1942), ch. 247, sec. 4; Laws 1943, ch. 52).

Here is an important section entitled "Relation of Payment of Poll Tax to Voting":

A person excused from paying taxes at his own request is disqualified from voting; but he may become qualified as a voter by tendering payment of all taxes assessed against him during the year prior to his offer to vote to the moderator, collector of taxes, or to one of the selectmen of the town in which he lives and has his home; and, at the time he offers to vote, present evidence of such tender (Rev. Laws (1942), ch. 31, secs. 1, 4–5; Const., art. 28).

That seems to be the clear law of the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. President, at the time I was somewhat diverted from my main argument to take a little excursion into the State of New Hampshire to see if we could determine here the question of the payment of poll taxes in that State. I was

about to discuss the question of electors for President and Vice President of the United States. Up to this time we have been talking largely about electors who vote for Members of the House of Representatives and for Members of the United States Senate. But certainly I think we should turn our thoughts for a few moments to the question of electors for President and Vice President of the United States. As we know, the only provision of the Federal Constitution relating to the power of appointment of electors is contained in article II, section 1, of the Constitution, which confers upon and vests in State legislatures plenary power over the method, except as to the time of choosing the electors. In other words the States under the Constitution of the United States have full power over the question of electors, the question of who are to vote for President and Vice President, with the single exception of the time of choosing electors. The second clause of the section provides as follows:

> Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: But no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.

The third clause reads as follows:

> The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States.

So, Mr. President, nothing can be clearer than the effect of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States which I have just quoted. In drafting and adopting the Constitution, the States were not conferring powers on themselves. In the course of this debate, I have sought to emphasize time and again that the States were not conferring powers on themselves. They were reserving powers already possessed, and conferring them upon their own State legislatures.

By these provisions in the Federal Constitution the States delegated to Congress the power only to determine the time of choosing electors, while they conferred on their own respective State legislatures the exclusive power to direct the method and manner in which the electors should be chosen or appointed. There is no requirement that they shall be chosen by the people or that they shall be elected by the people, but, if so elected, the qualifications which the legislature may prescribe for those privileged to vote are left entirely to the States. The whole matter, as I have said, with the exception of the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they are to vote, is left entirely with the States. In fact, Mr. President, history reminds us that in the first Presidential election, in 5 of the 11 States which had then ratified the Constitution the appointment of electors was made by the State legislatures.

The State legislatures did not see fit to delegate this power to the people or to place the power in the hands of some other authority. They did not see fit to give the power to anyone else. They simply proceeded to exercise that power themselves and, in 5 of the 11 States, they proceeded to appoint electors.

In the case of *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 36 L. ed.), in construing the second clause, Mr. Chief Justice Fuller said:

> The Constitution does not provide that the appointment of electors shall be by popular vote, nor that the electors shall be voted for upon a general ticket, nor that the majority of those who exercise the elective franchise can alone choose the electors. It—

Meaning, of course, the Constitution—

> recognizes that the people act through their representatives in the legislature, and leaves it to the legislature exclusively to define the method of effecting the object.

The object being to elect the electors.

At page 877 of 36 Law Edition, Chief Justice Fuller of the Supreme Court had this to say:

> In short, the appointment and mode of appointment of electors belong exclusively to the States under the Constitution of the United States. They are, as remarked by Mr. Justice Gary in the case of *In re Green* (134 U. S. 377, 379), "no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of the State legislatures when acting as electors of Federal Senators, or the people of the States when acting as the electors of Representatives in Congress."

Congress is empowered, as I have said, to determine the time of choosing electors, and the day on which they are to cast their votes, which must be the same day throughout the United States. Mr. Justice Gray goes on to say:

> Otherwise the power and jurisdiction of the State is exclusive, with the exception of the provision as to the number of electors and the ineligibility of certain persons.

When Justice Gray referred to the ineligibility of certain persons he was referring to that provision of the Constitution which says that no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be appointed an elector. The framers of the Constitution did not think that officers or officials of the Federal Government should act as electors in naming the President and Vice President of the United States. With this exception, the plenary power to determine who the electors shall be is vested in the States.

The opinion of Chief Justice Fuller also quotes a report of a committee of the Senate. The Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, which met in 1874, stated:

> It is no doubt competent for the legislature to authorize the governor or the supreme court of the State or any other agent of its will, to appoint these electors.

We find a committee of the Senate saying that under the plenary power provided in the Constitution of the United States, the State legislature may provide that the governor of a State shall appoint the electors for President and Vice President. The legislature can even provide that the supreme court of a particular State shall make these appointments; in other words the power of the legislature is so complete that it can even go into the judicial branch of the State government and have the supreme court make the appointment of electors.

After referring to the provision of the fourteenth amendment penalizing State representation in the House of Representatives where the right to vote at any election is denied or abridged except for crime, the Court said, further:

> The first section of the fourteenth amendment does not refer to the exercise of the elective franchise, though the second provides that if the right to vote is denied or abridged to any male inhabitant of the State having attained majority and being a citizen of the United States, then the basis of representation to which each State is entitled in the Congress shall be proportionately reduced. Whenever Presidential electors are appointed by popular election, then the right to vote cannot be denied or abridged without invoking the penalty.
>
> "The right to vote intended to be protected refers to the right to vote as established by the laws and constitution of the State," declares Chief Justice Fuller in his opinion.

Then he proceeds:

> There is no color for the contention that under the amendment every male inhabitant of the State being a citizen of the United States has from the time of his majority a right to vote for Presidential electors.

Such a contention would be absolutely unsound, would be absolutely unwarranted, would have no justification at all, under the clear language and the clear provision of the Constitution of the United States, which leaves all this power of fixing qualifications of these electors in the hands of the State.

It is clear, Mr. President, that nowhere does the Constitution confer on Congress any power to supervise or in any manner interfere with the State legislatures in directing the manner of the appointment of a State's presidential electors or in saying who may vote in elections to choose them, for the legislature determines the method of selection, and prescribes who may vote.

There is absolutely nothing in the record, nothing in the debates at the time the Constitution was under consideration in the Philadelphia Convention, and nothing in any of the debates when the fourteenth, fifteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth amendment was under consideration by either the House of Representatives or the Senate; there is nothing to be found in any language of any court in all these United States, from the beginning of our Government down to date, which in any way disputes or in any way questions the fact that this power to set the qualifications for these electors rests in the States. This power is a fixed right in the States under the Constitution, absolutely definite and certain.

Mr. President, in my remarks a little earlier I referred to Justice Story, and I should now like to call the attention of the Senate to a few words to be found in Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, eighth edition, Carrington, volume 2. Mr. Cooley, a great and universally accepted authority on the Constitution, declared:

> Among the absolute, unqualified rights of the States is that of regulating the elective franchise; it is the foundation of State authority; the most important political function exercised by the people in their sovereign capacity. Whilst "the right of the people to participate in the legislature is the best security of liberty and foundation of all free government," yet it is subordinate to

the higher power of regulating the qualifications of the electors and the elected. The original power of the people in their aggregate political capacity, is delegated in the form of suffrage to such persons as they deem proper for the safety of the commonwealth; Brightly Election Cases (*Anderson* v. *Baker* (32, 33, 34, 23 Md. 531)).

Then he quotes from Justice Story.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. With the understanding that it will not interfere with my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska to put something into the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nebraska may proceed.

(At this point Mr. BUTLER addressed the Senate regarding Indian estates, which appears elsewhere in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska I had quoted from Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, in which he quoted Justice Story, to whom I said I had referred earlier in my remarks. I wish to quote further from Justice Story at this point:

Every constitution of government in these United States has assumed, as a fundamental principle, the right of the people of the State to alter, abolish, and modify the form of its own government according to the sovereign pleasure of the people. In fact, the people of each State have gone much further and settled a far more critical question by deciding who shall be the voters entitled to approve and reject the constitution framed by a delegated body under their direction. (1 Story, Constitution, ch. 9, sec. 581.)

Then Mr. Cooley says:

From this it will be seen how little, even in the most free of republican governments, any abstract right of suffrage, or any original and indefeasible privilege, has been recognized in practice (ibid.). In no two of these State constitutions will it be found that the qualifications of the voters are settled upon the same uniform basis, so that we have the most abundant proofs that among a free and enlightened people convened for the purpose of establishing their own forms of government and the rights of their own voters the question as to the due regulation of the qualifications has been deemed a matter of mere State policy, and varied to meet the wants, to suit the prejudices, and to foster the interests of the majority.

The exclusive right of the several States to regulate the exercise of the elective franchise and to prescribe the qualifications of voters was never questioned, nor attempted to be interfered with, until the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was forced upon unwilling communities (the States then lately in rebellion) by the military power of the General Government, and thus made a part of our organic law; a necessary sequence, perhaps, of the Civil War, but nonetheless a radical change in the established theory of our Government. (Brightly Election Cases, author's note, pp. 42, 43.)

He quotes the Brightly election cases, author's note, pages 42 and 43. He says, that the fourteenth amendment was a radical departure, a radical change in the established theory of our Government, that theory being, of course, to leave to the States the plenary power as to the qualification of electors. And then, as I have said and reiterated, and again reiterate, when those who advocated this change sought to bring it about, they never for 1 minute proposed to try and make the change by legislative enactment, by legislative fiat. They recognized that under the Constitution of the United States the only way the change could be made was by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and therefore they submitted the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution.

Mr. Cooley continues:

The right to vote is not of necessity connected with citizenship. The rights of the citizen are civil rights, such as liberty of person and of conscience, the right to acquire and possess property, all of which are distinguishable from the political privilege of suffrage.

Senators will notice that Mr. Cooley there departs from the use of the word "right" and uses the word "privilege"; not even conceding that there is any right to suffrage; that it is a privilege conferred by government, and under our Federal system conferred by the States.

The history of the country shows that there is no foundation in fact for the view that the right of suffrage is one of the "privileges or immunities of citizens."

I have discussed that earlier, Mr. President, in connection with the fourteenth amendment, and shall not go into it at this point.

"The right to vote is not vested, it is purely conventional, and may be enlarged or restricted, granted or withheld, at pleasure and without fault."

Then Mr. Cooley cites the case of *Blair* v. *Ridgely* (41 Mo., 161). He continues:

In *Blair* v. *Ridgely* (41 Mo. 161), the question at issue arose out of the provision of article II, section 3, of the Constitution of 1865 of the State of Missouri. By this section it was provided that no person should be deemed a qualified voter who had ever been in armed hostility to the United States, or to the government of the State of Missouri; that every person should, at the time of offering to vote, take an oath that he was not within the inhibition of this section, and that any person declining to take such oath should not be allowed to vote. The plaintiff, at an election held in the city of St. Louis on November 7, 1865, offered to vote, but refused to take the oath prescribed by the constitution. His vote being rejected, he brought his action against the judges of the election for damages. The case was taken to the Supreme Court of Missouri, where it was argued exhaustively, and with much learning, by eminent counsel, and the argument is to be found in full in the Reports of the Supreme Court of Missouri, volume 41. It was contended by the plaintiff that the section of the constitution in question was in violation of the Constitution of the United States, being a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law within the meaning of that instrument, and, in consequence, null and void. But the court held against this contention, drawing the distinction between laws passed to punish for offenses in order to prevent their repetition and laws passed to protect the public franchises and privileges from abuse by falling into unworthy hands. It is said by the court that—

"The State may not pass laws in the form or with the effect of bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts. It may and has full power to pass laws, restrictive and exclusive, for the preservation or promotion of the common interests as political or social emergencies may from time to time require, though in certain instances disabilities may directly flow in consequence. It should never be forgotten that the State is organized for the public weal as well as for individual purposes, and while it may not disregard the safeguards that are thrown around the citizen for his protection by the constitution, it cannot neglect to perform and do what is for the public good."

In other words, that the general weal of the State, the public good, and the welfare of all the people comes ahead of the individual.

It was argued in *Blair v. Ridgely* that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277), where it was held that this section of the Missouri Constitution, so far as it provided an oath to be taken by preachers, was in the nature of pains and penalties, and consequently void, was decisive of the Blair case. But the distinction between the right to practice a profession or follow a calling and the right to vote is clearly stated in the opinion of Judge Wagner, as follows:

"The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Cummings case proceeds on the idea that the right to pursue a calling or profession is a natural and inalienable right and that a law precluding a person from practicing his calling or profession on account of past conduct is inflicting a penalty, and therefore void. There are certain rights which inhere in and attach to the person, and of which he cannot be deprived except by forfeiture for crime, whereof he must be first tried and convicted according to due process of law. These are termed natural or absolute rights. * * * But is the right to vote or to exercise the privilege of the elective franchise a right either natural, absolute, or vested? It is certain that in a state of nature, disconnected with government, no person has or can enjoy it.

"That the privilege of participating in the elective franchise in this free and enlightened country is an important and interesting one is most true. But we are not aware that it has ever been held or adjudged to be a vested interest in any individual.

"Suffrage in the United States not being a vested right, it results that persons who have enjoyed and exercised the privilege, and who have been qualified electors, may be entirely disfranchised and deprived of the privilege by constitutional provision, and such persons are entirely without a remedy at law. (McCrary, Elections, p. 9.)

"The whole subject of the regulation of elections, including the prescribing of qualifications for suffrage, is left by the National Constitution to the several States, except as it is provided by that instrument that the electors for Representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and as the fifteenth amendment forbids denying to citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

If Judge Cooley were writing these comments on constitutional limitations today, he would have to include the nineteenth amendment; but these commentaries were written before the nineteenth amendment, and therefore he did not include the nineteenth amendment, which, as we know, is the woman-suffrage amendment.

Participation in the elective franchise is a privilege rather than a right, and it is granted or denied on grounds of general policy, the prevailing view being that it should be as general as possible consistent with the public

safety. (Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 8th ed., Carrington, vol. 2.)

In Morse on Citizenship we find a commentary along the same lines as those of Mr. Cooley. Pomeroy on Constitutional Law, section 535, is to the same effect. I read from Pomeroy:

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Article I, section 2:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Article I, section 4:

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

Article I, section 8, clause 18:

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER COURTS

To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State, and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate. The privileges and immunities protected are only those that arise from the Constitution and laws of the United States and not those that spring from other sources. *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277, 283); *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 Fed. 2d 218, certiorari denied by Supreme Court, 62 Sup. Ct. Rep. 64); *Huber* v. *Reiley* (53 Penn. St. 112); *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. U. S. 162, 170); *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214, 217, 218); *United States* v. *Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 542); *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 38, 39); *Anderson* v. *Baker* (23 Md. 531); *Ex parte Yarborough* (110 U. S. 631, 664, 665); *Blair* v. *Ridgely* (41 Mo. 63); *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347, 362, L. R. A. 1916 A, 1134); *Ex parte Stratton* (1 W. Va. 305); *Kring* v. *Missouri* (107 U. S. 221); *Hamilton* v. *Regents* (293 U. S. 245, 261); *Washington* v. *State* (75 Ala. 582).

Mr. President, we are considering today whether there shall be brought before the Senate a piece of legislation which several Senators have characterized as sectional, and which certainly many people in the United States feel to be directed at one section of the country. Many people feel this legislation to be inspired by political pressure and conceived for political purposes. Without in any way questioning the motives or the good intentions of the authors of the bill, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate at this time a few words from an address which, by order of the Senate, is read to the Senate on one day of each session. It is an address which commends itself so strongly and so impressively to the heart and mind of every American, and sets up so many guideposts for the direction of our feet, that the Senate has ordered that it shall be read on the 22d day of every February. I refer to the Farewell Address of George Washington. President Washington, we remember, as he relinquished the office of President of the United States, addressed these words to the American people, reminding them that he had given of the best of over 25 years of his life to the service of his country, reminding them of the deep and abiding affection which he felt for them and for the new government which had been brought into being. We recall that in that address President Washington referred to himself as an old and affectionate friend. He said he was offering to his countrymen—of his day and of every day, to you and to me, to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to the people of all the United States—the counsels of an old and affectionate friend. In that address he said to us:

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquillity at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize.

Washington was reminding us that our unity, the unity of the people of the United States, is the main pillar of these dear and cherished and treasured possessions of ours.

He went on to say:

But, as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your National Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

This was George Washington speaking more than 150 years ago. Today those words come with a new emphasis, with a new timeliness, with a new eloquence, yea, with a new warning.

We have been speaking here of events which transpired in Philadelphia where the Constitution of the United States was drafted, there in the very hall in which the Declaration of Independence was written.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I was attempting to develop the latter part of my remarks. I hope the Senator will make his question a brief one.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is the Senator going to speak of some events which occurred recently in Philadelphia?

Mr. HILL. That is exactly what I am coming to now. I say to the Senator from Mississippi that I believe he was necessarily absent from the Chamber or unavoidably detained a few moments ago when I read to the Senate the words of George Washington in his Farewell Address, when he commended to us the unity of our Government, the unity of our people.

Mr. EASTLAND. But I was referring to the events of the past 30 days.

Mr. HILL. I shall come to that. I have been moving rather fast this evening. If the Senator will be a little patient with me, I shall come to what he has in mind.

First, let me repeat these words from Washington's Farewell Address:

But, as it is easy to foresee, that from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth—

That is to say, the truth that the main pillar of our blessings and of our cherished possessions is the unity of our Government and the unity of our people.

Washington continues:

As this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies—

Internal and external enemies—

will be most constantly and actively—

Mark well the following words:

(though often covertly and insidiously) directed—

Again I say, these words from George Washington come to us today with a new emphasis, a new meaning, a new significance, a new timeliness, and a new warning.

In the very city of Philadelphia about which we have spoken so often today, the city in which the Declaration of Independence was written, the city in which the Constitution of the United States had its birth, we saw a political party gathered, denouncing practically everything that the American Government is doing and praising all that the Soviet Communist Government is doing. We saw a recognized political party here in the United States, a party with Communists and fellow travelers and those who are in the bed with Communists and fellow travelers, denouncing our American Government and singing its hosannas to the Communist Government of Russia. A few years ago I think most of us would have been astounded even to have contemplated that there would be in existence in America such a political party. We know that there are some in our country who cannot see, or who refuse to see, the true picture in the world today, the threat to peace and the threat to America. We build the peace, or war will come, war that will consume our people with fire and death, sear the earth, leave behind the shattered buildings and blackened ruins of our cities, engulfing all that is beautiful and free, and destroying God's richest blessings. There are some who either cannot see or who will not see that true picture. They are like those who could not see or who refused to see the awful menace of Adolf Hitler and the Japanese war lords. There are those, as I have said, who met in Philadelphia, giving their aid, their encouragement, their help, to the things for which Communist Russia stands, to the actions the Communist Government is taking today to defeat the peace of the world and to carry on its cold war

against the United States of America and against all the freedom-loving peoples and freedom-loving nations of the world.

These people here in America aid and further and abet communism, while Russia's aggressions and Russia's stubborn refusal to cooperate under the United Nations Charter impede the building of the peace of the world at every turn and move the world toward war.

The hope for the peace of the world lies in the strength of the United States of America, in the unity of our people and the leadership of our country. Only if America remains strong—strong in her domestic economy, strong in her armed might, strong in the unity, the determination, and the will of her people—can we hope that Russia will change her course and be willing to come to agreement for the peace of the world. Yet today we see that the Communists and their fellow travelers in the United States and all those who play their game seek to sow confusion, promote discord, and confound agreement. They would separate us. They would divide us. They would turn us one against the other. They would split us into many parties and factions, just as they did in those European nations that have fallen their prey. The Communists, their fellow travelers, and those who play their game would destroy our strength. They would make us weak—weak at home and weak abroad—so weak that the other peace-loving nations would be afraid to rely upon us or our commitments, and would be afraid to associate themselves with us or work with us or follow our leadership for the building of the peace of the world.

My plea to America today is to adhere to the words of George Washington, words proclaiming that the main pillar in the edifice of our independence, of our tranquillity at home, of our peace abroad, of our safety, of our prosperity, and of that very liberty which we so highly prize, is the unity of a democratic government and the unity of a free people.

Let us be done, Senators, with these measures, brought here in the heat of a political campaign and under the pressure of political expediency, which distract and misguide our people, which separate and divide us, and which open the way for the destruction of the fundamental rights of the States and the fundamental rights of the people of all the United States. Let us be done with these measures.

Let us stand united. Strong and resolute in our unity, let us support squarely the rights of the people of the United States and the rights of the States of the United States that our Government may be preserved. Let us stand squarely upon the Constitution of the United States—rock of freedom, ageless and enduring foundation of our rights, our hopes, and our democratic faith.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cain	Kem	Saltonstall
Capper	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Knowland	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cordon	Lodge	Taft
Donnell	Lucas	Taylor
Downey	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McFarland	Thye
Ecton	McGrath	Tobey
Ellender	McKellar	Tydings
Feazel	McMahon	Umstead
Ferguson	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

FRACTIONATED INDIAN HEIRSHIP LANDS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD following my remarks a statement which I have prepared relating to the deplorable condition now existing with respect to the administration of the estates of deceased Indians by the Office of Indian Affairs.

So far as the interests of various estates owned by individual Indians are concerned, in most instances, the shares received are too small to be of any practical value. For example, in one of the estates which has been probated, the common denominator used in designating the shares of the various heirs was 56,582,064,000. Some of the shares are so small that $750 in lease rentals must be collected before an heir will receive one cent as his or her share. Checks are not usually issued for less than $1. Therefore, if this practice is followed, it will be over 1,600 years before sufficient funds will accumulate to the credit of a particular heir from a given estate so that a check may be issued. In one estate, that of Joseph Renville, or Akipa, a Sisseton Indian, of South Dakota, who died in 1891, the appraised value of the estate is $1,200, but it was estimated by the Interior Department in 1939, after 48 years, that $2,400 had then been expended in connection with the probate proceedings. If the estate were sold at the appraised value, some of the heirs would receive as little as $0.016. This demonstrates quite clearly the immense amount of administrative work caused by the present state of the titles to the allotments. The Indians are at present making very little, if any, use of such scattered holdings.

Nowhere is the insidiousness of the Bureau's control over Indian affairs more serious or more dangerous in its potentialities than in the matter of fractionated Indian heirship lands.

I regard this as a matter of the greatest importance and I earnestly trust that it will receive the attention which it so urgently deserves. No action will be proposed at this special session, but I hope Senators may find the statement I have prepared helpful in formulating a constructive proposal that can be considered early in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRACTIONATED INDIAN HEIRSHIP LANDS

When Congress passed the Dawes Act in 1887 and subsequent acts to implement this program, it anticipated the gradual and complete liquidation of all the Indian reservations in the United States. However, the period from 1934 to the present has seen the complete reversal of the expressed will of Congress and the American people through th retention of all land held in Indian reservations and, in some instances, expansion of these reservations. Thus, the Indian Bureau has completely disobeyed the mandate given it and acted in a fashion contrary to the legislative enactment.

The most flagrant example of this disobedience and dereliction of duty is to be seen in the problem of the "heirship lands." These are lands of deceased allottees which have passed again under the power of the Indian Bureau after having been originally freed therefrom. Instead of selling such lands and dividing the proceeds among the heirs, the Indian Bureau has retained them, rented or leased them, and used them for its own purposes. Thus, the continuance of control over Indian lands has been maintained in deliberate contradiction to the congressional will. The Indian Bureau has, in fact, hypocritically maintained that the heirship system, with its endless fractionation of holdings, has been all to the advantage of white men and encouraged their use of the land rather than the Indian's use of it. Nothing could be further from the truth.

If it were not so tragic, the situation has all the elements of a comic opera. Here, on the one hand, is the Indian Bureau crying its eyes out over the poor Indian and the continuous increase in heirship land which it avers will become prey to white exploitation, while, on the other hand, all the Bureau has to do is to sell the lands and divide the proceeds among the heirs. It should be obvious to anyone that the Indian Bureau is simply holding on to these heirship lands for the purpose of keeping its control at the expense of the Indians, the public, and the taxpayer. This is contrary to every principle of decency and of public welfare, and constitutes the rankest sort of discrimination against our Indian fellow citizens.

In the interests of the public welfare and of justice it is imperative that we take action now to remedy this intolerable misuse of our national land resources. We cannot afford to have these large areas of heirship lands to remain under the control of a bureaucratic organization interested only in its own benefit. The Indian Bureau asserts that "no really adequate and effective solution has yet been found (for the heirship problem), though the search has been intensively pursued." This is an example either of wishful thinking or of purposeful prevarication. Of course there is a solution for this problem—a solution so simple that it needs only an honest administration of the Indian Bureau to carry it out.

This solution lies in the dissolution of all special status adhering to Indian lands and the granting of full liberties in the buying and selling of individual lands to all the adult members of our citizenry of Indian descent. Heirship problems would vanish overnight if these lands were immediately

put up for sale and the proceeds divided among the heirs in proportion to their shares.

There is only one thing hindering the application of this solution. That obstacle is the present administration of the Indian Bureau which, having grown fat on the proceeds of its ill-gotten gains, stubbornly refuses to recognize that the public is calling for immediate action to remedy this intolerable situation. When a new administration takes over the Federal Government next January, then, and then only, will it be possible to remedy this grave situation and remove these intolerable discriminations against the property of our Indian fellow citizens.

THE HEIRSHIP TANGLE WORKS AGAINST THE CONSERVATION OF NATIONAL RESOURCES

The present heirship situation represents the natural tendency to aggrandize itself which has indelibly marked the Indian Bureau under the New Deal.

The heirship lands contain an unassessed but indubitably enormous value in terms of unrealized potential natural resources. Where it does not suit the Indian Bureau to lease or rent out the use of these lands and their resources, the United States as a whole suffers a corresponding loss of use of its potential wealth. Some heirship land has valuable timber which has been eaten up by beetles, or otherwise deteriorated, with a dead loss of all the potential wealth of lumber involved. Some of the heirship land has, from neglect of its Bureau administrators, suffered gulleying, wind erosion, and loss of the valuable top soil. To restore such submarginal land will require the activities of other Federal agencies whose efforts might have better been spent elsewhere. Some of the heirship land again undoubtedly contains valuable but unexploited mineral deposits awaiting badly needed use by the Nation for national defense and strategic purposes. Again the heirship land, like other Indian lands under control of the Indian Bureau, pays no local taxation and this item alone mounts up to a formidable sum when the entire United States is considered.

Nor do our losses stop there. The loss to the general taxpayer must also be considered. Not only do we have the Indian Bureau withholding heirship land from local taxation, but it is taxing the general public in order to do it. In other words, the Indian Bureau compels you and me to pay taxes in order that it may control tax-free land for its own uses. The gigantic waste of clerical assistance in the administration of these lands constitutes a fundamental item in the expense of the Indian Bureau which must be met by annual appropriation of millions of dollars from the Public Treasury. How much longer can Congress afford to pour this money down the rat hole of bureaucracy? Isn't it about time something was done?

Administration of heirship lands constitutes a major excuse for the Indian Bureau to continue its existence. Clearly, it is the part of common sense to stop this waste of the public substance at once by putting a new administration into power in this country. Under a Republican administration the affairs of heirship lands will be wound up at once through the honest policy of removing Government control from Indian lands. These lands will be considered as any other citizens' lands are in this country, as disposable by open sale and by disposition of the proceeds to the heirs in proportion to their holdings. The leakage of public funds would be stopped at once, the heirship lands thrown open to taxation, and the tax burden of supporting this intolerable bureaucracy would be removed from the citizens of this country. This is not a matter which would be like the Dutch boy plugging up the hole in the dike with his finger, but would represent the building of a permanent storm wall against the increasing possibility of bankruptcy which the future growth of Indian heirship lands could easily entail.

THE INDIAN BUREAU KEEPS ITS OWN COUNSEL AND THE NATURE OF ITS ARBITRARY ACTS IS NOT GENERALLY KNOWN

The Indian Bureau is in the peculiarly advantageous position of being able to control and censor all information regarding its transactions in the administration of Indian affairs and of heirship lands. Because of the rural location and somewhat isolated position of most Indian reservations, it is difficult to have any impartial reporting of what goes on in agency offices. Even when outside observers do make inquiry, the best they can get are hand-outs representing previously prepared defenses of the Indian Bureau and of its special interests. The temptation to conceal disadvantageous facts, when there is no other check up, is overwhelming for any bureaucratic organization. This holds true also for financial transactions, particularly in the case of the Indian Bureau. The result of this situation is an amount of skullduggery in all its forms which is almost unimaginable. For, like the Russian Soviet Government, the Indian Bureau has set up an "iron curtain" about itself and its activities which no one can penetrate. Even the General Accounting Office has no idea of the nature of the Indian Office transactions.

In recent years, under the guise of an economy measure, the Bureau has cut down its statistical staff to one man so that it will easily be able to plead ignorant on details which it would not like to divulge. It must, indeed, be obvious that any agency of this size cannot have its statistical work handled by one man. This is only another link in the chain of evidence regarding the cynical lack of responsibility and common honesty which characterizes the Indian Bureau under its New Deal administration. For how can Congress know what is going on in the matter of heirship lands when the very information needed for intelligent corrective legislation is withheld by the Indian Bureau?

The arbitrary handling of heirship matters, along with other Indian affairs by the Indian Bureau, runs through all the details of administration. Since identity of the heirs to a particular property is determined by the Bureau at its own pleasure and the amount of shares of each heir are entirely at its disposition, the Bureau can locate heirs or not, as it sees fit. At its own will the Bureau obtains their consent to the leasing of heirship properties, whenever its own convenience is suited, and can dispose of the lands to the tribe, by trade or by other arrangement of consolidation. At its own pleasure, again, the Bureau may allow the heirship lands to lie idle and completely withdrawn from any productive use under the specious plea that Congress will have to legislate before any action can be taken. Income from rentals and leases is accounted for, or not, at the pleasure of the Bureau, in each instance, thus making it possible for huge sums to be accumulated by local agencies which are not accounted for publicly. Who can call the Indians citizens when they are subjected to such bureaucratic arbitrariness as this? Yet this is all concealed from the public by the Indian Bureau's own iron curtain. Within the limits of its own self-imposed secrecy the Indian Bureau can do absolutely what it pleases with the heirship lands, exploiting them for its own purposes where it wishes, and disposing of them as it finds conditions convenient.

THE INDIAN HEIRSHIP PROBLEM IS ONE OF THE COMPLEXITIES OF BUREAUCRACY WHICH URGENTLY STANDS IN NEED OF SIMPLIFICATION

It is a cardinal principle of government nowadays that simplification of functions is of the utmost importance in solving the stupendous problems of administration arising from overelaboration of Federal agencies and bureaus. In the interest of efficiency, honesty, and economy in Government it is absolutely necessary to pare down the innumerable branches and vines which have grown up in the administration. Many agencies of the Federal Government overlap in functions and needlessly confuse the situation with wasteful competition among themselves. At present, the Hoover Commission, for example, is trying to prepare a plan for reducing this tremendous burden of Federal bureaucracy. What, then, of the Indian heirship lands which exceed in complexity most other problems of governmental administration?

It is admitted by all parties concerned that the administration of heirship lands is becoming more complex each day. Fractionation of each heirship plot continues indefinitely as heirs die and numerous new heirs arise for each of the deceased. Take for example, the situation of the heirs of Nice Knife on the Crow Reservation, Mont., who died in 1890 and received Allotment No. 1211 on April 5, 1938. Among his numerous heirs the following may be noted: Walks in the Night had 2,857,680 parts out of 65,318,400, but is now deceased and his heirs are not determined. Another heir was Mary Hill Big Hair who had left 12 heirs of her own, each receiving from 20 to 1 parts out of 60. Of these heirs Aloysius Big Hair, with one part out of 60, died and left 4 heirs, while Peter Big Hair, with 1 part out of 60, passed away with 5 heirs of his own. And so it runs down the list. It can be seen that with such a situation a premium would be put on the nondetermination of heirs.

To add to this confusion the Indian Bureau, under the Wheeler-Howard Act, has encouraged the organization of collective enterprise on an exclusive Indian basis (in theory at least) on each reservation. This has led to the development of a large number of puppet Indian governments on reservations which, in reality, are but the tools of the Indian Bureau. By means of its control over funds, the heirship lands, loans, and other devices, the Bureau maintains a rigid but concealed control over these Indian tribal groups. The multiplication of these Indian corporation charters and constitutional tribes has led to a tremendous complexity in connection with the administration of heirship lands. Using the prospect of obtaining heirship lands as a bait, the Indian Bureau can easily secure the ready obedience of the tribal puppets. It is vital for the Bureau to keep as much of these lands as possible under its own direct control, although it constantly hints at restoration to tribal land status. Thus, the system of probate for Indian heirs is so utterly foreign to common practice in the United States that it almost appears to be a foreign importation.

On the face of it, the heirship tangle is nothing more than the impasse resulting from the unwillingness of the Indian Bureau to carry out the congressional mandates for allotment of all Indian reservations. This unwillingness to do what it is ordered to do by law is absolutely inexcusable in a Federal agency, yet it has had the encouragement and abetment of the present administration to the detriment of both efficiency and morale in the public service. The public has come to assume a skeptical attitude on the whole Indian problem because of the maladministration of just such affairs as the heirship lands.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE HEIRSHIP LANDS CONSTITUTES RANK RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

The present policy of administering heirship lands represents an impossible future for the Indian in the United States. It is plainly evident that if you keep Indian lands for Indians only, eventually all non-Indian citizens will suffer increasing discrimination as time goes on. As the Navajo Indians increased during the last 75 years, large tracts of land have been added to the reservation which now comprises parts of four States. This process of expansion exclusively for Navajos cannot continue indefinitely without vitally infringing on the land ownership, not only of whites, but of other Indian tribes in

Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah. The solution of the problem of Indian wardship cannot be found in piling new kinds of restrictions on Indian property such as heirship entails. The policy of the present Indian Bureau to hold on to the heirship lands under the false plea that the law will not allow it to dispose of these lands by public sale, unless to properly qualified Indians, i. e., Indians under Bureau control, is a parallel to the expansion of the Navajo lands. Heirship status simply creates new ways by which the Indian Bureau can hold its control over land which was meant to be free from all special control and to be owned in fee simple by its Indian and white occupants under the full enjoyment of their constitutional citizenship rights.

In its essence the Indian Bureau policy of holding on to heirship lands is as racially discriminative as restrictive covenants, since the Indian Bureau refuses to allow heirship lands which it deems Indian to be sold to members of any other race. The United States Supreme Court has recently made a decision that restrictive covenants in which landowners agree not to sell property to Negroes or other nonwhites are not constitutional. How, then, can the Indian Bureau turn around and guarantee by restrictive covenant, of its own making, that certain land shall be conveyed to Indians only, and to members of no other race? The answer is that it cannot legally do so, and that its policy in these matters is not only unconstitutional, but is morally indefensible as rank racial discrimination. No, of course the Indian Bureau makes its covenants only with its puppets, tribal governments set up by it and entirely amenable to its will. There is no right, no law, which guarantees to members of one race ownership forever of property within the United States. The Indian Bureau clearly has not a foot on which to stand in its pursuit of such a discriminative policy.

ADMINISTRATION OF HEIRSHIP LANDS SHOWS GOVERNMENT REGULATION RUN WILD

The handling of heirship lands by the Indian Bureau actually portrays one of the worst phases of the New Deal period, namely, the trend toward excessive Federal regulation of the business of the individual. In some respects this trend has a resemblance to the totalitarian philosophies of the Fascist and Communist governments of Europe which regulate the individual in a police state. Whether or not the devices instituted under the Wheeler-Howard Act by the Indian Bureau really constituted part of some Communist conspiracy to sovietize the United States will probably never be known. The facts, however, are indisputable that the heirship lands were originally allotted and designed to make Indians full citizens free from wardship. The Indian Bureau, on the contrary, has remanded these lands to a direct control by the Federal Government with an ostensible view toward reincorporating them under tribal control and ownership. This would amount to communalization of land originally designed for private ownership by act of Congress.

Again recurring to the Navajo case, we have reason to notice the notorious Dreifkoff plan for the industrialization of the Navajo which received the general endorsement of Secretary Krug. This plan envisioned a tribal commune to handle all business affairs of its members and to drive out all individual enterprise from the reservation. Thus, the complete control on the part of the Indian Bureau over affairs on the Navajo Reservation could be maintained under the guise of tribal enterprise. Admittedly, this represents a tendency dangerous for all our citizens, both Indian and white.

Heirship lands are not distributed through all of the Indian reservations. They are most important in the reservations from the Dakotas westward and, as such, represent a golden opportunity for the Indian Bureau to foist communal ownership theories in areas where none originally existed (in contrast with the Pueblo Indians of the Southwest). The principle of private ownership of property had made great headway among the Indians of the Northwest, and they were on a fair way to becoming citizens, rather than wards, when the New Deal stepped in about 1934.

It is still quite evident that the Indians of the Northwest do not want communal ownership under the Indian Bureau as their permanent status, but the control which the Bureau has over the heirship lands offers a powerful weapon to force such communalization. Most evidence goes to show that these Indians want private ownership of property, but what can they do when the Indian Bureau decides to make heirship lands part of the projected future tribal estate? Everything on these reservations operates to increase the dependence of the Indians upon the Bureau, loan funds, increasing indebtedness for gratuity expenditures, and above all, the administration of increasing acreages of heirship lands by the Bureau.

It is quite evident by now emancipation of the Indians will not come about so long as the present administration holds power. For how can the Indians escape from the status of wards when large portions of their lands are willfully retained by the Indian Bureau in the form of heirship lands? The policy of the Indian Bureau, through its administration of heirship lands, is to increase the special responsibilities of the Federal Government for the Indians. The administration of heirship lands is quite evidently on the debit side of the ledger and will continue to be so until a new administration comes into power and takes over Indian affairs.

CONCLUSION

In this discussion I have reviewed several phases of the heirship problem and have shown how they all fit into a concerted plan to defeat the assimilation of the Indians into American citizenship. The heirship lands act against the best interest of the United States in our conservation of resources, in our policy of freedom of the press and free dissemination of information, in the pathological overexpansion of bureaucracy in the Federal Government, in its rank racial discrimination, and in its exemplification of Government regulation run wild. The heirship problem is only one phase, but an extremely important one, of the entire Indian policy of the New Deal and its rejection of the principle that Indians shall become full citizens.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, President Truman in his recent message to the joint session of the Congress on July 27, 1948, recommended a "comprehensive health program based on health insurance."

There is nothing new in this proposal, or in Mr. Truman's espousal of it. On November 14, 1945, Mr. Truman, in a message to Congress, advocated a compulsory health-insurance system which, he solemnly assured the Congress, is not "socialized medicine." Later the President let the cat out of the bag. In his message on the state of the Union on February 7, 1948, Mr. Truman stated: "Our ultimate aim must be a comprehensive insurance system to protect all our people equally against insecurity and ill health." In order "to protect all our people," the scheme must be compulsory. So there is no question where Mr. Truman stands on socialized medicine. Apparently he finds this term distasteful. Nonetheless, he has decided to go "all out."

We also know, by way of contrast, where Mr. Dewey stands. In some extemporaneous remarks before the House of Delegates of the Oregon State Medical Society in Portland, Ore., on May 1, 1948, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey stated his position very clearly and in language anyone may understand:

> Compulsory socialized medicine is no good. It cannot be done. Accordingly I have spent the last two years of my life knocking down every propcsal that anybody has made to regiment the medical profession and the people of America through any program of socialized medicine. * * * I don't want to run the risk of happening to the health of our people what has happened to the health of every group of people which has tried to drag the medical profession down to the Socialists' level. You won't drag anything up. You will enlarge the volume of medical care but utterly destroy the quality of medical care the minute you try that process.

Again Governor Dewey said:

> This idea which has been shared by the last two occupants of the White House that you can improve medical care by passing a law must be stopped. We must get vast broad educational ideas to the people as to the quality of care that now exists and, as to a greater program that is going forward by men of medicine, we must have a program all can take a share in. Let's get some good public-relations men and get the businessman to do his share and get the lawyers and the labor leaders and everybody else. They are the ones who will lose most of all, if freedom in medicine is ever lost.

The issue between the two major candidates for President of the United States is clear and clean cut. Mr. Truman believes as an "ultimate aim" there must be a compulsory comprehensive insurance system to apply to all our people. Governor Dewey believes that "compulsory socialized medicine is no good." For my part, I believe that the position of the Republican candidate, Governor Dewey, is sound, backed up by theory and experience. I believe the ideas of the Democratic candidate, President Truman, are a distinct threat to the medical and allied professions as we now know them and to our American way of life.

The advances in public health in the United States already made show that our basic institutions are sound. Existing shortcomings—and some are admitted—can be corrected within the framework of our time-tried, time-tested system of nonpolitical medicine. Relying in the future, as in the past, mainly upon individual initiative and personal cooperation, we may reasonably expect the health of the people of the United States to continue to improve.

There are two ways of life competing for supremacy in the world today. One is the Russian system, based on the Marxian principles of the abolition of private enterprise as the means of production. The other, the American system, is based on the principles of free enterprise, and personal initiative. Our English friends are trying to combine the two with conspicuous lack of success. Under the Marshall plan England is receiving from us more than one-third of our total gifts to western Europe. These goods and commodities produced under our free-enterprise system, are going forward to England as free-will gifts from the American people because the English tell

us that under their present regimented economy, which now includes socialized medicine, England is not producing enough to maintain a fair standard of living for her own people.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield until I finish my prepared address. I shall then be glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Socialized medicine is not new. Nations throughout the world have for decades been experimenting with one form or another of government-sponsored programs. Germany, for example, adopted a socialized-medicine plan in 1883 when Bismarck was forging his "golden chain" around the necks of the German people. Australia followed with a similar program in 1888. Britain took the first step in 1911, and completed the socialization of medicine when the Socialist majority in Parliament passed the National Health Service Act, which went into effect on July 5 of the present year. This legislation is designed to unify medical and auxiliary services in an insurance scheme directed by the state and supported by compulsory contributions by all citizens. In other words, Britain has achieved that point which Mr. Truman now describes as his "ultimate aim."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate, invited the Brookings Institution, the outstanding research organization famous for its impartiality, to prepare a report on the issue of compulsory health insurance. The conclusions and recommendations furnished the Senate committee came as a bombshell into the camp of the advocates for socialized medicine, who have been extolling the virtues of various foreign systems.

These are some of the conclusions reached in the report published in April, 1948:

First. Probably no great nation in the world has among its white population better health than now prevails in the United States.

Second. The United States, under its voluntary system of medical care, has made greater progress in the application of medical and sanitary science than any other country.

Third. The nonwhites in the United States have materially poorer health than the whites, but the evidence does not indicate that this condition is primarily or even mainly due to unavailability or inadequacy of medical care.

Fourth. The advances in health among both the whites and nonwhites that have been made in the United States in the past four decades do not suggest basic defects in the American system.

The learned professions of the United States have always enjoyed a distinction not found in any other field of human endeavor. The clergyman, the lawyer, the physician, and the dentist have always dealt directly with humanity. A personal relationship is the touchstone of their service to mankind. To the present day in the United States no man has intervened between them and those who sought their aid, counsel, service, and assistance. Contrary to the claims of the advocates, schemes for socialized medicine place a middleman between the doctor and the patient. For my part, I hope the learned and respected profession of medicine, as well as its allied professions, will be able to withstand this onslaught on its cherished heritage. If they are unable to do so, what does the future hold for the other professions?

The Republican Eightieth Congress has been unusually alert in matters connected with the health of the American people. It established a National Heart Institute within the United States Public Health Service to fight America's No. 1 killer, diseases of the heart and circulation. It provided $500,000 to the Research Institute to combat these diseases which affect 1 person in every 16 and cause 1 out of every 3 deaths.

It authorized a National Institute of Dental Research, the functions of which in the dental field are similar to the Heart Institute.

In addition, it provided $28,400,000 for the National Cancer Institute to study the disease of cancer and to disseminate knowledge on how to reduce its terrible toll of lives.

Furthermore, it passed a bill establishing a National Science Foundation to develop and encourage a national policy for scientific research and scientific education, and to initiate and support scientific research in medical and other sciences. The National Science Foundation bill passed by the Congress was vetoed by President Truman for reasons best known to himself. These measures are directed to the improvement of the health of all our people, without resort to socialism.

After all, the American way of life has given us the American standard of living—the envy of the rest of the world.

I am proud to say, the Republican Congress in all of these acts has been alert to protect the American way, to cherish and preserve it for our children and our children's children.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Montana is not present. I should like recognition.

Mr. KEM. I want the RECORD to show that I am very glad at this time to answer any questions which the Senator from Montana or any other Senator may desire to ask.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to inquire who has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair has already recognized the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I notice that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has returned to the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor. He has yielded for a question.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MURRAY. The able Senator from Missouri has told us where the Republican candidate for President stands on the problem of compulsory health insurance. He has also told us where President Truman stands on that subject. I should like to ask the able Senator to tell us where the candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket stands on this question.

Mr. KEM. I am unable to advise the Senator from Montana. I am sure that the able candidate for Vice President can speak for himself.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a statement published by the Republican candidate for Vice President, Governor Warren of California, which statement appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A3824. In that statement by the candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket, the Governor of California has completely endorsed compulsory health insurance. It seems to me that if the able Senator from Missouri knows where the Presidential candidate on the Democratic ticket stands on that very important subject, he ought also to know where the Governor of California stands.

Mr. KEM. I cannot say, of course, what was in the minds of delegates to the Republican National Convention; but that may be one reason why Governor Dewey was selected as the standard bearer for the Republican Party, over other candidates for that nomination.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana has further questions, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. MURRAY. For the enlightenment of the Senator from Missouri, I should like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the statement made by Governor Warren, which statement was published in Look magazine of recent date. I have not the date at the present time, but I shall furnish it for the RECORD shortly.

Mr. KEM. I suggest that the Senator from Montana read the statement which he has in mind. It may be that some Members of this body might care to comment on it at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. I can do so, Mr. President.

The Governor of California said:

> For the past 5 years I have been trying to find a way for ordinary California families to keep themselves from going broke when serious illness strikes someone in their homes. I have had a lot of encouragement from husbands and wives who know from their own human experience how a huge wad of unexpected doctor and hospital bills can wreck a lifetime of frugal planning. I have also had a lot of discouragement from groups that push aside the simple, human catastrophe of serious illness and see only the reasons why nothing much can be done about it.
>
> I am convinced the people of my State want a plan that will protect ordinary families from being wrecked by the costs of serious illness. Any plan that is fair and that will do the job will be accepted.

PLAN TO GUARD FAMILY NEST EGG

Any change that will improve a plan either before or after it is adopted will be welcomed. I would not object if the date on which a plan goes into effect is set far enough ahead to give the medical and hospital facilities of California time to make fully ready for it. My mind is open as to the details. It will not be closed until the ordinary family can look at the family nest egg without fear that serious sickness may gobble it up next day or week or month.

I often wonder just how many people even in California are clear in their own minds about what I have proposed to do. A blizzard of propaganda has hidden the simple facts about my proposal, about what the plan is and what it is not. Certainly the American people as a whole do not know how we propose in California to become the Nation's first State to solve this problem.

It seems important to me that both Californians and people in other States understand how we hope to have this State, standing on its own feet, help its citizens to help themselves to keep serious illness from wrecking homes. Sudden, serious illness is as much a wrecker of homes in other States as it is in California. The threat is national. But there are very strong reasons why this particular social problem can be better solved by States than by the Federal Government. Some assistance to the States from the Federal Government may prove to be needed. But the closer the solution is tailored to each State's needs, the better it is likely to work. Our experience can be of help to other States.

I doubt whether many citizens really know the whole problem of human sickness and health in their own State. California is a fairly typical, progressive State in handling these problems, so, first, let's look at the whole picture there.

In California, as in most other States, we have accepted the broad humanitarian principle that no one will be left to sicken and die for lack of help because they cannot afford treatment. No one questions this principle. Questions arise only about how it should be applied. Many of these questions have been settled by common-sense agreement, and are no longer debated in public and legislative forums.

THE STATE HELPS DISEASE VICTIMS

For instance, we have agreed that the State and its subdivisions will help individuals and families that have been hit by tuberculosis if they are not able to help themselves. We tax people who have fortunately escaped this universal scourge to aid its victims. That is the decent, humane thing to do, we all agree.

We take much the same view of mental diseases. They are a human misfortune that springs from the strenuous pattern of our social life. We recognize the humanitarian common sense of mutual cooperation through our State and local governments in sharing the burdens of the misfortune of mental illness.

We accept the idea that people who fall sick with any one of dozens of ailments, and have no money to pay for treatment, shall be treated free at city and county and State hospitals and their out-patient clinics. We sometimes call these people the medically indigent, and use the disagreeable word "pauper" regarding them. The learned and disagreeable words do not change the human facts. These people are our own, and we take care of them, all of us willingly paying taxes to carry a human burden we humanly acknowledge. But we go a step further.

The statement made by the Governor of California continues. In the course of his statement he endorses the compulsory-insurance system.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that since the Senator from Montana is placing part of the statement in the RECORD——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order. I demand the regular order. The Senator from California has not been recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. I continue with the statement made by the Governor of California:

Not many years ago, after a debate that reminds me of the one now going on in California, we accepted the simple principle that a breadwinner who is injured while he labors shall be treated for his injuries and paid during his days of enforced idleness. The cost of this assistance—we call it workmen's compensation—is met by a levy on employers through an insurance system. But the simple fact is that we all help pay for it in the purchase prices of the goods and services we buy. Although workmen's compensation was bitterly fought with all the mustn't-do-this-or-that slogans, it is now taken as a matter of course.

Recently, almost without dissent, we broadened our unemployment-insurance law to provide benefits for workers who lose wages because they are sick, not because they are laid off or dismissed. This extension of the unemployment-insurance principle to cover wage losses due to illness made simple sense to the people of my State.

The principle that no one shall lack medical care because they can't afford it has a partner principle. It is that people who can afford to pay for their own medical care shall pay for it themselves, without burdening other citizens. So we have two principles: 1. Mutual sharing of responsibility for the unfortunate; 2. Self-reliance for the fortunate.

These two simple principles are as old as America, and likely much older. To me they are basic ideas about the ways and means by which human beings live together in good fortune and bad luck.

SLOGANS CONFUSE ISSUE

Certainly, they are a lot older than the ideas behind the mustn't-do-this-or-that slogans used to postpone their application. They were accepted as good human principles long before anyone heard of socialism or Fascist regimentation. I confess it disturbs me deeply to hear these ideological blackjack slogans used to frighten forthright citizens out of responding to their American instinct to do something about misfortune when they see it.

What I have said so far is the background to my own thinking about a plan that will keep serious illness from wrecking homes. We have solved the problems of mutual sharing of the costs of sickness and injury on a wide scale and in a variety of ways. Yet there is one important part of the problem we have not solved. We have not found a way to put the principle of mutual sharing to work to help families of such moderate incomes that the costs of serious illness are likely to push them down into a lower social group.

Economic disaster is always close enough to these families, which are the great middle bulk of our society that does most of the hard work. Both the welfare and the outlook of this great middle bulk are profoundly important. Society loses part of its stability when one of these families is compelled to give up its self-reliance. It loses something almost as important when the parents in such a family are forced to abandon reasonable ambitions for their children. I can show you what I mean in a personal way.

WARREN TELLS OWN STORY

I was born and raised in a small California town. My father worked for the railroad, and his pay was never much more than he had to have to pay the family bills for a healthy family. But he and mother squeezed enough out of that pay to send me to college.

I was older before I realized that if my father's health hadn't been perfect during those years, I would have been like most of the other boys in my town. I would never have got to college at all. That means a lot to me, but it isn't the whole story, either. My father had his heart set on sending me to college, so I could have a better chance than he had. If his health had failed, I think he might have been a heartsick man, too.

My parents had the good luck to have good health. As Governor of California, I have learned a lot about families that had bad luck, and about what the bad luck of serious illness does to ordinary families. Not the well-off or the poor families. They are always taken care of by themselves or society. But the families in between, whose self-reliant efforts make the wheels of society go round; the families that just naturally want a peaceful, productive community with no nonsense about isms or get-rich-quick schemes.

Let's look at a family I was told about recently. They lived in San Mateo County, which is just south of San Francisco, and had been doing very well. They'd bought a small home, and got a good loan from the bank on it because they had savings of their own to put into it, and the husband had a fine record. They have one son and one daughter, and the children were doing excellent work at school.

Then the mother came down with a very serious heart ailment. It was curable, but the kind of thing that means months of hospital care and expensive treatment. By the time she was well enough to care for her family again, they'd lost the home and he had borrowed every cent he could. The strain was too much for the husband and he did what you know a lot of perfectly good human beings do, if you're honest with yourself about it. He drank too much. He lost his job, and along with it a fine chance for promotion that he'd earned by being a good, responsible workman.

I don't know what is going to happen to that fine family, but my experience with human problems has long since convinced me that four whole lifetimes have been seriously damaged. And that's just one case out of hundreds in California, and out of thousands in America. That kind of tragedy is as familiar as apple pie.

Right now I can hear one of my mustn't-do-this-or-that critics saying: "Yes, but if they had shown the foresight to subscribe to a voluntary health insurance plan they would have been all right."

Of course they would have been all right if they had done any one of several things they did not do, and perhaps could not do. I can see that if every ordinary family always had the foresight and the means to do what hindsight says they should have done, then they wouldn't get into much trouble. The hard fact is they don't have such foresight.

What I cannot comprehend is why some of our best people do not understand the real question society must answer in this problem: How can we help families of moderate income to have the means and the foresight to protect themselves against the tragic consequences of unexpected, serious illness?

The plan I have recommended in California requires that all employees already covered by our unemployment insurance act and all public employees pay 1 percent of their salary or wages up to $3,000 a year into a health-service fund. This means that the worker making $200 a month would pay $2 a month. The worker making $250 a month or more would pay $2.50 a month. These contributions would be matched by the employers. Provision is made to include others who may wish to join the system. It is my

hope that eventually we can work out methods by which all families of moderate income can participate.

Contributing members of the fund, and their dependents, will be assured payment in full of the costs of hospital and laboratory services, with certain reasonable restrictions, and the costs of medical care in hospital cases. The plan is designed to protect families against the more costly kinds of serious illness, not to provide for sickness involving only home visits by the doctor or office visits by the patient. The very important relationship between doctor and patient in the home and in the physician's own office is not disturbed.

M. D.'S TO WORK AS NOW

Furthermore, my plan does not call for any change in the traditional relationship between the doctor, the patient, and the hospital. My belief in the virtue of these traditional relationships is so deep that the plan expressly provides they are not to be changed. Patients are free to choose their own doctor and hospital, just as they do now. Doctors and hospitals are left free to select the patients they want to care for.

There is nothing in the plan to compel employees to use the benefits of the system if they prefer not to. It is carefully provided that the well-to-do can take their benefits in money indemnities to pay their own doctor bills if they wish to do so.

The bill I am sponsoring to put the plan into effect expressly provides that no system shall be created for dispensing medical or hospital care by the State through doctors employed by the State. So, far from regimenting or socializing medicine, the plan expressly prohibits State medicine.

The method for payment of doctors and hospitals is borrowed from the successful experience of private hospitals and medicine. It is the fee-for-service system used by voluntary medical and hospital service plans.

I emphasize this because I want it understood that the California proposal is anything but a revolutionary scheme. It represents the minimum change that must be made to make sure people in moderate circumstances will not be bankrupted by serious illness.

The plan supports the highest standards and ethics of the medical profession in a practical way. The California Health Service Authority it establishes is directed to offer needed scholarships for postgraduate medical study when funds are available. I hope that in this way we will be able to improve medical standards in communities where surveys have shown they are too low. There are no hidden strings tied to these scholarships.

One further point. The plan will not disturb existing group voluntary plans or insurance policies that provide equal or superior protection to the limited number of families that can be covered by them. Voluntary action has made a splendid contribution toward the solution of this problem. I have watched its growth with warm feeling. Yet, as Governor of all the people of my State, I have had to say that voluntary action is not enough. Tragic facts made known to me in the day-to-day administration of my office have forced me to the reluctant conclusion that it will never be enough.

I think I have said enough about the plan and its background to convince Look's readers that it is designed to solve the very real problem of payment for the unexpected costs of serious illness, and not to interfere with the methods of professional treatment. Now I would like to say why I think there has been so much opposition to my proposals, and how I feel about this opposition.

I'd like to have you sit down in my chair in the Governor's office for a little while so you will get my point of view.

Let's take a fairly typical day. On my appointment list for 11 in the morning is Dr. So-and-So. He's an old friend. I am proud to have many old friends in the medical profession. Dr. So-and-So is a sincere man who holds the humanitarian ethics of his profession close to his heart. He is the good Samaritan if I have ever known one. The respect and admiration of his professional colleagues has made him their spokesman, and he is genuinely troubled as he takes a chair across my desk.

DOCTOR'S FEARS UNFOUNDED

Dr. So-and-So is fearful of what my prepaid medical service plan will lead to for his profession. He has no very specific objection to the bill I have offered to put the plan into effect. I have yielded to every reasonable objection. But the plan, he says, may be the basis on which some later, less responsive governor will adopt the kind of system of state medicine that proved a destructive failure in Germany and New Zealand. I am, he says, letting the camel of socialization get his head inside the tent of free enterprise. It is socialism, regimentation, compulsion that he fears.

As Dr. So-and-So explains his objections to my plan, my hand reaches for a letter that came to me that same morning. I try to explain to Dr. So-and-S that his fears are probably not well grounded. But what I say is not convincing to the good doctor. That is understandable. There is really no bone of contention between us. I believe as deeply in free enterprise as he does. There is no flaw in my admiration for his profession, and he knows it.

Finally I fished out the letter I have been thumbing and hand it across the table to him. It's a very ordinary letter, carefully written in pencil on paper from a ruled tablet. The erasures that show on the coarse paper bear witness to the soul searching that went into writing it. It tells again the same old tragic tale of serious illness and wrecked lives, and pleads with me not to drop my health-service plan. Dr. So-and-S reads it carefully, then looks up at me questioningly.

"Which argument would weigh more with you?" I ask. "The argument in that letter or the argument you have given me?"

Take another day. A delegation of insurance men call to impress upon me that my plan is not exactly insurance in the actuarial sense. They bring along an expert to make a learned, mathematical argument. I explain to them as carefully as I can that we can't make a start on the basis of exact insurance principles because no one has had enough experience with exactly this problem. We've got to start the plan with equal percentage contributions to get the experience. If we waited until after we got the experience, we'd never start the plan.

The argument drones on, and again I find myself reaching for a letter. I get them almost every day. They aren't the sort of thing actuaries deal with—they're human stories, not dry figures. This time I read the letter aloud. "Which argument would weigh the most with you gentlemen?" I ask.

WE CANNOT NEGLECT PROBLEM

There it is as I see it from the Governor's chair in California. Tragic human need versus long-reaching fear of foreign ideologies, and the knife-sharp theories of experts. I do not discount the fears, and the experts are of great service in their special fields.

But I am wholeheartedly convinced that in our struggle to prevent our democratic processes from being infected with foreign ideologies we cannot afford to run away from any of the basic problems of American life.

We must prove to the world that the American system can solve these problems through the application of democratic procedures. But first of all we must prove it to ourselves. To prove it to ourselves we must have faith that our institutions are so practical, so adjustable, and so responsive to every situation that we can make them fully serve our needs, whatever they may be. After that we must have the will to do whatever should be done.

With such determination, we will be willing to face human facts, even unpleasant human facts. We will not hide behind slogans that are easy to repeat but have no real application to the facts. Such slogans are dangerous to progress.

It is, in my opinion, the misfortune of our times that too many men in public life use slogans to promote or oppose ideas, as if ideas were commodities. Ideas are not commodities. They should not be built up or torn down by slogans, as if they were a new brand of breakfast food. Ideas can be tested only with facts.

SLOGANS DON'T TEST FACTS

My attempts to do something practical about the fact that serious illness wrecks homes have taught me that slogans are the lazy man's way of slaughtering an idea he is unwilling to test against the facts. And that slogans are the designing man's way of defeating an idea he knows he cannot successfully meet on the facts. The experience has increased my determination to solve this problem despite the sloganeers.

I think it is very important that something be done now about the catastrophe of sudden, serious illness in ordinary homes. We have, now, a period of good times and moderate social tensions. We have time to cut and fit and alter and improve a solution to the problem, learning as we go along. We have an opportunity to do this in the States, close to the people who are affected. We can have the advantages of flexibility and intimate contact that the Federal Government can never hope to have.

I do not like to sound alarms about the future. But I would be less than honest about this matter if I did not caution my mustn't-do-this-or-that critics. If times change, we may all be compelled to accept hasty and radical measures that can be avoided if we act now.

That, Mr. President, is the statement of the Vice Presidential candidate of the Republican Party regarding health insurance.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for the trouble he has taken in reading that interesting article by Governor Warren. The Senator was taking me to task because I said I did not know what Governor Warren had said on this particular matter. After listening to the article, I see it is entirely erroneous to say that in that article Governor Warren proposed or advocated what Mr. Truman is proposing and advocating, which is a comprehensive, compulsory Federal system. Governor Warren makes it clear by reiteration. He states time and time again that he is speaking as the Governor of California, that his proposal is applicable to California, and that he is advocating a system of that kind for his State.

Mr. President, I think it was Mr. Justice Holmes who said that the beauty of the Federal Union is that each State may be used as a laboratory for social and political experiments. So far as I am concerned, if Governor Warren and the citizens of California desire to experiment with the plan, as Governor Warren says, that is perfectly all right with me, and it is perfectly all right with the people of my State, so far as I know. Governor Warren says, clearly and specifically, that we do not have sufficient experience to establish the plan on a scientific actuarial basis, that they must feel

their way along. If they want to use the State of California as a laboratory for that purpose, that is fine. There has been some experience with the idea in certain countries of the world, which has not been very satisfactory; but if the people of California want to try it, all right. But, Mr. President, it is entirely another thing to pass laws in the Congress of the United States which will impose a compulsory, comprehensive Federal system of health insurance on every State of the Union, whether the people want it or not.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I wanted to say something further, and then I shall be glad to yield for a question.

It is also perfectly apparent in the article which the Senator from Montana has read that the thing which impresses Governor Warren regarding the system is the personal cooperation among citizens who want to spread the risk. There is no reason in the world why people cannot spread the risk. There are a great many cooperative organizations, associations, and societies, some of which are doing business on a national basis, which will enable people who want to join to spread the risk, and I think some are doing that very adequately and very well. But that, also, Mr. President, is an entirely different thing from establishing a comprehensive, compulsory, Federal system which Mr. Truman says is his ultimate aim.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not true that many State medical associations either already have established or are in the process of establishing machinery whereby certain classes of people may take advantage of the spread in the risk, as the Senator has so ably explained?

Mr. KEM. I think that is quite correct, and they no doubt recognize the difference in fundamental conditions in different States which require an entirely different system of treatment. That, if I may again borrow the language of Justice Holmes, illustrates the beauty of our Federal Union.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator further yield for one more question?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Governor of California, in his statement explaining his position, mentions industrial insurance. That, also, is altogether a State institution which spreads the risk and is weighted according to the hazards of employment in a particular State or area in general, is it not?

Mr. KEM. It varies as the geographical districts of the United States vary. I thank the able Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make a brief observation in reply to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois, sitting as acting minority leader, said he wanted to make a reply to 2 or 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri. I am under very definite instructions to attempt to get my speech out of the way tonight, because it represents the point of view of an extensive group on this side of the aisle; but, if there is no objection, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, because I know what he is going to discuss and that what he says will be germane to the issue now pending before the Senate.

I want briefly to reply to the Senator from Missouri in connection with the colloquy which has been going on between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. When he says that the Vice Presidential candidate, from the State of California, is not in favor of a health-insurance program——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I have only 5 minutes, and I regret I cannot yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his courtesy.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I tried to get the Senator from Missouri to yield to me some time ago but was unsuccessful.

When the Senator from Missouri says that the Vice Presidential candidate of the Republican Party is not in favor of compulsory health insurance, he fails to understand, or cares not to understand, the article which was read into the RECORD by the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. Furthermore, Mr. President, Dr. Marjorie Sharron, legislative consultant in Washington, D. C., at one time held a position under the Republican National Committee having to do with health insurance; I understand she was later an adviser to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and who, I am now advised, is an adviser to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] on health matters. If I am incorrect in these assertions, I want to be corrected. Dr. Sharron had this to say about Governor Dewey and Governor Warren on this particular question:

> Dewey has come out strongly in the past 2 years against compulsory health insurance. Warren has come out even more strongly, and for a much longer time, in favor of such insurance. Dewey has promised to make Warren a full partner in his administration, if elected. Warren counts not only on the time-honored statutory job of President of the Senate, but also on new functions said to have been promised him by Dewey. Warren for years has been trying to put over compulsory health insurance in California and has failed, but he is still for it. One must ask at this time what effect it will have on Dewey if both are elected. They have a party platform commitment to extend the Democratic social-security benefits. I think that plank was included as a vote getter—

Like a great many other planks adopted by the Republican Convention:

> I understand Warren regards health insurance in that light. The Democrats are already committed to Federal health insurance legislation, and are more than likely to include it in their platform to attract the labor vote. How long do you think the Republicans will abide by the Dewey opposition to Federal health insurance? How soon will he adopt Warren's views as a matter of political expediency?

Mr. President, it is not a question of Mr. Warren yielding to Mr. Dewey upon this very important question of national health, but this adviser to the Republican National Committee and to Republican Senators questions whether or not Dewey will not yield to Warren as a matter of political expediency.

When Governor Dewey comes into the State of Missouri in the approaching campaign I can hear the Senator from Missouri, and as the Senator introduces the Governor, say something like this:

"I am introducing to this great audience in Missouri the next President of the United States, a man who is unalterably opposed to socialized medicine."

Then a month later the Vice Presidential candidate, Mr. Warren, will come along, and when the distinguished Senator from Missouri presents Mr. Warren to an audience in Missouri he will say, "I am now presenting Mr. Warren, an individual who is absolutely for compulsory health insurance."

I am sure that he will do that, because the Senator from Missouri is a man of frankness and candor, and he will not hesitate to tell the people of Missouri exactly where these two gentlemen stand upon this important issue, as he told us here tonight where Governor Dewey stands upon this extremely important question affecting the national health of all our people.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. President, that the Senator from Missouri made a political speech tonight. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] made a political speech last week, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made a political speech a few days ago, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] has made a political speech, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has made a political speech at a time when the issue before the Senate of the United States is one of the great question of civil rights, involving the poll tax. Not a single Senator on this side of the aisle, except, perhaps, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who answered the distinguished Senator from Ohio briefly the other day, has made a political speech.

I mention this because I contend seriously that this battle on the poll tax, so far as the Republicans are concerned, is a mere sham and a delusion. They do not intend to pass the bill at this special session. They never intended to when they brought it before the Senate, yet they keep Senators here late at night for shadow-boxing purposes. Mr. President, the Republican leadership is not sincere about this great issue. The Republican majority do not propose to adopt any of the President's proposals on the high cost of living and inadequate housing. Why, under such circumstances do they continue to remain here? Why do they not adjourn this special session instead of keeping us here day after day debating the poll-tax issue which they know cannot pass?

I will say that most of the Senators on this side of the aisle have really debated

the issue. They have not fooled around with political speeches, as has been done on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. President, the Republicans in Congress are not fooling the American people as they seek to drive a wedge in the Democratic Party upon this sham battle on the poll tax. The people back home understand the situation; they know exactly what is going on. They are expecting constructive action and unless the Republican-controlled Congress gives it to them the majority party is going to hear plenty from them before the coming Presidential campaign is over.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I have been very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Illinois. I recall that Junius said, a long time ago, "Assertion is merely nugatory."

No matter how many times the Senator repeats that the article of Governor Warren is an outright endorsement of Mr. Truman's proposal of a Federal, compulsory, comprehensive system of health insurance, it does not make any difference; the article is there, it will appear in the RECORD, and anybody can read it and see exactly what Governor Warren said.

I think the Senator from Illinois is a lawyer. One might be inclined to doubt it sometimes when listening to his speeches, but my understanding from the Congressional Directory is that he is.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator would not know whether I was or not, because he would not understand.

Mr. KEM. I admit, Mr. President, that I am uncertain, but I think I recall having read in the Congressional Directory that the Senator was engaged in that calling at one time.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

Mr. KEM. I decline to yield. The Senator from Illinois is undertaking to tell the Members of this body what I will do and what I will think when Governor Dewey and Governor Warren come into my State, and if I am called on to take part in their meetings.

Mr. President, the best evidence, which lawyers always want, is here. The Senator from Illinois did not ask me what I thought or what I would do, but he undertook to state it. This I take to be clearly secondary evidence, as the lawyers say, and not the best evidence.

Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be clear, I should like to say for the benefit of the Senator from Illinois and anyone who listened to his secondary evidence about what I would do or say in a hypothetical case, that here now is the best evidence. If Governor Dewey came into my State, I should be proud to introduce him as an opponent of socialized medicine, and socialism, incidentally, in other forms. I should be glad to say that Governor Dewey had stated on public occasions that socialized medicine was no good.

When Governor Warren comes into my State I shall be glad to say, "Governor Warren has been, and is, an outstanding humanitarian. He is perfectly willing to experiment in his own State with various forms of humanitarianism. He says, for example, that the evidence and experience affecting socialized medicine are not complete, but he is willing to try it in California. He is willing that in this instance his own State of California be used as a laboratory for such an interesting experiment. This is, of course, a different thing from a Federal system."

So, Mr. President, that is the best evidence of what I will say in the hypothetical situation which the Senator from Illinois has conjured up.

In this connection it is interesting to speculate, first, whether Mr. Truman, as the Democratic candidate, will go into the Southern States in this campaign; into Georgia, Mississippi, and Alabama, for example; and, second, if he does so, just how he will be introduced by the able and eloquent Senators from those States, respectively.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 1 O'CLOCK P. M. WEDNESDAY

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the acting majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening it take a recess until the hour of 1 o'clock p. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is made.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the appeal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] from the decision of the Chair holding that the cloture motion on the motion to take up House bill 29 was not in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, so that there will be an understanding at the beginning of my speech as to the position I shall take in regard to yielding during the course of my remarks, and for the reasons I shall hereafter set forth, I hereby advise the Chair, and any successor to the present occupant of the chair who may be in the chair during the course of the evening, that a request of the junior Senator from Oregon to yield should be replied to by the Chair in the language, "The Senator declines to yield." I think we will save a great deal of time if we have that blanket ruling and that understanding at the beginning.

I am sure my colleagues in the Senate know that that is not the usual rule, self-imposed in this instance, under which I debate in the Senate, because I know of no Member of the Senate who finds it more pleasing to yield in the course of debate than the junior Senator from Oregon. However, I am in a very peculiar position in making this speech tonight because of the fact that I find myself, and those whom I represent in this argument, in a position where we might be subject to the very fair criticism that we were aiding and abetting a filibuster, if I did not adopt and apply that rule. It is perfectly obvious that the controversial points which I shall raise in the course of my remarks, about which reasonable men can differ, can lead to scores of questions time consuming in nature, and therefore we on the Republican side of the aisle would find ourselves in fact consuming a great deal of time to the delight, the enjoyment, and the satisfaction of our good friends on the opposite side of the aisle..

The only reason it has been decided that this speech should be made in support of the major premise relating to the anti-poll-tax legislation which we urge this special session of Congress to adopt, is that those of us who are the proponents of the bill believe it to be constitutional. If we did not believe it to be constitutional we would not urge upon the Senate of the United States the passage of the bill.

We find ourselves further in the situation that in the debate on the constitutionality of the bill—and that is what up to date the discussion on the anti-poll-tax bill for the most part has dealt with—the negative side of the proposition has been set forth by three very able day-long speeches made by distinguished colleagues in the Senate representing that side, and up until this moment the affirmative case in support of the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill has not been made a matter of record in the debate. Some of us had a conference and some of the leaders on this side of the aisle honored me with the suggestion that over last week end I prepare a statement in connection with the constitutionality of the proposal and present it when the opportunity was made available to me on the floor of the Senate. I believe my colleagues know that for many hours, in fact for days, indeed since last Friday, I was ready, prior to the preparations I made over the week end, to make a preliminary statement on the constitutionality of the measure, but since the convening of the Senate on Monday, this is the first opportunity I have had to put in the RECORD the affirmative side of the case on the constitutionality of the measure.

Mr. President, my speech will involve some dry and technical discussion of constitutional points, and the main purpose of the speech is to make it a part of the RECORD. I want to say to my good friends who have honored me by their presence at least this long in the speech, that no offense will be taken by the junior Senator from Oregon if they do not stay through it, because I am making it solely for the purpose of the RECORD for future reference, so that my colleagues may read it when we proceed further with the parliamentary situation in connection with this proposed anti-poll-tax legislation.

At the outset, I want to say that I think it would not be fair of me, in fact I think I would show an unsportsmanlike lack of appreciation for the speeches which have been made by good friends of mine on the other side of this proposition, if I did not compliment the dis-

tinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for what I consider to be the very able arguments they have presented in support of their point of view—which I think is a mistaken point of view, but nevertheless their point of view—that the anti-poll-tax bill pending before the Senate is unconstitutional because according to their sights it contravenes article I, section 2, of the Constitution. I think the speeches they have made in support of their position will deserve a fitting place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. President, for the study of students of constitutional law and lawyers generally, as we proceed in the years ahead to face the weighty constitutional problems which will arise from time to time, and the great contest that is always going on in the field of constitutional law over the proposition of whether or not the Constitution of the United States is to be interpreted as a static, literal document, or whether it is to be interpreted as a dynamic, liberal document, subject to adjustment and to changing conditions that confront the American people from decade to decade.

I desire to say as the first premise I lay down in my remarks, Mr. President, that there is a wide difference between the constitutional law philosophy entertained in the mind of the junior Senator from Oregon and that presented by the three distinguished Senators who have presented the majority argument in support of their contention that the bill is unconstitutional. I have listened to them, I have read the cases which they have cited, and I contend and submit that not a single case have they cited which is directly on the nose, so to speak, as lawyers use that term, because of the fact that Congress has not passed such legislation as would have to be passed in order to bring about the type of Supreme Court interpretation and determination which would afford an answer to the question as to whether or not their narrow and literal interpretation of the Constitution is the one the Supreme Court would adopt.

The point I make, and the first point I stress, is that here again in this debate on the meaning of the Constitution we see that great clash between two historic views as to what that document is; the view, on the one hand, of the Brandeises and the Holmeses and the Cardozos that it is a dynamic document which lays down the framework of a constitutional, representative form of government, adjustable to changed social conditions as they confront the American people from decade to decade, and the other literal, narrow point of view that the Constitution of the United States is the product of a dead historic hand.

I do not accept that view, Mr. President. I say that students of the Constitution are predominantly of the opinion that the trend is clear, and has been now for almost a quarter of a century, that that great document is not a static instrument, but it is a dynamic instrument, its terms to be adjusted and interpreted in accordance with existing social determined by the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I desire to make very clear that that does not mean that the junior Senator from the State of Oregon takes the position that the Constitution is subject to judicial amendment, that it is subject to amendment by the judiciary through interpretation, because in many writings, while I was occupying a chair in a law school, I tried to draw the distinction between a liberal interpretation of the Constitution and the idea that the Supreme Court has any implied or alleged right to amend that document by judicial interpretation. I deny the Court has any such power.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I take the position that the terms, principles, and concepts of the Constitution, as we find them in black and white in that document, are to be applied by the Court in the light of the state of facts involved in a given case, as the Court finds them to be. After all, we cannot separate the true meaning of a legal principle from the dynamics of a set of facts which raise the principle into litigation.

I suggest, in the second place, that in their discussion of legal principles in certain cases which my good friends of the opposition have cited in the course of this argument, they have not called the attention of the Senate, to the extent that I think it should be called if we are to get the true meaning of those decisions, to the operative legal facts on the basis of which the decisions must be read. Legal principles laid down in any judicial decision must be read, interpreted, and subsequently applied in terms of the limitations of the framework of the operative facts which gave rise to the case in the first instance. I respectfully submit that my good friends have fallen into the common error of taking out of the context of a decision here and there a paragraph now and then, and laying it down as applicable to a set of hypothetical facts which they raise in connection with the anti-poll-tax situation, when what they should do is refer the principle to the operative facts of the decision which gave rise to its penning in the first instance.

The third proposition which I wish to lay down is that the Constitution, too, must be read in its entirety. Article I, section 2, needs to be read, as I shall endeavor to point out by language which we can find in Supreme Court decisions, in terms of the other sections of the Constitution and in terms of the other powers which the Constitution makes clear are delegated to the Federal Government, and through it to the Congress.

My good friends of the opposition in this debate, have, I think, taken the position that article I, section 2, should be considered as the sole language of the Constitution which has any reference whatsoever to the anti-poll-tax legislation. They have conveniently overlooked certain other sections of the Constitution to which I shall allude, and which I shall discuss in some detail in the course of my remarks. In particular have they overlooked certain sections of the Constitution which place upon the Congress of the United States the right and the power to enact legislation carrying out the powers delegated to the Congress within that basic organic law.

Mr. President, I would be thoroughly intellectually dishonest if I took the position that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] did not raise some serious questions as to the constitutionality of this proposed legislation which ought to be resolved in favor of its constitutionality before any individual Senator votes for it. So far as I am concerned, I agree not only with the Senator from Alabama, but with the three speakers of the opposition, on the proposition that if a Member of this body has a serious doubt as to the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill, then in accordance with his oath of office he certainly should not vote for it. We can have a meeting of the minds, I think, on that point, because I agree with the Senators who have spoken that if any Senator honestly believes that there is a serious question as to the constitutionality of any piece of legislation which comes before this body, then in accordance with his oath of office he should vote against such legislation, for I think the primary and all-important responsibility of each one of us is to carry out to the letter the full meaning of the oath which we take to uphold the Constitution. I have never voted, and so long as I am a Member of this body I shall never vote, for a piece of legislation with respect to the constitutionality of which there is doubt in my mind.

I would be intellectually dishonest, too, Mr. President, if I took the blind attitude that I think reasonable men should not or cannot disagree over the points of constitutionality which Senators have raised. I can understand how reasonable men can disagree on this point; but the fact that I appreciate the point that reasonable men can disagree over the question of the constitutionality of this particular bill does not mean that I have any reasonable doubts as to its constitutionality. My study has convinced me that the bill is in keeping with the Constitution. It is because I believe that it is in keeping with the Constitution that I have been working as hard as I have for consideration of the subject by way of legislation rather than by way of constitutional amendment.

I have mentioned the point of handling the problem as was suggested in the first instance in this debate by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], through the medium of a constitutional amendment. I want the RECORD to show the decision which I have reached as to that procedure. After thorough consideration of the proposal of the Senator from Arizona I have decided that we should not seek to solve the problem in the first instance by way of a constitutional amendment.

I have reached that conclusion for two reasons: First, because I am satisfied that a constitutional amendment is not necessary insofar as constitutional objections to the pending legislation are concerned. In other words, I am satisfied that a direct approach by way of legislation or statute can be used by the Congress as a solution to the civil-rights program.

In the second place, I have reached that conclusion because I believe that minority groups who in my opinion have been greatly imposed upon now for many, many years past, in the sense that their full civil rights under the Constitution have been denied them because of the existence of such infringements upon their right of franchise as a poll tax, have the right to look to the elected representatives of the people of the United States to correct that injustice by way of direct legislation rather than by trying to avoid facing it squarely and directly by resorting to the time-consuming, delaying device of a constitutional amendment.

I am satisfied that if we should accept the proposal of the Senator from Arizona to get out of the particular parliamentary box in which we now find ourselves by way of submitting a constitutional amendment, it would be many years before the constitutional amendment would be adopted.

I cannot prove that, and I hasten to have the RECORD show that I admit that I cannot prove it. But with the exception of the suffrage amendment, constitutional amendments have consumed long periods of time in our history. When we have, as has been made perfectly clear in the course of this debate, the strong opposition of a small minority to granting this civil right to millions of Americans to whom the right is now denied, I am inclined at least to take the position that it is a reasonable conjecture that it would be a good many years before the requisite number of States would approve such a constitutional amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of that conclusion on my part, I shall not be a party—and I have so told the leaders on this side of the aisle who have talked to me today in private conference about it—to any proposal at this session of Congress to get out of the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves, by way of submitting a constitutional amendment. I say that because I think the great majority of the American people have the right to have their elected representatives face this issue squarely by way of the passage of an anti-poll-tax bill.

Mr. President, let us assume the hypothetical—and I am well aware that it is certainly hypothetical—that the Congress at this session or at any future session should pass a statute on the subject. No constitutional right would be denied anyone in this country, because under our balance-of-power representative system of government, with its checks and balances, in the last analysis the Supreme Court would be the final judge on the basis of legislation which would directly raise the constitutional point as to whether the bill passed was constitutional. For those of us who honestly believe, as I do and as the proponents of this bill do, that it is entirely constitutional, it is quite proper to take the position that we are willing, with that conviction to let the issue finally be determined by the Supreme Court. Then, Mr. President, we shall not have to engage in the interesting pastime of lawyers of trying to piece together quotations from a series of Supreme Court decisions, when not a single one of those decisions rests on a set of operative facts that make it possible to rest a decision directly "on the nose," so far as the legal problem is concerned. The only way we can have the particular constitutional question finally determined without equivocation and without any question as to whether it is directly applicable to the facts involved is for the Congress to proceed to pass this proposed anti-poll-tax legislation, and then let the Supreme Court in the course of litigation render a direct decision on the question.

I wish to add, so that no one will misinterpret me or misquote me, that I do not offer that as a line of procedure to be followed by any Member of this body who has an honest and sincere question as to the constitutionality of this bill. To such Senators I say, "If that is your honest opinion, then you should vote against the anti-poll-tax bill."

Mr. President, I believe that on the basis of the authorities as they exist, the conclusion should be reached by individual Senators, if they will carefully analyze the cases and carefully trace the history of constitutional developments throughout the Constitutional Convention, that this bill is in fact constitutional.

I now proceed to address myself to the major question, whether this anti-poll-tax bill is constitutional.

Last Thursday, when the able and distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] discussed House bill 29, the anti-poll-tax bill, on the floor of the Senate, he made a statement with a portion of which I find myself in complete and hearty agreement. He said:

> It was stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday that the bill affects only seven States, namely, the so-called poll-tax States. I respectfully submit to the Senate that we shall go far wrong if we consider that this bill affects only those States which have poll taxes in effect. In reality it affects 48 States.

Mr. President, I completely agree with the Senator from Mississippi on that premise. The bill affects 48 States, and in my judgment it affects the civil rights of every man, woman, and child in this country, because it goes to the basic question of the most precious right I think we have—the right to exercise a free ballot at a free ballot box without the type of restriction on that freedom that is characterized by the poll tax. When all is said and done, we cannot get away from the great question of civil rights involved in this issue—the question as to whether we are now to give equality of meaning to the Constitution to all our citizens and whether we shall put into practice the sound doctrine of American jurisprudence, that there should be uniformity of application of law when it comes to the basic rights of all our citizens. I submit that so long as there is this infringement upon a basic right, we are not giving equality of application of the Constitution to all our people.

In order to prove my point, I do not have to dwell, I think, on the unrest or the deep-seated resentment or the fertile ground for spreading the seeds of communism in this country which is being developed because of the fact that up until now both major parties, Democratic and Republican alike, over the years have not enacted legislation which would protect all the American people and afford them equality of civil rights under the Constitution. I am very happy that under the leadership of my party in the past few years a valiant and determined effort has been made in the Congress of the United States to pass legislation which will carry us nearer the social and political ideal of equality of constitutional rights for all our people, irrespective of race, color, or creed.

I heartily disagree with the statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] a few minutes ago when he sought to place upon the Republican Party the responsibility for the failure to pass civil-rights legislation. I am very fond of the Senator from Illinois. I recognize his difficulties and the difficulties of other Democratic Senators in the coming campaign who have a record in favor of civil-rights legislation. But if there is one thing which has been clear in this special session of Congress—and let the American people understand it thoroughly—it is that the full responsibility for the failure in this special session of Congress up until this hour to pass civil-rights legislation rests on the shoulders of the Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle.

What does the record show? It shows that for days we have been debating—the anti-poll-tax bill? Not at all, Mr. President; we have been debating the question of whether a motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill shall be allowed to come to a vote on the floor of the Senate. I think the American people will see through that, in due course of time; and when they do, they will understand that there is no basis at all for the position taken by the Senator from Illinois that the responsibility rests on the Senators on the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. STENNIS. What is the pending order of business? What is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair, holding that the cloture motion filed on the motion to take up House bill 29, the anti-poll-tax bill, was not in order, stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the cloture petition was submitted, and the appeal from the Chair's ruling on the cloture petition is now before the Senate because we could not get the Democratic side of the aisle to agree to let us vote upon a motion to proceed with the consideration of the anti-poll-tax bill. That cannot be erased from the RECORD. That is the RECORD, and the responsibility clearly rests on the Democratic side of the aisle for the tactics which have been used in order to prevent a debate on the merits of the anti-poll-tax bill. If I seem to be unduly critical, it is not with any

personal feeling that I make the criticism. I recognize the rights of my Democratic friends under the rules of the Senate. They have not violated those rules so far as their rights under them are concerned.

I want to say to my good friend from Illinois in regard to the little speech he made a few moments ago, which I submit would be subject to at least the interpretation that he was seeking to place the blame for the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves on the Republican side of the aisle, that I hope, come January, he will join with us under a Republican administration in seeing to it that rule XXII is so modified that the word "measure" will be clarified and made to encompass any motion, any item of business, pending before the Senate, so that cloture will be applicable. I want the American people to understand that there is no way of breaking a filibuster in the Senate of the United States in my honest judgment if a substantial number of Senators join in conducting the filibuster, so long as rule XXII remains on the book as it is. There is a great deal of talk about breaking the present filibuster, if a true filibuster develops, as we all know it will develop if we continue to press for action on the anti-poll-tax bill, but, as I have said to some of my colleagues—and I have found none of them who disagreed—under rule XXII, if 10 or 11 or 12 Senators actually combine in a determined effort to prevent a vote from ever taking place in this special session of Congress, because of the limitation of time resting upon us, I think it would be a physical impossibility to break the filibuster.

I think a well-organized group of 10 or 11 or 12 Senators speaking in relays, with all the opportunities rule XXII affords them to filibuster on various items, which under the precedents cannot be classified as measures, can talk here for the rest of the summer. Therefore, as I have said to some of my colleagues, if we really want to do something about breaking the filibuster tactics in the Senate of the United States, there is only one way to do it. I also said that, in an article in Collier's magazine 2 years ago. That way is, at the beginning of a regular session, to make the modification of rule XXII the first item of business, and then go to work in the regular session of Congress with a determination to stick it out for as many days and weeks, and if necessary, months as may be necessary, until the rule is amended. Given time, a filibuster can be broken, because 145,000,000 American people will eventually come to understand the close relationship between the rules of the Senate and their civil rights. The pressure, I think, will be overwhelming in support of any concerted effort on the part of the majority under those circumstances to modify the rule. But it should be done, Mr. President, as I said the other day, in a manner in keeping with the proposals and the protections contained in my antifilibuster resolution.

I recognize, too, as I have more than once said on the floor of the Senate, that majorities can become tyrannical. Under our system of government we constantly must be on the alert to protect the minorities from tyrannical and steam-rolling tactics of majorities. That is why I think it is so important that when we proceed to amend rule XXII we shall do it by way of an antifilibuster resolution which will guarantee, after a cloture petition has been filed, that each Member of the Senate will have at least a minimum of 2 hours of debating time, with the right and the privilege of farming out all or part of such time to any colleague. Such a procedural reform would allow in round numbers approximately 8 days of debating time on any issue pending before the Senate after cloture had been filed upon it. Keep in mind, Mr. President, that ordinarily cloture is never filed and should never be filed, and that it is difficult to get a cloture petition adopted by the Senate, unless a clear showing can be made that there has been adequate time already given for debate on the merits of an issue. After that time has elapsed, if there has been added to it approximately 8 days of further debating time, I do not see how anyone in good reason can argue that minority rights are not protected under that type of antifilibuster rule.

I say, Mr. President, there is no chance in my judgment of breaking the contemplated filibuster in this special session of Congress, unless we are willing to proceed now to tackle the problem of rule XXII. In view of the obvious limitations of time forced upon us by the special session, and in view of the obligations resting upon us in connection with the oncoming political campaign, which in my judgment will be one of the most historic in all our history, I do not think the American people expect us to remain here all summer in order to break the filibuster, by way of attempting to modify rule XXII this summer. It would be difficult to get some of them to see the relationship between this procedural problem and the passage of civil rights legislation. Once they do, once they come to understand it, then I think they will highly approve whatever parliamentary procedure we may subsequently adopt in the special session of Congress in order to transact, to the extent we are allowed to transact it by the Democratic side of the aisle, the business we can transact in the people's interest.

I think the RECORD will make it clear on the basis of the language I have used, but because I have been speaking extemporaneously I want to make certain that the RECORD is clear that I have not charged up to this moment any filibuster has been conducted in this special session of Congress. I have not charged it, Mr. President, because I honestly believe no filibuster, in fact, has been progressing on the floor of the Senate. I have no doubt that in discussing the merits of the issue as they see it, the Senators who have spoken in support of the contention that the pending bill is unconstitutional have made a point of speaking at length, but that is their right. I sometimes think, especially when we are dealing with a question so complex as is this one, that repetition, reiteration, and cumulative effect are perfectly legitimate in argument and debate. I have no objection to the lengthy speeches which have been made thus far on this particular issue. On the other hand, there is not a Member of the Senate who does not know, in fact, some of our good friends on the other side in private conversation are frank to confess it, and we know it to be true, that there is a determination on the other side of the aisle to use to the maximum extent permitted by the rules all their rights and privileges to prevent a vote taking place on any of the civil-rights legislation which may be proposed by Senators on the Republican side of the aisle. I think that also should be clear for the RECORD.

Hence, Mr. President, speaking only for myself, and for no one else on this side of the aisle, on this particular point, I hold to the view, knowing what I know to be the strategy and the plan of a substantial number of Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle, that we have no hope in this special session of Congress of passing this particular civil-rights legislation or any other civil-rights legislation. I usually know when I am licked, Mr. President. Sometimes I do not. But on this particular issue I think I do. I am willing to confess that because of the advantages which the present rules give my opponents on civil-rights legislation I do not have any chance. If those of us who are in support of civil-rights legislation have no chance of having any such legislation passed in this special session of Congress, I intend, after I have made my case on the merits of the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax legislation, and have double checked to find, as I am sure I shall find, a continued determination on the part of a substantial number of Democrats to prevent a vote from ever taking place on the poll-tax legislation or any other civil-rights legislation in this session of Congress, to advise my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, for whatever my advice may be worth, that we had better face the reality that we cannot pass any civil-rights legislation in this special session of Congress and then proceed to give consideration to other items contained in the President's agenda.

I think it has been of service to the country to follow the course of action we have thus far followed in the special session of Congress, not only because it has been made very clear where the responsibility rests for our inability to pass civil-rights legislation, namely, squarely on the Democratic side of the aisle, but time has been afforded during the consideration of the subject so that our committees can complete their hearings and discussions on the issues which involve inflation, housing, and the other items presented to us in the President's message.

I say that tonight——

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am refusing to yield.

I say that tonight because I think the time has come for some of us to tell

the American people why in all probability it will be necessary to set aside civil-rights legislation and proceed to give consideration to the other issues and see if there is anything we can do by way of passing any reasonable, fair, and workable legislation on other subject matters which will not cause a greater inflation than that which is already sweeping the country.

Mr. President, returning to the question of the constitutionality of the pending bill, I should like to say that in the seven States which exact the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in Federal elections, Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, reside, according to the 1940 census, 20,874,383 persons—one-seventh of the population of the entire United States. The poll tax has an immediate—and all too often—paralyzing effect on their privilege and opportunity to participate in the American electoral process. Ten million, about half of them, are disfranchised outright by the poll-tax requirement. Those who do succeed in voting are put to great disadvantage. In many States they have to pay the tax in considerable advance of the election date at a time when interest in politics and elections is at the lowest ebb. Many people not familiar with the operation of the poll tax do not realize that. The date at which the poll tax must be paid, or prior to which it must be paid, if they are to vote in a subsequent election, is frequently fixed so far in advance of the election that there is very little interest at the time, and thousands of people by oversight fail to pay the poll tax, only to discover, when the issues of the campaign start to rise in their State that they have lost their right to vote because some months previously thereto they did not pay the poll tax.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator reconsider and yield to me on that point?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry. I shall not yield on any point. I shall be very glad to hear the Senator from Mississippi at a later time, after he has had an opportunity to read my speech. But if I start yielding on this speech I shall certainly be aiding and abetting a prolonged debate on the other side of the aisle in opposition to ever coming to a vote on the poll-tax issue.

In many States, unless the citizen is a property owner, he receives no notice whatever of the deadline for paying the tax.

Yes, I agree with the junior Senator from Mississippi that a bill to abolish the poll tax is a matter which affects 48 States, because any device which systematically disfranchises 10,000,000 people, one-fourteenth of the citizens of this country, affects all of us in a very serious way. The poll-tax requirement goes to the very heart and core of the electoral process, the democratic process of our Government. Corrective action by the Congress, I submit, has been long overdue.

In my judgment, the effect of disfranchising American citizens en masse by means of the poll tax goes even further. Its consequences extend considerably beyond the confines of our geographic boundaries. The existence and operation of the poll tax have been a continuous source of embarrassment to our Government in its international relations. Time and time again, when representatives of the United States have been working to establish or support democratic elements in Europe or elsewhere in the world, they have had the ground literally cut out from under their feet by a barrage of antidemocratic propaganda conveyed by word of mouth, newspaper, and radio to the effect that if democracy is so wonderful, if it works so well, why does not America extend it to the millions of its own citizens who are kept away from the ballot box because of the poll tax.

Mr. President, as an ardent opponent of the third-party movement in America under the leadership of Henry Wallace, because I cannot accept the motivations of the party and because it is my personal conviction that whether Mr. Wallace appreciates it or not, his party has become a great medium for the spread of communistic propaganda in America, I say, nevertheless, that I cannot ignore the fact that the failure on the part of both major parties in years gone by to pass civil-rights legislation has given subversive elements fertile opportunity to spread the vicious propaganda that minority groups in the United States cannot look to the major parties for protection of their civil rights under the Constitution. That is the way communistic propaganda works in this country. I, of course, categorically contradict their charge. I take the position that the Republican Party has submitted and is submitting to the American people a sound program of civil rights. I have only to cite the platforms of 1940 and 1944, and now the great forward-looking progressive platform of 1948 we adopted in Philadelphia. I submit that if we could have gotten away from the obstructions that are thrown in our path by Democratic leadership, and in the Senate of the United States, the minority groups of this country, long past, would have had their rights protected to a great degree by a Republican majority in the Congress.

I make this point, nevertheless, Mr. President, that there is no denying the fact that one of the propaganda arguments the Communists are using, particularly among the colored people, is that they must turn to a third-party movement in order to gain protection for their civil rights, and freedom from the restrictions upon their right to exercise the franchise at a free ballot box, without the obligation of paying a poll tax.

They are making political hay, too, Mr. President. I know great Negro leaders who are just as patriotic, just as devoted to the principles of our constitutional form of government, as is any Member of the Senate, who are greatly alarmed about the threat of the spread of communism among members of their group in some of the great industrial centers of the United States. Every Senator who is within the hearing of my voice I think shares the same conclusion, that there is a concerted drive going on among the minority groups, on the part of subversive communistic elements, trying to convince them that their only hope for the full enjoyment of their constitutional rights is to be found in a repudiation of both the major parties. That is one reason why I think every American, who holds as dear as I do the constitutional freedom which it is our privilege to enjoy under our form of government, should devote his attention and his interest to the question of meeting that propaganda by seeing to it that the legal steps necessary to guarantee these rights are taken by the duly elected representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, in his very able and scholarly speech in the Senate—and I am most sincere in using those words—the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] purported to show that the framers of our Constitution deliberately wrote article I, section 2, on which he bases his entire argument, so as to perpetuate restrictions on the suffrage. This is the oft-quoted section which reads:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The Senator from Mississippi said:

> Let us see what the picture was when the word "qualifications" was written into the Constitution of the United States, in article I, section 2. Let us see what those men, the framers of the Constitution, were considering and what was in their legal minds and what was in their minds as the leading political thinkers of their day. * * * We know that those men had before them the constitutions of the various States.

I have no disagreement with the historical facts the Senator points out in continuing his argument. The various States did at that time, as he pointed out, have various forms of property or tax restrictions on the suffrage in their constitutions. But I want to support and underline the words of the late Senator George Norris in the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Seventy-seventh Congress on an anti-poll-tax bill practically identical with H. R. 29, the bill we are seeking to have passed during the special session of the Congress. That eminent constitutional lawyer and liberal Senator said:

> Those who believe the proposed legislation is unconstitutional rely on the statement of a historic fact that, when the Constitution was adopted, all of the original States had property or tax qualifications. This ignores entirely the testimony of scholars which clearly demonstrates why that fact alone does not prove the right of Congress today to forbid such requirements for voting in Federal elections. It seems to us that this regulation is subject to the criticism which Mr. Justice Holmes leveled against the use of history when he said:
>
> "It is revolting to have no better reason for a rule of law than that it is laid down in the time of Henry IV. It is still more revolting if the grounds upon which it was laid down have vanished long since and the rule persists from blind imitation of the past." (Holmes: The Path of the Law, in Collected Papers, p. 187.)

We think also Justice Holmes was right when, in discussing the situation in *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416, 413), he said:

"It [the Constitution] must be considered in the light of our whole experience and not merely in that of what was said a hundred years ago."

In his attempt to justify the perpetuation of restrictions on the suffrage, the Senator from Mississippi cited certain discussions in the Constitutional Convention as showing the intent of the founding fathers to set for all time conditions that existed in that day. To be sure, he is correct in saying:

This very matter of dealing with the qualifications of electors came before the Constitutional Convention. The men there passed on it—James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, and others * * *.

* * * the question arose—and this was one of the most serious of all—who shall be the electors, the qualified electors?

There were three proposals. The first one was that it should be left to the Congress to decide as to who would be qualified electors. That is the very thing the pending bill proposes to do. But that plan was rejected.

The second plan proposed was that there should be written into the Constitution itself the definition of who would be qualified electors to choose the Members of the House of Representatives. That plan was rejected.

The third plan was that definitions should be written into the Constitution to the extent of saying, "This matter being so important, so highly controversial, we prescribe the rule that in all Federal elections in each particular State those who are qualified to vote in the most numerous branch of that particular State legislature shall be qualified to vote for the Members of the House of Representatives."

That is what they said. That is what they decided on. That is what they wrote into the face of the Constitution itself.

But I want to point out that the bill to abolish the poll tax does not attempt to give Congress power to prescribe qualifications for voting. I suppose in a very real sense that is the crux of the difference between the Senators on the other side of the aisle and those of us who take the position that our anti-poll-tax bill is constitutional. Of course, if we accepted the definition and interpretation of the word "qualification" as used in the Constitution, as it is contended for by the Senators who allege that our bill is unconstitutional, there would be no debate. But I sincerely contend that their interpretation of the meaning of the word "qualification" in the Constitution, as I hope to show before I finish, is an erroneous interpretation of the word. On the contrary, our bill seeks to remove a limitation on those qualifications which was not in the minds of the founding fathers and which was reimposed relatively recently under historical conditions which are in no way comparable to those of 1789.

Let me dwell on that point, Mr. President. The word "qualification," if the historical argument is to be used, which is the argument employed by the Senator from Mississippi must be interpreted in light of the conditions that existed at the time the founding fathers used the word. Thus, as I have said, what we are seeking to do by our bill, is to remove a limitation upon those qualifications which was not in the minds of the founding fathers, and which limitation was reimposed relatively recently under historial conditions which are in no way comparable to those of 1789.

In 1789, the States which had taxpaying qualifications for voting did not look upon them as restrictions of suffrage. That is the basic point in the debate. We are talking now about a limitation on suffrage, and my argument at this point is that the restriction, that is, the taxes, to which the Senator from Mississippi referred in his historical argument as being in existence at the time the Constitution was adopted, were not restrictions upon suffrage. The founding fathers did not have that in mind. Therefore, as I said in my earlier remarks in the course of this speech, if the historical argument is to be used, then those who use it must apply the premises of that argument to the operating facts existing at that period in history to which they refer if they want a conclusion to be drawn in accordance with their contention. I emphasize that point because it is that shift in the logic on the part of Senators who are contending that the bill is unconstitutional, it is that shift in their logic as they present their meaning of the word "qualification" which I submit is not supported on the basis of historic fact. On the contrary, our founding fathers talked of and thought of it in terms of liberalizing the right to vote, of liberalizing suffrage, of not restricting it and putting further limitations upon it. Just the contrary was the approach and the intention of the founding fathers.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida was not on the floor when I advised the Chair that he should reply to all requests that I yield by saying that I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The present occupant of the chair will say to the junior Senator from Oregon that he was not in the Chamber at the time the Senator began his speech. The Chair is now advised that the Senator at that time stated that he would not yield to anyone until he had concluded his speech.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sorry I did not know of that situation.

Mr. MORSE. I repeat, Mr. President, that in 1787, the States which had taxpaying qualifications for voting did not look upon them as restrictions of suffrage. They were expansions of it--part of the evolution from the freehold requirement to universal suffrage. Even the freehold qualification, at the outset, was broadly democratic. In England, with its huge estates, freehold voting was part of the feudal system. In America, limitless free land gave it a totally different aspect. Landownership was not a criterion of wealth, but of permanent attachment to the community. The freehold requirement excluded vagabonds, migrant settlers, and indentured servants. As the country filled up and more people became shopkeepers and mechanics, the rights of suffrage were expanded by allowing taxpayers and the owners of personal property to vote. The Constitution was written in the midst of a steady progression from the freehold requirement to universal suffrage. Article I, section 2, was looked upon as an automatic guaranty that the rights of national citizenship would be safeguarded by the devotion of the people to their rights as citizens of the individual States.

I repeat that sentence, because I think it is rich in meaning so far as understanding the theory from which the junior Senator from Oregon is arguing the constitutionality of the bill. Article I, section 2, was looked upon as an automatic guaranty that the rights of national citizenship would be safeguarded by the devotion of the people to their rights as citizens of the individual States.

This is clearly revealed in what Madison wrote about this section of the Constitution in the Federalist:

Who are to be the electors of the Federal Representatives? Not the rich, more than the poor—

"Not the rich more than the poor." Is that true in the poll-tax States today?—

Not the learned, more than the ignorant—

Is that true in the poll-tax States today? This is Madison writing in the Federalist at the time the great document was being forged and hammered on the anvil of the experience of the Thirteen Colonies into the greatest governmental document for protecting the rights of freemen ever written by the hand of man.

Not the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States. They are to be the same who exercise the right in every State of electing the corresponding branch of the legislature of the State.

That statement by Madison can be repeated today in 41 States of the Union. In seven it is no longer valid. And why not? Because Madison was mistaken when he said in the Federalist:

It cannot be feared that the people of the States will alter this part of their constitutions in such a manner as to abridge the rights secured to them by the Federal Constitution.

I take the position that when, subsequent to the adoption of the Constitution, poll taxes were imposed as limitations upon suffrage, the acts imposing them did not conform to the historic theory that was in the minds of the founding fathers when they wrote article I, section 2, into the Constitution, because they were thinking in terms of a national universal suffrage in which discrimination would not favor the rich over the poor, or the learned over the ignorant, or the haughty over the humble sons of more obscure citizens, to use Madison's language. But some of the States have digressed from Madison's theory and the theory of the other founding fathers, when seven poll-tax States have not continued suffrage restrictions of colonial days, but have reimposed them only about 50 years ago

with the avowed purpose of decreasing the vote.

Let us look at another of the statements of the Senator from Mississippi. He said:

> When we go back to the statutes of the various colonies prior to the formation of the Union * * * when we go back to the wording of the Constitution based upon the facts as the framers of the Constitution found them, I cannot see how it is possible so to play on language as to say that the legitimacy of the poll tax as a qualification is not written boldly into the Constitution.

In answer to the Senator from Mississippi on that point, let me say that at the time of the Constitutional Convention the whole trend was toward broadening the franchise rather than toward placing restrictions upon it. If the Senator from Mississippi is going to quote history, he should quote that fact. In 1789, it was possible for the poll tax to represent a step forward, a lightening of the restrictions on voting, compared with the property restrictions of earlier days. In the spirit of 1789, therefore, we should be moving toward removal of all restrictions on the franchise.

Prior to the Declaration of Independence, the right of suffrage in this country, as elsewhere, was limited for the most part to landowners. The first cautious steps to extend the right were taken in 1776, when North Carolina reduced the restrictions on voting for the lower house of the State legislature to payment of a property tax. Pennsylvania substituted tax payment for property ownership as the condition of voting in all elections.

In the same year the Virginia bill of rights, written by George Mason, declared that the right to vote should be granted to all who showed "sufficient evidence of common interest in and attachment to the community." This became the dominant American theory of voting rights, though it left unsolved how to judge "evidence of common interest."

In 1784, New Hampshire reduced the voting requirements to the payment of a small poll tax. In 1791, Vermont entered the Union with free manhood suffrage; and in 1792 Kentucky followed suit. In the same year New Hampshire abolished the poll tax as a requirement of voting—subject let the record be clear, to the extent to which the record made this afternoon in the colloquy between the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] shows that to a restrictive extent there is at least some remnant of a poll tax still in the State of New Hampshire. If the constitutional provision read by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], purportedly out of the State constitution of New Hampshire, was correctly quoted, then I would be the first in the Senate to say that I think there is some form of poll tax still remaining in New Hampshire, still applicable as a restriction in some degree upon the right of suffrage in New Hampshire. As I said this afternoon, if that is the fact, then, of course, it is my contention that our anti-poll-tax bill is equally applicable to New Hampshire, and illustrates quite clearly no intention on the part of the proponents of the anti-poll-tax bill to discriminate against any section of the country for the sake of discriminatory purposes alone. The only reason we are pressing for the anti-poll-tax bill is that we think that the poll tax imposes a restriction, in conflict with the spirit and intent of the Constitution, upon approximately one-fourteenth of our population; and we want to see such restriction removed wherever it exists, both in the South as well as in any New England State or any Western State, or any other State.

As I have stated, in 1792, according to my research, New Hampshire abolished the poll tax then existing as a requirement of voting. In 1796 Tennessee provided that residence alone, as well as property ownership, could qualify a voter.

By 1787, when the Constitutional Convention met, four States had already substantially broadened the base of suffrage, and a number of others were soon to do so.

I want to return for a moment to a point I previously quoted from the Senator from Mississippi—his concern as to what was "in their—the framers of the Constitution—minds as the leading political thinkers of that day."

The framers of the Constitution were considering how to form a more perfect Union, while also establishing a government which would guarantee to its citizens the rights for which they had so recently fought the American Revolution. In the matter of suffrage, they had to make a compromise acceptable both to the more conservative States and to the more progressive States. This compromise, embodied in article I, section 2, provided that Congress would accept the qualifications which each State might impose for the most numerous branch of its legislature, that is, the most liberal requirement then existing.

This compromise was essentially liberal in character, as the trend in most States was toward broadening the franchise. This is borne out by the fact that after 1819, all new States adopted free manhood suffrage. In the older States, the road to free suffrage traversed the following general stages: From a real-property to a general tax requirement; thence to a poll tax unconnected with property ownership; finally to a free vote dependent only on residence and good character. By the end of the Civil War, the poll tax as a requirement of voting was found in the South only in Georgia, which has since abolished the poll tax.

What some of the founding fathers thought of limitations on suffrage is indicated by Madison's Notes of Debates.

When Elbridge Gerry, delegate from Massachusetts, declared:

> The evils we experience flow from the excess of democracy—

He was answered by George Mason, of Virginia.

> Mr. Mason—

Said Madison—

> argued strongly for an election of the larger branch (the House of Representatives) by the people. It was to be the grand depository of the democratic principle of government.

He was followed by James Wilson, of Pennsylvania. To quote Madison again:

> Mr. Wilson contended strenuously for drawing the most numerous branch of the legislature immediately from the people. He was for raising the Federal pyramid to a considerable altitude, and for that reason wished to give it as broad a basis as possible. No government could long subsist without the confidence of the people.

Then came James Madison himself:

> Mr. Madison considered the popular election of one branch of the National Legislature as essential to every plan for free government.

When the compromise embodied in article I, section 2, was proposed, Gouverneur Morris objected. He wanted the franchise limited to landowners, just as the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Virginia pointed out in their speeches. However, Benjamin Franklin protested. As reported by Delegate McHenry:

> The venerable Franklin opposed to this the natural rights of man, their right to an immediate voice in the General Assembly of the whole Nation, or to a right of suffrage and representation.

Franklin pointed out that—

> One British statute excluded a number of subjects from suffrage. These immediately became slaves.

Judge Ellsworth, of Connecticut, declared, according to Madison:

> The people will not readily subscribe to the National Constitution if it should subject them to be disfranchised.

Mason, of Virginia, pointed out that—

> Eight or nine States have extended the right of suffrage beyond the freeholders. What will the people there say if they have been disfranchised?

Butler, of South Carolina, declared:

> There is no right of which people are more jealous than that of suffrage. Abridgments of it tend to * * * a rank aristocracy.

Mr. President, I say that the founding fathers had to give ground to men like Gouverneur Morris; but in accepting the qualifications for voting set by the States, it was clearly not their purpose to limit the suffrage, as the poll tax does now. It was their purpose, rather, to forbid restrictions on it by a Congress in which men like Morris might hold the upper hand, to avoid compulsory uniformity, and to use the expanding suffrage of the States as the most effective guaranty of a broad base for the Federal Government, to adopt national, universal suffrage. That was the trend. That was the objective. I think it was the obvious intent of the founding fathers.

It has been repeatedly contended on the floor of the Senate that the sum involved in the poll-tax payment is a trifling one—a mere dollar or two. Curiously enough, however, the States which require the payment of a poll tax are those which, in relation to the national average, have the lowest per capita income. Let us have a little light on that subject. Probably there are more recent figures—in fact I have one group of

figures which I found since I prepared this speech, but the last ones to come to my attention were those published by the Department of Labor in October 1946. These are sufficient, however, for my purposes tonight.

When the country was in the trough of the depression in 1933, the list of average per-capita-income payments showed that Mississippi, to take the lowest income State, had $123 per annum, against a national average of $368. Stated in another way, the average Mississippian earned only about one-third as much as the average American did. Now I ask, Mr. President, whether a $1 or $2 poll-tax payment is a trifling sum if it constitutes as much as 2 percent of the annual income of a voter? Even in 1945, when income was comparatively high, the average resident of a so-called poll-tax State had to spend a significant percentage of his income in order to vote, particularly, if he was in a State which permitted the accumulation of poll taxes, and was confronted with a situation in which he had to pay back poll taxes before he could vote.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a table showing the per-capita-income payments for poll-tax States for 1929, 1933, 1939, 1941, and 1945, as derived from the Monthly Labor Review for October 1946, on page 497.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Per capita income payments for poll-tax States

	1929	1933	1939	1941	1945
United States	$680	$368	$539	$693	$1,150
Virginia	422	266	402	565	903
South Carolina	252	167	261	354	663
Tennessee	349	190	295	413	813
Alabama	305	154	242	359	700
Mississippi	273	123	201	283	557
Arkansas	305	152	246	332	654
Texas	465	257	401	497	917

Source: Derived from Monthly Labor Review, October 1946, p. 497.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, following the table just offered, a table which is to be found on page 116 of the hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee on Senate bill 1280, a forerunner anti-poll-tax bill. This table shows the per capita income, by States, for the year 1940. It is taken from the Survey of Current Business, the August 1941 issue, published by the Department of Commerce.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Per capita income, by States, for the year 1940

[From Survey of Current Business, August 1941 issue, published by the Department of Commerce]

Alabama	$264
Arizona	478
Arkansas	253
California	819
Colorado	551
Connecticut	864
Delaware	836
District of Columbia [1]	1,022
Florida	465
Georgia	321
Idaho	470
Illinois	691
Indiana	551
Iowa	471
Kansas	418
Kentucky	330
Louisiana	350
Maine	504
Maryland [1]	703
Massachusetts	757
Michigan	656
Minnesota	526
Mississippi	195
Missouri	499
Montana	579
Nebraska	444
Nevada	980
New Hampshire	560
New Jersey [1]	852
New Mexico	386
New York [1]	814
North Carolina	335
North Dakota	385
Ohio	644
Oklahoma	384
Oregon	586
Pennsylvania	624
Rhode Island	730
South Carolina	281
South Dakota	334
Tennessee	325
Texas	422
Utah	487
Vermont	542
Virginia [1]	455
Washington	633
West Virginia	401
Wisconsin	537
Wyoming	638
United States	573

[1] Before computing per capita incomes, salaries and wages, and total income were reduced in the District of Columbia and New York, and increased in Maryland, Virginia, and New Jersey to account for residents of the latter States employed by establishments located in the District and New York.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is very interesting to note that this table and also the table previously submitted for the RECORD show an extremely low per capita income in the poll-tax States, and therefore a relatively high percentage of that income, comparably speaking, taken for poll-tax purposes. I do not dwell at any length on that argument, other than to say that one of the realities of the situation is that the imposition of a poll tax is an economic obstacle to voting, in poll-tax States, because of the exceedingly low per capita income of the average people in those States. When we are talking about an income of $133 for a year, a poll tax of even $1 is a substantial sum to a person who finds himself so low in the economic strata of our country that his annual income is only $133 a year. In such cases we cannot ignore or brush off quite so easily as the opponents of the anti-poll tax bill would brush off, the economic obstacle to voting which is presented by a poll tax.

The proponents of poll taxes make no serious claim that they were intended, or are in fact used, as true taxing measures. Let us not forget this point, Mr. President. If Senators do not remember anything else I say in the course of this argument, I wish them to remember this point. When they read the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which are at all relevant to this problem, they will find—at least, I have found—that without exception the Court is proceeding on the assumption and theory—and rightly so, as far as the language of the acts is concerned—that the poll tax laws are truly taxing measures. Until the Congress of the United States by direct legislation squarely "on the nose" passes legislation—because, as the Court has pointed out, it is a legislative problem, not a judicial one, to determine this question of policy—which makes very clear that it is the policy of the Congress to look upon poll taxes as an infringement of the right of franchise, I do not see how we can get behind the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Let me repeat that in another way, for I say that is another one of the basic premises we must consider in determining the question of constitutionality, at least to the extent that the decisions being offered by the Senators of the opposition have a bearing on the subject. The court has proceeded on the assumption that State poll-tax laws are true taxing measures. It is my theory that when we determine national congressional policy in regard to poll taxes as being a restriction upon the franchise, there will then for the first time—and not until then—be before the Supreme Court a set of operative facts which will make it possible for the Court judicially to determine whether article I section 2, of the Constitution contains within the word "qualifications" a constitutional meaning which prohibits the passage of an anti-poll-tax law by the Congress. Every time it has been possible to get it before the Court thus far, in any of the cases cited by my friends of the opposition, if I read the cases correctly, the Court has been passing upon a State law which, in the light of the circumstances of the case, was passed as a "true taxing measure," to use the language of the court.

I submit that if poll taxes make for or contribute to the raising of revenue, it is purely incidental. This is clear from the fact that most if not all the statutes or State constitutional provisions imposing the tax prohibit its payment by anyone other than the person taxed, a prohibition not general in tax statutes, and from the fact that no effort is generally made or provided for the collection of delinquent taxes. The sole penalty for delinquency is disfranchisement, with the possible exception of the alleged poll taxes existing in some of the New England States which were discussed in the colloquy that took place on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, to which I previously alluded in these remarks.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to refer to a brief digest of poll-tax provisions of State law as submitted in the testimony of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] in March 1948, when he testified in support of House bill 29. He pointed out:

1. The seven poll-tax States are Alabama (1901), Arkansas (1908), Mississippi (1890), South Carolina (1885), Tennessee (1890), Texas (1903), Virginia (1901).

I think the historical record is clear, that the laws of all these States were passed obviously for the purpose of limiting suffrage, when the whole trend at the time the constitutional fathers, as I have previously pointed out in these remarks, wrote article I, section 2, was to enlarge the franchise in order to establish universal suffrage. That was the trend, but because of the compromises which had to be arranged, particularly in order to satisfy men in the convention such as Gouverneur Morris, the compromise of article I, section 2, was agreed upon.

In his testimony, the Senator from Florida further pointed out:

2. The rates per year are: Alabama, $1.50; Arkansas, $1; Mississippi, $2; Virginia, $1.50; South Carolina, $1; Tennessee, $1 in some counties, and $2 in 72 others; Texas, $1.75.

3. The maximum in Alabama is $36 for citizens 45 and over who previously never were able to pay; in South Carolina there is a penalty of $2.12 if in arrears above $1; Mississippi, the tax is cumulative up to $6; in Virginia the maximum is $5 per taxpayer who is in arrears as much as 3 years.

4. Most of the people technically are now in arrears. A husband and wife in Virginia may have to pay as much as $10 if they fall behind for 3 years. In recent years, the textile workers' union in Danville, Va., campaigned among their members until each one in arrears saved the $5 necessary to pay the taxes (a total of 3,000 paid this amount). The union members in Madison City, Ala., saved money for years until they paid on the average $12 to $21.

5. Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and Tennessee must amend their State constitutions to repeal the State poll-tax requirements. In view of the fact that between 1909 and 1948 only four States have actually repealed or removed the requirement, the odds are strongly against removing it in the seven States in the next few years in view of the arduous procedure necessary to amend the respective State constitutions.

6. In Mississippi, the poll tax can be a lien against assessable property. Everybody is liable to pay it and condemnation proceedings may be taken against such property.

Senator PEPPER proceeds:

Now, I am nearing the conclusion here. I also offer, Mr. Chairman, a statement showing the way the vote in the several States declined as soon as the poll tax was imposed, and also the way the vote in the several States increased as soon as the poll tax was taken off.

In my State of Florida in a white primary in 1938, 100,000 more citizens voted in my senatorial race than voted 2 years before in 1936, the last election preceding the abolition of the poll tax, and I have here another—I have it in the data that I will not detail to this committee, because I am sure others have presented such information. Let us take the State of Louisiana, and I am talking here about white primaries. In Louisiana, the total number of registered voters increased by 44.5 percent after the poll tax was removed. The women's vote—the women's vote in a white primary increased by 77 percent, and the votes cast in two gubernatorial white primaries increased 64 percent over the averages over the two preceding ones, and the one senatorial primary, which was also a white primary after repeal, showed a 90-percent increase in the number of registered voters. So, I am putting this, Mr. Chairman, not upon any reference to any class or any section or any religion or any nationality or national origin: I am putting this upon the basic principles of democracy. It affects men and women, and as far as that is concerned, it adversely affects far more white people than it does colored people, if you want to get down to a distinction as between the two.

Mr. President, I do not think that is conclusive, but I think the statistics are certainly sufficiently clear to support the inference that the elimination of the poll tax in several States has resulted in an increase in the number of persons voting at the next election, and supports what I think is the obvious conclusion that the poll tax serves in fact and in effect as a limitation upon suffrage.

Of course, the defenders of the poll tax insist that it is a qualification for voting in Federal elections within the meaning of section 2 article I, of the Constitution which provides:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Actually, of course, the poll tax is no more a true qualification to determine a prospective voter's inherent ability, understanding, or capacity to exercise the high privilege of citizenship involved in voting than would a requirement that the prospective voter be baldheaded, or stand 6 feet tall in his stocking feet, or have a net annual income of $10,000,000. Neither of these things has anything whatever to do with the capacity of a voter and cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered a qualification within the meaning of our Constitution. If a State can say that the payment of $1 is a qualification, what in the world would hinder it from exacting $100 or $1,000, or any other arbitrary sum it desires? As Madison, one of the founding fathers, wrote:

We may define a republic to be, or at least may bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure, for a limited period, or during good behavior. It is essential to such a government that it be derived from the great body of society, not from an inconsiderable proportion, or a favored class of it.

The origin of the poll tax, and the way in which it has operated, shows only too clearly that it is not, and was not intended to be a bona fide qualification. Its intended purpose, and its intended result, was to eliminate or greatly restrict a particular element of the citizenry from the use of a free ballot.

The Senate Judiciary Committee considering, during the Seventy-seventh Congress, House bill 1024, a bill substantially the same as the one under discussion, made an exhaustive investigation and study of this question. In its report dated October 27, 1942, favorably recommending the bill, which was practically identical with the pending bill, it wrote:

We think a careful examination of the so-called poll tax constitutional and statutory provisions, and an examination particularly of the constitutional conventions by which these amendments became a part of the State laws, will convince any disinterested person that the object of these State constitutional conventions, from which emanated mainly the poll-tax laws, were moved entirely and exclusively by a desire to exclude the Negro from voting. They attempted to do this in a constitutional way but, in order to follow such a course, they deemed it necessary to even prohibit the white voter the same as they did the colored voter and hence they devised the poll-tax method which applied to white and colored alike. In other words, the poll-tax laws were prohibitive to all people, regardless of color, who were poor and unable to pay the poll tax.

We desire to call attention to the Virginia constitutional convention which submitted an amendment which was afterward adopted to the Constitution of Virginia by which it was intended to disfranchise a very large number of Virginia citizens. We think this convention can be regarded as a fair sample of other conventions in other poll-tax States. Hon. Carter Glass was a member of that convention. Near the beginning of the convention Senator Glass made a speech in which he outlined in very forceful language what the object was, after all, of the convention. He did this in his usual commendatory method of getting at the real cream in the coconut. Near the beginning of the convention he made a speech in which he said:

"The chief purpose of this convention is to amend the suffrage clause of the existing constitution. It does not require much prescience to foretell that the alterations which we shall make will not apply to 'all persons and classes without distinction.' We were sent here to make distinctions. We expect to make distinctions. We will make distinctions."

Near the conclusion of the convention, Senator Glass delivered another address in which he referred to the work already performed by the convention. He said:

"I declared then [referring to the beginning of the convention and the debate on the oath] that no body of Virginia gentlemen could frame a constitution so obnoxious to my sense of right and morality that I would be willing to submit its fate to 146,000 ignorant Negro voters [great applause] whose capacity for self-government we have been challenging for 30 years past."

There is no doubt but what Senator Glass stated the real object the convention had in view. The fact that his remarks were received with great applause indicates that his fellow members of that convention agreed with him and that the real object they had in view, and which they believed they could accomplish, was disfranchising "146,000 ignorant Negro voters."

The intention of the framers of the Virginia Constitution, as reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, is typical of other States adopting the poll-tax requirement, and I would say that they have certainly succeeded in achieving their object.

The votes cast in the 1946 general elections for Members of the United States House of Representatives in States requiring a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting was tragically small as compared with those in non-poll-tax States. To take two typical States, one a so-called poll-tax State and the other a non-poll-tax State, will show what I mean.

I have before me a table showing the votes cast in Mississippi and Minnesota in the 1946 congressional election and indicating the population in 1940 by congressional districts, the total vote cast in the 1946 election, and percentage of population voting.

Mr. President, let us take a view of the results in Mississippi. Let us take a district which I shall call district 1, in which there were 263,367 persons, as shown by the population statistics, 5,429 of whom were eligible to vote. Two and one-tenth percent voted.

Let us take a corresponding district in the State of Minnesota, which I shall call district 1, containing 318,154 persons, of whom 96,345 voted, or 30 percent, as contrasted with 2.1 percent in Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator reconsider and yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon stated at the outset of his remarks that he would like to continue with his speech without interruption, and he has previously declined to yield to the Senator from Florida. For that reason the Chair is quite certain that he would not desire to yield at this time.

Mr. MORSE. The Chair correctly states my position. No one regrets more than I do the parliamentary situation in which I find myself, because, by inclination and practice, I am always willing to yield while speaking on the floor of the Senate. But under the particular circumstances in which we find ourselves in this debate, and because we have no desire to be of any assistance whatsoever in carrying on a prolonged debate at the direction of the Senators on the other side of the aisle, I shall continue to insist on my right to complete my statement, and then I shall be very glad to answer such questions as may be put to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, since he has been interrupted at this point?

Mr. MORSE. For what purpose?

Mr. WHERRY. When the Senator comes to a place in his speech where he feels we might permit the Senate to conclude its work for today, provided unanimous consent be given that the Senator may have the floor to finish his speech when the Senate meets tomorrow, would the Senator advise me of that point in his address so that I may make the motion?

Mr. MORSE. I am aware of what the Senator from Nebraska has in mind, Mr. President, because he has spoken to me with reference to it. I am trying to finish my speech as rapidly as I can. I am speaking and reading as rapidly as it is physically possible for me to do, because I do not want to consume any more time than is necessary to make the case which we think has to be made on the affirmative side of this proposition. I have been waiting for some days to make the speech. I do not see how I can possibly finish it tonight, unless the Senate wants to continue in an exceedingly long session, to which I have no objection. I am perfectly willing to remain here and complete the speech.

The acting majority leader has suggested that he thinks that when I come to an appropriate place in my speech, namely, the end of the branch of the subject I am now discussing, he would like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock, with the understanding that I be privileged to take the floor and complete my speech at that time. If the Senator wishes to put that request at the present time so that Senators now present can go home while I finish this portion of my remarks, I have no objection, if I do not jeopardize my right to the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In order that the Chair may correct the statement of the junior Senator from Oregon, he will state that a unanimous-consent request has already been agreed to that the Senate meet at 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. I accept the correction.

Mr. WHERRY. I now propose the unanimous-consent request that when the Senate meets tomorrow the junior Senator from Oregon be recognized to conclude the address he is making at this time, and which he will conclude for the day in the next few minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does that indicate that the Senate is to take a recess in the immediate future? Of course, some of us must remain here——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is that when the junior Senator from Oregon arrives at an appropriate place in his speech he may desist with the understanding that he will be recognized when the Senate meets at 1 o'clock p. m. tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Reserving the right to object, I certainly have no objection to the Senate recessing at this time, but the distinguished Senator from Oregon is in a parliamentary pillbox from which he fires on all Senators and their speeches on the floor, and refuses to accept any counterfire. I think it is a little unfair to keep us here if the Senator is not going to yield. If we are to recess, let us recess at this time. I am sure we are at a very appropriate place in the Senator's remarks, since he will have the floor tomorrow, occupying the same place of vantage.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit me to make an observation, my reason for suggesting that the Senator from Oregon conclude tomorrow was the fact that I stated at the beginning of the session today that the Senate would remain in session at least until 10 o'clock. Several Senators have planned on the hour of 10 o'clock as the recess hour, so I believe we are quibbling over a molehill. If the Senator from Oregon could see his way clear, now that we have interrupted him, to permit the Senate to recess now, we would like to do it. If not, I can repeat the unanimous-consent request when he comes to the particular place in his remarks where he thinks he can stop.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that on the particular topic I am now discussing, there is one page, plus a couple of tables I shall ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD. I do not think it will take me more than 3 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under those conditions, I shall not object, but some of us who had wished to interrupt the Senator from Oregon at times were compelled to remain here tonight; but if he is to occupy only 3 minutes longer I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Nebraska is agreed to. The junior Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I shall look forward with anticipation to the firing that comes from his pillbox after I finish tomorrow. I have already explained why I am following what for me is the extraordinary course of not yielding during the presentation of my formal remarks, but there will be time on the floor to ask such questions as the Senator may wish to ask me when I conclude.

Mr. RUSSELL. I confess it is extraordinary for the Senator from Oregon to take that position, because he usually joins freely in debate. But he realizes the impossibility of Senators coming back to each point he has raised in the debate. I did not hear his preliminary statement. I understand that because of the fact that he did not want to be accused of participating in any filibuster he asked not to be interrupted. I assumed it was because of the weakness of his case.

Mr. MORSE. Knowing the Senator from Georgia as I do, if he can find weakness in my case, he is not going to be stopped by the fact that he has to read my remarks in order to find it, and I am perfectly willing to have the strength of my case submitted to the Senator from Georgia for rebuttal.

Now, returning to the effect of a poll tax on the number of people who vote in an election for Members of the House of Representatives, I ask permission to have inserted at this point in my remarks a table which draws a comparison between the State of Minnesota and the State of Mississippi in the congressional elections of 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Votes cast in Mississippi and Minnesota in 1946 congressional elections

	Population, 1940, by congressional districts	Total vote cast, 1946 election	Percent of population voting in election
MISSISSIPPI			
1. Rankin	263,367	5,429	2.1
2. Whitten	231,701	6,491	2.8
3. Whittington	435,530	4,185	1.0
4. Abernethy	201,316	10,017	5.0
5. Winstead	261,406	7,122	2.7
6. Colmer	319,635	6,448	2.0
7. Williams	470,781	10,345	2.2
MINNESOTA			
1. Andresen	318,154	96,245	30.0
2. O'Hara	305,559	91,434	29.0
3. MacKinnon	321,987	111,519	34.0
4. Devitt	309,935	88,702	28.0
5. Judd	321,859	114,614	35.0
6. Knutson	334,781	96,548	28.0
7. Andersen	305,139	88,536	29.0
8. Blatnik	291,041	106,065	37.0
9. Hagen	283,845	78,242	27.0

Mr. MORSE. I shall read only the percentages, that is, the percentage of population voting in the Mississippi districts as compared with the percentage

voting in the Minnesota districts. Here they are. In Mississippi 2.1 percent, 2.8 percent, 1 percent, 5 percent, 2.7 percent, 2 percent, 2.2 percent.

Compare that, Mr. President, with the percentage of voters who went to the polls in a non-poll-tax State such as Minnesota: 30 percent, 29 percent, 34 percent, 28 percent, 35 percent, 28 percent, 29 percent, 37 percent, 27 percent.

I do not argue a direct cause and effect relationship between the existence of a poll tax in Mississippi and the percentage of voters who went to the polls, but I do argue that we cannot exclude the presence of the poll tax in Mississippi in any explanation of that exceedingly low percentage of voting in Mississippi.

When we add to that table, Mr. President, other tables of comparable nature from other poll-tax States, I submit that there is sound basis for the conclusion that the poll tax results in men being sent to the Congress of the United States by an exceedingly small percentage of the citizens of a State, whereas, in my judgment, if their full rights were given under the Constitution, and they could enjoy the advantage of a free ballot box without the obstacle of a poll tax, a much larger percentage would register their views as to who should represent them in this representative government.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks another table taken from the 1948 hearings of our Judiciary Committee on House bill 29, showing the effect of the poll tax repeal in increasing voting in Florida, Arkansas, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, being States used for comparable purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF POLL-TAX REPEAL IN INCREASING VOTING—FLORIDA AN EXAMPLE

Florida repealed the poll tax in 1937. The following table contrasts the increase in the vote in Florida between the 1936 Presidential election (that is the Presidential election immediately before and immediately after repeal) to the change in the vote in the remaining poll-tax States in the same elections:

[All figures rounded to nearest 1,000]

State	Presidential vote, 1936	Presidential vote, 1940	Percent increase
Florida	328	485	48
Alabama	276	294	7
Arkansas	179	202	13
Georgia	293	313	7
Mississippi	162	176	9
South Carolina	115	97	[1] 16
Tennessee	476	523	10
Texas	843	1,041	23
Virginia	355	347	4

[1] Decrease.

Source: World Almanac, 1948, pp. 251-278.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that another table of the same order taken from the Judiciary Committee hearings for this year on this particular point be printed in the RECORD, including the footnote to the table.

There being no objection, the table and footnote were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statistics

Voting State	Year tax adopted	Record of vote		Percent reduction
		Before adoption	After adoption	
		1888	*1892*	
Florida	1889	66,000	35,000	47
Mississippi	1890	117,000	52,000	56
Tennessee	1890	304,000	265,000	13
		1852	*1900*	
South Carolina	1895	70,000	51,000	28
		1856	*1900*	
Louisiana	189-	101,000	68,000	33
		1900	*1904*	
North Carolina	1900	292,000	207,000	29
Alabama	1901	165,000	102,000	34
Virginia	1901	266,000	136,000	49
Texas	1903	401,000	221,000	45
Arkansas	1908	151,000	115,000	24

During this period there was an average increase of one-third of the population.

Louisiana repealed its poll tax in 1934. The voters in 1932 were 268,000 and in 1940 were 372,000 or a 36-percent increase.

North Carolina repealed its tax in 1920. Between 1920 and 1928, the vote rose from 533,000 to 3,636,000 or 18 percent.

Florida repealed its poll tax in 1937. Between 1936 and 1940 the vote rose by 46 percent from 327,000 to 485,000.

In 1940, there were in the 8 States, including Georgia, 13,600,000 eligible persons and only 3,000,000 or 22 percent paid the poll tax; 10,600,000 citizens of voting age did not vote. In 1942 the poll-tax vote fell to 829,000 or 6 percent of the eligible population.

A comparison of adjoining States for 1944 is illuminating. In 1944 North Carolina had 21 percent of its eligible population voting and South Carolina with a poll tax only 5 percent. In 1946 West Virginia with no poll tax had 542,000 persons voting and Virginia with a much larger population had only half as many voting.

In 1946 less than 9 percent of the eligible population voted in the seven poll-tax States in comparison with 13 percent for the four States which repealed the tax requirement in recent years and 47 percent for the non-poll-tax States.

In Louisiana the total number of registered voters increased by 44.5 percent; the women's vote increased by 77 percent and the votes cast in two gubernatorial primaries increased 64 percent over the average for the two preceding ones and the one senatorial primary showed a 90-percent increase, after repeal.

In Florida the average number of votes cast in two senatorial primaries increased by 140 percent over the average for the four preceding ones and the one gubernatorial primary showed an increase of 91 percent over the four preceding.

Mr. MORSE. Thus I say, Mr. President, that we all know that the vote is lighter in a non-Presidential election year. In Georgia, the poll-tax requirement was repealed in 1945. Although the vote cast in 1946 was considerably below that in the 1944 election, yet it was substantially above that in the previous off-year election of 1942.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing the votes cast in Georgia in the 1942 and 1946 congressional elections, the first one being at the time of the existence of a poll tax, the second one being after the removal of the poll tax.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Votes cast in Georgia in 1942 and 1946 congressional elections

	Votes cast, 1942 [1]	Votes cast, 1946 [2]
District 1	7,109	20,973
District 2	3,704	10,806
District 3	4,824	8,961
District 4	5,108	8,476
District 5	9,558	54,013
District 6	5,795	13,563
District 7	5,172	7,575
District 8	4,785	8,985
District 9	10,497	14,815
District 10	5,393	16,404

[1] P. 252, Congressional Directory, May 1943.
[2] P. 246, Congressional Directory, January 1948.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this table shows that in the fifth district more than five times as many votes were cast in 1946 as in 1942. There was no increase in population commensurate with the increased vote. Population is therefore not the answer. I believe the true answer lies in the removal of the poll-tax barrier which thereby released a part of the dammed up white as well as Negro voters, making it possible for that backlog of voters, restricted by the, shall I say, log jam of a poll tax, from going to the polls prior to the repeal of the Georgia poll-tax laws in 1945, to cast their votes.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point tables contained in the remarks of the Honorable Richard P. Gale, a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Minnesota, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 12, 1942, showing the congressional vote and percent of population voting in elections and primaries in poll-tax States in 1940, as well as in non-poll-tax States. There are two tables, Mr. President, with footnotes, in the compilation.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congressional vote and percent of population voting in elections and primaries in poll-tax States, 1940

State, congressional district, successful candidate	Population 1940 by State and congressional district	Final press figures on vote in Democratic primary	Estimated percent of 1940 population voting in primary	Total vote cast in election	Percent of 1940 population voting in election
Alabama:					
1. Boykin	297,473	[4] 11,039	8	25,993	
2. Grant	356,553	(3)	(3)	33,433	9
3. Steagall	303,837	[5] 22,036	9	22,987	8
4. Hobbs	283,622	(3)	(3)	28,298	10
5. Starnes	294,539	[6] 38,466	14	31,967	11
6. Jarman	251,757	[5] 24,687	10	18,881	8
7. Bankhead	285,138	(3)	(3)	39,064	14
8. Sparkman	300,112	(3)	(3)	29,020	10
9. Patrick	459,930	[6] 31,775	7	40,002	9
Total	2,832,961				

Footnotes at end of table.

***Congressional vote and percent of population voting in elections and primaries in poll-tax States, 1940*—Continued**

State, congressional district, successful candidate	Population 1940 by State and congressional district	Final press figures on vote in Democratic primary	Estimated percent of 1940 population voting in primary	Total vote cast in election	Percent of 1940 population voting in election
Arkansas:					
1. Gathings	423,152	[7] 37,522	10	33,127	8
2. Mills	222,974	(2)	(2)	26,105	12
3. Ellis	177,476	(2)	(2)	29,626	17
4. Cravens	242,165	(2)	(2)	28,999	12
5. Terry	293,023	[8] 28,784	13	36,067	12
6. Norrell	303,301	[9] 18,910	9	27,972	9
7. Harris	287,296	[10] 38,077	13	26,994	9
Total	1,949,387				
Georgia:					
1. Peterson	335,654	[12] 31,419	9	26,948	8
2. Cox	273,436	(2)	(2)	20,081	7
3. Pace	357,295	(2)	(2)	22,882	6
4. Camp	280,472	(2)	(2)	25,609	9
5. Ramspeck	487,552	(2)	(2)	41,724	9
6. Vinson	289,404	(2)	(2)	21,987	8
7. Tarver	308,761	(2)	(2)	37,344	12
8. Gibson	255,139	11,626	[13]	24,454	10
9. Whelchel	235,420	10,240	[14]	30,164	13
10. Brown	300,590	(2)	(2)	18,530	6
Total	3,123,723				
Mississippi:					
1. Rankin	263,367	(2)	(2)	19,330	7
2. Doxey	231,701	(2)	(2)	16,939	7
3. Whittington	435,530	(2)	(2)	13,864	3
4. Ford	201,316	[15] 15,554	8	15,329	8
5. Collins	261,466	(2)	(2)	24,079	9
6. Colmer	319,635	(2)	(2)	26,879	8
7. McGehee	470,781	(2)	(2)	29,799	6
Total	2,183,796				
South Carolina: [17]					
1. Rivers	289,482	[18] 33,956	12	16,904	6
2. Fulmer	361,933	[19] 44,990	13	15,126	4
3. Hare	304,379	[20] 60,049	21	16,085	5
4. Bryson	339,858	[21] 74,524	23	24,482	7
5. Richards	251,137	[22] 45,308	18	14,997	6
6. McMillan	353,015	[23] 52,176	15	12,197	3
Total	1,899,804				
Tennessee:					
1. Reece (R.) [24]	385,747	(2)	(2)	57,628	15
2. Jennings (R.) [24]	420,146	(2)	(2)	72,937	16
3. Kefauver	331,120	[25] 25,489	9	51,431	17
4. Gore	320,012	(2)	(2)	43,055	13
5. Priest	386,944	[26] 31,534	9	48,957	13
6. Courtney	213,939	[27] 23,610	12	24,536	11
7. Pearson	250,693	(2)	(2)	25,560	10
8. Cooper	248,992	(2)	(2)	34,762	14
9. Davis	358,250	(2)	(2)	58,261	16
Total	2,915,841				
Texas:					
1. Patman	306,803	[28] 55,205	----	27,030	9
2. Dies	331,069	[29] 56,392	----	43,597	13
3. Beckworth	292,631	[30] 56,688	----	43,139	15
4. Rayburn	259,239	[31] 42,533	----	46,333	18
5. Sumners	398,564	(2)	(2)	66,602	17
6. Johnson, L. A	262,735	(2)	(2)	33,546	13
7. Patton	259,721	(2)	(2)	30,950	10
8. Thomas	528,961	[32] 71,430	----	94,721	18
9. Mansfield	355,317	[33] 45,133	----	52,754	15
10. Johnson, L. B.	286,110	(2)	(2)	48,442	17
11. Poage	251,852	[34] 39,163	----	37,227	15
12. Lanham	286,132	[35] 37,445	----	54,108	19
13. Gossett	279,924	[36] 58,680	----	51,970	19
14. Kleberg	368,764	[37] 52,557	----	59,609	16
15. West	334,616	(2)	(2)	34,428	10
16. Thomason	230,700	(2)	(2)	34,516	15
17. Russell	230,010	[38] 55,692	----	45,456	20
18. Worley	298,736	[39] 56,978	----	52,873	22
19. Mahon	275,339	[40] 54,138	----	53,510	19
20. Kilday	338,176	[41] 45,345	----	56,447	17
21. South	258,425	(2)	(2)	53,300	21
Total	6,414,824	[42]	----		----

Footnotes at end of table.

***Congressional vote and percent of population voting in elections and primaries in poll-tax States, 1940*—Continued**

State, congressional district, successful candidate	Population 1940 by State and congressional district	Final press figures on vote in Democratic primary	Estimated percent of 1940 population voting in primary	Total vote cast in election	Percent of 1940 population voting in election
Virginia:					
1. Bland	250,621	(2)	(2)	22,513	9
2. Darden, Jr.	332,864	(2)	(2)	29,800	9
3. Satterfield	309,756	(2)	(2)	36,026	12
4. Drewry	243,165	(2)	(2)	19,832	8
5. Burch	301,157	(2)	(2)	25,641	9
6. Woodrum	301,988	(2)	(2)	44,115	15
7. Robertson	259,048	(2)	(2)	40,292	16
8. Smith	318,495	(2)	(2)	41,829	13
9. Flannagan	360,679	(2)	(2)	56,528	16
Total	2,677,773	1,128,130	----		----
Total	23,998,109		----	1,729,682	7
Average poll-tax district	307,668		----	22,175	7
Average non poll-tax district	306,674		----	128,162	42

AVERAGE PRIMARY VOTE—1940

	1940 population	Votes cast	Percent of population voting
13 computable districts	307,411	[43] 31,047	10
South Carolina	316,634	[45] 53,314	17
Texas	305,468	[47] 51,956	17

[1] 108 of 240 precincts (45 percent), the Montgomery Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala., May 9, 1940.
[2] No opponent.
[3] 178 of 248 precincts (78 percent), the Montgomery Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala., May 9, 1940.
[4] 266 of 277 precincts (96 percent), the Montgomery Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala., May 9, 1940.
[5] Complete—the Montgomery Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala., May 9, 1940.
[6] 269 of 277 precincts (97 percent), Mobile Register Mobile, Ala., May 9, 1940.
[7] 274 of 306 precincts (90 percent), Arkansas Democrat, Little Rock, Ark., Aug. 28, 1940.
[8] 178 of 277 precincts (78 percent). Arkansas Democrat, Little Rock, Ark., Aug. 14, 1940.
[9] 220 of 316 precincts (70 percent), Arkansas Democrat, Little Rock, Ark., Aug. 28, 1940.
[10] 310 of 311 precincts (99 percent), Arkansas Gazette, Little Rock, Ark., Aug. 14, 1940.
[11] Lacking 1 precinct in 1 county in district of 18 (100 percent), Savannah Morning News, Savannah, Ga., Sept. 13, 1940.
[12] 20 counties, 20 reported, 5 complete, Savannah Morning News, Savannah, Ga., Sept. 13, 1940.
[13] 19 counties, 11 reported, 2 complete, Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga., Sept. 12, 1940.
[14] Average for 4 districts.
[15] 191 of 202 precincts (95 percent), Jackson Clarion Ledger, Jackson, Miss., Aug. 29, 1940.
[16] No poll tax required in South Carolina primaries.
[17] 197 of 199 precincts (99 percent), the News and Courier, Charleston, S. C., Aug. 29, 1940.
[18] 234 of 248 precincts (94 percent), the Charleston Evening Post, Charleston, S. C., Aug. 28, 1940.
[19] 312 of 327 precincts (95 percent), the Charleston Evening Post, Charleston, S. C., Aug. 28, 1940.
[20] 258 of 262 precincts (95 percent), Spartanburg Herald, Spartanburg, S. C., Aug. 29, 1940.
[21] Complete (100 percent), Spartanburg Herald, Spartanburg, S. C., Aug. 29, 1940.
[22] 1 precinct missing (100 percent), Spartanburg Herald, Spartanburg, S. C., Aug. 29, 1940.
[23] Republican candidate nominated by convention.
[24] 198 of 234 precincts (85 percent), Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., Aug. 2, 1940.
[25] Practically complete (estimated 95 percent), Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., Aug. 2, 1940.
[26] 238 of 261 precincts (91 percent), Nashville Banner, Nashville, Tenn., Aug. 2, 1940.
[27] 11 counties, 11 reported, 8 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[28] 11 counties, 11 reported, 6 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[29] 8 counties, 8 reported, 5 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[30] 7 counties, 6 reported, 3 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[31] Harris County complete official. The Houston Chronicle, Houston, Tex., July 31, 1940.
[32] 15 counties, 14 reported, 5 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[33] 6 counties, 5 reported, 2 complete, Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex., July 29, 1940.
[34] 5 counties, 5 reported, Fort Worth Star-Telegram Fort Worth, Tex., July 29, 1940.
[35] 15 counties, 15 reported, 6 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[36] 19 counties, 18 reported, 12 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[37] 12 counties, 12 reported, 11 complete, Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex., July 31, 1940.
[38] 28 counties, 28 reported, 19 complete, Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex., July 31, 1940.
[39] 25 counties, 23 reported, 12 complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[40] Bexar County complete, San Antonio Express, San Antonio, Tex., July 30, 1940.
[41] Average for 3 districts.
[42] Based on 11 districts in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, where 84 percent of precincts reporting: Average of 26,479; hence, 100 percent estimated to equal 31,600; plus 2 districts in Alabama and Georgia reporting 100 percent and averaging 28,003; 2 districts in Georgia, 1 in Tennessee, and all in Texas excluded as noncomputable.
[43] Average for 14 computable districts.
[45] 4 districts, 96 percent of precincts reporting—average of 53,380; hence, 100 percent estimated to equal 55,600; plus 2 districts reporting 100 percent and averaging 48,742.
[46] No primary, candidate nominated by convention.
[47] Incomplete.

EXHIBIT 14.—*Congressional vote and percent of population voting in 1940 election, by non-poll-tax States*

State and successful candidate	District	1940 population	Votes cast for successful candidate	Percent of 1940 population	Total votes cast	Percent of 1940 population
Arizona:						
Murdock	[1]	499,261	99,424	20	139,784	28
California:						
Lea	1	308,986	103,547	33	111,306	36
Englebright	2	218,002	71,033	33	71,040	33
Buck	3	409,404	135,461	33	148,889	36
Rolph	4	313,190	75,369	24	138,034	44
Welch	5	321,346	119,122	37	124,265	39
Carter	6	356,509	131,584	37	137,032	38
Tolan	7	256,952	72,838	28	131,353	51
Anderson	8	416,212	148,180	35	153,536	37
Gearhart	9	358,101	99,708	28	99,764	28
Elliott	10	415,762	125,845	30	130,065	31
Hinshaw	11	384,969	170,504	44	177,306	46
Voorhis	12	348,129	99,494	29	155,421	44
Kramer	13	400,911	127,167	32	168,120	42
Ford, T. F	14	302,511	73,137	24	113,882	38
Costello	15	334,229	94,435	28	168,155	50
Ford, L. M	16	443,470	188,649	42	195,434	44
Geyer	17	279,113	75,109	27	114,763	41
Johnson	18	292,311	73,932	25	136,106	46
Sheppard	19	397,392	84,931	21	160,571	40
Izac	20	349,088	69,874	20	136,812	39
Colorado:						
Lewis	1	322,412	110,078	34	170,354	53
Hill	2	319,067	76,850	24	144,340	45
Chenoweth	3	308,970	70,842	23	136,111	44
Taylor	4	172,847	44,095	25	74,221	43
Connecticut:						
Kopplemann	1	450,189	109,880	24	202,870	45
Fitzgerald	2	269,312	63,021	23	120,220	45
Shanley	3	323,756	84,439	26	157,517	48
Downs	4	418,384	91,192	22	185,699	44
Smith	5	247,601	62,783	25	114,340	46
Maciora	[1]		407,868		782,593	
Delaware:						
Traynor	[1]	266,505	68,205	26	134,778	51
Florida:						
Peterson	1	476,820	88,158	18	88,164	18
Green	2	388,053	68,797	18	77,179	20
Sikes	3	306,264	36,562	12	36,570	12
Cannon	4	436,825	84,594	19	112,410	26
Hendricks	5	289,452	49,715	17	65,929	23
Idaho:						
White	1	224,516	62,107	28	100,106	44
Dworshak	2	300,357	69,804	23	131,530	44
Illinois:						
Mitchell	1	140,527	34,641	25	65,781	47
McKeough	2	612,641	155,688	25	302,625	49
Kelly	3	575,799	148,382	26	290,151	50
Beam	4	223,304	74,977	34	96,836	43
Sabath	5	112,116	35,637	32	50,177	45
Maciejewski	6	641,719	187,393	29	333,646	52
Schuetz	7	914,053	229,161	25	449,954	49
Kocialkowski	8	123,743	40,074	32	51,306	41
Dewey	9	215,175	56,806	26	106,622	50
Paddock	10	625,359	199,418	32	325,246	52
Reed	11	385,207	128,645	33	199,226	52
Mason	12	298,072	90,744	30	149,692	50

[1] At large.

EXHIBIT 14.—*Congressional vote and percent of population voting in 1940 election, by non-poll-tax States*—Continued

State and successful candidate	District	1940 population	Votes cast for successful candidate	Percent of 1940 population	Total votes cast	Percent of 1940 population
Illinois—Con.						
Allen	13	186,433	65,698	35	97,201	52
Johnson	14	214,500	60,909	28	116,360	54
Chiperfield	15	217,334	65,639	30	116,459	53
Dirksen	16	276,685	79,780	28	137,347	49
Arends	17	176,337	56,712	32	92,814	53
Sumner	18	235,134	64,409	27	121,153	51
Wheat	19	284,001	75,933	27	150,024	53
Barnes	20	162,528	44,824	27	86,631	53
Howell	21	237,279	67,896	29	131,636	56
Schaefer	22	359,343	98,162	27	182,543	51
Arnold	23	243,130	64,072	26	125,593	52
Heidinger	24	174,396	49,731	29	92,781	53
Bishop	25	262,426	69,165	26	137,056	52
Day	(1)	------	2,050,493	----	------	----
Stratton	(1)	------	2,020,006	----	------	----
Indiana:						
Schulte	1	293,195	71,606	24	117,753	40
Halleck	2	279,887	87,652	31	150,942	54
Grant	3	298,117	73,914	25	144,122	48
Gillie	4	288,062	80,259	28	138,416	48
Harness	5	267,953	78,691	29	143,891	54
Johnson	6	281,124	80,595	29	154,094	55
Landis	7	285,772	81,632	29	156,378	55
Boehne	8	305,344	87,141	29	156,902	51
Wilson	9	272,343	71,624	26	140,851	52
Springer	10	289,196	80,725	28	152,203	53
Larrabee	11	286,711	79,070	28	152,944	53
Ludlow	12	280,092	80,954	29	153,128	55
Iowa:						
Martin	1	253,513	70,120	28	116,160	46
Jacobsen	2	321,511	75,774	24	145,072	45
Gwynne	3	269,042	65,425	24	109,134	40
Talle	4	250,752	66,691	27	118,249	47
LeCompte	5	268,900	66,940	25	125,658	47
Cunningham	6	313,157	70,707	23	135,235	43
Jensen	7	261,793	71,633	27	122,277	46
Gilchrist	8	284,021	64,687	23	111,284	39
Harrington	9	315,579	67,017	21	131,894	42
Kansas:						
Lambertson	1	264,680	64,766	24	106,141	40
Guyer	2	308,392	73,659	24	136,446	44
Winter	3	249,574	60,381	24	109,352	44
Rees	4	209,271	58,183	28	92,150	44
Houston	5	247,351	58,486	24	111,387	45
Carlson	6	251,805	69,627	28	114,329	45
Hope	7	269,955	75,349	28	117,867	44
Kentucky:						
Gregory	1	251,346	60,777	24	60,777	24
Vinpent	2	354,347	69,905	17	69,905	19
O'Neal	3	385,392	96,253	25	160,306	41
Creal	4	280,609	55,561	20	95,008	34
Spence	5	225,426	51,954	23	84,935	38
Chapman	6	340,438	74,463	22	123,163	36
May	7	286,766	44,185	15	77,759	27
Bates	8	307,613	61,881	20	106,617	35
Robsion	9	413,690	69,415	17	112,428	27
Louisiana:						
Hébert	1	280,600	58,234	21	58,234	21
Boggs	2	327,645	56,026	17	56,026	17
Domengeaux	3	269,762	27,081	10	41,014	15
Brooks	4	318,513	33,704	11	33,713	11
Mills	5	325,374	33,462	10	33,462	10
Sanders	6	333,295	41,173	12	41,173	12
Plauché	7	268,525	28,518	11	28,518	11
Allen	8	240,166	28,904	12	28,904	12
Maine:						
Oliver	1	290,335	55,503	19	87,521	30
Smith	2	276,695	57,152	21	88,486	32
Fellows	3	280,196	46,732	17	70,666	25
Maryland:						
Ward	1	195,427	36,057	19	66,871	34
Cole	2	534,568	113,495	21	173,718	32
D'Alesandro	3	206,526	38,540	19	62,663	30
Meyer	4	276,856	50,120	18	88,564	32
Sasscer	5	288,851	58,418	20	82,276	28
Byron	6	319,016	60,037	19	112,296	35
Massachusetts:						
Treadway	1	272,454	72,750	27	137,387	50
Clason	2	291,886	76,373	26	120,801	41
Casey	3	294,400	72,839	25	133,519	45
Holmes	4	291,547	70,542	24	132,660	45
Rogers	5	337,619	120,435	35	158,028	47
Bates	6	256,953	88,834	34	124,048	48
Connery	7	309,642	89,966	29	144,861	47
Healey	8	291,937	71,127	24	128,345	44
Eliot	9	313,337	81,523	26	156,446	50
Tinkham	10	286,265	78,029	27	132,124	46
Flaherty	11	212,644	68,041	32	81,220	38
McCormack	12	265,505	97,588	33	124,890	42
Wigglesworth	13	287,356	92,651	32	142,448	49
Martin	14	284,784	65,780	23	121,021	42
Gifford	15	290,392	73,358	25	120,940	41
Michigan:						
Tenerowicz	1	352,977	87,451	25	169,516	31
Michener	2	285,648	72,235	25	116,027	40
Shafer	3	283,352	74,614	26	120,137	42
Hoffman	4	242,339	65,666	27	106,191	44
Jonkman	5	305,598	65,240	21	121,412	39

[1] At large.

EXHIBIT 14.—*Congressional vote and percent of population voting in 1940 election, by non-poll-tax States*—Continued

State and successful candidate	District	1940 population	Votes cast for successful candidate	Percent of 1940 population	Total votes cast	Percent of 1940 population
Michigan—Con.						
Blackney	6	379,423	77,340	20	151,409	40
Wolcott	7	314,368	73,926	23	113,408	36
Crawford	8	294,842	68,265	23	111,634	38
Engel	9	236,861	52,343	22	92,674	39
Woodruff	10	218,768	52,685	24	85,163	39
Bradley	11	224,551	48,687	21	94,045	42
Hook	12	200,265	47,429	24	92,491	46
O'Brien	13	357,775	68,985	19	122,744	34
Rabaut	14	386,437	80,463	21	136,373	35
Dingell	15	382,399	85,239	22	137,722	36
Lesinski	16	371,096	73,956	20	125,756	34
Dondero	17	419,007	82,809	20	151,310	36
Minnesota:						
Andresen	1	318,154	88,814	28	136,993	43
O'Hara	2	305,559	66,610	22	135,817	44
Gale	3	321,987	63,854	20	146,885	46
Maas	4	309,935	68,526	22	116,473	37
Youngdahl	5	321,859	79,491	25	152,500	47
Knutson	6	334,781	84,023	25	136,527	41
Anderson	7	305,139	65,958	22	130,110	43
Pittenger	8	291,041	74,521	26	137,618	47
Buckler	9	283,845	48,999	17	112,830	40
Missouri:						
Romjue	1	232,484	62,461	27	123,584	53
Nelson	2	282,904	77,952	27	144,720	51
Duncan	3	291,744	77,424	26	145,181	50
Bell	4	243,543	72,331	30	120,524	49
Shannon	5	234,285	63,202	27	116,611	50
Bennett	6	288,849	78,746	27	146,648	51
Short	7	313,435	86,547	28	145,891	47
Williams	8	276,634	64,263	23	125,833	45
Cannon	9	214,757	60,204	28	108,108	50
Zimmerman	10	315,691	69,859	22	121,614	39
Sullivan	11	327,287	85,722	26	153,832	47
Ploeser	12	503,738	127,005	25	235,687	47
Cochran	13	259,253	82,417	32	127,699	49
Montana:						
Rankin	1	235,859	56,616	24	103,968	44
O'Connor	2	323,597	83,101	26	134,007	41
Nebraska:						
Copeland	1	260,459	64,431	25	115,955	45
McLaughlin	2	269,975	68,760	25	121,429	45
Stefan	3	268,118	60,561	34	113,275	42
Curtis	4	256,206	66,966	26	116,084	45
Coffee	5	261,076	63,025	24	108,573	42
Nevada:						
Scrugham	(1)	110,247	32,714	30	50,746	46
New Hampshire:						
Jenks	1	244,491	57,982	24	113,416	46
Stearns	2	247,033	55,530	22	104,790	42
New Jersey:						
Wolverton	1	370,220	97,547	26	175,912	47
Wene	2	226,169	60,392	27	115,809	51
Sutphin	3	286,838	76,048	26	146,967	51
Powers	4	294,331	69,834	24	124,870	42
Eaton	5	329,305	82,840	25	148,082	45
McLean	6	328,344	78,361	24	142,033	43
Thomas	7	283,041	82,287	29	127,296	45
Canfield	8	305,875	72,197	23	123,180	40
Osmers	9	292,576	91,352	31	145,670	50
Hartley	10	292,947	64,699	22	113,821	39
Vreeland	11	290,822	61,606	21	110,333	38
Kean	12	309,482	67,996	22	126,665	41
Norton	13	271,807	92,356	34	131,654	48
Hart	14	278,408	84,538	30	129,494	46
New Mexico:						
Anderson	(1)	531,818	106,972	20	182,057	34
New York:						
Hall, L. W	1	848,971	276,873	33	429,526	51
Barry	2	817,553	216,309	26	409,710	50
Pfeiffer, J. L	3	177,667	42,884	24	60,723	34
Cullen	4	205,310	36,595	18	65,838	32
Heffernan	5	260,159	63,295	24	114,723	44
Somers	6	511,317	130,391	25	226,130	44
Delaney	7	183,723	50,189	27	68,954	37
O'Toole	8	941,210	217,599	24	383,035	42
Keogh	9	473,557	92,559	20	160,400	34
Celler	10	210,555	57,286	27	80,208	38
O'Leary	11	227,020	46,616	20	94,440	42
Dickstein	12	70,307	17,176	24	33,816	48
Capozzoli	13	92,148	18,334	19	29,235	31
Edelstein	14	113,820	26,455	23	46,498	41
Kennedy, Michael J	15	112,491	26,314	23	44,095	39
Pheiffer, W. F	16	148,476	31,020	21	63,731	43
Simpson	17	257,564	53,316	22	104,280	40
Kennedy, Martin J	18	141,597	31,151	22	59,075	42
Bloom	19	294,046	71,018	24	113,048	38
Marcantonio	20	129,881	25,254	19	40,414	31
Gavagan	21	424,410	108,139	25	170,992	40
Lynch	22	207,255	44,296	21	73,759	36
Buckley	23	762,698	190,396	24	357,264	44
Fitzpatrick	24	742,687	161,577	21	338,995	46
Gamble	25	402,095	125,412	31	196,043	49
Fish	26	277,210	68,715	25	132,525	48
Rockefeller	27	215,120	65,618	30	113,228	52

[1] At large.

EXHIBIT 14.—*Congressional vote and percent of population voting in 1940 election, by non-poll-tax States*—Continued

State and successful candidate	District	1940 population	Votes cast for successful candidate	Percent of 1940 population	Total votes cast	Percent of 1940 population
New York—Con.						
Byrne	28	257,392	89,592	35	155,070	60
Cluett	29	234,124	82,328	35	120,224	55
Crowther	30	234,421	66,159	28	120,683	52
Kilburn	31	223,568	58,727	26	94,034	42
Culkin	32	217,691	71,782	33	104,370	48
Douglas	33	263,163	72,412	27	128,286	49
Hall, E. C	34	289,274	93,990	32	137,580	48
Hancock	35	328,776	97,688	30	171,926	52
Taber	36	215,675	64,507	30	108,250	50
Cole	37	241,036	76,630	32	118,060	49
O'Brien	38	339,667	92,866	27	179,063	53
Wadsworth	39	240,708	73,316	30	121,449	50
Andrews	40	433,091	119,972	27	196,440	45
Beiter	41	265,578	62,843	24	120,178	45
Schwert	42	259,818	64,250	25	109,343	41
Reed	43	235,913	67,520	29	108,500	45
Merritt	(1)	------	------	----	------	----
O'Day	(1)	------	------	----	------	----
North Carolina:						
Bonner	1	239,040	26,722	15	39,573	16
Kerr	2	293,297	41,217	14	41,217	14
Barden	3	251,370	33,760	13	45,008	18
Cooley	4	358,573	57,616	16	72,536	20
Folger	5	323,217	53,778	17	69,650	21
Durham	6	314,659	55,549	18	70,808	22
Clark	7	318,298	41,663	13	48,831	15
Burgin	8	340,457	57,879	17	86,111	25
Doughton	9	310,225	60,875	20	89,162	29
Bulwinkle	10	481,132	87,156	18	124,892	25
Weaver	11	341,355	75,763	22	109,867	----
North Dakota:						
Burdick	(1)	641,935	------	----	430,285	----
Robertson	(1)	------	111,125	----	------	----
Ohio:						
Bender	1	308,578	84,622	27	146,004	47
Young	2	313,409	77,769	25	138,179	44
Elston	3	439,058	103,291	23	196,203	45
Hess	4	245,130	65,534	27	113,299	46
Holbrock	5	163,561	48,040	29	79,113	48
Jones	6	207,229	52,769	25	101,026	49
Clevenger	7	302,068	83,415	28	143,082	47
Davis	8	183,187	49,218	27	93,823	51
Brown	9	368,693	86,956	23	158,883	43
Smith	10	180,482	48,217	27	81,915	45
Claypool	11	181,117	43,548	24	80,946	45
Vorys	12	388,712	91,767	23	178,882	46
Baumhart	13	219,310	62,442	28	102,716	47
Harter	14	531,489	121,037	23	231,580	44
Secrest	15	199,609	57,359	29	97,592	49
Thom	16	372,099	92,469	25	164,098	44
McGregor	17	254,315	69,102	27	125,445	49
Imhoff	18	321,626	79,718	25	146,384	45
Kirwan	19	441,240	122,075	28	197,091	45
Sweeney	20	282,616	72,395	25	107,000	38
Crosser	21	305,434	79,602	26	93,260	30
Bolton	22	698,650	165,322	24	291,595	42
Bender	(1)	------	------	----	------	----
Young	(1)	------	------	----	------	----
Oklahoma:						
Disney	1	416,863	93,366	22	150,141	36
Nichols	2	239,001	50,351	21	80,981	34
Cartwright	3	320,322	68,344	21	86,489	27
Boren	4	324,741	69,040	21	97,086	30
Monroney	5	397,385	93,457	23	129,148	32
Johnson	6	242,241	52,338	22	74,681	31
Massingale	7	189,547	39,884	21	56,970	30
Rizley	8	206,434	48,737	24	90,545	44
Rogers	(1)	------	------	----	------	----
Oregon:						
Mott	1	523,594	145,675	28	213,143	41
Pierce	2	210,991	44,832	21	79,765	38
Angell	3	355,099	84,275	24	169,054	48
Pennsylvania:						
Sacks	1	252,131	64,599	26	104,791	42
McGranery	2	239,193	62,844	26	103,138	43
Bradley	3	272,577	77,436	28	122,636	45
Sheridan	4	273,964	74,458	27	118,117	43
Smith	5	296,060	76,724	26	137,499	46
Myers	6	293,854	82,550	28	135,092	46
Scott	7	304,555	29,416	26	155,886	51
Wollenden	8	310,756	29,601	25	138,219	54
Gerlach	9	285,248	55,919	20	106,730	37
Kinzer	10	348,130	72,843	21	126,274	36
Boland	11	301,243	65,368	22	124,199	41
Flannery	12	441,518	101,854	23	176,159	40
Fenton	13	355,218	68,501	19	139,993	39
Moser	14	241,884	48,140	20	85,941	35
Rutherford	15	212,979	54,981	26	91,085	43
Rich	16	244,920	61,167	25	101,159	41
Ditter	17	289,247	75,006	26	120,630	42
Simpson	18	215,352	46,595	22	80,925	38
Kunkel	19	324,857	74,420	23	136,726	42
Jarrett	20	286,430	64,188	22	110,200	38
Walter	21	260,496	52,530	20	93,520	36
Haines	22	286,835	60,848	21	110,985	39
Van Zandt	23	285,660	57,027	20	101,296	35
Snyder	24	285,156	54,631	19	96,474	34

[1] At large.

EXHIBIT 14.—*Congressional vote and percent of population voting in 1940 election, by non-poll-tax States*—Continued

State and successful candidate	District	1940 population	Votes cast for successful candidate	Percent of 1940 population	Total votes cast	Percent of 1940 population
Pennsylvania—Continued						
Faddis	25	255, 523	58, 442	23	95, 801	37
Graham	26	341, 221	64, 669	19	126, 942	37
Tibbott	27	428, 490	75, 243	17	145, 751	34
Kelley	28	303, 411	58, 772	19	105, 998	35
Rodgers	29	252, 533	50, 147	20	92, 441	36
Scanlon	30	276, 948	62, 450	22	124, 549	45
Weiss	31	318, 564	76, 819	24	137, 854	43
Eberharter	32	206, 796	62, 121	30	90, 533	44
McArdle	33	287, 077	70, 824	25	128, 723	45
Wright	34	322, 134	75, 004	23	139, 341	43
Rhode Island:						
Forand	1	338, 883	87, 327	26	151, 844	45
Fogarty	2	374, 463	87, 253	23	162, 179	43
South Dakota:						
Mundt	1	485, 829	135, 406	28	227, 373	47
Case	2	157, 132	47, 051	30	71, 178	45
Utah:						
Granger	1	256, 388	62, 654	24	109, 675	43
Robinson	2	293, 922	86, 874	29	137, 200	46
Vermont:						
Plumley	(1)	359, 231	89, 637	25	140, 477	39
Washington:						
Magnuson	1	412, 680	113, 988	28	185, 098	45
Jackson	2	269, 757	66, 314	25	115, 523	43
Smith	3	258, 301	60, 529	23	109, 459	42
Hill	4	244, 908	50, 493	21	98, 496	40
Leavy	5	274, 754	67, 582	24	121, 840	44
Coffee	6	275, 782	71, 536	26	113, 870	41
West Virginia:						
Ramsay	1	281, 333	72, 717	26	136, 632	49
Randolph	2	297, 167	77, 045	26	133, 956	45
Edmiston	3	316, 917	79, 441	25	141, 251	45
Johnson	4	323, 202	82, 979	26	157, 470	49
Kee	5	305, 725	81, 903	27	130, 126	42
Smith	6	378, 630	105, 927	28	171, 689	45
Wisconsin:						
Bolles	1	293, 974	69, 276	23	124, 122	42
Sauthoff	2	319, 069	60, 481	19	136, 842	43
Stevenson	3	290, 719	54, 457	19	118, 399	40
Wasielewski	4	375, 418	57, 381	15	161, 125	43
Thill	5	391, 467	73, 728	19	166, 159	42
Keefe	6	284, 114	66, 821	23	116, 371	41
Murray	7	295, 305	58, 696	20	113, 749	39
Johns		329, 815	49, 005	15	111, 000	33
Hull	9	294, 618	61, 009	21	115, 600	39
Gehrmann	10	263, 088	50, 776	19	106, 026	40
Wyoming:						
McIntyre	(1)	250, 742	57, 030	23	106, 888	43

[1] At large.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, I intend to conclude my remarks for this evening with this summary statement. I sought in this part of my speech to show, first, that I think when we come to interpret any section of the Constitution, including article I, section 2, we must remember that we have to consider the Constitution in its entirety, and we have to look to make certain whether there are other restrictions within the Constitution that bear upon article I, section 2.

In the course of my remarks tomorrow I shall take the position and argue the point that article I, section 2, must be read in light of other restrictions which will be found in the Constitution, particularly in connection with amendments 14 and 15.

Second, I sought to point out in my remarks tonight that we must decide, when we are considering a constitutional question, whether or not we are going to make a liberal, dynamic approach to the Constitution, whether we are going to look upon it as an instrument subject to adjustment of the changing trends of social conditions, or whether we are going to look upon it simply in its literal sense as the product of a dead historic hand.

Next, Mr. President, I sought in my remarks to point out that at the time the Constitution was written the trend, the objective, the point of view of the Constitution fathers was to work in the direction of a national universal suffrage, and instead of imposing further restrictions on the right of suffrage, the result of the Constitutional Convention was to remove theretofore existing restrictions, and it was not until some years later that there was reimposed upon the right of suffrage in this country the poll tax as a limitation upon suffrage itself. Furthermore, that the tax and the property restrictions on suffrage which existed at the time the Constitutional Convention was in session were in the process of being lifted by the States that were parties to the Constitutional Convention.

Lastly, Mr. President, I have sought to point out in these remarks that we cannot escape the fact that the poll tax is an effective economic barrier to a free franchise, and it does, in fact, have the effect of disfranchising people who, under the Constitution, should be recognized as free citizens. It does have the effect of having Members of Congress elected to this body by an exceeding small percentage of the adults of their States in contrast with the much higher percentage of voters who go to the polls in poll-tax-free States.

Tomorrow, in the course of my remarks, Mr. President, I shall proceed to discuss some of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court previously cited and discussed by my good friends on the opposition side of this issue, but I shall endeavor to point out that I think that in many respects the decisions are not subject to the application my good friends have given to them.

With that statement I conclude for the evening.

RECESS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, may I ask to what hour the unanimous-consent agreement provided that we should recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in my motion I was about to state the hour to which the recess would be taken.

We have now, as I understand, concluded the business of today's session, so I now move that the Senate, under the order previously entered, take a recess until tomorrow at 1 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 4, 1948, at 1 o'clock p. m.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4, 1948

(Legislative day of Wednesday, July 28, 1948)

The Senate met at 1 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou gracious Benefactor, who art ever making us the beneficiaries of Thy bountiful providence, we rejoice in the glad assurance that Thou wilt not withhold from us anything that is needful if we walk uprightly and that where Thou dost guide Thou wilt provide.

We pray that this assurance of Thy goodness may kindle within our hearts a more vivid sense of social responsibility. Help us to understand that the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" must be answered conclusively in the affirmative.

Fill us with a longing to minister unto all who are finding the struggle of life so difficult. May we seek to bring about a more ethical and equitable distribution of the blessings of life.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 3, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 737)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control of the District of Columbia for the period January 1 to June 30, 1948, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the East Twenty-fifth Assembly District of the Independent Progressive Party of California, San Francisco, Calif., signed by J. Canterbury, chairman, praying for the enactment of legislation providing price controls, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by religious, labor, and civic leaders at Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the prompt enactment of civil-rights legislation; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by religious, labor, and civic leaders at Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the arrest of Communist Party leaders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADEQUATE HOUSING FOR WORLD WAR II VETERANS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Catholic War Veterans, Inc., an outstanding group of patriotic citizens, and endorsed by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, in annual convention at Hagerstown, Md., May 7 to 9, 1948. The resolution emphasizes the need of adequate living facilities for veterans of World War II.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS, INC., ENACTMENT OF FEDERAL HOUSING AID BILL

Whereas the most crying need of World War II veterans of today is that of adequate living facilities; and

Whereas a conservative estimate yields a figure of only 710,000 new dwelling units slated for completion this year, but with over 2,000,000 American families in need of adequate housing it is evident that, at present construction rate, several years will be required for construction to come abreast of present needs unless direct Government actions are taken; and

Whereas the major part of the 700,000 dwelling units now under construction are designed for sale at prices not within the reach of the vast majority of veterans today; and

Whereas the National Department of Catholic War Veterans, Inc., has gone on record endorsing passing of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill and has petitioned the aid of the various State departments in obtaining passage of that legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Maryland implement the program of the national department by going on record as favoring direct Government aid on the Federal, State, and municipal levels in the solution of this pressing crisis, Federal action taking the form of congressional enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill or some similar piece of legislation, with State and municipal action consisting of the appointment needs of veterans in Maryland and Baltimore with the view in mind of rendering complete data to the Federal Government so as to facilitate the carrying out of the provisions of whatever Federal legislation may be enacted; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Senators, and Representatives from Maryland's six districts, the Governor of Maryland, and the mayor of Baltimore City.

THOMAS M. BAILEY,
Department Commander.
GEORGE W. BLUM,
Department Adjutant.

The above resolution endorsed by the Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, department convention assembled in Hagerstown, Md., May 7-9, 1948.

JAMES F. AUBREY, Sr.,
Department Commander, Department of Maryland, Disabled American Veterans, Takoma Park, Md.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Acting Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 2927, to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate to state what the parliamentary situation is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In response to the inquiry, the Chair will state that the pending question is on the appeal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] from the decision of the Chair holding that the cloture motion on the motion to take up House bill 29 was not in order. Under the order of the Senate of yesterday, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for an announcement?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPORT AND CONSIDERATION OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, subsequent to the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, any committee now considering proposed legislation recommended in the recent message of the President to the Congress be authorized to report a bill thereon; that any such bill may be deemed to have been read twice and to have gone over one legislative day, and that a motion on tomorrow to proceed to its consideration may be in order.

I ask further unanimous consent that, subsequent to the conclusion of the day's business, the Secretary be authorized to receive a message from the House, that any bill received therefrom shall be deemed to have been read twice, and that likewise a motion on tomorrow to proceed to its consideration shall be in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska state the request again?

Mr. WHERRY. All we are asking is unanimous consent that any bill reported subsequent to the recess or adjournment following today's session shall be considered as having been reported for the calendar so that we may proceed to take it up tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO NIGHT SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield further, I wish to announce to the Members of the Senate that there will not be a night session tonight. Already there has been released by the chairman of the Policy Committee the reasons for not having a night session, and also, I think, a statement as to what can be expected so far as our program for tomorrow is concerned. Before a motion to recess or adjourn is made today I shall have an additional statement to make to the Members of the Senate, but at this time I think all that is necessary is to say that when the Senate concludes its work today there will be a recess or adjournment, and it is not contemplated that there will be a night session.

THE POLL TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. WHERRY to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 29) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the appeal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] from the decision of the Chair holding that the cloture motion on the motion to take up House bill 29 was not in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on completing my remarks yesterday——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion?

Mr. MORSE. I was just about to announce that I shall find it necessary to decline to yield for any purpose until I complete my remarks—and I say this with regret to my good friend the Senator from Connecticut, as I am sure he understands. As I said last night during the course of my formal remarks on the pending subject, I shall not yield for any purpose, for two reasons: First, because I think it of importance that the Republican side of the aisle make its statement in the RECORD with continuity as to its position on the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax legislation. Second, as I said last night, we have no desire on this side of the aisle, and certainly the present speaker has no desire, to aid or abet in any way prolonged debate by way of what is commonly known as a filibuster. Nevertheless, for the RECORD and for future reference I think it important at this time that a statement, of unbroken continuity, be placed in the RECORD, setting forth the position of the proponents of the anti-poll-tax bill as to its constitutionality and as to its merits from the standpoint of being sound civil-rights legislation.

Further by way of recapitulation, Mr. President, I think it is important that once again I call the attention of the American people to what I think is the realistic parliamentary fact which confronts us in this special session of Con-

gress. As I said in my remarks last night, and I repeat it today, I think it has been clearly demonstrated in this special session of Congress that there is no chance of passing any anti-poll-tax legislation, and the reason why there is no chance of doing that is the obvious fact that we are confronted with a concerted movement on the part of a group of Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle to use, to the maximum extent the rules permit, their parliamentary privileges in the Senate.

The American people should thoroughly understand that when a group of Senators—5, 6, 10, 11, or 12—make up their minds to prevent the passage of legislation, the archaic rules of the Senate give them the power to succeed in their attempt. So, in my judgment, there is no chance of passing any civil-rights legislation at this special session of Congress, be it anti-poll-tax legislation, FEPC legislation, antilynch legislation, or any other section of the President's civil-rights program, so long as there is the clear, obvious, and announced determination on the part of leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle, representing those who have the power in their hands, to prevent the passage of any civil-rights legislation by the exercise of their full parliamentary rights. So long as the Democrats take that position, we cannot break a filibuster in this special session of Congress. We cannot break it because time does not permit. We cannot break it because physically it is impossible to break it due to the fact that a small group of Senators, resting between their separate speeches, can wear down the majority, because the majority has to be on hand for quorum calls and for sudden votes which may be requested.

Therefore, Mr. President, as I said about 2 years ago in an article which I published in Collier's magazine entitled "D-day on Capitol Hill," I think there is no chance at all of eliminating what I consider to be the filibuster evil under the rules of the United States Senate, unless at the beginning of a regular session of Congress—and I proposed it in the article—the majority party in the Senate makes up its mind to amend rule XXII of the Senate rules.

As I pointed out in that article, the American people should understand that under rule XXII, which refers to the filing of a cloture petition on a measure, the petition is not applicable to motions, such as the motion to take up the anti-poll-tax legislation which was pending before the Senate prior to the appeal that was taken from the ruling of the Chair on cloture.

The Presiding Officer of this body, in what I am sure will be recognized in the years ahead as a historic ruling in the Senate the other day—and a statesmanlike ruling it was, too—pointed out to the Senate that the fundamental issue before us is the problem of amending rule XXII.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of my remarks at this point the article I published some 2 years ago in Collier's magazine, discussing that very problem, and pointing out then that what we should do in the Senate of the United States is to proceed to amend the rule at the beginning of a regular session. I said we should do so the first day of a regular session, and subsequent to the writing of the article, I submitted in this body an antifilibuster resolution by which I sought to accomplish the purpose which I think we must accomplish, namely, amend rule XXII, so that a cloture petition can be filed on any question pending before the Senate, such as a motion to take up a bill, or a motion to approve the Journal, or any other type of motion.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

D-DAY ON CAPITOL HILL

(By WAYNE L. MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon)

On the floor of the Senate a small band of willful men had been holding up Senate action on a bill to promote equal employment opportunity for all Americans, regardless of race, religion, or color. A clear-cut majority of the Senate favored the principles of the bill. President Truman, on behalf of the Democrats, had asked for the legislation. The Republican Party platform of 1944 had pledged itself to the principles of the measure. Nevertheless, a group of southern Democrats had banded together to talk the bill to death. Hearing it, a young veteran burst out to me:

"But, Senator, it's dictatorship."

The air in the Senate was fervid with oratory. Senator WALLACE WHITE, of Maine, the Republican leader, defended the filibuster, although not a party to it, by stating that: "There may be times and circumstances in which minorities can in one way alone successfully resist the power of a temporary majority."

My veteran friend was bewildered. "If the Senate's rules allow a minority to control it," he asked, "where's democracy in Congress?" And if we don't have democracy in Congress, how can we preserve democracy in the United States?

Millions of people are asking these same questions. Not only because they have witnessed the disgraceful spectacle of filibustering in the Senate, but also because in the House of Representatives they have seen the principle of majority rule stifled by the small but powerful Rules Committee.

It is common knowledge that 7 members of this 12-man committee wield what amounts to dictatorial power over the entire House. These men have time and time again prevented important measures from being properly considered in debate by the House as a whole, or even from reaching the House floor.

The theory behind the Rules Committee is that it should act as a traffic director on the legislative highway. In actual fact, the committee has become an obstruction to orderly traffic. Like feudal barons who levied a toll upon those who used their roads, the committee often allows bills to come before the House only on the condition that certain amendments be written into them. It frequently usurps the functions of the regular legislative committees by conducting hearings on bills that already have been carefully studied by the proper legislative committee and not confining itself, as it should, to questions of procedure.

UNFAIR CONTROL OF LEGISLATION

There have been notable occasions when the Rules Committee, in effect, has originated legislation, although it was never contemplated that it should exercise this privilege. Recently, it will be recalled, the House Labor Committee approved the kind of bill it thought would contribute to labor peace. But a majority of the Rules Committee favored the Case bill, which the legislative committee had rejected. So it ruled that the Case bill be considered by the House rather than the Labor Committee's bill.

The job of the Rules Committee is to report to the House, in conjunction with a bill, a resolution setting the terms of debate upon the measure. Often the committee blocks the legislative road completely by failing to give a bill the right of way to the House floor under any rule of debate. Sometimes the committee works its will upon the entire House membership by imposing "gag rules" that restrict the time allowed for debate and the circumstances under which amendments may be offered.

There is no hope for government by the majority in Congress until the rules are thoroughly overhauled to free the House and the Senate from the legislative tyranny of a willful minority in either branch. These two infections of the body politic—the powers of the Rules Committee and the filibuster—are sources of intolerance and reaction. The Rules Committee must be assigned its original role of traffic director for House bills, and the Senate must adopt rules empowering a majority to end a filibuster.

It must be made clear to the voters that their substantive rights in the passage of all sound legislation needed in the interests of the general welfare cannot be separated from their procedural rights in attaining passage of such legislation. The people must be made to realize that the archaic rules of Congress permit self-seeking minority blocs to defeat legislation the people want without letting it come to a vote.

Most writers dip their pens in despair when they attempt to make suggestions for remedying these two evils. They point out that any resolution to reform the House Rules Committee would be referred to that committee itself—which group could be expected to protect its dictatorship by quietly filing the proposal.

They call attention to the fact that the Rules of the Senate have been carefully devised to protect the filibuster. A third plus one of the Senators can now prevent cloture—put a limit on the length of time a Senator may talk—thereby allowing a filibuster to continue until the legislation against which it is directed has been withdrawn or emasculated. Thus, most critics say it is almost hopeless to propose a resolution to eliminate the filibuster because the proposal itself would be subject to the filibuster technique.

The Senate has a Rules Committee, too. Although it does not have the sweeping powers possessed by the House Rules Committee, it does have jurisdiction over any proposal to change the rules and procedures of the Senate. Judging from the past, this committee could be counted upon to bury alive any proposal referred to it which seeks to reform the procedures of the Senate in the interest of majority rule.

EXAMPLE IN SELF-DEFENSE

A good example of the way the Rules Committees of both Houses protect what they believe to be their vested interests is the action which they took in passing upon the resolution setting up the La Follette-Monroney committee to make recommendations for the reorganization of Congress.

Since early 1945 this committee has been making an exhaustive study of various proposals for the reorganization of Congress, and it recently submitted a splendid report on the subject.

However, although the report presents sound proposals for reorganizing most other congressional committees, it makes no recommendations whatsoever in regard to the House Rules Committee, and says nothing about the colossal waste of congressional time occasioned by the filibuster. The omissions are startling, but no fault of the La Follette-Monroney committee.

The resolution that set it up was rewritten by Senate and House Rules Committees specifically to prohibit the special committee from making "any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, and/or precedents of either House."

But the problem is not as hopeless as the experts seem to think it is, provided enough Members of the Congress have the will to make the fight. The situation calls for a two-front attack in both Houses of Congress. The time to attack is on the first day of the new Congress next January.

On the first day of a new Congress the House adopts the rules that will guide it for the next 2 years. Usually the rules of the last Congress are accepted without change, by a routine motion. But that need not be the case. During that brief period on the opening day between the time that the Speaker of the House opens the session of the new Congress and the time when the House passes a motion adopting the rules of its previous session with whatever changes it may wish to authorize, the Rules Committee is temporarily stripped of power.

Hence it is at this time that the proponents of majority rule must strike their blows against the dictatorship of the committee. They must be prepared to offer at precisely the right moment an amendment to the rules depriving the committee of its broad powers over legislation, limiting it to the task of directing legislative traffic on the House floor.

This proposal would become pending business of the House, open to full debate on the floor and not subject to reference to the Rules Committee. The changes would become effective if approved by a majority of the House.

If the majority of the Members of the new Congress elected next November really want to establish majority rule in the House and be freed from the dictatorial domination of the Rules Committee, let them stand up and be counted on the opening day of the new session.

A similar fight for democracy should be waged in the Senate on the first day of the next session of Congress. On that day all Senators who believe in the establishment of majority rule in the Senate should support a resolution aimed at preventing any future filibusters. By a majority vote such a resolution can be made the subject of Senate business and disposed of without reference to committee. There is little doubt, of course, that the introduction of such a resolution will be vigorously opposed by the defenders of the filibuster. The sponsors of Senate rule by the minority already have made themselves clear. During the recent FEPC filibuster, Democratic Senator Tydings, of Maryland, stated: "The rule of the majority. The rule of votes. Majority to Hades * * * Let us not fool ourselves with the silly thought that majorities are always right."

Democratic Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, rejected the idea of "a pure democracy, where every man's vote would be counted on every issue," and then later referred to the filibuster as a "bulwark against oppression by a mere popular majority."

WILL USE OBSTRUCTIVE TACTICS

It is clear that these Senators will wage a last-ditch fight against antifilibuster legislation with their customary weapon, the filibuster. However, a filibuster can be defeated. The recent FEPC filibuster could have been broken if a serious attempt to do so had been made by the Democratic Senators.

At that time the Democratic majority in the Senate, supported by many Republicans, recessed the Senate between 4 and 6 o'clock each afternoon during the filibuster, and on Friday afternoon recessed until each following Monday at noon. The Democratic administration made public statements in support of the FEPC, but took no effective action against the filibuster. No Democratic Senator and only a few Republican Senators were willing to join in my suggestion at that time to hold the Senate in continuous session for 24 hours a day for as many days, weeks and months as might be necessary to break it. An opportunity to establish, once and for all, majority rule in the Senate was passed up. It should not happen again.

Under the filibuster with all its insidious effrontery, the principle of rule by a majority is denied the people in the determination of congressional policy. I do not say that the majority is always right; but I do say that under our form of representative government a minority of Senators should not be permitted, by means of the filibuster, to block legislation favored by the majority. If the majority passes legislation which the people of the country do not favor, it must answer to the voters of the country for their action on that legislation, and the voters will then have a chance to send men to the Senate under instructions to repeal any legislation that the people do not want.

There is no way to smash a filibuster but to exhaust the filibusters by forcing them to speak day after day for 24 hours a day.

In a very real sense a filibuster is an endurance test. If a majority of the Senators really want to free themselves from the dictates of a willful minority they must be willing to take the time and undergo the physical strain that may be necessary to abolish once and for all the filibuster travesty.

If a majority of the present Senate really doesn't want to make that fight, then the voters should start finding it out in the 1946 elections. They should see to it that they send back to the Senate men pledged to make that fight. For my part, I am determined that the fight shall be made. But it cannot be made without the assistance of Senators in both parties. It will not be a pleasant fight. But with demonstrated public backing, it undoubtedly would end quickly.

FOR THE DIGNITY OF THE SENATE

When continuous sessions were proposed as the only effective method of beating the recent FEPC filibuster, the criticism was made that the procedure was beneath the dignity of Senators. That, of course, was pure nonsense. Nothing could be more undignified than the manner in which the Senate record is disgraced with long-winded ranting and meaningless talk during a filibuster. My proposal for continuous sessions of the Senate has been criticized as too dramatic. That argument is without weight. It is highly important that this issue be fully dramatized in order to impress upon the American people its vital importance to their legislative rights.

There are two reasons why it is important that the fight to pass an antifilibuster resolution should be waged at the beginning of the next session of Congress. First, it should be conducted concurrently with the fight to establish majority rule in the House in order that public attention may be focused on the same basic issue, namely, the need of democracy in both Houses of Congress.

Second, if the resolution is followed by a filibuster, it will not hold up any other legislation, since none will be ready for Senate action. It would be very difficult to break a filibuster near the close of a session, because the unity of action required on the part of Senators is difficult to obtain when so many of them are anxious to recess and go home. It is likewise difficult to wage a successful fight against a filibuster in the middle of a session, since the argument is always made that taking the time to defeat a filibuster blocks actions on other legislation vital to the welfare of the country.

One rule in political strategy, as in boxing, is never to telegraph your punches. But this fight involves more than political strategy. This is a fight to establish the people's rights to democratic procedures in their Congress, and it is important that the people themselves should become understanding participants. Everyone should know months ahead of time that January 7, 1947, or whatever day Congress reopens, will be D-day on Capitol Hill—Democracy Day for reasserting and reestablishing majority rule in the Congress of the United States; Duty Day for all Members of Congress to restore representative government to the legislative processes of Congress.

If majority rule is to characterize the procedures of Congress, the voters of this country must make that clear to congressional candidates in November. Either we are going to reestablish the principle of majority rule in our Congress or we are going to continue to drift into government by minority interests and bloc pressures. This is another test of liberalism versus reactionism.

It is important that the American people recognize that our form of government can protect their rights only so long as they keep it strong and effective. Representative government is not a machine that works automatically. It is but a set of rules and principles which the people by their own consent have decreed shall be binding upon their own conduct. These principles cannot work unless they are administered by men and women responsive to the will of the voters who elected them.

The people must be ever watchful against institutions—like the filibuster and powers of the House Rules Committee—which permit the perversion of free government by self-seeking men. If the people relax their vigilance, they may lose the fruits of democracy which promote the greatest good for the greatest number within the framework of our private-property economy.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the article, as I said again in my remarks last night and I want to repeat it today, we must make clear to the American people the relationship between the rules of the Senate and their substantive rights in connection with needed social legislation. In some way, somehow, we must enable every man and woman on the streets of America to understand that the rules of this body have a direct relationship to their liberties and freedoms. We must get them to understand that under rule XXII of this body such power is vested in a small group of men in the Senate of the United States—and it is always an ever-changing group—that five, six, seven, or eight, or more Senators who want to league themselves together can successfully block the passage of any piece of legislation they want to block. The only way we can ever remove this great danger to our national welfare is for a Republican majority in the Senate, come January 1949, to do what I suggested in the Collier's article we should have done in January 1947, namely, make up our mind to change rule XXII in such manner that a cloture petition can be filed on any pending question, be it a measure as now interpreted under rule XXII, or a motion affecting any other item of business.

Mr. President, I shall dwell on this point a while longer, because, as I said last night, I want the American people fully to understand why we are blocked in this special session of Congress in the passing of civil-rights legislation. We are blocked because, in my judgment, a group of Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle have, under the rules, the

power to block the passage of such legislation. I have every reason to believe, as every other Member of the Senate has reason to believe, as the words in the RECORD spoken from the lips of one of their leaders at the special session already show, that they have served notice on the Senate of the United States that they intend to use the rules to the extent of their application in an endeavor to block the passage of civil-rights legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will not yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon has announced that he will not yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President in view of that parliamentary situation which confronts us, I repeat what I set out in the Collier's article, I repeat what I have said to Republican groups since the writing of that article, that come January 1949, we as a Republican majority in the Senate of the United States, must deliver the American people from the encroachment—which I consider the filibuster power in the Senate of the United States to be—on their rights, welfare, and interests.

I heard the Presiding Officer of this body—and I am sure he will not object to my saying so—in discussing the problem, point out with the crystal clearness that always characterizes his pronouncements, that it is not safe in time of great national crisis to have the rules of the Senate in such form that a small group of men can balk the passage of needed legislation to meet a great national crisis. I agree with the Presiding Officer of this body.

From this forum I remind the people of the country today, Mr. President, that the cloture petition rule in the first instance was found necessary because of the great crisis which then confronted the Nation. It goes back to the dark days of 1917 when the Senate of the United States was threatened to be tied up by a filibuster which endangered the very security of the Nation. The cloture rule was adopted to block that filibuster.

Subsequently thereto interpretation of rule XXII developed whereby the precedents have been well established, as the Presiding Officer pointed out the other day, that the word "measure" in rule XXII is not applicable to a motion, and, therefore, motions to approve the Journal or motions to take up an item of business are not subject to the application of a cloture petition.

I say, Mr. President, that we must change that rule, and we must use the record of this special session of Congress on the anti-poll-tax bill and the concerted drive on the part of the Democratic side of the aisle to block the passage of that bill as our exhibit A to the American people of the necessity of adopting a modification of rule XXII, so, as I pointed out in the Collier's article, cloture will be applicable even to a motion to approve the Journal.

Mr. President, I do not like to take a licking any more than anyone else does, but one is called upon sometimes to be realistic enough and honest enough to admit when he is licked. I am perfectly willing here and now to say that in my opinion the proponents of an anti-poll-tax bill in this special session of Congress are licked. I do not think there is any chance of getting through this special session of Congress an anti-poll-tax bill.

Some might say, "Why do you not try to amend rule XXII in this special session of Congress?" I think there are two very good reasons why that cannot be done. In the first place, the time limitation itself would prevent it, because we would be confronted with a filibuster on any proposal to amend rule XXII. I think that is perfectly obvious. We shall need to have a rather long bracket of time in which to beat such a filibuster, and time does not permit in the special session of Congress.

I think we should also be sufficiently realistic to say that we cannot imagine anything the Democrats would relish more than to have us stay here in a long drawn-out fight in an attempt to break a filibuster on a proposal to modify rule XXII, with a great, historic political compaign in the offing, because as a Republican Party we also have the great responsibility of making clear to the American people the importance of a Republican victory in November in the interests of our national welfare. As Republicans we have the responsibility of making clear to the American people that the irreconcilable conflict and controversy between the White House and the majority in the Congress must be brought to an end, and, I will add quickly, Mr. President, that the conflict between the White House and a large number of Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle must be brought to an end. It is not good for our Government. It is not safe, in my opinion, for sound representative government that this conflict between the Congress and the White House, which is the natural result of having the Congress of one political complexion and the White House of another, should longer continue. I think that this campaign is so important in making clear to the American people the importance of a Republican victory in November that I believe we should pass as quickly as we can on the vital issues facing the country relating to housing and inflation, matters which are bringing great suffering to the American people from the standpoint of the high cost of living, and then go into that campaign, assuring the American people that if they will give us a Republican President and a Republican Congress in November we will proceed immediately after the election to put into effect and practice the great progressive, forward-looking platform which my party adopted at Philadelphia.

Mr. President, I think we must be frank enough to say to the American people that we do not propose to be caught in a political trap, or in a parliamentary situation of prolonging the special session of Congress in a fight over a filibuster to modify rule XXII of the Senate, thereby putting ourselves out of the position in which we can give to the American people, as we should, all the help we can in reaching their decision as to how to vote in November.

I think it is important that the Republican Members of this body, at the earliest opportunity, go out into the country and carry these campaign issues to the American people in order to assure a Republican victory in 1948. That is why I say it is unrealistic to suggest that in a special session of Congress time permits the breaking of a filibuster over the proposal to modify rule XXII. Therefore I shall join with my Republican colleagues, now that we shall have demonstrated by the end of this day the impossibility of passing any anti-poll-tax legislation, in recognizing that fact and proceeding to other items on the agenda, giving the American people the assurance that, come January, we intend to make the first order of business the modification of rule XXII. At that time we will fight to a finish any filibuster that develops in the Senate in opposition to a modification of that rule.

Before I proceed to discuss some of the cases which have been stressed by my good friends of the opposition on the constitutional issue which is before us, I should like to invite attention to the fact that there are increasing indications that, through the judicial process, the true meaning of the Constitution, particularly the fifteenth amendment, is going to be put into application. I invite attention to an item which appears on the first page of this morning's New York Times. It reads as follows:

NEW MEXICO INDIANS GET RIGHT TO VOTE

SANTA FE, N. MEX., August 3.—A special three-judge Federal court ruled today that a New Mexico constitutional provision denying the right to vote to Indians was contrary to the United States Constitution.

The decision, in effect, gives the voting privilege in New Mexico to Indians.

The court ruled that New Mexico's law providing that "Indians not taxed" may not vote contravenes the fifteenth amendment of the United States Constitution, which assures a ballot for everyone of voting age regardless of race, creed, or color.

The far-reaching decision was made in a suit that had been filed in behalf of Miguel H. Trujillo, an Isleta Indian, living at the Laguna Pueblo. It charged that Eloy Garley, clerk of Valencia County, had refused to register Trujillo before the New Mexico primary election on June 8.

I have not read the decision, but I shall do so as soon as I can get it in my hands. I cite that case as applicable to the discussion before us only to the extent that it is another brick in the great judicial wall of protection of civil rights that is being built by the courts of America. It is another brick in that wall similar to some other decisions which I shall discuss later in my remarks. I am satisfied that legislation such as our anti-poll-tax legislation will be sustained by the United States Supreme Court when directly before the Court for decision.

That is one reason, among others, why I am opposed to the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] early in the special session that we lay aside the anti-poll-tax bill and substitute therefor a proposal for a constitutional amendment.

I am opposed to that approach because I am satisfied, in the first instance, that an anti-poll-tax bill is constitutional. If I did not think so, as I said

last night, Mr. President, I would not be asking my colleagues to vote for it, because I take the position that a Senator who has any doubt as to the constitutionality of any piece of legislation which is called up for a vote in the Senate should, in keeping with his oath of office, vote against the legislation. But I submit that a study of the cases and a careful study of the Constitution will remove any doubt as to the constitutionality of anti-poll-tax legislation.

In the second place, I am opposed to the constitutional-amendment approach because I believe that it would result in years of frustration, years of delay in giving to 10,000,000 people in this country the franchise right to a free ballot, to which they are clearly entitled under the Constitution. I say that because I am satisfied that a terrific campaign, even in the Southern States which have abolished their own poll-tax legislation, would be carried on in order to prevent the ratification by the States of such a constitutional amendment. It does not take very many States to block it.

Therefore, I say that the challenge of statesmanship in regard to anti-poll-tax legislation is to pass the bill pending before the Senate and then give to the courts of the country, in accordance with our system of checks and balances, and in accordance with the judicial rights of our courts under the Constitution, an opportunity to render a decision squarely in point involving the interpretation of an anti-poll-tax bill itself. As I stated last night, up until this time the litigation which has reached the Supreme Court on this issue has been what we call mixed litigation, at best. It has involved mixed questions of interpretation of State law and State election problems in relation to article I, section 2, of the Constitution. There has not been before the Supreme Court a bill passed in accordance with the enabling clauses of various sections of the Constitution, in a case dealing directly with the poll-tax issue, which raises the question as to whether or not such a bill falls within the legislative power of Congress, for example, in carrying out its obligations under the fifteenth amendment.

Most of my constitutional argument today--but not all of it—will rest upon the powers and duties of Congress under the fifteenth amendment. I think it is interesting to note that in the New Mexico decision announced in the New York Times this morning, and apparently rendered yesterday, that court considers the fifteenth amendment as the basis for declaring null and void the constitutional provision of the State of New Mexico which sought to deny to Indians the right to vote because they did not pay taxes.

During the past few days there have been very learned discussions on the floor of the Senate as to whether the Congress has the authority under our Constitution to enact legislation such as that proposed in House bill 29. This is not a new area of discussion. The niceties of the legal questions have been argued in committees of Congress and on the floors of both Houses from time to time for about 6 years now. There have been able and eminent lawyers on both sides of the question. In the light of this fact, I think that every Member of Congress is going to have to be his own constitutional lawyer on this question. It is rather clear that the majority of both Houses have consistently believed—and so voted—that Congress has the constitutional authority to abolish the poll tax insofar as it affects the election of Federal officers.

Let me take just a moment to review the history of this legislation. In the Seventy-seventh Congress, the House passed House bill 1024, an anti-poll-tax bill similar to the measure now under discussion, by a vote of 252 to 84 on October 12, 1942. During the Seventy-eighth Congress, the House on May 25, 1943, again passed House bill 7, similar to House bill 29, and sent it over to the Senate by a vote of 265 to 110. Again, the House during the Seventy-ninth Congress resolved its doubts about the constitutionality of this proposed legislation and passed House bill 7, on June 12, 1945, by a vote of 251 to 105. The bill I now speak in behalf of was passed by the House, after full hearings before the Committee on Administration, by a vote of 290 to 112, on July 21, 1947.

Committees of the Senate have given full and careful consideration to the constitutionality of this proposed legislation, and have repeatedly reported it to the Senate. Extensive hearings, at which many eminent constitutional lawyers appeared and testified, were held by the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1942. I was not a Member of this body at that time, but I understand that the late Senator George Norris, a member of the committee and a distinguished lawyer in his own right, went into those hearings with very serious reservations in his own mind regarding the constitutionality of this proposed legislation—the power of Congress to abolish the poll-tax requirement by statute. After listening to countless witnesses who appeared and after making his own painstaking legal research, Senator Norris was not only convinced that Congress did have the constitutional power and responsibility for eliminating these taxes, but he himself wrote the majority report and led the fight on the floor of the Senate for the bill during the fall of 1942. I recommend that historic debate and the report of Senator Norris' Judiciary Committee in 1942 to any of my brethren who may have any doubts as to the constitutionality of this bill. In the Seventy-eighth Congress the Senate Judiciary Committee found that legislation such as House bill 29 was constitutional, and the committee reported the then pending bill to the Senate. House bill 29 was itself considered at length by the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, and was reported favorably in the Senate on April 30, 1948.

I mention these facts simply to show that in the light of the legislative history of anti-poll-tax legislation in this and preceding Congresses, a substantial majority of the Members have come to the conclusion, and I think a very sound one, that this proposed legislation is constitutional.

I have some views on this question which I should like to discuss.

First, a large number of cases have been cited by the opponents of this proposed legislation in an attempt to show that it cannot be constitutionally enacted by the Congress. But not a single one has been, or can be, cited to show that House bill 29 is unconstitutional, for the simple and incontrovertible reason that the Supreme Court of the United States has never had an occasion to pass on whether an act of Congress such as is proposed in House bill 29, abolishing the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a Federal election, is or is not constitutional. That question has never been before the Court. We can argue from now until doomsday, Mr. President, about the cases that involve what I call mixed litigation, cases which involve the application of poll-tax laws to both State and Federal elections; but, as I said last night, all the Court has to do is to pass on the fact that the measure is offered as a true taxing measure, in order to eliminate from its discussion or consideration any other facet of the case. Let the Congress pass an anti-poll-tax measure under its alleged constitutional power to protect the ballot of free citizens in a national election for Federal officers, and then the Court will have to lay down a decision directly "on the nose" of our problem. I am satisfied that, if the Court is given such a set of facts, there will be no escape from a decision that the bill is constitutional, because in my judgment the Court will find that poll taxes contravene the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. President, the Constitution affords a number of bases on which the Congress may, in my opinion, properly and constitutionally enact a statute abolishing the poll-tax requirement.

Section 4 of article I requires that—

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

This grant of power is further implemented by broad legislative authority contained in section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which empowers Congress—

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

Before I conclude, I shall have something to say about the power of the Congress to perpetuate a republican form of government; but I call especial attention to this enabling clause of article I of section 8 of the Constitution, which gives the Congress the clear constitutional power and places upon it the constitutional duty of passing whatever laws are necessary to carry out the provisions of the Constitution. It is vital in America today to preserve a republican form of government; and in my judgment we cannot preserve, in the true constitutional sense, a republican form of government if 10,000,000 supposedly free citizens are denied a free ballot box in a

national election. That is a vital constitutional issue, Mr. President, and I submit that when the Supreme Court has an opportunity to pass on it directly by way of interpreting and applying the constitutional powers under an anti-poll-tax bill passed by the Congress, the Court will find that the enabling clauses are a part of the basis for the constitutionality of the act.

These two broad provisions—section 4 of article I and section 8 of article I—have constituted the basis of a number of Federal statutes designed to rid the elective machinery of certain evils and burdens. The Federal Corrupt Practices Act is one, and the act, passed during the recent war exempting members of the armed services from the payment of poll taxes, is another example. Both those examples, and likewise the exemption which is sought under the bill now under discussion, rest upon the constitutional power to regulate the manner of holding elections.

Let me repeat that, Mr. President, because I desire to dwell at some length on the anti-poll-tax bill which, in fact, we passed when we enacted the soldier voting measure during the war. I want to connect the constitutional theory of such acts as the Corrupt Practices Act and the Soldier Voting Act, with its anti-poll-tax provision, to sections 4 and 8 of article I of the Constitution. Therefore, I repeat the reading of those two sections. Section 4 says:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Section 8 says:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

Mr. President, Members of this body I am sure would be enlightened, and some, I think, no little amused, if they would read the debates as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the time the Corrupt Practices Act was under consideration, and at the time the soldiers vote bill was under consideration. They would find a remarkable similarity between the arguments then made and the arguments now made by the opponents of an anti-poll-tax bill. It was contended by the opponents in those debates that the prerogatives and the rights of the States were being infringed and impinged upon by such legislation. I think there is only one place to meet the issue of States' rights. Let the record be perfectly clear that I shall defend States' rights as granted under the Constitution as vigorously as any other Member of the Senate, but I shall not read into the Constitution, as I submit many of my colleagues do, the vesting in the States of rights which in fact were delegated to the Federal Government under the Constitution.

I say sections 4 and 8 of article I of the Federal Constitution delegated broad powers to the Congress of the United States in protecting national elections. In my view, it is impossible to read those sections and give any other meaning to them. Therefore, from time to time in the past the Congress of the United States has seen fit to enact legislation in the very face of arguments that such legislation, which would keep pure the national elections by way of congressional law, impinged upon States' rights.

Now a word or two about the soldier-vote bill that was passed during the war. The bill contains an anti-poll-tax provision. The bill, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, and I shall go to it in a minute, was a Republican bill. I want to say to the proponents of the anti-poll-tax legislation throughout the Nation, and I want to say to some of those in minority groups who from time to time raise questions as to the good faith of the Republicans in connection with civil-rights legislation, that we can stand on the record of our support of civil-rights legislation. Let us see whether or not the Democrats can.

The distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] offered an amendment to the soldier-vote bill to eliminate the poll-tax restriction. Let me go to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It speaks for itself. I turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1942, at which time the soldier-vote measure was pending before the Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator yield merely for an inquiry? Is the Senator going to put the page number in the RECORD at this point, so it will make it easier to find?

Mr. MORSE. I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 25, 1942, starting on page 6970. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] said:

> Mr. President, I do not desire to prolong the argument. I merely wish to add that the junior Senator from Illinois is not concerned or is not attempting in any way to interfere with the election, the method of holding the election, or the conduct of the election in any State.
>
> I wish to reiterate what I stated yesterday, the Federal Government, by vote of this body, has reached into the sovereign States and said to the young manhood of the States, "You register and present yourselves for service wherever you are told to go by the Federal Government." Many of them left without paying a poll tax, many of them left without registering their right to vote at home. By no choice of theirs, by no act or thought of theirs, they are scattered all over the world, and this body, which by its vote created the situation by which they find themselves throughout the world, can do well to remove the simple restrictions which deprive them of the right to participate in the choice of those who shall in the future occupy seats in this body, while we talk about spreading four freedoms throughout the world after the war.
>
> We have told our people that soon, I understand, we will have another bill under which we will register more of our citizens. We say they can no longer live as usual, think as usual, or have business as usual, but by our conduct apparently we are going to say to them, "We are going to conduct our political restrictions as usual," notwithstanding what we do about their vote. We may say that we love the soldier, and that we want every soldier to have the right to vote, but when one votes against giving him the right to vote in a primary, or against removing a simple restriction, he proves the depth of his love and affection for the men in the armed services. We have no desire to attempt to interfere in any State, but the rights of those men rest in this body, and I am ready to have the record made on the pending amendment.

This is the Republican Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] making a speech in support of his amendment to eliminate the poll-tax requirement from the soldier-vote measure.

The Senator from Illinois brought out very clearly in his remarks, as it was brought out in other remarks made during the debate, that there was a clear duty vested in the Congress of the United States to see to it that the arbitrary restrictions upon suffrage represented by the poll tax should be removed from the men in uniform. On what theory? On the theory that it interfered with States' rights? On the theory that the proposal was unconstitutional, as has been alleged here throughout the debate on House bill 29? No; but as Senator BROOKS said, on the theory that it is the clear duty and the obligation of the Congress to protect the rights of soldiers to vote in national elections. I say on the theory that under amendment 15 of the Constitution the Congress has a clear duty to pass legislation to protect the right of suffrage of free citizens. That was a Republican proposal, and it was fought for by the Republicans on the floor of the Senate during that historic debate.

Let us look at the record in connection with the vote on the proposal. I have said so many times—I cannot say it too often—that the test of a man's political philosophy, the acid test of his constitutional liberalism, is to be found in his votes in the Congress of the United States. What he says is not so important; what he says is important only if he backs up his statements with votes which support them. Many people, for long years past, Mr. President, have been playing political football with the civil-rights issue in the United States. I would not say that my party has been free of such hypocrites; we have had some of them. But at any time I will lay the Republican record on civil rights alongside of the Democratic record and have no fear as to what an impartial jury of independent voters will say when they come to study and to pass judgment upon the record. I say that because the record is perfectly clear that the Republicans for many years past have attempted to put through civil-rights legislation, and such legislation as Congress has been able to put through has been put through with Republican votes.

During the war the anti-poll-tax provision of the soldier-vote bill came from a Republican Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]. How did the Senate vote on it? That is a good test of where Republicans and Democrats stand on the issue of civil rights. That, in my judgment, is the test of where people stand on civil-rights matters, at least insofar as true support of anti-poll-tax legislation is concerned. The Brooks amendment was called up for a vote on August 25, 1942, as shown on page 6971 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day. Let me make plain what amendment I am talking about. I am talking about

the amendment which proposed to relieve the soldiers from a poll-tax restriction in casting their votes in a Federal election for national officers. That was the issue. It was crystal clear, unequivocal, calling for a vote as to where a man stood on that civil-rights issue. The roll was as follows: Those voting "yea" were: Bone, Brewster, Bridges, Brooks, Brown, Capper, Danaher, Downey, Johnson of California, Johnson of Colorado, Kilgore, La Follette, Lodge, McCarran, McFarland, McNary, Maloney, Mead, Murray, Norris, Pepper, Reynolds, Rosier, Schwartz, Stewart, Taft, Thomas of Idaho, Thomas of Utah, Tunnell, Vandenberg, Walsh, White, Wiley.

Counting the number of Republicans in light of the few Republicans who were in the Senate in 1942, it will be seen that the Republicans in the Senate by a large majority voted to protect the precious civil right that our soldiers should be freed of the restriction of a poll tax on their suffrage.

Let us look at the "nay" votes: Andrews, Bailey, Barkley, Byrd, Clark of Idaho, Clark of Missouri, Connally, George, Gerry, Green, Guffey, Hayden, Herring, McKellar, Radcliffe, Russell, Smathers, Truman, Tydings, Van Nuys.

Mr. President, I am willing to let that record speak for itself as to who believed in delivering on civil-rights legislation. I am willing to let that vote speak for itself as to whether those of us on the Republican side of the aisle are fighting and voting for civil-rights legislation, and whether, in the main the Democrats are merely talking for it. I am willing to let the vote of the President of the United States, when he served as a Member of this body as a Senator from Missouri, in opposition to the proposal offered by the Senator from Illinois to protect the soldiers from a poll tax in the national election, during the war, speak for itself as to whether he means to deliver on civil-rights legislation. We cannot go behind that vote. I repeat, Mr. President, that I shall judge the political record of a man not on what he says, but on both what he says and how he votes to back up what he says.

Mr. President, we Republicans have made other fights for civil-rights legislation, and we have backed up our speeches with our votes. Let me for a moment refresh the memories of Senators as to what I think was a rather historic fight, as time will prove, in the Eightieth session of Congress, when Democratic representatives, in the main, in the Senate of the United States, from 16 Southern States, offered to the Senate for ratification a compact which would have empowered, with congressional approval, 16 Southern States to establish regional schools of higher education based on the principle of segregation, which they sought to make Federal policy by getting the Senate to approve, if they could, that compact. I make no apology to the American people for leading the fight against that compact on the ground that the compact section of the Constitution did not require the approval of that type of compact. I pointed out in the debate, and I have no fear of successful contradiction on that point, that one of the obvious motivations of that fight was to enable its proponents to get themselves in a position so that when civil-rights legislation involving racial questions in the field of education reached the United States Supreme Court they could point to the Senate of the United States as having placed its stamp of approval on a policy of segregation in higher education in the United States. I have already said, and I now repeat, that I have no intention to interfere with State policy in the field of education, but when the Senators from 16 Southern States sought to have the Senate place its stamp of approval, by way of ratification, on that compact, which had embodied in it the principle of segregation, I had no hesitation in leading the fight against that transgression on what I think is a precious civil right, because never by my vote will I put my stamp of approval on segregation in free public schools in America.

I know something about schools which are attended by all races. I went through the grade school in the city of Madison, Wis., known as the Greenbush School, which was located on the edge of the slum area of Madison, Wis. There attended that school throughout the 8 years I was there boys and girls from all races of that area, many Negro children, many Jewish, Greek, Italian, Polish, indeed attending that school was a cross-section of the great melting pot which America is.

It is difficult by way of self-analysis and introspection to determine how one comes to hold certain views which he entertains on certain social questions, but I am satisfied, as I analyze my own thinking, that the whole background of my constitutional liberalism is to be found in the conditioning and the training and the understanding of democracy I learned in 8 years in the Greenbush School in Madison, Wis.

Never, Mr. President, with my vote will I deny what I think is a precious civil right in this country, the right of any child to go to a public school irrespective of any attempt to discriminate against him because of race, color, or creed. Democracy will never remain strong in America unless we drive from our midst intolerable prejudice against people because of their race, color and creed. I may add that the civil rights principles of the Constitution are on trial before the world today. As I said last night, our attitude in this country in not taking a courageous and forthright forward step to eliminate discriminations practiced against the civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution is developing a hotbed for communism in the United States.

There is not a southern Democrat, there is not a northern Democrat, there is not a Republican in the whole Congress who hates and despises the Communist ideology more than does the junior Senator from Oregon. The way to meet a threat to democracy is to make democracy work so well that the propaganda of the Communists will not mislead or deceive a single American. Many of them are now being deceived, many of them are being misled. Many Americans, I fear far too many, are going to register a protest vote this fall by voting for the third party because of their opinion that we are not putting into effect as rapidly as we should the full guarantees of the Constitution.

Oh, here is a chance, by the passage of this anti-poll-tax bill, which, as I have said, we shall not be able to pass because of the parliamentary tactics of the Democratic side of the aisle—to answer the third party advocates on the question of whether or not we are going to march forward and prohibit further discrimination because of race, color, or creed.

Mr. President, we defeated the attempt to have the United States Senate approve the policy of segregation in higher education in this country. The vote was close, but the fact remains that the major fight against it came from the Republican side of the aisle. I think it is clear from the RECORD that the only effective blow struck in defense of civil rights in the Eightieth Congress was struck by those of us on the Republican side of the aisle who succeeded in preventing the Senate ratification of the compact to which I have referred. Therefore I say to the proponents of civil-rights legislation, that is another bit of evidence of the good faith and the sincerity of purpose of the Republicans in the Congress of the United States in delivering on civil-rights legislation, in backing up their talk with their votes.

Now, for the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a portion of the final soldier vote law which was enacted in 1942, and which contained an anti-poll-tax provision protecting our men in the armed services from the type of infringement upon suffrage which poll taxes constitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the law was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[PUBLIC LAW 712—77TH CONG.]

[CH. 561—2D SESS.]

[H. R. 7416]

An act to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence

Be it enacted, etc.,

SPECIAL METHOD OF VOTING IN TIME OF WAR

SECTION 1. In time of war, notwithstanding any provision of State law relating to the registration of qualified voters, every individual absent from the place of his residence and serving in the land or naval forces of the United States, including the members of the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, the Women's Navy Reserve, and the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, who is or was eligible to register for and is qualified to vote at any election under the law of the State of his residence, shall be entitled, as provided in this act, to vote for electors of President and Vice President of the United States, United States Senators, and Representatives in Congress.

SEC. 2. No person in military service in time of war shall be required, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, referring again to the Corrupt Practices Act and to the soldier-vote measure, I wish to repeat that both these statutes rest upon the constitutional power to regulate the manner of holding elections no less than do the exemptions which are sought under the pending bill. The Federal Government has the inherent right to "insure its own preservation" for, as pointed out in the dissenting opinion of Justices Brandeis, Clark, and Pitney in *Newberry* v. *United States* (256 U. S. 232, at 281)—

> The election of Senators and Representatives in Congress is a Federal function; whatever the States do in the matter they do under authority derived from the Constitution of the United States. * * * [Any other conclusion] would be to leave the General Government destitute of the means to insure its own preservation without governmental aid from the States, which they might either grant or withhold according to their own will. This would render the Government of the United States something less than supreme in the exercise of its own appropriate powers; a doctrine supposed to have been laid at rest forever by the decisions of this Court in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 405, et seq.); *Cohens* v. *Virginia* (6 Wheat. 264, 381, 387, 414); and many other decisions in the time of Chief Justice Marshall and since.

It should be recalled that in McCulloch against Maryland, supra, Chief Justice Marshall, that great expounder of our Constitution, had observed—Fourth Wheaton, 316, 424—that—

> No trace is to be found in the Constitution of an intention to create a dependence of the Government of the Union on those of the States for the execution of the great powers assigned to it. Its means are adequate to its ends, and on those means alone was it expected to rely for the accomplishment of its ends. To impose on it the necessity of resorting to means which it cannot control, which another government may furnish or withhold, would render its course precarious, the result of its measures uncertain, and create a dependence on other governments which might disappoint its most important designs, and is incompatible with the language of the Constitution

I apply that language Mr. President, to the power of the Congress, through the enabling clauses to which I have heretofore referred, to pass legislation which will protect the national suffrage of 10,000,000 American people now denied that protection by existing poll-tax laws.

I say, Mr. President, that these quotations from two landmarks in our constitutional history make it abundantly clear that the revisionary power conferred upon the Congress by section 4 of article I of the Constitution, to regulate the "manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives," was intended to and does authorize the Federal Government to take all steps deemed by it to be necessary and proper to insure that the election of its officers shall conform with true democratic principles; shall be without fraud, corruption, or pernicious political activities attendant upon the exercise by the people of their highest privilege; and that substantial portions of the populace in the several States shall not be disfranchised by a pseudo qualification bearing no reasonable relation to their fitness to vote.

I dwell upon that criterion, Mr. President, because when we do get this matter before the Supreme Court there is no doubt of the fact that it will give an interpretation of the word "qualification," as contained in article I, section 2 of the Constitution, in regard to which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], as well as my friend the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], dwelt at such great length. The court will have to give an interpretation to the word "qualification." What will be its text?

As a lawyer, I suggest that one of the things the court will look into is the relationship between the poll tax and the qualification or capability or ability of a man to vote. Do Senators know what I think the court will say respecting that? Dangerous as predictions are for a lawyer even to suggest in attempting to prophesy a court decision, I think the court will be bound to find that there is no relationship between the poll tax and the ability of a man to vote. I think the court will pierce the veil of sham which the poll tax is, and will not let the States hide behind that veil under the pretext that the poll-tax requirement is a qualification under article I, section 2. To the contrary, I think the court will say that qualification under article I, section 2, has to have some reasonable relationship to the ability to vote if it is to in any way limit the right to vote.

There is no such relationship, I submit, when a poll tax is imposed on an individual under the pretext that it defines his qualifications to vote. I think the court will tear the veil from the face of the poll tax and recognize that the Congress of the United States has the obligation and the power under the Constitution to protect free citizens from that type of restriction upon what ought to be recognized as a guaranty of free suffrage.

Thus I say, Mr. President, that to make sure that there should be no doubt on this score, the framers of our Constitution wisely inserted a "necessary and proper" clause specifically authorizing the Congress, "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers." Under that enabling clause, under the power therein given to preserve the republican form of government, if it were desired to put it on no other basis, I submit that the court would find that the exercise of our power in passing an anti-poll-tax law met all constitutional requirements.

I have already pointed to the fact that 10,000,000 citizens of the United States are disfranchised by the poll-tax requirement and shown that its abolition in Georgia resulted in an immediate and substantial increase in the number of voters who participated in the elections when not hindered and impeded by the poll-tax requirement. Moreover, the difference in the size of the electorate in poll-tax States as compared with that in non-poll-tax States generally, fully demonstrates that the republican form of government contemplated by the Constitution is nonexistent in the poll-tax States.

The report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights at page 38 carries a chart, Suffrage in Poll-Tax States. It shows that of the potential voters who voted in the 1944 Presidential elections, 68.74 percent voted in the then 40 non-poll-tax States while only 18.31 percent voted in the 8 poll-tax States. In 1944 Georgia required the payment of the poll tax, and therefore her statistics are included in the table.

Section 4 of article IV of the Constitution provides:

> The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

It is well settled that questions arising under this clause are political, not judicial, in character, and thus are for consideration of Congress and not the courts. *Ohio ex rel. Bryant* v. *Akron Metropolitan Park District* (281 U. S. 74, 80 (1930)), citing *Pacific States Teleph. Co.* v. *Oregon* (223 U. S. 118 (1912)), *O'Neill* v. *Learner* (239 U. S. 241, 248 (1915)).

I recognize that this is a technical point of law to the layman, and hence, even at the expense of time, I want to reiterate it, because I think it is one of the points that my friends of the opposition have overlooked in their entire discussion of the constitutionality of a proposed anti-poll-tax bill. I said last night, for example, that in my judgment, our power to pass an anti-poll-tax law rests in part under the political powers of the Constitution vested in the Congress. Thus section 4 of article IV of the Constitution, which reads "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government" raises what the Court has called a question political in character and not judicial. What does that mean? It means that very broad and wide powers are given to the Congress of the United States to pass legislation which in its judgment is necessary, and which it is empowered to pass under the enabling sections of the Constitution, to protect, preserve, and perpetuate a republican form of government.

I think I can hear the Supreme Court say it is not for the Court to dictate to the Congress of the United States what steps it should take to preserve, perpetuate, and protect a republican form of government, because that is basically a political question which primarily vests in the wise judgment and discretion of the elected representatives of the people. I think I can hear the Court say that, if in the exercise of their wisdom in the legislative branch of government they come to the finding of fact that the existence of a poll tax endangers free suffrage in America, it rests within their political power under section 4, article 4, of the Constitution to pass an anti-poll-tax bill, and by so doing they exercise their right to preserve a republican form of government.

That is an additional premise on top of my premise respecting amendment 15, Mr. President, on which I base my argument that an anti-poll-tax bill would be declared by the Supreme Court to be constitutional. It is not for the Court, as the precedents which I have cited

clearly indicate, by way of judicial action to amend the Constitution by means of an interpretation, by saying that a bill which Congress passed to protect, preserve, and perpetuate a republican form of government is unconstitutional, because if it did, then in a very real sense it would be substituting itself as the legislature, on a question which it has already recognized in its decisions is political and not judicial in character.

Of course, I do not mean that we can pass any sort of legislation we might want to pass under section 4 of article IV of the Constitution. I mean that on this subject, too, the well-established judicial rule of reasonableness will prevail. In my judgment, under this section the Court would have to find that the law we passed was highly capricious and arbitrary, bearing no reasonable relationship whatsoever to the power granted under the section before it would be justified in declaring it to be unconstitutional. I do not believe that the Court could possibly so find in this instance, because, in my humble judgment, the existence of a poll-tax restriction on suffrage which has the effect, as I pointed out in the statistics presented last night, of disfranchising 10,000,000 supposedly free American citizens is a serious threat to the perpetuation of a republican form of government. Therefore I say to my friends who are puzzled—and I can understand their puzzlement—over this constitutional question, that they should reconsider the meaning of section 4, article IV, of the Constitution and refresh their recollections of the decisions which I have cited thereunder. I submit that Congress has the constitutional mandate, as provided in section 8 of article I, to "make all laws which shall be necessary for carrying into execution powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States," to restore a republican form of government to the people of the seven poll-tax States by enacting House bill 29.

The Senate Judiciary Committee, on October 27, 1942, in its report on House bill 1024, which was also an anti-poll-tax bill, practically identical with House bill 29, said the following in its excellent report on the bill:

> Can we have a republican form of government in any State if, within that State, a large portion and perhaps a majority of the citizens residing therein are denied the right to participate in governmental affairs because they are poor? We submit that this would be the result if under section 2, article I, of the Constitution, the proposed law is held to be unconstitutional. The most sacred right in our republican form of government is the right to vote. It is fundamental that that right should not be denied unless there are valid constitutional reasons therefor. It must be exercised freely by free men. If it is not, then we do not have a republican form of government. If we tax this fundamental right, we are taxing a Federal privilege. We might just as well permit the States to tax Federal post offices throughout the United States.

I say that House bill 29 is authorized by the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution. That amendment provides as follows:

> SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
>
> SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

I pointed out in my comments last night that there is no doubt as to what the purpose was for calling the constitutional conventions in several of the poll-tax States at the time their constitutions were amended in order to put into them a poll-tax provision. A distinguished former Member of this body, the beloved Carter Glass, of Virginia, in the speeches from which I quoted last night, made perfectly clear the purpose in Virginia. When he spoke to the convention in Virginia he made it very clear that the convention had been called to discriminate against approximately 146,000 ignorant Negroes in Virginia. We cannot erase the record of history, and that is what the record of history shows was the dominant motivation which produced the poll-tax laws and the constitutional amendments in the several States which sought to solve the problem by way of a constitutional amendment.

Mr. President, with the passage of an anti-poll-tax bill by the Congress, and thereafter a direct raising of the issue before the United States Supreme Court on the question of the constitutionality of such legislation, I have no doubt as to the inescapable conclusion which the Court must reach; namely, that the power vests in the Congress of the United States to carry out the mandate of amendment XV of the Constitution:

> SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
>
> SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

I say that a thoroughly prepared case before the Supreme Court on the true meaning of amendment XV can lead to no other decision than the right of the Congress to protect national suffrage of free citizens from the type of restriction and imposition on that basic right which the poll taxes constitute in the States which have them.

Let us take a look at the history of the fifteenth amendment for a moment. This amendment was proposed to the legislatures of the several States by the Fortieth Congress on February 26, 1869, following the dark days of the Civil War. It was declared to have been ratified March 30, 1870. It is not simply a coincidence that shortly after this date the payment of a poll tax as a requirement for voting became a qualification in those States having a large percentage of Negro voters. Tennessee was the first State to adopt the requirement, in 1870; Virginia in 1875.

I digress for a moment to emphasize a point which I think needs to be reemphasized in this debate. We have heard a great deal from members of the opposition about the tax requirements and the property requirements which existed at the time the Constitution was adopted. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the adoption of poll taxes as a restriction on voting, designed definitely and with purpose to prevent certain people from voting, and to disfranchise them, followed the Civil War, subsequent to the adoption and ratification of the fifteenth amendment. They were adopted by the Southern States having a large number of Negro citizens as a way, they thought—and it has worked for a great many years—of getting around the fifteenth amendment. They were adopted in the hope that if and when the issue reached the Supreme Court, they might prevail under an interpretation of the word "qualification," as it is found in article I, section 2. But, Mr. President, as I said last night, we are still waiting for a case squarely on the nose, so that the Court clearly can interpret the meaning of qualification under section 2, article I, in relation to the exercise of Federal power by the Congress to protect national suffrage through the medium of an anti-poll-tax bill. So I say that the issue as to the constitutionality of such a bill cannot now be settled by the Supreme Court, because the Court must have before it a congressional enactment which clearly raises the question whether it infringes on the constitutional power in consideration of the word "qualification" as it appears in section 2, article I. I am not afraid of the result when the Supreme Court is given a chance to render a clear-cut decision on that issue.

That is why I think that, although it is pertinent to discuss the border-line cases on this problem, which thus far have been passed upon by the Supreme Court, they are not binding or sound precedents on the present issue, because the only way we can obtain a decision on the issue is to get it before the Court. But it has not been before the Court, and we shall not get it before the Court until under the fifteenth amendment, we, the Congress, proceed to carry out what I think is the clear mandate of that amendment to see to it that under section 2 of amendment fifteen the necessary laws are passed to protect all free citizens from discrimination or abridgement or denial of their rights on the basis of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Mr. President, I rest my argument on this point on the proposition that that is exactly what a poll tax does. It abridges free suffrage. It denies, on a discriminatory basis, on the basis of race, color, or creed, the right of approximately 10,000,000 American citizens to cast a free ballot unless they meet certain highly arbitrary restrictions imposed upon them through a poll tax.

As I was saying, Mr. President, Tennessee was the first State to adopt the requirement, and did so in 1870; Virginia in 1875; Florida, 1885; Mississippi, 1890; Arkansas in 1892; South Carolina in 1895; Louisiana, 1898; North Carolina, 1900; Alabama in 1901; Texas in 1903. It is a long, long way from 1787 to 1903, Mr. President. The Georgia constitutions of 1865 and 1877 made the payment of all taxes a prerequisite to voting in general elections; but in 1908 its constitution was amended so as to make the payment of the poll tax a requirement for voting in the primary election also. This statement appears in the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee Hearings on

Senate bill 1280 in July 1942, at page 253 in the testimony of Henry H. Collins.

Seven of the 11 States which originally had poll taxes still retain their poll-tax requirements. The Negro population of those States alone amounts to 5,449,186 on the basis of the 1940 census. In round figures that is about one-third of the entire Negro population of the United States.

I have already alluded to the findings contained in the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee regarding the original purpose of these poll-tax requirements, namely, to disfranchise Negro citizens. I wish to quote very briefly from the report again, to show that these taxes, at their very inception, violated Federal statutes:

At page 5, the report states:

> It ought to be borne in mind also that many, if not all, of these constitutional amendments in the poll-tax States are in direct conflict with the statutes under which these States were readmitted to the Union under the act of Congress of June 26, 1870 (16 Stat., p. 62). The provision which refers to Virginia reads as follows:
>
> "The constitution of Virginia shall never be so amended or changed as to deprive any citizen or class of citizens of the United States of the right to vote, who are entitled to vote by the constitution herein recognized, except as punishment for such crimes as are now felonies at common law, whereof they have been duly convicted under laws, equally applicable to all the inhabitants of said State: Provided, That any alteration of said constitution, prospective in its effect, may be made in regard to the time and place of residence of voters."
>
> It therefore follows that these State poll tax constitutional amendments were in direct violation of this statute and therefore absolutely unconstitutional.
>
> It seems perfectly plain that the object of this poll-tax provision in the State constitutions was not to prevent discrimination among the citizens but to definitely provide for a discrimination by which hundreds of thousands of citizens were taxed for the privilege of voting.

Mr. President, the principal purpose behind these State poll-tax requirements being the disfranchisement of a large number of Negro citizens, which purpose is today still being achieved, it is submitted that such poll-tax laws are violative of the express language, purpose, and intent of the fifteenth amendment; and the Congress should proceed to eliminate these sham "qualifications" under the specific authority granted it under section 2 of the amendment "to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." *James* v. *Bowman* (190 U. S. 127, 137); *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214); *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347).

Chief Justice Marshall, in the celebrated case of McCulloch against Maryland, from which I have already quoted, laid down a basic principle in American constitutional law when he declared that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." States cannot levy or exact a tax on a Federal instrumentality or function. Yet we have the anomalous situation of State governments requiring a tax as a condition to exercising the highest and most basic right in a democratic society—the right to cast a ballot for the President, the Vice President, and Members of the Congress.

Action by the courts is not the only avenue for the redress of this wrong or the only protection against the danger implicit in permitting a State to tax a Federal function. That Congress of its own initiative can enact legislation to safeguard and preserve the structure and very existence of government is a proposition too elementary to require argument. If the States under the guise of setting up a "qualification" for voting, levy a $1 tax on the right of a Federal elector to vote—and I have already shown that certain States through their poll-tax requirements have compelled, and continue to compel, their citizens to spend as much as 2 percent of their annual income in order to vote in Federal elections—what is there to hinder such States from exacting a larger proportion, or, conceivably, to reduce it to the absurd, all the earnings of the prospective voter? If there were no other constitutional basis for the enactment of House bill 29, the implied power of a sovereignty to protect itself from destruction would alone afford ample constitutional authority and justification.

Mr. President, I wish to turn now to the group of cases about which we have heard so much in the very able arguments presented by the Senators of the opposition. First, I think the RECORD should contain at this point a very brief digest of those alleged leading cases. I take such a digest from a report of the Senate Judiciary Committee, after having checked the decisions and read them very carefully and after having satisfied myself that the digest in fact sets forth an accurate thumbnail sketch of the decisions themselves.

First let us turn to *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. Repts. 277), decided December 6, 1937. The dates are important in this discussion, and I should like my colleagues to keep them in mind. The action was brought to determine whether or not the appellees, State officials, had acted unlawfully or illegally in refusing to register a white man aged 28 to vote for Federal and State officers at primary and general elections, for the reason that he had neither made poll-tax returns nor paid any taxes. The opinion of the Court was perfectly proper, in my opinion, in view of the fact that the appellant demanded that the State official qualify him to vote in a State election as well as a Federal election. But I think the Court arrived at an erroneous conclusion, because it had erroneously judged the nature of the right to vote for a Federal official. The Court thought the nature of the right or the source of the right to vote for a Federal official was the State itself. Surely the State is not the one to grant a Federal privilege. The Court said:

> Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State.

In the second case, *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (C. C. A., 6th Ct., 118 Fed. Repts., 2d ed., 218), decided March 8, 1941, certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court. The issue in this case was whether the State could condition a right to vote for a Representative in Congress in an election, not a primary, because the citizen had failed to pay a poll tax. It was not a State election and not a primary, and the citizen had qualified in every way except to pay the tax. The State levied the tax and set up the method of collection. It had experienced difficulty in getting it collected, and burdened the franchise with the duty to pay the tax, as a method of collecting it. It was therefore a condition precedent to the exercise of the right to vote. The Court held that the right to vote in a national election is conditioned upon such terms as the State wants to impose, and, using the Breedlove case as a precedent, about the right conferred by the State, the Court said such right was conferred save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments with respect to race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and other provisions of the Constitution. It was a unanimous opinion by three judges of the circuit court.

The gentlemen of the opposition have laid great stress on the Breedlove and Pirtle cases. If I were in their position and honestly believed, as I am sure they honestly believe, that an anti-poll-tax law is unconstitutional, as a lawyer I certainly would stress for all it is worth their argument on the Breedlove case and on the case of Pirtle against Brown. Those cases are what I call fringe cases. They approach the issue in question, but they are not cases on all fours with the issue we now face.

The first case, as I have pointed out, involves a question in which a State law is mixed up with a Federal election. The second case is a court of appeals case relying upon the Breedlove case, even though the Classic case, which I shall shortly discuss, came in between. It was disposed of in what manner? By denial of a writ of certiorari by the Supreme Court. I think my lawyer friends of the opposition have done a masterful job in creating the impression in this body among some of my colleagues that Pirtle against Brown represents a decision by the United States Supreme Court on the merits of the issues involved. Lawyers know that reasons for denying certiorari rest in the bosom of the Supreme Court. Lawyers know that it is a pretty weak precedent to cite, if all that can be cited in support of their position in a case is the fact that the Supreme Court denied a writ of certiorari. I would be the last in this Chamber to cast any reflection to any degree whatever on the Supreme Court, but it is important that the American people understand the procedure of the Supreme Court. There are many reasons why the Supreme Court may deny certiorari, and it is generally recognized that one of the most common reasons is that because the agenda of the Court is so large, the docket of the Court is so extensive, the mass of cases the Court is called upon to decide in a given term is so great, that the Court must follow a selective process. It has to meet a timetable, and very frequently—and I do not think there can be any denial of this fact—it denies certiorari, not because it does not think the issues involved in a case should in due course of time be litigated, but because the time element does not permit. It follows a selective process in acting upon petitions for writs of certiorari. It is not uncommon at all to have a writ

denied in one term of Court, and to have the identical issue involved in another case at the next session of the Court taken up by the Court by granting a writ in that case. Therefore I am not saying that Pirtle against Brown should not be cited by the gentlemen of the opposition; it should, of course, be cited. It has some weight in the argument. But I am saying that the mere fact that a writ of certiorari was denied in Pirtle against Brown does not constitute a ruling by the United States Supreme Court on the merits of the issue involved in this debate. There will not be a Supreme Court decision on the merits of this great constitutional issue until a congressional act is before the Court in the form of an anti-poll-tax bill seeking to lift the restriction upon the privilege of voting now imposed upon some 10,000,000 citizens by way of a poll tax.

The next case is that of *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299), decided May 28, 1941. The gentlemen of the opposition make considerable point of the fact that the denial of a writ of certiorari in the Pirtle case follows the decision in the Classic case. I do not think that is particularly relevant, because the Classic case speaks for itself. I shall not claim and I do not want to claim too much for the Classic case. I may say to my good friends of the opposition, however, that as a lawyer I somewhat enjoyed the speed with which they passed over the Classic case and laid all the emphasis of their argument on the Breedlove and Pirtle cases. That is good lawyer technique. I understand it. I do not want to give any greater emphasis to the Classic case than I honestly think it deserves, but I do want to say, and I do not think the statement can be denied, that so far as concerns the language of the Court in discussing the general merits of the problems before us in this constitutional argument, it is, in fact, the last pronouncement of the Court on the subject, because the mere denial of a writ of certiorari in the Pirtle case did not, in fact, involve any discussion on the part of the Court by way of a decision on the issue itself which confronts us. But the Classic case, like the Breedlove case and the Pirtle case, is still a border-line case, and I claim no more for it than that. As such, however, it is deserving of some attention on the part of my colleagues.

In the Classic case, the charge was that the election officials had violated sections 19 and 20 of the Criminal Code by wilfully ordering and falsely counting and certifying ballots cast in a primary in Louisiana for a Representative in Congress.

The Court said:

> The questions for decision are whether the right of qualified voters to vote in the Louisiana primary and to have their ballots counted is a right "secured by the Constitution" within the meaning of Sections 19 and 20 of the Criminal Code, and whether the acts of the appellees charged in the indictment violate those sections.

Chief Justice Stone, after citing cases, said:

> The right of the people to choose their elective officers is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution, and, hence, is one secured by it to those citizens, inhabitants of the State, entitled to exercise that right.

He continues:

> While in a loose sense the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the State—

Citing cases—

> this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4, and it has some general power under article I, section 8, of the Constitution to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers. Section 4 authorizes Congress to regulate the times, places, and manner of electing Representatives.

In *United States* v. *Mumford* (16 Fed. 223) the Court said:

> There is little regarding elections that is not included in the terms "times, places, and manner," and Congress could legislate generally in respect to general elections.

Mr. President, my good friends of the opposition like to talk about the language in the Classic case as being dictum. I do not share their characterization of the language as dictum. I shall not quibble about that; but, nevertheless, the language of Chief Justice Stone in the Classic case is the last formal pronouncement by way of court discussion of the question of the power of Congress in the field of national elections. The opponents of the anti-poll-tax bill may characterize it in any way they want; but they cannot erase it; and the Supreme Court has not, as yet, by any specific language, retracted or repudiated the language of Chief Justice Stone in the Classic case. Note to what he refers. Note his reference to those powers in section 4 of article I and in clause 8, section 18, of article I, which I discussed at some length earlier in my remarks this afternoon. When it comes to tracing the trend of constitutional law under a conception of the Constitution as a dynamic document, do I not think there can be any doubt about the fact that in the Classic case the Court made very clear to the Congress of the United States that there is vested in it a great residual power to pass legislation that will protect free suffrage in the United States.

I should welcome the opportunity, Mr. President, to stand before the Court in support of the constitutionality of an anti-poll-tax law and discuss with the Court its own language in the Classic case. I do not think there is any way the Court could possibly get over, behind, or around that language, and I do not fear that the Court would revoke or reverse the position which it took in the famous Classic case. No, Mr. President, I do not propose in this debate to let my good friends of the opposition forget the Classic case. I know they would like to do it, because I know the language of the Classic case gives them great trouble in their thinking when they seek to sustain what I consider to be a fallacious proposition, that an anti-poll-tax bill would be unconstitutional.

Let us go into the case for a moment, because I think it not only proper and right but very important to have a very full discussion of the Classic case in this debate.

On page 310 of the decision, the Chief Justice said:

> Article I, section 2, of the Constitution commands that "The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." By section 4 of the same article, "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations except as to the places of choosing Senators." Such right as is secured by the Constitution to qualified voters to choose Members of the House of Representatives is thus to be exercised in conformity to the requirements of State law, subject to the restrictions prescribed by section 2 and to the authority conferred on Congress by section 4 to regulate the times, places, and manner—

And manner—

> of holding elections for Representatives.

My good friends of the opposition like to quote the first part of that sentence, and then, with falling voices, skim over the second part. The second part of that sentence also is pregnant with great constitutional meaning, and calls attention to the fact that the right discussed in the first part of the sentence is, however, subject to the right and authority conferred on Congress to regulate the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Representatives.

On page 311 the Chief Justice said in the Classic case:

> Pursuant to the authority given by section 2 of article I of the Constitution and subject to the legislative power of Congress under section 4 of article I and other pertinent provisions of the Constitution, the States are given, and in fact exercise, a wide discretion in the formulation of a system for the choice by the people of Representatives in Congress. In common with many other States, Louisiana has exercised that discretion by setting up machinery for the effective choice of party candidates for Representatives in Congress by primary elections and by its laws it eliminates or seriously restricts the candidacy at the general election of all those who are defeated at the primary. All political parties, which are defined as those that have cast at least 5 percent of the total votes at specified preceding elections, are required to nominate their candidates for Representatives by direct primary elections. (Louisiana Act No. 46, regular session, 1940, secs. 1 and 3.)
>
> The primary is conducted by the State at public expense. (Act 46, supra, sec. 35.) The primary, as is the general election, is subject to numerous statutory regulations as to the time, place and manner of conducting the election, including provisions to insure that the ballots cast at the primary are correctly counted, and the results of the count correctly recorded and certified to the secretary of state, whose duty it is to place the names of the successful candidates of each party on the official ballot. The secretary of state is prohibited from placing on the official ballot the name of any person as a candidate for any political party not nominated in accordance with the provisions of the act. (Act 4o, sec. 1.)
>
> One whose name does not appear on the primary ballot, if otherwise eligible to become a candidate at the general election, may do so in either of two ways: by filing nomination papers with the requisite num-

ber of signatures or by having his name "written in" on the ballot on the final election.

Then the Chief Justice proceeds to discuss the Louisiana statute and corresponding constitutional provisions of the State of Louisiana. On page 313 of the decision the Chief Justice proceeds as follows:

The right to vote for a Representative in Congress at the general election is, as a matter of law, thus restricted to the successful party candidate, at the primary, to those not candidates at the primary who file nomination papers, and those whose names may be lawfully written into the ballot by the electors. Even if, as appellees argue, contrary to the decision in *Serpas* v. *Trebucq*, supra, voters may lawfully write into their ballot, cast at the general election, the name of a candidate rejected at the primary and have their ballots counted, the practical operation of the primary law in otherwise excluding from the ballot on the general election the names of candidates rejected at the primary is such as to impose serious restrictions upon the choice of candidates, by the voters, save by voting at the primary election. In fact, as alleged in the indictment, the practical operation of the primary in Louisiana is and has been since the primary election was established in 1900, to secure the election of Democratic primary nominee for the Second Congressional District of Louisiana.

Interference with the right to vote in the congressional primary in the Second Congressional District for the choice of Democratic candidate for Congress is thus, as a matter of law and in fact, an interference with the effective choice of the voters at the only stage of the election procedure when their choice is of significance, since it is at the only stage when such interference could have any practical effect on the ultimate result, the choice of the Congressman to represent the district. The primary in Louisiana is an integral part of the procedure for the popular choice of Congressman. The right of qualified voters to vote at the congressional primary in Louisiana and to have their ballots counted is thus the right to participate in that choice.

Then there follows language which I prophesy here today, Mr. President, will become historic legal language in this great fight for civil rights in the United States because it is language on which I think a powerful argument can be based in the Supreme Court once we pass an anti-poll-tax bill. The Chief Justice said:

We come then to the question whether the right is one secured by the Constitution. Section 2 of article I commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes. The right of the people to choose, whatever its appropriate constitutional limitations, where in other respects it is defined, and the mode of its exercise is prescribed by State action in conformity to the Constitution, is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution, and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right. * * * See *Hague* v. *CIO* (307 U. S. 496), * * * giving the same interpretation to the like phrase "rights" "secured by the Constitution" appearing in section 1 of the Civil Rights Act of 1871. * * * While in a loose sense the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States—

Citing cases, including the Breedlove case; and I shall dwell on that citation for a moment.

Sometimes when one picks up a United States Supreme Court decision and reads it, he knows that the Court has omitted reference to a very important case on the same subject matter which had previously been decided by the Supreme Court. This does not happen often but it does happen. The reader is astounded to discover that the case he is reading nowhere mentions the previous case. So as a lawyer he is puzzled; he does not know whether the Court has overruled the previous decision or whether it thinks the present decision is in conformity with the previous decision. In such instances the situation presents to the lawyer advising his clients a very perplexing problem.

The Court here cites the Breedlove case, the case on which the opposition lays so much emphasis, showing perfectly clearly that the Chief Justice had in mind the Breedlove case when he enunciated what I say is historic legal language, because immediately after citing the Breedlove case the Chief Justice said:

This statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution, to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers."

Citing cases. No one can argue with me as to whether or not the Supreme Court was cognizant of the Breedlove case when the Chief Justice wrote that historic language. Of course he was cognizant of it. He cited it. I think he made just as clear in that language as he could that the States are not free, under the sham of qualification, to pass any law restricting the right of suffrage they may want to pass. On the contrary, I think the Classic case is ample legal precedent for supporting the argument until such time as the Supreme Court rules directly on the issue when it comes to decide an anti-poll-tax law passed by the Congress, that the right of the State under article I, section 2, is subject to the restrictive rights of the Congress in section 4 and in section 8 of article I.

I go further, Mr. President, and say that it is perfectly clear that this decision can be cited in support of the proposition that the right of the State under article I, section 2, of the Constitution, insofar as qualification is concerned, must be exercised in conformance with and subject to the right of Congress to pass legislation under the other enabling clauses of the Constitution, including amendment 15, protecting the right of suffrage of free Americans from the type of restriction that clearly impinges upon a free ballot box by way of a poll tax.

Senators were talking last night about shooting away at my argument. Shoot all they will, Mr. President, they cannot erase from the Classic case that language of the Supreme Court. Shoot all they will, they cannot cite language from the Supreme Court in a case that retracts the language of the Classic case.

From the standpoint of a legal argument, the only attempt they made—and I respectfully submit it must be classified by lawyers as a feeble attempt—was to cite denial of a writ of certiorari in the Pirtle case. I do not know, and no one else knows, all the factors that entered into the denial of that writ of certiorari. Lawyers who are familiar with the procedure of the United States Supreme Court know that the Court does not have to give any reason for denying certiorari. As we lawyers say, their reasons rest in their own bosoms.

We know it was not so many years ago that the Supreme Court was under severe attack because of the long delay in disposing of its docket. And again I offer no disrespect to the Court when I point out that it is a fact that the denial of writs of certiorari following the public discussion of the condition of the docket of the Supreme Court increased at a very rapid rate. There are those who are of the opinion that the Court, after that criticism, exercised to a greater extent its selective powers in determining what cases it would pass upon in a given term of court, and denied writs of certiorari, possibly as a means of speeding up action on its docket. At least the fact remains that we do not know in a given case, in the absence of any explanation of the Court, the reasons behind a denial of a writ of certiorari, because frequently all we read is "writ denied."

So I say, there stands the language of the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court in the Classic case, and I think it is rich with constitutional meaning when we apply it to the constitutional problem before us.

The Chief Justice proceeds on page 315 to say:

Obviously included within the right to choose, secured by the Constitution, is the right of qualified voters within a State to cast their ballots and have them counted at congressional elections. The Court has consistently held that this is a right secured by the Constitution.

Citing cases.

And since the constitutional command is without restriction or limitation, the right, unlike those guaranteed by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, is secured against the action of individuals as well as of States.

Citing cases.

But we are now concerned with the question whether the right to choose at a primary election, a candidate for election as Representative, is embraced in the right to choose Representatives secured by article I, section 2. We may assume that the framers of the Constitution, in adopting that section, did not have specifically in mind the selection and elimination of candidates for Congress by the direct primary any more than they contemplated the application of the commerce clause to interstate telephone, telegraph, and wireless communication, which are concededly within it.

But in determining whether a provision of the Constitution applies to a new subject matter, it is of little significance that it is one with which the framers were not familiar. For in setting up an enduring framework of government they undertook to carry out for the indefinite future and in all the vicissitudes of the changing affairs of men, those fundamental purposes which the instrument itself discloses. Hence we read its words, not as we read legislative codes which are subject to continuous revision with the changing course of events, but as the revelation of the great purposes which were intended

to be achieved by the Constitution as a continuing instrument of government.

Citing cases.

That the free choice by the people of representatives in Congress, subject only to the restrictions to be found in sections 2 and 4 of article I and elsewhere in the Constitution, was one of the great purposes of our constitutional scheme of government cannot be doubted.

That is the third time in his decision the Chief Justice points out these restrictions over and above the rights granted in section 2, article I. In his decision the Chief Justice constantly refers to the powers of congressional restriction found elsewhere in the Constitution, including section 4 and section 8, making very clear that section 2, article I, is in fact in the form of words of limitation, as we lawyers say. They are subject to the modifications and restrictions of language qualifying them, to be found elsewhere in the Constitution. They do not confer a blanket right, nor the power to set up any so-called qualification the State wants to; but it is clear in itself, it seems to me, that section 2, article I, must be administered by the States in conformance with the other restrictive clauses of the Constitution, such as amendment 15, which give clear power to the Congress of the United States to pass legislation that will protect suffrage in national elections.

So the Chief Justice says:

Subject only to the restrictions to be found in sections 2 and 4 of article I, and elsewhere in the Constitution, was one of the great purposes of our constitutional scheme of government cannot be doubted. We cannot regard it as any the less constitutional purpose, or its words as any the less guaranteeing the integrity of that choice, when a State, exercising its privilege in the absence of congressional action—

Have we heard the gentlemen of the opposition stress that sentence, Mr. President? I cannot find a word in their speeches about the importance of that sentence. According to my sights on this constitutional question it is very important language. Let me repeat it.

We cannot regard it as any the less the constitutional purpose, or its words as any the less guaranteeing the integrity of that choice, when a State, exercising its privilege in the absence of congressional action, changes the mode of choice from a single step, a general election, to two, of which the first is the choice at a primary of those candidates from whom, as a second step, the representative in Congress is to be chosen at the election.

Nor can we say that that choice which the Constitution protects is restricted to the second step because section 4 of article I, as a means of securing a free choice of representatives by the people, has authorized Congress to regulate the manner of election, without making any mention of primary elections. For we think that the authority of Congress, given by section 4, includes the authority to regulate primary elections when, as in this case, they are a step in the exercise by the people of their choice of representatives in Congress.

Let those of the opposition try to erase that language from the Supreme Court decision. That is the last language which the Supreme Court has handed down on the power of Congress under section 4 of article I of the Constitution. That language is not changed by denial of a writ of certiorari in the Pirtle case. That language is clear notice to the Congress of the United States that section 4 of article I is wealthy in power so far as the right of Congress to take action in protecting the people of the United States in their right of suffrage is concerned. Dictum, is it, Mr. President? Squarely on the nose is that language as to Federal power over primary elections in States, which was one of the questions raised in the Classic case.

The language which I have just read has no semblance of dictum. It is decisive language, bearing upon congressional power under section 4 of article I. A part of my constitutional argument in support of the constitutionality of anti-poll-tax legislation is based upon my contention that, under section 4, Congress has the power vested in it to take the steps necessary to protect national suffrage, which is being imposed upon by poll-tax restrictions under the sham and guise of qualifications in accordance with section 2, article I.

I am not worried about what the Supreme Court will say on this constitutional question, if the opposition will let us get a case before the Supreme Court based upon an actual congressional act prohibiting poll taxes. I think that is a fair proposition. I do not mean that they should vote for an anti-poll-tax bill if they do not believe it to be constitutional, but I do mean that I think it is fair, after they have had their say on their point of view concerning the constitutionality of such legislation, that they give the rest of us, who sincerely believe that it is constitutional, the opportunity to pass it through the Senate and an opportunity then to start it on its way, in accordance with our system of checks and balances in government, to the Supreme Court for final decision.

I do not interpret motives, nor do I assign motives. I simply wish to say that I do not see how there is any escaping the fact that there are many opponents of anti-poll-tax legislation who are not very anxious to have a bill get before the Supreme Court, in view of the language of the Classic case. I have a hunch—and one cannot be blamed for having hunches—that there are a good many opponents of anti-poll-tax legislation who have grave doubt as to whether or not their arguments as to the alleged unconstitutionality of such legislation would survive a Supreme Court test, in view of the language of the Classic case.

The Chief Justice went on, on page 317 in the decision, to say:

The point whether the power conferred by section 4 includes in any circumstances the power to regulate primary elections was reserved in *United States* v. *Gradwell*, supra, 487. In *Newberry* v. *United States*, supra, four Justices of this Court were of opinion that the term "elections" in section 4 of article I did not embrace a primary election, since that procedure was unknown to the framers. A fifth Justice, who with them pronounced the judgment of the Court, was of opinion that a primary, held under a law enacted before the adoption of the seventeenth amendment, for the nomination of candidates for Senator, was not an election, within the meaning of section 4 of article I of the Constitution, presumably because the choice of the primary imposed no legal restrictions on the election of Senators by the State legislatures to which their election had been committed by article I, section 3. The remaining four Justices were of the opinion that a primary election for the choice of candidates for Senator or Representative were elections subject to regulation by Congress within the meaning of section 4 of article I. The question then has not been prejudged by any decision of this Court.

To decide it we turn to the words of the Constitution read in their historical setting as revealing the purpose of its framers, and search for admissible meanings of its words which, in the circumstances of their application, will effectuate those purposes. As we have said, a dominant purpose of section 2, so far as the selection of representatives in Congress is concerned, was to secure to the people the right to choose representatives by the designated electors, that is to say, by some form of election. Compare the seventeenth amendment as to popular election of Senators. From time immemorial an election to public office has been in point of substance no more and no less than the expression by qualified electors of their choice of candidates.

Long before the adoption of the Constitution the form and mode of that expression had changed from time to time. There is no historical warrant for supposing that the framers were under the illusion that the method of effecting the choice of the electors would never change or that, if it did, the change was for that reason to be permitted to defeat the right of the people to choose representatives for Congress which the Constitution had guaranteed. The right to participate in the choice of representatives for Congress includes, as we have said, the right to cast a ballot and to have it counted at the general election, whether for the successful candidate or not. Where the State law has made the primary an integral part of the procedure of choice, or where in fact the primary effectively controls the choice, the right of the elector to have his ballot counted at the primary is likewise included in the right protected by article I, section 2. And this right of participation is protected just as is the right to vote at the election, where the primary is by law made an integral part of the election machinery, whether the voter exercises his right in a party primary which invariably, sometimes or never determines the ultimate choice of the representative. Here, even apart from the circumstance that the Louisiana primary is made by law an integral part of the procedure of choice, the right to choose a representative is in fact controlled by the primary because, as is alleged in the indictment, the choice of candidates at the Democratic primary determines the choice of the elected representative. Moreover, we cannot close our eyes to the fact, already mentioned, that the practical influence of the choice of candidates at the primary may be so great as to affect profoundly the choice at the general election, even though there is no effective legal prohibition upon the rejection at the election of the choice made at the primary, and may thus operate to deprive the voter of his constitutional right of choice.

This was noted and extensively commented upon by the concurring Justices in *Newberry* v. *United States*, supra, 263–269, 285, 287.

Unless the constitutional protection of the integrity of elections extends to primary elections, Congress is left powerless to effect the constitutional purpose.

Note that, Mr. President, because we must not forget that many of the same arguments we have been hearing in opposition to congressional interference, so-called, with State election laws as they relate to poll taxes were made in an attempt to prevent Federal interference,

so-called, into primary elections. That is why this decision of Chief Justice Stone is, in my judgment, so applicable to the issue before us. Of course, it is a fringe case, a borderline case; but, nevertheless, it deals with the interpretation of congressional power over elections, and it recognizes the right of Congress to take a look into procedures that involve primary elections, because the primary elections so frequently determine who the final congressional representative shall be. So Mr. Chief Justice Stone says:

Unless the constitutional protection of the integrity of elections extends to primary elections, Congress is left powerless to effect the constitutional purpose, and the popular choice of representatives is stripped of its constitutional protection save only as Congress, by taking over the control of State elections, may exclude from them the influence of the State primaries. Such an expedient would end that State autonomy with respect to elections which the Constitution contemplated that Congress should be free to leave undisturbed, subject only to such minimum regulation as it should find necessary to insure the freedom and integrity of the choice.

What do you suppose, Mr. President, he means by the use of the words "freedom and integrity of choice"? I think they, at least, are a peg on which to hang an argument that, after all, we do not have freedom of choice and we cannot have integrity of choice, either, when 10,000,000 people find themselves restricted as to their freedom to exercise a free ballot.

Mr. Chief Justice Stone further said:

Words, especially those of a Constitution, are not to be read with such stultifying narrowness. The words of sections 2 and 4 of article I, read in the sense which is plainly permissible and in the light of the constitutional purpose, require us to hold that a primary election which involves a necessary step in the choice of candidates for election as representatives in Congress, and which in the circumstances of this case controls that choice, is an election within the meaning of the constitutional provision and is subject to congressional regulation as to the manner of holding it.

I agree that this case deals with a primary election problem. But I also contend that it deals with the inherent power of the Congress, under section 4 of article I and under the fifteenth amendment, to step in and see to it that the necessary regulations are imposed by Congress to protect free suffrage in any instance in which a State adopts a method or manner of conducting elections which impinges or infringes upon the rights guaranteed by the Constitution as to elections. I do not think we can get away from that point. There is no reversal of that language of the Chief Justice, and it is not dictum. Its language bears directly upon the issue involved in this case.

Chief Justice Stone further said:

Not only does section 4 of article I authorize Congress to regulate the manner of holding elections, but by article I, section 8, clause 18, Congress is given authority "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof." This provision leaves to the Congress the choice of means by which its constitutional powers are to be carried into execution.

That cannot be erased, and I know of no reversal or retraction of that language. In my judgment, it is a clear notice upon the Congress that this decision by the United States Supreme Court recognizes the power, as I have argued in this debate, of the Congress to enact legislation which will protect the suffrage of free citizens; and it seems to me it recognizes by a clear, logical application of the language of the Court to article I, section 2, that that section contains words of limitation subject to the powers of the Congress over elections, vested elsewhere in the Constitution. That is a part of the very heart of the argument I am trying to make clear. It is a part of the very basis of the argument I would urge upon the Supreme Court if I were pleading the constitutionality of an anti-poll-tax bill before that Court. I think the Court would recognize the applicability of that language to the constitutional issue before us.

So I repeat for purposes of emphasis that Chief Justice Stone said:

This provision leaves to the Congress the choice of means by which its constitutional powers are to be carried into execution. Let the end be legitimate; let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional. *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 421). That principle has been consistently adhered to and liberally applied, and extends to the congressional power by appropriate legislation to safeguard the right of choice by the people of representatives in Congress, secured by section 2 of article I.

Mr. President, I think the excerpts I have read from the opinion of Chief Justice Stone in the famous Classic case lay the basic framework and foundation for my argument that the word qualification in section 2, article I, is a word of limitation, subject to the powers over elections given to the Congress in sections 4 and 8 of article I and also in the fifteenth amendment.

But in the Classic case there is a dissenting opinion, not dealing with the particular points I have been stressing. The dissenting opinion is by Mr. Justice Douglas.

There is certain language in the dissenting opinion which I think is worthy of notice in this debate, recognizing, as I do, of course, that it is the language of a dissenting opinion. The lawyers in the Senate Chamber know that the history of constitutional law in this country is one containing many pages which disclose that the dissenting opinions of one decade frequently become the majority opinions of succeeding decades. Therefore, I think this point of view, at least, of Mr. Justice Douglas as set forth in his opinion in the Classic case should be made a part of my remarks. At page 330 of that case, he said:

The important consideration is that the Constitution should be interpreted broadly so as to give to the representatives of a free people abundant power to deal with all the exigencies of the electoral process. It means that the Constitution should be read so as to give Congress an expansive implied power to place beyond the pale, acts which, in their direct or indirect effect, impair the integrity of congressional elections. For when corruption enters, the election is no longer free, the choice of the people is affected. To hold that Congress is powerless to control these primaries would indeed be a narrow construction of the Constitution, inconsistent with the view that that instrument of government was designed not only for contemporary needs but for the vicissitudes of time.

So I agree with most of the views expressed in the opinion of the Court. And it is with diffidence that I dissent from the result there reached.

The disagreement centers on the meaning of section 19 of the Criminal Code, which protects every right secured by the Constitution. The right to vote at a final congressional election and the right to have one's vote counted in such an election have been held to be protected by section 19 (*Ex parte Yarbrough*, supra; *United States* v. *Mosley* (238 U. S. 383)). Yet I do not think that the principles of those cases should be, or properly can be, extended to primary elections. To sustain this indictment we must so extend them. But when we do, we enter perilous territory.

We enter perilous territory because, as stated in *United States* v. *Gradwell* (243 U. S. 476, 485), there is no common-law offense against the United States; "the legislative authority of the Union must make an act a crime, affix a punishment to it, and declare the court that shall have jurisdiction of the offense" (*United States* v. *Hudson* (7 Cranch 32, 34)).

Thus he proceeded to dissent on the ground of a difference with the majority over an application of section 19 of the Criminal Code, but not on the broad principles laid down by the Chief Justice, which I have cited at considerable length, in regard to the powers of Congress in respect to national elections.

There are other cases I intended to discuss and other authorities to which I contemplated referring, but I have spoken at much greater length than I had any thought I would when I started this discussion. I have laid down at least the major premises on which I rest my constitutional argument. With the permission of the Senate, rather than take the time of the Senate to cite the further authorities, I ask to insert as part of my remarks certain material which I shall describe.

First, for review purposes, I should like to have inserted at this point in my remarks the digests to which I have referred, dealing with the Breedlove case, the Pirtle case, the Classic case, and the Edwards case, the so-called California "Okie" case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the digests were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONALITY

1. *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277), decided December 6, 1937: This action was brought to determine whether or not the appellees, the State officials, had acted unlawfully or illegally by refusing to register a white man aged 28 for voting for Federal and State officers at primary and general elections because he had made neither poll-tax returns nor paid any poll taxes. The opinion of the Court was perfectly proper in view of the fact that the appellant demanded the State official to qualify him to vote in a State election as well as a Federal election.

The Court arrived at this erroneous conclusion because it had erroneously judged the nature of the right to vote for Federal officials. The Court thought the nature of the right or the source of the right for a Federal official was the State itself. Surely, the State is not the one to grant a Federal privilege. The Court said "Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State."

2. *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (U. C. A., 6th Ct. (118 Fed. (2d) 218)), decided March 8, 1941, and certiorari denied by the Supreme Court: The issue in this case was whether the State could condition a right to vote for a Congressman in an election, not a primary, because the citizen had not complied, or had failed to pay a poll tax. It was not a State election and not a primary and the citizen had qualified in every way except pay the tax. The State levied the tax and set up the method of collection, having had difficulty in getting it collected, they burdened the franchise with the duty to pay the tax, as a method of collecting. It was therefore a condition precedent to the exercise of the right to vote. The court held that the right to vote in a national election is conditioned on such terms as the State wants to impose, and using the Breedlove case as a precedent about the right conferred by the State, said such right was conferred save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments on race, color, or previous condition of servitude and other provisions of the Constitution. (Unanimous opinion of three judges.)

3. *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299), decided May 28, 1941: In this case the charge was that election officials had violated sections 19 and 20 of the Criminal Code by wilfully altering and falsely counting and certifying the ballots cast in a primary in Louisiana for a Representative of Congress. The questions for decision were whether the rights of qualified voters to vote in Louisiana and to have their ballots counted is a right secured by the Constitution and whether the appellees violated the sections of the code. Stone said, after citing cases going back to *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651) that the right of the people to choose their elective officers is a right "established and guaranteed by the Constitution and hence is one secured by it to those citizens and inhabitants of the State entitled to exercise the right."

He continued: "While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (cites cases), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution, 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.'"

Section 4 authorizes Congress to regulate the times, places, and manner of electing representatives in *United States* v. *Mumford* (16 Fed. 223, C. C., Virginia, 1883).

The Court said there is little regarding an election that is not included in the terms "time," "place," and "manner" and that Congress could legislate generally in respect to general elections.

In the Classic case, Justice Douglas went further on to say: "The important consideration is that the Constitution should be interpreted broadly so as to give the representatives of a free people abundant power to deal with all the exigencies of the electoral process. It means that the Constitution should be read so as to give Congress an expansive implied power to put beyond the pale, acts which in their direct or indirect effect, impair the integrity of congressional elections.

In the California "Okie" case, Justice Jackson in a concurring opinion (*Edwards* v. *California* (314 U. S. 181)): "We should say now, and in no uncertain terms that a man's mere property status, without more, cannot be used by a State to test, qualify, or limit his rights as a citizen of the United States."

The Breedlove case does not distinguish between rights of citizens as State or Federal electors, and the Pittle case is an effort to strike down the poll-tax restriction in Federal elections by judicial reasoning without the exercise of Congress of its power to regulate such elections.

In the Classic case Douglas went on to say that sections 2 and 4 of article I are an arsenal of power ample to protect congressional elections from any and all forms of pollution.

Mr. MORSE. Then, after only a brief mention of it, I shall ask shortly to have inserted in the RECORD certain arguments in support of the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill as submitted by some unquestionably outstanding authorities on constitutional law, in a memorandum entitled "The Case for the Constitutionality of the Pepper Anti-Poll-Tax Bill." I am not offering it as yet. I want first to describe it, if I may. The introduction of the pamphlet reads as follows:

INTRODUCTION

Too often constitutional questions are raised simply to obstruct or delay. In consequence many laymen have come to regard them with impatience as the occasion for a lawyer's game of matching precedents with little relation to actualities. When those who discuss such questions remember that the Constitution primarily embodies great principles of government, that it is indeed "a charter and not a document," constitutional issues assume a new importance. To discuss them in the light of history and political philosophy as well as of the law as formulated by the courts results not only in a more just understanding of the particular issue but also in a quickened sense of the meaning and value of our scheme of government. Such a discussion is of value to lawyers and laymen alike.

It is in the spirit of broad statesmanship that the supporters of the constitutionality of the Pepper anti-poll-tax bill have discussed the specific constitutional questions propounded to them by the Senate committee in charge of that bill. These questions are framed in narrow terms, but no satisfactory answer could be found without consideration of the history of the Constitution and the political philosophy of its founders.

The Pepper bill itself (S. 1280), the constitutional questions posed by the commitee, and the three principal statements in answer to those questions are printed in this pamphlet. The first statement is a memorandum, purposely brief, signed by 10 outstanding legal scholars, 6 of them connected with the poll-tax States either by birth and education or by recent affiliation. These signers are George Gordon Battle, of North Carolina and Virginia, long the leading southern member of the New York bar; Walton Hamilton, of Tennessee, now professor of constitutional law in the Yale Law School; Myres McDougal, of Mississippi, also of the Yale Law School; Leon Greene, of Louisiana and Texas, now dean of Northwestern University Law School; Robert K. Wettach and M. T. Van Hecke, dean and ex-dean of the law school of the University of North Carolina; Lloyd K. Garrison, dean of Wisconsin Law School; Charles Bunn, of the Wisconsin Law School faculty; Walter Gellorn, of Columbia University Law School; and Edwin Borchard, specialist in public law and professor in the Yale Law School.

The statement of Irving Brant is that of an outstanding student of the Constitution, who is also a political philosopher. Mr. Brant is the author of Storm Over the Constitution.

Mr. Morrison, the author of the third statement, has long been professor of constitutional law in Tulane University, and is now a practicing lawyer in New Orleans. Like Mr. Brant, he makes use of constitutional history in his statement, but uses it as the constitutional lawyer rather than the political philosopher. Because his statement will appear in full in the Lawyers Guild Quarterly it has been somewhat abridged for printing in this pamphlet, but no alteration of the meaning has been made.

These three statements all reach the same conclusion, but their authors travel different roads, and so their arguments supplement and strengthen each other. They constitute an important contribution to the understanding of the meaning of the Constitution, and of the plan of our forefathers in establishing a republican form of government.

These statements are in answer to a series of questions which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], then chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, propounded at the Judiciary Committee hearings on the so-called Pepper anti-poll-tax bill. I simply want to read the questions, because they show that the papers presented in answer to the questions bear directly on the great issue of this debate; namely, the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill.

The first question the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] propounded to these gentlemen was this:

Whether or not the drafters of the Constitution adopted, for the Federal election of the House of Representatives, the qualifications that might be laid down, whatever they were, by the legislatures of the several States.

The second query was:

Does this section recognize the right of the separate States to fix the qualifications of the electors by failure to make any reference whatsoever to those qualifications?

The third query was:

Does this justify the inference that again the right to fix the qualifications of the voters is a State right?

The next query was:

Is this not tantamount to acknowledgment by the Congress and by the States, when the nineteenth amendment was submitted and approved, that the fourteenth amendment did not prohibit the States from denying or abridging the right to vote?

And then, the next question that arises is, whether since there are only eight States which now have the poll-tax requirement, the object sought by this bill might not more effectively be attained by a constitutional amendment which should provide that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of any property qualification or poll-tax requirement?

Mr. President, these legal scholars, recognized authorities in the field of constitutional law, wrote answers, in the three memoranda which comprise this pamphlet, to the questions which the Senator from Wyoming put to them, and I ask unanimous consent to have the contents of the pamphlet printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PEPPER ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL

[77th Cong., 1st sess.; S. 1280; in the Senate of the United States, March 31, 1941, Mr. PEPPER introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary]

A bill concerning the qualification of voters or electors within the meaning of section 2, article I, of the Constitution, making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or general election for national offices

Whereas the requirements in many jurisdictions that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote at primaries or elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, have deprived many citizens of the right and privilege of voting as guaranteed to them under the Constitution, and have been detrimental to the integrity of the ballot in that frequently such taxes have been paid for the voters by other persons as an inducement for voting for certain candidates; and

Whereas these requirements have no reasonable relation to the residence, intelligence, ability, character [education, maturity, community-consciousness, freedom from crime], or other qualifications of voters; and

Whereas such requirements deprive many citizens of the right and privilege of voting for national officers, and cause, induce, and abet practices and methods in respect to the holding of primaries and elections detrimental to the proper selection of persons for national offices: Now therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or elections for said offices, within the meaning of section 2 of article I, of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and elections for said national offices and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national offices.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any person from voting or registering to vote in any primary or election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified to vote in such primary or election. No State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision shall levy a poll tax or any other tax on the right or privilege of voting in such primary or election, and any such tax shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified from voting at such primary or election.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to interfere with the manner of selecting persons for national office by requiring the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the cover of authority of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof, to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1942.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The fact that you have presented this memorandum on the constitutional question, and the fact that I have discussed this matter on numerous occasions with Senator PEPPER, the sponsor of the bill, prompts me to take advantage of this opportunity to pose the constitutional questions that seem to appear to some of the members of the committee, in the hope that those witnesses who, hereafter, undertake to testify upon constitutional questions, will endeavor to answer these questions.

Now, the bill, itself, shows on its face a question of the interpretation of section 2, article I, which has arisen in the minds of the sponsors, as well as in the minds of the committee. Now, this provision of the Constitution reads as follows:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

It is obvious, from the language, that the drafters of the Constitution, in providing in this clause the qualification of those who should choose the Members of the House of Representatives, said, in so many words, that these electors should have the qualifications requisite for the elector of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The query is this: Whether or not the drafters of the Constitution adopted, for the Federal election of the House of Representatives, the qualifications that might be laid down, whatever they were, by the legislatures of the several States.

Now, the next section of moment there is section 4, of article I, which reads as follows:

"Time, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may, at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations except as to the places of choosing Senators."

It would seem to be clear, from this provision, that the drafters of the Constitution recognized the right of the respective State legislatures to fix the time, places, and manner of holding elections, but reserved to the Congress the right by law, to make or alter such regulation except as to places of choosing electors.

Query: Does this section recognize the right of the separate States to fix the qualifications of the electors by failure to make any reference whatsoever to those qualifications?

Then we come to article II, section 1, second clause:

"Each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress, et cetera," the electors spoken of, of course, being Presidential electors, and it was recognized by the drafters of the Constitution that the legislatures of the respective States have complete authority to direct the manner of election of such presidential electors.

Query: Does this justify the inference that again the right to fix the qualifications of the voters is a State right?

Then, I am prompted to call attention to the fourteenth amendment and to the nineteenth amendment, both of which have already been mentioned in this testimony this morning.

The portion of the fourteenth amendment which seems to be of significance is this:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

Obviously, this provision has the effect of making all native-born or naturalized persons in the United States citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside.

The question, then, arises as to whether or not the next sentence, which raises a prohibition upon the State, and prevents the State from abridging the privilege or immunity of the citizens, whether that is a prohibition upon the State to make a property qualification or a poll-tax qualification as the basis of the right to vote.

In construing this, the question will arise whether the nineteenth amendment does not have a bearing, because the nineteenth amendment, which was adopted many years after the fourteenth amendment, reads:

"The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

Query: Is this not tantamount to acknowledgment, by the Congress and by the States, when the nineteenth amendment was submitted and approved, that the fourteenth amendment did not prohibit the States from denying or abridging the right to vote?

And then, the next question that arises is, whether, since there are only eight States which now have the poll-tax requirement, the object sought by this bill might not more effectively be attained by a constitutional amendment which should provide that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of any property qualification or poll-tax requirement?

I leave that to the constitutional experts.

Dr. RICE. As to that last question raised, I can only say, momentarily, that the history of child-labor protection is perhaps a nice parallel. Congress tried to prevent child labor by two specific acts, both of which were held to be unconstitutional, and then a constitutional amendment was proposed which never received sufficient strength and finally Congress ratified a bill which has gone into effect.

Senator O'MAHONEY. In other words, the Constitution occasionally is flexible?

Dr. RICE. The Constitution grows.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The committee will be in recess until tomorrow morning at 10:30 o'clock.

Whereupon, at 12:30 o'clock p. m., the committee recessed until 10:30 o'clock the following morning, Saturday, March 14, 1942.

MEMORANDUM

This memorandum is directed to answering briefly certain questions affecting the constitutionality of S. 1280, a bill to eliminate poll-tax requirements in Federal elections. The question as raised by the chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary considering the bill, are appended hereto. In answering these questions, this memorandum deliberately avoids discussion of controversial points not essential to the determination of the constitutionality of S. 1280.

Query 1. "Whether or not the drafters of the Constitution adopted, for the Federal election of the House of Representatives, the qualifications that might be laid down, whatever they were, by the legislatures of the several States."

The answer is "yes"; but such an affirmative reply leaves unresolved the crucial issues.

The basic issue is not whether the States have power to prescribe the qualifications for the Federal suffrage. The Constitution provides that to vote in congressional elections the voters shall have "the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." The basic question is whether the payment of a poll tax is a "qualification" for voting in the constitutional sense.

The Constitution looks to the substance and not to the form. Cf. *Nixon* v. *Condon* (286 U. S. 73). The Constitution does not authorize the States, under the guise of prescribing voting qualifications, to impose, contrary to the laws of Congress regulating Federal elections, restrictions on the Federal franchise that have no reasonable relation to a citizen's qualification to vote. If the payment of a poll tax has no rational relationship to the citizen's capacity to participate in the choice of public officials, it need not be treated by the Congress as a qualification within the meaning of the Constitution. A poll-tax requirement imposes a restriction on the citizen's right to vote, but if it is not a qualification in the constitutional sense, then it is within the power of Congress in regulating Federal elections to override such a restriction on the right of a qualified citizen to vote. As Justice (now Chief Justice) Stone stated in *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299, 315), "While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (citing cases), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution, to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.'"

In *Edwards* v. *California* (314 U. S. 181), the Supreme Court unanimously held that a State could not deny entry to a citizen of the United States merely because he was indigent. The majority of the Court resting their decision upon the commerce clause rejected the suggestion that the State police power could be exercised, as California had attempted to exercise it, to discriminate against citizens because of their indigence. Four of the Justices were of the opinion that, apart from the commerce clause, such discrimination was in violation of the rights of national citizenship as guaranteed both under the original Constitution and the privileges and immunities clause of the fourteenth amendment. One of them, Mr. Justice Jackson, in his concurring opinion, stated broadly (314 U. S. 181, 184–5):

"We should say now, and in no uncertain terms that a man's mere property status, without more, cannot be used by a State to test, qualify, or limit his rights as a citizen of the United States. * * * The mere state of being without funds is a neutral fact—constitutionally an irrelevance, like race, creed, or color. I agree with what I understand to be the holding of the Court that cases which may indicate the contrary are overruled." Whatever might have been true in times past, there is no doubt a serious question today how far property may properly be regarded as a reliable index of or even a rough and ready guide for determining the educational qualification, civic worth, or community loyalty of the citizen.

But a poll-tax requirement clearly has much less relationship to a citizen's capacity to perform the civic responsibility of voting than has a property test. The most shiftless of men may pay the tax because he found a $5 bill upon the street. The worthiest citizen may prefer to feed his family. In truth it is difficult today to establish any real or substantial relationship between the poll-tax requirement and the civic worth or capacity of the citizen. Until the Congress acts, the courts may hesitate to disturb State electoral practices because of their own views of the logical requirements of the Constitution. But any such hesitancy upon the part of the courts to upset State practices of doubtful constitutionality would be dispelled by congressional action. It would seem clear, therefore, that the poll-tax requirement need not be regarded by the Congress as an electoral qualification within the meaning of the Constitution giving the States the power to fix qualifications for the Federal suffrage, cf. *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (312 U. S. 277).

The Congress has affirmative power to regulate Federal elections to protect the rights of citizens under the Constitution and to guard against fraud and corruption in the exercise of the Federal franchise. The right of citizens to vote at congressional elections, subject only to such limitations as may be legally imposed by the State or Federal Government in conformity with the Constitution, is a right secured by the Constitution, which the Congress is empowered to protect by appropriate legislation. (*United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299, 314–315, 320).) Otherwise the rights of qualified voters could be set at naught. Assuming that certain restrictions on the suffrage which are not genuine qualifications in the constitutional sense may be imposed by the States in the absence of congressional action, such restrictions do not escape the Federal power to preserve the integrity of Federal elections and to protect the rights of constitutionally qualified voters. In the exercise of its powers over Federal elections, it is altogether fitting and proper for the Congress to prohibit State poll-tax requirements if in the judgment of the Congress such requirements unduly restrict the rights of national citizenship and make for fraud and corruption in Federal elections.

It is unnecessary to consider in this memorandum whether the State poll taxes are invalid in the absence of Federal legislation on the ground that they violate the rights of national citizenship secured by the original Constitution or by the fourteenth amendment. It is sufficient to affirm the power of the Congress to nullify such State statutes in the exercise of its power to regulate Federal elections and to protect the rights of constitutionally qualified voters. It is sufficient to affirm that should the Congress exercise its power in the premises, the courts in our judgment would sustain and uphold the action of the Congress.

Query 2. "Does this section (art. I, sec. 4) recognize the right of the separate States to fix the qualifications of the electors by failure to make any reference whatsoever to those qualifications."

Answer: We may assume an affirmative answer to this query. The power of the States to fix qualifications, however, is limited, as explained in our answer to query 1, by (1) the inherent meaning of the word "qualifications" as used in the Constitution, and (2) the power of Congress to protect the integrity of Federal elections and the rights of constitutionally qualified voters.

Query 3. Relates to article II, section 1, clause 2 of the Constitution which provides that "Each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct" the presidential electors.

While Congress could not question the right of a State legislature to provide the manner of appointment of Presidential electors, a State legislature in exercising that right must exercise it in conformity with the requirements of the Constitution. If the legislature provides for the appointment to be made by the process of election, that election, like a primary election for congressional candidates, "involves a necessary step in the choice of candidates" for national office "which in the circumstances of this case controls that choice" (*United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299, 320)), and that choice must be made in a manner that does not offend the Constitution or such legislation as the Congress may reasonably deem appropriate to protect the rights of constitutionally qualified voters from discrimination and invasion. Article II, section 1, clause 2 of the Constitution does not authorize the State legislature to fix arbitrary conditions to the right to vote for Presidential electors which have no relation to the voter's worth or ability.

Query 4. Relates to the privileges and immunities clause of the fourteenth amendment; and to the effect of the nineteenth amendment upon its interpretation.

Answer: The right of a qualified voter to vote subject to the limitations imposed by the Constitution, is a right secured by the Constitution itself prior to the adoption of the fourteenth amendment, and that right may be protected by appropriate congressional legislation (*United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299, 315, 320)). That right has only been fortified and strengthened by the privileges and immunities clause of the fourteenth amendment. The imposition by the States of proper qualifications for voting does not abridge the rights of national citizenship, either under the original Constitution or the fourteenth amendment. But restrictions which are not qualifications in the constitutional sense cannot survive congressional action to protect the rights of national citizenship under the original Constitution or the fourteenth amendment. It is unnecessary to consider whether a poll-tax requirement or a property test is invalid under the Constitution or the fourteenth amendment in the absence of Federal legislation.

The nineteenth amendment merely took note of the fact that sex was historically recognized as an appropriate qualification. It decreed that thereafter the right to vote should not be denied on account of sex either by the United States or by the States. It applied to State as well as Federal suffrage. It certainly throws no light on whether a State poll-tax requirement should be regarded by the Congress as a qualification in the constitutional sense for voting at a Federal election. The nineteenth amendment, which was designed to broaden the suffrage, certainly was not intended to take away any power the Congress might otherwise have to protect the rights of national citizenship.

If the poll tax is not a legitimate qualification for the Federal suffrage in the constitutional sense, the Congress has the power to eliminate it and protect the rights of national citizenship. A constitutional amendment is not necessary to achieve a result within the existing power of the Congress.

George Gordon Battle, Walton Hamilton, Myres S. McDougal, Leon Greene, M. T. Van Hecke, Robert K. Wettach, Lloyd K. Garrison, Edwin Borchard, Walter Gellhorn, Charles Bunn.

STATEMENT OF IRVING BRANT ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF S. 1280, BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE, JULY 30, 1942

The poll tax, employed as a restriction upon the right of suffrage, directly violates two provisions of the Constitution and comes within the regulatory powers of Congress under three other provisions.

It violates and can be abolished by Congress under article IV, section 4, which says that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

It violates and can be abolished by Congress under the Fourteenth Amendment,

which says that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

It comes within the regulatory powers of Congress, and can be abolished, through the combined effect of article I, section 2, and the 18th clause of article I, section 8. The original jurisdiction arises from section 2, which says that in the election of the House of Representatives, "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

It comes within the regulatory powers of Congress, and can be abolished, under article I, section 4, which gives Congress power to regulate the "time, places, and manner" of electing Members of Congress.

All of these clauses have back of them the broad authority of the eighteenth clause of article I, section 8, which empowers Congress to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested in the Government of the United States. From that eighteenth clause Congress also derives independent power of legislation to protect the Federal Government in its constitutional independence and supremacy. That would include the power to control Federal elections.

To pursue this last point first, the Federal Government, by the terms of the Constitution, is a republican government, a government of the people, and a supreme government in all that comes within its scope. This carries with it, implemented by the "necessary and proper" clause, the right of the Federal Government to insure its own perpetuation, its independence of State control, its supremacy over the States in Federal affairs, and its status as a government of the people of the United States. If the Constitution did not contain a single word on the subject of congressional elections Congress would have plenary power to regulate them as a part of the implied power of a supreme government to maintain its supremacy, of an independent government to maintain its independence, of a republican government to maintain its republicanism.

However, it is not necessary to rely on this implication. The election of Members of Congress is specifically made a Federal matter by sections 2 and 4 of article I—section 2 setting up the qualifications of electors, section 4 regulating elections.

Article I, section 2, bears upon S. 1280 in two respects, first as to the nature of governmental power over Federal elections, whether it is primarily a Federal power or a State power; second, as to the scope and meaning of the proviso that congressional electors shall have the same qualifications as electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

It has been argued, by opponents of S. 1280, that because of the way congressional electors are defined the fixing of their qualifications is a State right and that any intervention of the Federal Government in that field is a Federal interference with a right of the States. To show the fallacy of that argument, we need but ask from what source the States derive this supposed right. It stems entirely from the Federal Constitution. Therefore it is not a State right at all, but a use by the Federal Government, for Federal purposes, of certain State electoral machinery. This has been the ruling of the United States Supreme Court and it was the opinion of those who wrote the Constitution. James Madison made it clear in No. 52 of the Federalist when he said:

"The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government. It was incumbent on the convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the Constitution."

In the Newberry case Chief Justice White called sections 2 and 3 of article I "reservoirs of vital Federal power constituting the generative sources of the powers of section 4," and Justice Pitney, agreeing on this point in his dissent from the decision, declared for himself and Justices Brandeis and Clarke: "For the election of Senators and Representatives in Congress is a Federal function; whatever the States do in the matter they do under authority derived from the Constitution of the United States." The same position was taken by Chief Justice Stone for the majority, and Justice Douglas for the minority, in *U. S.* v. *Classic* (decided in 1941).

Section 2, therefore, does not appear in the Constitution as a State right to define Federal electors, but as a definition and establishment of a Federal right in terms of State law. When Madison discussed this subject in 1787, he had no fear of the effect of it. "It cannot be feared," he wrote in Federalist 52, "that the people of the States will alter this part of their constitutions in such a manner as to abridge the rights secured to them by the Federal Constitution." Madison misjudged the future, but in the very act of expressing his mistaken belief that the rights of State citizenship would not be abridged by the States, he made it plain that misuse of section 2 by the States would be an abridgement of Federal citizenship. Thus, at the very dawn of consitutional history, we have an answer to the question which next presents itself—whether, having defined a Federal electorate in terms of a State electorate, the Federal Government is bound to accept anything, no matter what its nature, that a State chooses to call a qualification for voting.

The answer to that must be "no," for three reasons:

1. Any other answer would imply that the Constitution is not an organic whole, but that one section of it can be lifted out and interpreted without regard to any other section or to the general nature of the entire law.

2. The mere fact of placing an affirmative clause in the Constitution gives the Federal Government the power and duty of policing that clause, to see that it is obeyed in accordance with its true substance and purpose as a part of the fundamental law.

3. In the understanding of any law, words must be given their true meaning. A qualification for voting is not simply the ability to dodge an arbitrary or unnatural disqualification. It must bear some reasonable relationship to the purpose for which electoral qualifications are set up. It must be a test of fitness harmonizing with American principles of government and bearing a living relationship to the period in which it is in vogue.

That brings us to the specific question whether the States, in restraining the right of suffrage by means of a poll-tax requirement, have set up a qualification for electors within the meaning and purpose of article I, section 2; and, furthermore, whether such a restraint upon suffrage comes within the power of Congress under other provisions of the Constitution.

What did the framers of the Constitution have in mind when they drafted article I, section 2? Did they intend to establish a broad and democratic base for the election of representatives, or a narrow and aristocratic base? Or did they simply turn the matter over to the States with no thought of what the States might do?

You will notice, first, that this section accepts the qualifications of the "most numerous" branch of the State legislature. The reason for that was that in some of the States a broader right of suffrage existed in the election of the larger house of the legislature than of the smaller. In this distinction, the larger body stood for the rights of the people, the smaller for the rights of property. These words were put into the Constitution, therefore, to insure a broad suffrage for the maintenance of popular rights by the House of Representatives, while the Senate, chosen by State legislatures, was expected to have more regard for property rights.

The popular intent in framing section 2 was further emphasized by the fact that in the process of adopting this clause, the framers of the Constitution voted down a motion to limit the right of voting to freeholders of land. The recorded debate shows that the purpose and expected result was to broaden the right of suffrage for all time. James McHenry read this section of the Constitution to the Maryland Legislature on November 29, 1787. This is what he said about it:

"It was objected that if the qualifications of the electors were the same as in the State governments, it would involve in the Federal system all the disorders of a democracy; and it was therefore contended that none but freeholders, permanently interested in the Government, ought to have a right of suffrage. The venerable Franklin opposed to this the natural rights of man—their rights to an immediate voice in the General Assembly of the whole Nation, or to a right of suffrage and representation."

Franklin was not the only one who spoke thus. No man in that convention believed that in writing article I, section 2, they were simply leaving it to the discretion of the States whether few or many citizens should be allowed to vote.

Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, advocating the adoption of this provision, said: "The people will not readily subscribe to the National Constitution if it should subject them to be disfranchised."

George Mason, of Virginia, advocating its adoption, said: "Eight or nine States have extended the right of suffrage beyond the freeholders. What will the people there say, if they should be disfranchised?"

Pierce Butler, of South Carolina, advocating its adoption, said: "There is no right of which the people are more jealous than that of suffrage. Abridgments of it tend [as in Holland] to * * * a rank aristocracy."

Even the opponents of section 2 had the same opinion of its effect. Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, opposing this provision, said: "Give the votes to people who have no property, and they will sell them to the rich who will be able to buy them." John Dickinson, of Delaware, opposing the provision, warned against "the dangerous influence of those multitudes without property and without principle with which our country, like all others, will in time abound."

Because of differing State laws and differing opinions, it was easier to provide for uniformity between State and Federal qualifications than for Federal uniformity among the 13 States, but both in the phraseology employed and in the choice of alternatives the purpose of section 2 was revealed, and the purpose was to establish a broadly democratic base for Federal elections. Madison described the result to the people of America in No. 57 of the Federalist:

"Who are to be the electors of the Federal representatives? Not the rich, more than the poor; not the learned, more than the ignorant; not the haughty heirs of distinguished names, more than the humble sons of obscurity and unpropitious fortune. The electors are to be the great body of the people of the United States."

The record shows conclusively that article I, section 2 was adopted, not in recognition of any State right to define Federal electors, not to disclaim Federal responsibility, not to open the way to the disfranchisement of American citizens, but as a convenient means of assuring the right of suffrage to the great body of the people without overriding existing State laws which, on the whole, conformed to the standards of that day. Whenever Congress, by virtue of its power to make

necessary and proper laws, elects to enforce article I, section 2 by ending an arbitrary and unnatural disqualification of voters, it will but carry out the declared purpose of the framers of the Constitution to base congressional elections upon the great body of the people, rich and poor alike.

The fathers of our country could not visualize the coming of a time when the people would be corruptly deprived of their rights in State elections, and thereby cause Federal rights to be lost. Put they did look ahead to a time when the conduct of State governments might cause Federal suffrage rights to be lost, and they provided against it in article I, section 4. This section gives Congress power, by law, to regulate the time, places, and manner of electing Members of Congress, and to alter State laws on the subject. The debates in the Constitutional Convention show that the principal purpose of this clause was to make Federal authority paramount in Federal elections and to guard them against corruption. Rufus King, of Massachusetts, said that failure to give Congress this power would be "fatal to the Federal establishment." The words, "time, places, and manner," were not used narrowly. Madison said: "These were words of great latitude." It was impossible, he said, to foresee all the abuses that might arise from an uncontrolled discretion in the States. Whenever the State legislatures had a favorite measure to carry, he said, "they would take care so to mold their regulations as to favor the candidates they wished to succeed."

Under section 4, Congress has acted from time to time to prevent corruption in Federal elections. The poll tax is an agency of wholesale corruption, employed by political machines to debauch and control both Federal and State elections. The Virginia poll-tax requirement of the 1870's was described in the debate on its repeal as having "opened the floodgates of corruption." Poll-tax corruption was a prime factor in the repeal of the requirement in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania.

The poll tax corrupts elections in two ways, by a conditional disfranchisement of the voter, and by what amounts to an absolute disqualification.

The corrupting influence of the conditional disfranchisement is due to the fact that the disqualification can more easily be removed by an agent of political corruption than by the victim of the disfranchisement. Either in accordance with State law or in violation of State law, corrupt political machines buy up poll-tax receipts for those whose votes can be controlled. Citizens who cannot be controlled may be disfranchised by leaving their names off the assessors' books. If the law requires poll-tax payment several months before election, postdated receipts are given to the henchmen of the corrupt machine.

Relatively complete disfranchisement results from various forms of trickery in the writing of the law. In some States the tax is made cumulative, so that, although the yearly rate is small, the total is an impassable bar to voting. In some States it is unlawful to make any effort to collect the tax, which emphasizes the fact that it is not a revenue measure nor even a financial test, but a planned system of disfranchisement. The effect is to corrupt the election by the very development Madison said section 4 was to guard against, a slanting of it by State legislatures "to favor the candidates they wished to succeed." The corruption is the deeper and more pernicious because it aims, by legal trickery, to favor a particular class of candidates in successive elections.

Against the power of Congress to prevent corruption by forbidding poll-tax restrictions it has been argued that this method is unconstitutional because other and lesser measures might be employed to the same end. Those who argue thus would overturn the definition of the "necessary" and "proper" clause given by Chief Justice Marshall in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* and followed by the Supreme Court without deviation for a century and a quarter.

Observe what happens when you place sections 2 and 4 together, and consider them in relation to each other. Treated as broad and positive powers, they fit snugly together and complement each other. If Congress abolishes the poll-tax requirement under section 4, to prevent corruption, it thereby restores the breadth of suffrage contemplated by the framers of the Constitution when they drafted section 2. If you act under section 2 to defend the rights of citizens, you thereby put an end to the corruption which section 4 guards against. But if you hold that either of these sections takes away the power of Congress to act under the other section, you nullify the purpose of both.

One need not, I believe, go beyond these clauses of the Constitution to find ample power in Congress to put an end to the misuse of the poll tax in Federal elections. Yet this is a narrow approach. When the Constitution is treated as an organic whole, the constitutionality of S. 1280 ceases to turn upon the sections dealing with electoral processes and becomes a matter of the fundamental rights of American citizenship and the fundamental nature of American Government. The basic question is whether the millions of voters disfranchised by poll taxes are deprived of one of the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States guaranteed to them by the Constitution. Still more basic, but unnecessary to prove because it includes the last, is the question whether this denial of the rights of citizens goes so far as to subvert the republican form of State government made obligatory by the Constitution. For purposes of discussion, these two matters are interrelated. Anything that subverts republican government takes away the privileges and immunities of citizens. Anything that denies the constitutional rights of citizens in matters of government has a tendency to subvert the republican form of government founded upon those rights. Qualifications of electors laid down by State legislatures must harmonize with the constitutional rights of citizens.

Is the right to vote a privilege inherent in American citizenship? Franklin must have thought so when he made it still more basic, declaring that the right to vote is one of the natural rights of man. Jefferson must have thought so in 1824 when he said of his own State of Virginia: "The exclusion of a majority of our freemen from the right of representation is merely arbitrary, and a usurpation of the minority over the majority."

We are likely to be misled on this subject by the fact that property and taxpaying qualifications for voting were once universal in America, and were but slowly eradicated. Of this it may be said, first, that there is no basic resemblance—rather, indeed, a contrast—between the modern poll tax, used as a method of disfranchisement, and the early poll tax which was a true revenue measure and had the effect of extending the right of suffrage. In the second place, the failure to recognize a right at any given time does not prove its nonexistence; and, third, the absence of a right at one time does not prove its nonexistence later.

The rights of American citizens are not static. They are alive and growing, and the more slowly they grow the more surely they are established. Slow growth means a testing of principles in the face of opposition. The privileges and immunities protected by the Constitution are not merely those which were universally acknowledged in 1787 and 1868. They are the accumulated rights and privileges of the whole period in which they were developed, from the days of Protagoras down to the present moment. The poll tax as a weapon against the right to vote is not a recurrence to the property qualifications of 1787. It is a return to the principles of the Greek slave state of the time of Aristotle, who said, as paraphrased by Montesquieu: "It was only by the corruption of some democracies that artisans became freemen * * * a well-regulated republic will never give them the right and freedom of the city." Poll-tax disfranchisement is based on the argument against a broad suffrage set forth by Gouverneur Morris in the Constitutional Convention and denounced and rejected by that body. Said Morris: "The time is not distant when this country will abound with mechanics and manufacturers [by which he meant factory workers]. * * * Will such men be the secure and faithful guardians of liberty?" The founders of our country rejected that doctrine. The Constitution rejects it. But the poll tax accepts it. The poll tax is a device for turning mechanics, factory workers, sharecroppers, tenant farmers, poor landowners, and day laborers back to the condition of servitude which Aristotle and Gouverneur Morris and the Bourbon kings of France thought them fitted for.

I wish now to call attention to the contrast between the modern poll tax and the early American property qualifications for voting. The American colonies were settled in protest against feudal land monopoly. Early land ownership in America was the badge not only of good citizenship, but of democratic equality. It was associated with the doctrine of Montesquieu that in a well-regulated republic, wealth should be divided as evenly as practicable and land holdings should be small and equal. It was associated also with the feeling of those who lived upon the land that it was the source of all things good.

When the colonists first adopted the laws limiting the suffrage to landed freeholders, it produced a near approach to universal suffrage for free adult males, because practically all freemen were freeholders. As land rose in value and men turned to industrial pursuits, disfranchisement resulted. The right to vote was therefore broadened by admitting freemen who paid taxes. The levying of any new tax increased the number of electors. The New Hampshire poll tax of 1784, and other later poll taxes, were laid for the specific purpose of increasing the number of voters. The franchise was broadened further by extending it to citizens who worked upon the public roads or served in the militia. The fundamental test was not wealth, but evidence of devotion to the state, and when the turbulent frontier pushed westward, that evidence was finally found in the simple fact of residence and citizenship. All of this was part of the American march toward universal free manhood suffrage, which has been a part of the original constitution of every State admitted to the Union since 1819, and, until reversed by the modern poll tax, had been accepted by every other State of the Union except Georgia.

This whole evolutionary process toward universal suffrage was a mere writing into American history of the doctrine laid down by Franklin in 1787 that the right to vote is among the natural rights of men. The modern poll tax is an attempt to reverse the processes of political evolution.

Even more directly, the modern poll tax violates the principle of majority government upon which our Constitution is founded. Here there is no evolutionary process, no gradual recognition of public rights under changing conditions. Majority rule has always been the basic principle of American Government. Madison put the matter clearly in 1821 when he declared himself against any property qualification for voting, saying: "It violates the vital principle of free government that those who are to be bound by laws ought to have a voice in making them, and the violation would be

more strikingly unjust as the lawmakers became the minority."

Madison was protesting against the Virginia law limiting the franchise to landowners. But that law, when first adopted, extended the franchise to more than nine-tenths of the adult free males of the colony. It was only when the States lagged in changing their laws to meet changing conditions that they came into conflict with the vital principle of republican rule. These early practices and trends are diametrically opposed to the principle of the modern poll tax, which not only runs counter to the evolutionary development of the rights of American citizens, but also nullifies the fundamental principle of republican government—the rule of the majority.

Madison warned in No. 39 of the Federalist against the easy habit of calling everything a republic that was not a monarchy or a pure democracy. It is impossible, he wrote, to find the distinctive characteristics of the republican form except by recurring to principles. By that test, he wrote:

"We may define a republic to be, or at least may bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their offices during pleasure, for a limited period, or during good behavior. It is essential to such a government that it be derived from the great body of the society, not from an inconsiderable proportion, or a favored class of it."

Under that definition by Madison, the republican form of government does not exist today in eight States of the American Union. The government of those eight States, therefore, cannot be in accord with the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States.

Here we have something more than a denial of the individual right of the individual citizen to a share in his own Government. It is a denial also of the general public right to majority government in the several States, and to a national government based upon the great body of the people. The poll tax takes away from the individual his constitutional right to help write the laws by which he is governed. It takes away the right of the individual to share in the formation of a collective majority. It takes away the constitutional right of the entire society to enjoy the privilege of majority government.

The fourteenth amendment forbids the States to abridge these privileges, and Congress, under that same amendment, is empowered and enjoined to protect them. The Federal Government is required by the Constitution to maintain the republican form of government in the States. Government by a minority is not the republican form of government which our forefathers created, the only republican government known to our Constitution. It is no answer to say that citizens can obtain the right to vote by paying up their poll taxes. In the State of Alabama, a farmer who has spent his cash income raising a family, buying clothing and shoes for his children, paying for a small farm and keeping up his property taxes, may by default of poll taxes during this period find himself in a position where he must pay $72 cash to regain the franchise for himself and his wife. That is a lifetime disfranchisement, which bears no relationship to his qualifications as a citizen. The fourteenth amendment has little meaning if it does not extend to the cure of such a denial of American rights and perversion of republican government.

The question has been asked why, if the fourteenth amendment covers the voting rights of citizens, it was necessary to adopt the nineteenth amendment in order to extend the right of suffrage to women. That is an excellent negative illustration of the principle of evolutionary growth in the privileges of citizenship. The nineteenth amendment was necessary because the organic growth of the right of suffrage had been confined to men. Similarly, the fifteenth amendment was needed to enfranchise Negroes because the organic growth of the right of suffrage had been confined to white men. Let us suppose that men and women had enjoyed equality at the ballot box from the beginning of American history, that in the colonial period they had been disfranchised to an equal extent by property qualifications, and that each broadening of the right of suffrage had applied equally to men and women. We should then have attained, by 1868, not universal manhood suffrage, but universal suffrage regardless of sex. Then, we'll say, about the year 1919 some State passes a law forbidding women to vote, disfranchising at one stroke half of the entire electorate, taking away a right which they had enjoyed from the foundation of our country. Do you think it would take a nineteenth amendment to wipe out that denial of the privileges and immunities of citizens?

Thus you have four separate provisions of the Constitution, all harmonious, all supplementing each other, under any or all of which Congress has power to abolish the poll-tax restriction upon the right to vote in Federal elections. It has not only the power but the duty. I can hardly do better in closing than to quote the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Jackson in the unanimous decision by which the Court denied the right of California to exclude a citizen from its territory because of his indigence. He said: "We should say now, in no uncertain terms, that a man's mere property status, without more, cannot be used by a State to test, qualify, or limit his rights as a citizen of the United States." There you have in one sentence the judicial and moral verdict upon the poll tax.

STATEMENT OF JAMES T. MORRISON

I. THE FOUNDING FATHERS CONTEMPLATED AND AUTHORIZED CONGRESS TO LEGISLATE ON THE QUALIFICATION OF ELECTORS

In order to determine the intention of the founding fathers in drafting section 2 of article I of the Constitution, it is necessary to turn for a moment to the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention. The archetype of this section appears in the plan for a constitution submitted to the Convention by Mr. Pinckney. In the Pinckney plan, the provision appears as follows:

"ART. 3. The members of the House of Delegates shall be chosen every — year by the people of the several States; and the qualification of the electors shall be the same as those of the electors in the several States for their legislature." (5 Elliot's Debate, p. 129.)

This provision first came up for consideration in the Convention on Thursday, May 31, 1787, when it was proposed "that the members of the first branch of the legislature ought to be selected by the people of the several States." This resolution was opposed by Messrs. Sherman and Gerry, who favored election by the legislatures. Messrs. Mason, Wilson, and Madison, however, argued for the resolution, and it was carried by a vote of 6 to 2.

The question was again adverted to in Committee of the Whole on June 6, when Mr. C. C. Pinckney moved "that the first branch * * * be elected by the State legislatures, and not by the people." This time Mr. Rutledge joined Messrs. Gerry and Sherman in arguing for election by the State legislatures and Colonel Mason and Messrs. Dickinson, Read, and Pierce joined Wilson and Madison in arguing for election by the people. The Committee of the Whole defeated the proposed change by a vote of 8 to 3.

Again, on Thursday, June 21, the proposition was brought up and, according to Mr. Madison, "General Pinckney moved 'that the first branch, instead of being elected by the people, should be elected in such manner as the legislature of each State should direct.'" After considerable discussion, this proposal was finally rejected by a vote of 4 to 6. * * *

Finally, on Tuesday, August 7, the question of the qualification of electors was again taken up in a consideration of the report of the committee of detail. The committee had proposed the following as the constitutional provision:

"The qualification of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors, in the several States, of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures."

Mr. Madison reports that "Mr. Gouverneur Morris moved to strike out the last members of the section, beginning with the words 'qualification of electors,' in order that some other provision might be submitted which would restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders." This motion provoked considerable debate in the Convention. Mr. Wilson argued that this clause was carefully considered "and he did not think it could be changed for the better. It was difficult to form any uniform rule of qualification for all the States. Unnecessary innovations, he thought, too, should be avoided. It would be very hard and disagreeable for the same person at the same time, to vote for representatives in the State legislature, and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislature."

* * * * *

Finally, and conclusively, the Convention, on June 21, 1787, flatly rejected a proposition that would have placed the qualifications of voters exclusively within the discretion of the State legislatures on grounds incompatible with a surrender of the power to prescribe qualifications by the National Government. On that date, pursuant to prior notice, C. C. Pinckney moved "that the first branch, instead of being elected by the people, should be elected in such manner as the legislature of each State should direct."

This resolution was vigorously attacked:

"Hamilton considered the motion as intended manifestly to transfer the election from the people to the State legislatures, which would essentially vitiate the plan. It would increase the State influence which could not be too watchfully guarded against.

"Wilson considered the election of the first branch by the people, not only as the cornerstone, but as the foundation of the fabric. The difference was particularly worthy of notice in this respect, that the legislatures are actuated not merely by the sentiment of the people, but have an official sentiment opposed to that of the general government, and perhaps to that of the people themselves.

"King enlarged on the same distinction. He supposed the legislatures would constantly choose men subservient to their own views, as contrasted to the general interest, and that they might even devise modes of election that would be subversive of the end in view. He remarked several instances in which the views of a State might be at variance with those of the general government * * *."

Mr. Pinckney's motion was defeated by a vote of 6 to 4. (Prescott—Drafting the Federal Constitution, pp. 208 ff.)

Here, then, is a perfectly clear expression by the Convention that the State legislatures should not be permitted to exercise an exclusive discretion as to the qualifications of electors of national officers because "they may even devise modes of election that would be subversive of the end in view," which certainly the language of article I, section 4, of the Constitution does not override.

While the Constitution as finally submitted did not "restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders" as Gouverneur Morris proposed, it

did omit the significant phrase that the qualifications of electors "shall be the same, from time to time," as those of the electors in the several States, leaving the provision merely to read:

"Electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

This highly significant omission can be explained only on the basis of the objection urged by Gouverneur Morris in convention on August 7, "that it makes the qualifications of the National Legislature depend on the will of the State, which he thought not proper."

The significance of the omission of the requirement that the qualifications of electors "shall be the same, from time to time" as those of the electors in the several States, and of the refusal of the Convention to grant the State legislatures exclusive discretion with regard to national elections, because the State legislatures "might even devise modes of elections that would be subversive of the end in view," is made even more apparent by the inclusion of clause 1 in article I, section 4, providing:

"The time, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators."

These two clauses read together, particularly in light of Mr. Madison's notes on the discussion in the Convention, and the fears of the fathers that the State legislatures "might even devise modes of elections that would be subversive of the end in view," show clearly an attempt to synchronize the view of Mr. Wilson that "it was difficult to form any uniform rule of qualifications for all the States. Unnecessary innovations * * * should be avoided." With Gouverneur Morris' objection "* * * it makes the qualifications of the National Legislature depend on the will of the State, which he thought not proper." The Constitution as finally worked out provides no uniform rule of qualification, makes no innovations and gives to the State, in the first instance, regulatory powers with regard even to national elections; but it heeds Gouverneur Morris' objections by retaining in Congress the power "to make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

Finally, if there was any question but that the founding fathers did not intend to surrender completely to the States the fundamental democratic power of determining the qualifications of voters, it is erased by the plain language of article I, section 8, subsection 18:

"The Congress shall have power * * * to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution * * * all * * * powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States."

Not only is the regulation of the "time, place, and manner of holding elections" a power specifically and expressly vested in the Congress by article I, section 4, but the determination of the qualifications of voters is a power unquestionably exercised by the Government of the United States in article I, section 2 of the Constitution itself. The very exercise of the power by the Constitution proves conclusively that it is one "vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States," from which it inevitably follows that Congress has the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying (it) into execution."

It has been urged that article I, section 4, clause 1 should be restricted to the mechanics of election and that it does not apply to the substance thereof or to the qualifications of electors. But this view is totally inacceptable in light of the history of article I, section 2, as set out above. It would, indeed, be strange if the founding fathers, whose wisdom and political sagacity in creating a document of enduring strength, permitted in this single instance an aberration which reserved to the National Government the right only to tinker with the mechanics of election while leaving entirely within the discretion, one might almost say, within the caprice, of the States complete power over the substance thereof. But there is nothing in the Constitution to indicate that the founding fathers were so shortsighted. They must have known, for instance, that Massachusetts from 1631 to 1664 had a law declaring that "for time to come noe man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politicke, but such as are members of some of the churches within the lymitts of the same," and that in the colonial period from which the country was then but just emerging "Baptists, Quakers, Roman Catholics, and Jews frequently found themselves excluded from political rights."

Certainly it cannot be suggested that the founding fathers meant to perpetuate such a theocratic system, or to make it possible for it to gain a foothold or to endure as a result of individual State action. Indeed, the Convention was already split on the question of property qualifications by pressure from the rising mechanics and merchant class, who were opposed to the property qualification. The record of the Convention makes it clear that it was in order not to disturb the delicate balance achieved in the several States between the proprietary and mechanics classes that the compromise incorporated in article I, section 2 was hit upon and adopted. It represents an acceptance for the time being only, of the status quo; it does not even suggest that the adjustment made shall be permanent; indeed, it was purposely designed to permit of change; and certainly it does not even imply that only the individual States can change it. To the contrary, words which did imply exclusive power in the States to alter the qualification of voters were significantly omitted after Gouverneur Morris' objection "that it made the qualifications of the National Legislature depend on the will of the States, which he thought not proper." To turn this clause, then, into a surrender of power by the National Government to the States is to miss the point always insisted upon by the fathers, that the National Government must prescribe the qualifications of its voters, and to defeat the whole purpose of its inclusion in the Constitution, for it is obvious that if the purpose of the clause were to surrender the power to the States, it need never have been included in the Constitution at all, or would have been phrased in unambiguous language such as was used in giving the State legislatures exclusive jurisdiction, with certain exceptions, over the qualifications of Presidential electors.

That article I, section 4, clause 1, was neither intended nor understood to be the innocuous procedural regulations of election machinery ascribed to it by later writers, appears clearly from the storm of controversy which arose over its inclusion in the Constitution. This controversy was so heated that Hamilton felt constrained to devote two numbers of the Federalist to this clause of the Constitution (Federalist, Nos. 59 and 60). In this connection, he said:

"This provision has not only been declaimed against by those who condemned the Constitution in the gross, but it has been censured by those who have objected with less latitude, and greater moderation; and, in one instance it has been thought exceptionable by a gentleman who has declared himself the advocate of every other part of the system."

Certainly such a hue and cry was not raised over whether the Federal Government had the power to open the polls at 7 in the morning rather than at 8, or the power to declare that elections should be held on the first Tuesday after the second Monday of November, or the 31st of May, or even whether the election should be held in the precincts, counties, or special districts, or where not; and certainly Hamilton himself was not thinking purely in the terms of such mechanical devices when he declared the importance of the provisions to be as follows:

"I am greatly mistaken, notwithstanding, if there be any article in the whole plan more completely defensible than this. Its propriety rests upon the evidence of this plain proposition * * * every government ought to contain in itself the means of its own preservation. Every just reason will, at first sight, approve an adherence to this rule, in the work of the convention; and will disapprove every deviation from it which may not appear to have been dictated by the necessity of incorporating into the work some particular ingredient, with which a rigid conformity to the rule was incompatible. Even in this case, though he may acquiesce in the necessity, yet he will not cease to regard and to regret a departure from so fundamental a principle, as a portion of imperfection in the system which may prove the seeds of future weakness and perhaps anarchy.

"It will not be alleged, that an election law could have have been framed and inserted in the Constitution, which would have been always applicable to every probable change in the situation of the country; and it will, therefore, not be denied, that a discretionary power over election ought to exist somewhere. It will, I presume, be as readily conceded, that there are only three ways in which this power could have been reasonably modified and disposed: That it must either have been lodged wholly in the national legislature, or wholly in the State legislatures, or primarily in the latter and ultimately in the former. The last mode has, with reason, been preferred by the Convention. They have permitted the regulation of elections for the Federal Government, in the first instance, to the local administration; which, in ordinary cases, and when no improper views prevail may be both more convenient and more satisfactory; that they have reserved to the national authority a right to interpose, whenever extraordinary circumstances might render that interposition necessary to its safety.

"Nothing can be more evident, than exclusive power of regulating election for the National Government, in the hands of the State legislatures, would leave the existence to the Union entirely at their mercy. They could at any moment annihilate it, by neglecting to provide for the choice of persons to administer its affairs. It is to little purpose to say, that a neglect or omission of its kind would not be likely to take place. The constitutional possibility of the thing without an equivalent for the risk, is an answerable objection. Nor has any satisfactory reason been yet assigned for incurring that risk."

II. S. 1280 IS CONSTITUTIONAL AS WITHIN THE UNDISPUTED POWER OF CONGRESS TO PROTECT THE PURITY OF THE BALLOT

S. 1280 expressly provides that—

"The requirements * * * that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote * * * have been detrimental to the integrity of the ballot in that frequently such taxes have been paid for the voters by other persons as an inducement for voting for certain candidates; and * * *

"Whereas such requirements * * * cause, induce, and abet practices and methods in respect to the holding of primaries and elections detrimental to the proper selection of persons for national offices * * *."

This amounts to a direct finding by the Congress that abolition of the poll tax is essential to the protection of the purity of the ballot in Federal elections. Such a legisla-

tive finding is not subject to impeachment by the courts, certainly not where supported by evidence, and the peculiar susceptibility of the poll tax to corrupt practices in elections is a matter of common knowledge, too well known to require extended discussion.

Nothing can be clearer than that Congress possesses the power to legislate to protect the purity of the ballot in elections for national officers. The principle was completely settled and has never been deviated from since the first case to come before the Supreme Court raising the question (*Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651)).

* * * * *

It will be argued that the poll tax, be it a device for ever so much corruption, is immune from congressional interference, because, as a "Qualification requisite for elections of the most numerous branch of the State legislature," the power is expressly granted to the States by article I, section 2, of the Constitution to impose it as a qualification for the electors of national officers. But this is a fallacy to which at least three answers may be given:

1. Any such argument must assume that article I, section 2, grants to the States an exclusive power over the qualifications of voters for national officers, an assumption which the first part of this memorandum has demonstrated to be fallacious.

2. The Constitution expressly grants Congress plenary authority to regulate the "manner of holding elections." As said by the circuit court in *United States* v. *Munford* (16 Fed. 223):

"If Congress can provide for the manner of elections, it can certainly provide that it shall be an honest manner; that there shall be no repression of voters and an honest count of the ballot."

It should be clear, then, without going further, that the plenary authority with regard to the manner of conducting elections exercised by Congress under article I, section 4, supersedes even an exclusive State authority (if such it is) to prescribe qualifications.

3. Since the Classic case there is no longer any doubt but that the right to vote in national elections is one dependent on and secured by the Constitution—specifically by article I, section 2 thereof. This being so, it inevitably follows that Congress, under article I, section 8, clause 18, as well as under article I, section 4, is empowered to protect the exercise of such right against fraud, coercion, violence, or corruption. * * *

Again, the power of Congress to legislate upon matters within the scope of its authority is plenary under the very terms of the Constitution itself, which provides that:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby; any thing in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Hence, it is clear that an act of Congress passed pursuant to the Constitution is "the supreme law of the land," superior to its obligation to a State law or constitution, even although it, too, is passed pursuant to the Constitution of the United States. This has been decided in innumerable cases by the Supreme Court. * * *

And so here, too, with respect to S. 1280, even granting that the Constitution in article I, section 2, places the determination of the qualifications for voters in national elections exclusively in the States—yet when Congress exercises its undoubted power to protect the purity of the national ballot under article I, section 4, and under article I, section 8, clause 18, the exercise of which conflicts with a state power, the latter must, under our constitutional system, yield to the paramount power of Congress.

III. S. 1280 IS AUTHORIZED BY THE FIFTH SECTION OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Perhaps no power of Congress has been so little understood and so little exercised as that conferred upon the Congress by the fifth section of the fourteenth amendment. Like the spending power recently rediscovered in connection with the social security and agricultural adjustment programs, and the war power resurrected only in periods of national emergency, the enforcement power, as it may be called, of the fourteenth amendment has lain dormant since its first flurry of activity during the reconstruction period. But the failure of Congress to exercise this power must not be permitted to mislead, either as to its scope, or its importance; for the provision is pregnant with possibilities. This section merely provides that—

"The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

On its face, this provision is innocuous enough. But when it is considered that these words relate back to, and grant Congress the power to enforce, as against abridgments by States, such broad and comprehensive concepts as "Privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States"—deprivations of "life, liberty, and property without due process of law"—and denials of "the equal protection of the law"—then the tremendous scope of the latent congressional authority can be appreciated.

The significance of the tremendous scope of authority proposed to be conferred upon the Congress by this fifth section of the fourteenth amendment did not escape the Congress which proposed the amendment. It was consciously intended to confer broad and new powers, not theretofore possessed under the Constitution, on the Congress. Senator Howard, in introducing the resolution proposing the fourteenth amendment in the Senate, speaking for the joint Committee of Fifteen who drafted the proposal, said, in speaking of the fifth section:

"Here is a direct affirmative delegation of power to Congress to carry out all the principles of all these guaranties, a power not found in the Constitution" (Congressional Globe, 19th Cong., 1st sess., p. 130).

Its importance was emphasized by the attacks made upon the fifth section in the House. Mr. Hendricks said of it:

"When these words were used in the amendment abolishing slavery, they were thought to be harmless, but during this session there has been claimed for them such force and scope of meaning as that Congress might invade the jurisdiction of the States, rob them of their reserved rights, and crown the Federal Government with absolute despotic power. As construed, this provision is most dangerous."

A student of the period has commented on it as follows:

"These unequivocal statements by the representatives of the two parties leave little room for doubt as to the purpose of the section, or of the power to be conferred on Congress. What the one regarded as essential to the amendment to make it effective, the other regarded as dangerous."

The bearing of this on the constitutionality of S. 1280 is, of course, immediate, direct, and simple. The Classic case has held fully, finally, and decisively that—

"The right of the people to choose (i. e., the elective franchise in national elections) * * * is a right (privilege) established and guaranteed by the Constitution * * *."

This being so, it must inevitably be a "privilege or immunity of citizens of the United States" within the first section of the fourteenth amendment, and as such, under the fifth section thereof: "Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article," including abridgments of "privileges * * * of citizens of the United States"—i. e., abridgments of the elective franchise in national elections. As said by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Strauder* v. *Virginia:*

"A right or an immunity, whether created by the Constitution or only guaranteed by it, even without any express delegation of power, may be protected by Congress (*Prigg* v. *Com.* (16 Pet. 539)). So in *U. S.* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214, 23 L. ed. 563) it was said by the chief justice of this court: 'Rights and immunities created by or dependent upon the Constitution of the United States can be protected by Congress. The form and manner of the protection may be such as Congress in the legitimate exercise of its legislative discretion shall provide. These may be varied to meet the necessities of the particular right to be protected.' But there is express authority to protect the rights and immunities referred to in the fourteenth amendment, and to enforce observance of them by appropriate congressional legislation."

It is the fact of congressional exercise of its power under the fifth section of the fourteenth amendment to prevent abridgments by States of the right or privilege of citizens of the United States to exercise the elective franchise in national elections that distinguishes this situation from those presented in *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* and *Pirtle* v. *Brown*. In each of these cases the Court was asked to strike down the State requirement of payment of poll taxes on their own motion, and without implementation by Congress. This the court quite properly refused to do. As pointed out in the early case of *Ex parte Virginia:*

"All of the amendments derive much of their force from this latter provision. It is not said the judicial power of the General Government shall extend to enforcing the prohibitions and to protecting the rights and immunities guaranteed. It is not said that branch of the Government shall be authorized to declare void any action of a State in violation of the prohibitions. It is the power of Congress which has been enlarged. Congress is authorized to enforce the prohibitions by appropriate legislation. Whatever tends to enforce submission to the prohibitions and to secure to all persons the enjoyment of perfect equality of civil rights and the equal protection of the laws against State denial or invasion, if not prohibited, is brought within the domain of congressional power.

"Nor does it make any difference that such legislation is restrictive of what the State might have done before the constitutional amendment was adopted. The prohibitions of the fourteenth amendment are directed to the States, and they are to a degree restrictions of State power. It is these which Congress is empowered to enforce, and to enforce against State action, however put forth, whether that action be executive, legislative, or judicial. Such enforcement is no invasion of State sovereignty. No law can be, which the people of the States have, by the Constitution of the United States, empowered Congress to enact. This extent of the powers of the General Government is overlooked, when it is said, as it has been in this case, that the act of March 1, 1875, interferes with State rights. It is said the selection of jurors for her courts and the administration of her laws belong to each State; that they are her rights. This is true in general. But in exercising her rights a State cannot disregard the limitations which the Federal Constitution has applied to her power. Her rights do not reach to that extent. Nor can she deny to the General Government the right to exercise all its granted powers, though they may interfere with the full enjoyment of rights she would have if those powers had not been thus granted. Indeed, every addition of power to

the General Government involves a corresponding diminution of the governmental powers of the States. It is carved out of them."

In the present case, therefore, quite a different situation will prevail when the constitutionality of this statute is presented for adjudication. Unlike the situation which prevailed in the Breedlove and the Pirtle cases, Congress will have spoken. It will have declared, in effect, that the requirement in some of the States for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in national elections is an abridgment of a right or privilege of citizens of the United States, established and guaranteed by the Constitution. It will have prohibited the States from imposing through its legislatures and enforcing through its administrative and executive officers the abridgment found to exist. In so acting, Congress will have complied to the letter with the provisions of the fifth section of the fourteenth amendment in enforcing the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States as defined in *United States* v. *Classic*, in *Ex parte Yarbrough* and by Mr. Justice Bushrod Washington in *Corfield* v. *Coryell*. Under such circumstances no court will declare the act of Congress unconstitutional.

IV. CONCLUSION

The attention of the committee has so far been directed exclusively to justifying the power of Congress to prescribe the qualifications of voters in national elections. I should like, for just a moment, to direct the attention of the committee to the implications of the converse of that proposition—that the authority to prescribe the prerequisites to voting is a power resting exclusively in the legislature of each State over which the Congress has absolutely no control. These implications are, to say the least, startling, and, I submit, certainly not outside the boundaries of possibility, and even probability.

It must be recalled that the only constitutional restrictions on State abridgments of the elective franchise are contained in the XV and XIX amendments prohibiting the denial of the right to vote because of:

1. Race,
2. Color,
3. Previous condition of servitude, or
4. Sex.

It must be assumed, if the converse of the proposition here supported is true, that the individual States can impose any qualification on voting except such as violate the above prohibitions. Hence, Massachusetts could well reenact its statute of 1631, that "for time to come noe person shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politicke, but such as are members of some of the churches within the lymitts of the same."

There is no prohibition against the States establishing religious qualifications for voters. Montana could provide that only Catholics could vote; Nebraska that only Spiritualists; South Carolina only Lutherans, and Congress would be powerless to interfere. Moreover, Kansas could provide that only those who subscribed to the principles of the Communist philosophy possessed the qualifications requisite for voting; Idaho that only Fabian Socialists could vote; Indiana that only those who accept the principles of the corporative state; and Louisiana only members in good standing of the share-the-wealth clubs, who accepted the principles of every man a king, possessed qualifications entitling them to vote for Members of Congress. There is no constitutional prohibition against the imposition of any of the above qualifications—yet does any person seriously believe that the National Government would for a moment countenance such qualifications? And let no one say "It can't happen here"—it is now happening and has happened in too many parts of the democratic world.

Again, a number of States already disqualify from voting inmates of State-maintained charitable and eleemosynary institutions. It is but a step from this for States so inclined to disqualify recipients of WPA and social-security benefits. Already the cry is being raised in many sections of the country that such beneficiaries should be disqualified from voting. If Congress cannot outlaw the poll tax neither can it outlaw a disqualification based on receipt of benefits.

Thus the argument that Congress cannot constitutionally interfere with qualifications for voters in national elections established by the State legislatures reduces itself to an absurdity, and lays the foundation for a dissolution of the Union, for, obviously, it is impossible to adopt a separate constitutional amendment (such as the XV and XIX) to prohibit every deleterious qualification of voters that the ingenuity of the States can devise that would, as Mr. King pointed out on June 21, 1787, "be subversive of the end in view" in the establishment of the National Government.

Thus it appears that S. 1280 is constitutional from every point of view, and, indeed, that the position that Congress has no authority to prescribe the qualifications of voters in national elections leads to absurd and totally inacceptable conclusions. Perhaps this memorandum can but be concluded in the words of the venerable Benjamin Franklin, whose views on the qualifications of voters are particularly appropriate in view of the horrible and desperate war we are now waging. "It is of great consequence that we should not depress the virtue and public spirit of our common people; of which they displayed a great zeal during the war, and which contributed principally to the favorable issue of it. He related the honorable refusal of the American seamen, who were carried in great numbers into the British prisons during the war to redeem themselves from misery or to seek their fortunes, by entering on board the ships of the enemies to their country; contrasting their patriotism with a contemporary instance in which the British seamen made prisoners by the Americans readily entered on the ships of the latter on being promised a share of the prizes that might be made out of their own country. This proceeded, he said, from the different manner in which the common people were treated in America and Great Britain. He did not think that the elected had any right, in any case, to narrow the privileges of the electors." (Madison's Notes on the Debates on the Federal Constitution. Debate of August 7).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the question of the constitutionality of an anti-poll-tax bill has been considered by a great many lawyers in the United States, particularly by lawyers who have been representing the various minority groups vitally interested in and conversant with the need for anti-poll-tax legislation. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People had, as of counsel on the subject, three outstanding colored attorneys, William H. Hastie, Leon A. Ransom, and George W. Crockett, Jr., assisted by Leslie Perry. They prepared what I considered to be an exhaustive and very able and sound brief on the subject of the constitutionality of anti-poll-tax legislation. Section 4 of the brief deals with the subject The Poll-Tax Requirement Is Not a Qualification Within the Meaning of Section 2, Article I, of the Constitution, and section 3 deals with the subject H. R. 7 Is Authorized by the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

In view of the fact, Mr. President, that I have stressed throughout my argument in support of the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill many of the points raised in this brief, I ask permission to have sections 3 and 4 of the brief printed as part of my remarks, because I agree with the contents of the brief, particularly sections 3 and 4. I repeat that the brief was prepared by counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

There being no objection, the sections 3 and 4 of the brief were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

III. H. R. 7 IS AUTHORIZED BY THE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

In addition to the constitutional provisions already discussed, it is evident, too, that at least insofar as the Negro citizens of the Nation are involved, the enactment of H. R. 7 is authorized by the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution. This amendment provides that:

Section 1: The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Section 2: The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Ratification of this amendment was completed in 1870, and it is no mere coincidence that shortly after this date the poll-tax-payment requirement as a qualification for voting mushroomed into prominence and became indigenous to those States having the bulk of the country's Negro population.[1] The requirement was first adopted in Tennessee in 1870; then Virginia followed in 1875; Florida, 1885; Mississippi, 1890; Arkansas, 1892; South Carolina, 1895; Louisiana, 1898; North Carolina, 1900; Alabama, 1901; and Texas, 1903. (See the statement of Henry H. Collins, "The poll tax in the South after 1865," subcommittee's hearings on S. 1280, at p. 253.) Only 7 of the 11 original poll-tax States now have a poll-tax requirement; North Carolina, Florida, Georgia, and Louisiana have abolished their requirement. But these 7 remaining poll-tax States not only have substantial Negro populations,[2] but their combined Negro population totals 6,534,113, or more than half of the Nation's Negro citizens.[3]

We are not, however, relegated to the use of statistics to demonstrate that the primary purpose of the poll-tax requirement in these States was, and is, the disfranchisement of

[1] The Georgia constitutions of 1865 and 1877 made the payment of all taxes a prerequisite to voting in general elections; but in 1908 the constitution was amended so as to make payment of the poll tax a requirement for voting in the primary election also.

[2] Alabama's total population is 2,832,961 of which 983,290 are Negroes; Arkansas' total is 1,949,384 of which 482,578 are Negroes; Mississippi's population totals 2,163,796 which includes 1,074,578 Negroes; South Carolina's population of 1,899,804 includes 814,664 Negroes; while Tennessee's 2,915,841 includes 508,736 Negroes; 924,391 Negroes are included in Texas' population of 6,414,824; while Virginia's total of 2,677,773 includes 661,449 Negroes. (All figures taken from the United States Census, 1940.)

[3] The term "potential voters" might well be used instead of citizens since, according to the 1940 census, "The highest proportion [of native born persons above 21 years], 99.8, was found in four Southern States—North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Mississippi." In Alabama and Tennessee, 99.7 percent of the population 21 years and over, was native born; Virginia, 99.5; and Texas, 96.1 (Series P-10, No. 5, Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940.)

the Negro population. The great mass of testimony presented at the subcommittee's hearings on S. 1280 verifies this conclusion. Indeed, the Judiciary Committee's report to the Senate, recommending the passage of that bill, expressly so found. Its findings on this point are so strong and so well stated that extended quotation therefrom seems justified:

"We desire to call attention to the Virginia constitutional convention which submitted an amendment which was afterward adopted to the constitution of Virginia by which it was intended to disfranchise a very large number of Virginia citizens. We think this convention can be regarded as a fair sample of other conventions in other poll-tax States Hon. Carter Glass was a member of that convention. Near the beginning of the convention Senator Glass made a speech in which he outlined in very forceful language what the object was, after all, of the convention. * * * Near the beginning of the convention he made a speech in which he said: 'The chief purpose of this convention is to amend the suffrage clause of the existing constitution. It does not require much prescience to foretell that the alterations which we shall make will not apply to all persons and classes without distinction. We were sent here to make distinctions. We expect to make distinctions. We will make distinctions.'

"Near the conclusion of the convention, Senator Glass delivered another address in which he referred to the work already performed by the convention. He said 'I declared then (referring to the beginning of the convention and the debate on the oath) that no body of Virginia gentlemen could frame a constitution so obnoxious to my sense of right and morality that I would be willing to submit its fate to 146,000 ignorant Negro voters [great applause] whose capacity for self-government we have been challenging for 30 years past.'

"There is no doubt that what Senator Glass stated is the real object the convention had in view. The fact that his remarks were received with great applause indicates that his fellow members of that convention agreed with him and that the real object they had in view, and which they believed they could accomplish, was disfranchising '146,000 ignorant Negro voters.'

* * * * *

"It ought to be borne in mind also that many, if not all, of these constitutional amendments in the poll-tax States are in direct conflict with the statutes under which these States were readmitted to the Union under the act of Congress of June 26, 1870 (16 Stat., p. 62). The provision which refers to Virginia reads as follows: 'The constitution of Virginia shall never be so amended or changed as to deprive any citizen or class of citizens of the United States of the right to vote, who are entitled to vote by the constitution herein recognized, except as punishment for such crimes as are now felonies at common law, whereof they have been duly convicted under laws, equally applicable to all the inhabitants of said State: *Provided*, That any alteration of said constitution, prospective in its effect may be made in regard to the time and place of residence of voters.'

* * * * *

"It seems perfectly plain that the object of this poll-tax provision in the State constitutions was not to prevent discrimination among the citizens but to definitely provide for a discrimination by which hundreds of thousands of citizens were taxed for the privilege of voting and that, therefore, under section 2 of article I of the Constitution, it seems plain that such a provision in the State constitution, or State law, was simply a subterfuge to accomplish other aims by resorting to the so-called qualification clause in section 2 of article I of the Constitution. It is likewise equally plain that at the end of the War Between the States when these States were readmitted to the Union, they were readmitted under a statute of Congress which provided explicitly that the constitutions of the States 'shall never be so amended or changed as to deprive any citizen or class of citizens of the United States of the right to vote.'

"It is therefore plain, under all the circumstances, that the so-called poll-tax laws of the State bringing about such a disqualification to its citizens in the exercising of suffrage is in clear violation of the laws of Congress in addition to being a violation of the Constitution of the United States."

If then, the primary purpose of these State poll-tax requirements is, as the committee stated, the disfranchisement of a substantial portion of the Nation's colored population; and since, as the hearings on S. 1280 have indisputably demonstrated, this purpose has been and continues to be effectively achieved; it is readily apparent that these State enactments constitute an intentional denial or abridgment of "the right of [Negro] citizens of the United States to vote * * * on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Hence, they are violative of the express prohibition contained in the fifteenth amendment and the Congress is specifically authorized by section 2 of that amendment to strike down all such State abridgments by the adoption of such corrective and counteracting legislation as H. R. 7. (See *James* v. *Bowman* (190 U. S. 127, 137); *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214); and *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347).)

IV. THE POLL-TAX REQUIREMENT IS NOT A QUALIFICATION WITHIN THE MEANING OF SECTION 2, ARTICLE I, OF THE CONSTITUTION

Those who challenge the constitutionality of H. R. 7 rely upon the last clause in section 2 of article I of the Constitution. This section provides:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."[4]

These opponents of the bill contend that the language of the above article confers upon the States the power to determine who shall participate in Federal as well as State elections; that this power is uncontrollable, except as it has been modified by the fourteenth and nineteenth amendments; and that any further encroachment upon this power of the States must be amendments to the Constitution. In support of their position they rely upon the Supreme Court's decision in *Breedlove* v. *Suttle* (302 U. S. 277) and the later refusal by that Court to grant a writ of certiorari to review the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 F. (2d) 218). A close examination of these decisions, however, fails to indicate any support for such a broad proposition.

The Breedlove case concerned the validity, under the fourteenth and nineteenth amendments to the Constitution, of the Georgia poll-tax requirement. Petitioner, a white man, applied to the registrar to register "for voting for Federal and State officers at primary and general elections." The statutes of Georgia required that any person proposing to vote, should first subscribe to an oath that he had paid his State's poll tax. Petitioner, who had not paid the tax, demanded that the registrar administer the oath to him and omit all reference to the poll tax. Upon the registrar's refusal, petitioner requested the trial court to issue a writ of mandamus compelling the registrar to comply with his request. The trial court's refusal of the writ was affirmed by the Georgia appellate court and later by the United States Supreme Court.

The rationale of the Supreme Court's decision is, we submit, readily discernible from the above underlined quotation taken from its opinion. The petitioner in challenging the validity of the Georgia poll-tax requirement did so, not as a Federal elector, but as a State and Federal elector; he sought to register for both State and Federal elections. As we have seen (supra), it is not a privilege automatically inhering in United States citizenship that one be allowed to vote in Federal elections; and, certainly, there is no such privilege as to State elections. Also we have seen that nothing in the fourteenth amendment prohibits a State from imposing a poll tax, as a taxing measure, so long as it appears on its face to be a reasonable taxing measure. And there likewise is nothing in either the fourteenth amendment or in the nineteenth amendment that prohibits a State from making the payment of reasonable taxes a prerequisite to registering or voting in a State election. Since then, petitioner, insofar as the State election was concerned, was challenging a State statute of undoubted constitutionality as applied to him, the Supreme Court concluded that his claim should be denied.

The difficulty opponents of H. R. 7 seem unable to overcome in properly interpreting the Breedlove and Pirtle decisions stems from the Supreme Court's failure to restrict its opinion on this point. The particular language in the Breedlove opinion which has occasioned this misconception is the following:

"To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment (or the nineteenth amendment). Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate" (302 U. S. 277, 283).

Those who rely upon this language as supporting power in the States to condition the exercise of the Federal franchise upon the payment of State poll taxes, point out that the Court's opinion does not qualify the word "voting"; it does not say that payment may be made "a prerequisite of voting" in State elections only. And, of course, the Court's subsequent denial of certiorari in the Pirtle case lends color to this interpretation.

But did the Court intend to decide that the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments constituted the only restrictions upon the States' power to set forth the qualifications or the conditions precedent which should determine those privileged to vote in Federal elections? The answer, we submit, must be in the negative; both reason and authority militate against any such holding. Some significance must be attached to the Court's reference in the above quotation to "other provisions of the Federal Constitution." These "other provisions," together with their significance were quite forcefully pointed out by the Court's later opinion and decision in *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299), quoted supra, page 9.

[4] A similar provision is found in the seventeenth amendment providing for the popular election of Senators. The evident purpose of thus defining the Federal electorate in the several States in terms of the State electorate in those States was to insure the broadest and most democratic base administratively possible for the election of Federal officers—a policy with which the present State poll-tax requirements is at direct variance. This point is fully developed in the statement of Irving Brant before the Subcommittee on S. 1280 (Hearings, pp. 209–211) and the brief of the National Lawyers' Guild (Hearings 241, 246–247), and will not be enlarged on here.

Admittedly, however, this explanation of the Breedlove decision in terms of its application to State elections only does not reconcile the denial of the certiorari in the Pirtle case, where a Federal election only was involved. Also, it does not take into account the fact that certiorari was denied in the Pirtle case after the decision in the Classic case. All of which, we think, serves to emphasize what we have said before, namely, that the only logical explanation for this seeming conflict in the Supreme Court's actions in these cases is the fact that poll-tax statutes appear on their face to be bona fide tax measures, and the requirement that they be paid as a condition to voting also appears on its face to be a reasonable method of collecting the tax. It is only when the purposes or motives of the States in adopting this means of collection is presented—which were not considered in the Breedlove case—that the viciousness and illegality of the scheme is demonstrated. The Supreme Court, however, seems committed to the view that purposes or motives are "beyond the scope of judicial inquiry (*Magnano Co.* v. *Hamilton* (292 U. S. 40, 44)); but cf. *Child Labor Tax Case* (259 U. S. 20, 38, cited supra, p. 14)). Any petition seeking to eliminate these requirements as qualifications for Federal electors by showing their true purpose and effect must, therefore, be presented to the Congress as the only branch of the Federal Government capable to consider and deal adequately with the whole issue.

We have stated above that reason supported our conclusion that the power exercised by the States in setting forth the qualifications of electors for the most numerous branch of their legislatures and, by virtue of section 2 of article I of the Constitution, for Members of the Congress also, was limited by other constitutional provisions besides the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments. The reason inheres in the nature of our dual system of government. To hold that the States alone, and subject only to the constitutional mandate that no qualification be based upon sex, color, race, or previous condition of servitude, may determine who shall vote for Federal officers would, when carried to its logical extreme, be tantamount to denying to the National Government the only means by which its continued existence and the orderly conduct of its constitutional functions might be assured. For obviously, if the States alone are to have the final word on who shall be Federal electors, they may, by the imposition of qualifications stringent, unreasonable, and having no relation whatever to one's character or fitness to vote, exclude so many voters that the Federal electorate will be reduced to nil. Indeed, that is precisely the condition the poll-tax qualifications have produced. For example, the State of Rhode Island with 424,876 citizens 21 years of age and over, cast 319,649 votes for Presidential electors, or 75 percent of the potential vote in 1940. While Georgia, on the other hand, with a potential voting population of 1,768,969 citizens 21 years of age and over, only cast 312,539 votes, or 18 percent of its potential vote. (See chart on pp. 289–290 of subcommittee's hearings on S. 1280.) Nor is it any answer to this argument to urge that since the States can reduce the Federal electorate only by reducing the State electorate for the most numerous branch of the State legislature, reduction of the latter to a point where it ceases to be a means of insuring a republican form of government within the State would bring into operation section 4 of article IV of the Constitution, which provides that:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government."

The short reply to any such contention is that the above comparison between the size of the electorate in a poll-tax and in a non-poll-tax State, being typical, demonstrates conclusively that a republican form of government as contemplated by the Constitution does not now exist in the poll-tax States; and accordingly the Congress, pursuant to the general constitutional mandate to "make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the * * * powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States," is authorized to restore a republican form of government to the people of these poll-tax States by enacting H. R. 7. For the simple, evident, and indisputable truth is that the poll-tax requirement is not and never was intended by its sponsors to be a qualification or a gage of the citizen's fitness to participate in representative government. Therefore it should be abolished.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons we urge that this committee recommend to the Senate passage of H. R. 7.

Respectfully submitted.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE.
NEW YORK, N. Y.
Of counsel:
WILLIAM H. HASTIE.
LEON A. RANSOM.
GEORGE W. CROCKETT, Jr.
OCTOBER 1943.

Mr. MORSE. With that, Mr. President, I am about to conclude my remarks on the subject by saying to the gentlemen of the opposition that I consider it has been a great privilege to join issue with them on the subject. I am sure that they will share my opinion that we have fought it out on highly professional grounds, as lawyers should, and, as lawyers, I am sure they also agree with my point of view that in due course of time, if we are allowed to pass an anti-poll-tax bill in the Senate, our argument will be settled once and for all, by that repository of constitutional decisions, the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I close with the prayer and the plea that the Senators on the other side of the aisle, after completing their case on the merits of this issue in accordance with what I think, in the clear contemplation of the people of the country, should be the practice of the United States Senate, will agree to allow a vote to be taken on the bill, so that we may start the issue on its way to final constitutional determination by the men who, under our three-branch check-and-balance system of government, have the solemn obligation of passing finally on constitutional questions.

With that statement, that prayer, and plea, I close my remarks on this subject.

Mr. President, I should like now to say a few words regarding another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 by providing a secondary market for GI loans, so to speak, in respect to the purchase of houses by veterans. I shall not take the time to read the remarks which I intended to make at the time of introducing the bill but shall simply ask permission to have the bill printed in full in the body of the RECORD, to be followed by the statement which I intended to deliver on the floor of the Senate when I introduced the bill, including reasons for the enactment of a bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the bill, together with the statements presented by the Senator from Oregon, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2927) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 is hereby further amended as follows:

(1) Change the number of section "511" thereof to read "512"; and

(2) Immediately after section 510 thereof insert the following new section:

"SECONDARY MARKET

"SEC. 511. (a) The Administrator is authorized, empowered, and directed, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, consistent with this act, to purchase, at a price equal to the unpaid principal plus accrued interest, hereinafter referred to as 'par,' any residential real-estate loan guaranteed under sections 501, 502, or 505 (a) of this title: *Provided*, That, (1) such loan is offered to the Administrator for purchase within 5 years of the date of its origin by the lender to whom the evidence of guaranty was originally issued, (2) the amount of unpaid principal, plus accrued interest, of any loan guaranteed before September 1, 1948, shall not exceed $12,000, (3) the original amount of any such loan guaranteed on or after September 1, 1948, shall not exceed $7,500, (4) the loan shall not be in default at the time of purchase, (5) the seller shall enter into an agreement with the Administrator that at the option of the Administrator the seller will service the loan in return for a service charge at such rate, not in excess of 1 percent per annum of the unpaid balance, as may be provided in such agreement, (6) no mortgage, if insured after September 1, 1948, shall be purchased by the Administrator unless the mortgagee certifies that the housing with respect to which the mortgage was made meets the construction standards prescribed for insurance of mortgages on the same class of housing under the National Housing Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That the Administrator may sell any loan purchased under this section at a price not less than par, with the primary right of repurchase reserved to the original mortgagee: *And provided further*, That no mortgage shall be purchased by the Administrator from any one mortgagee (1) unless such mortage is secured by property used, or designed to be used, for residential purposes and (2) if the unpaid principal balance thereof, when added to the aggregate amount paid for all mortgages purchased and held by the Administrator from such mortgagee pursuant to authority contained herein, exceeds 66⅔ percent of the original principal amount of all mortgages made by such mortgagee which are guaranteed under sections 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

"(b) For the purpose of this section the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make available to the Administrator such sums as he may request from time to time between the effective date of this section and the expiration of the period of time in which loans may be offered for purchase pursuant to the terms of this

section. Such sums, together with all moneys received by the Administrator under this section, shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States in a special deposit account, to be disbursed through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department. On sums so advanced by the Secretary of the Treasury, less those amounts deposited in miscellaneous receipts under subsection (d) hereof the Administrator shall pay semiannually to the Treasurer of the United States interest at the rate or rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the deposit.

"(c) In order to make such sums available to the Administrator the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to use, as a public-debt transaction, the proceeds of the sale of any security hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act as now in force or as hereafter amended are hereby extended to include such purposes.

"(d) The Administrator shall from time to time cause to be deposited into the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of miscellaneous receipts, such of the funds in the special deposit account referred to in subsection (b) hereof, as in his judgment are not needed for the purposes hereof, and after the last day on which the Administrator may purchase loans under this section, he shall, with due allowance for outstanding commitments, cause to be so deposited all sums in said account, and all moneys received thereafter, representing the repayment or recovery of the principal of obligations purchased pursuant to this section. Interest collected by the Administrator in excess of the amount payable by the Administrator to the Treasurer pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, together with any miscellaneous receipts or credits the disposition of which is not otherwise provided for herein, shall constitute a reserve for payment of losses, if any, and expenses incurred in the liquidation of said loans. Without regard to any other provisions or limitations of law or otherwise (except the provisions of this title) the Administrator shall have authority in carrying out the functions hereby or hereunder vested in him to exercise any and all rights of the United States, including without limitation, the right to take or cause to be taken such action as in his judgment may be necessary or appropriate for or in connection with the custody, management, protection, realization, and liquidation of assets, to determine the necessary expenses and expenditures and the manner in which the same shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for and audited, to invest available funds in obligations of the United States, to make such rules, regulations, requirements, and orders as he may deem necessary and appropriate, and to employ, utilize, compensate, and delegate any of the functions hereunder to such persons and such corporate or other agencies, including agencies of the United States, as he may designate."

SEC. 2. Title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) In section 301 (a) (1) strike out the following: "or guaranteed under section 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended"; and

(2) Strike out the period at the end of section 302 thereof, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That after September 1, 1948, the Association shall not be authorized further to purchase loans guaranteed under sections 501, 502, and 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended."

XCIV——614

The statement presented by Mr. MORSE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I have introduced today a bill designed to allow veterans to take advantage once again, easily and in numbers, of the home-loan provisions of the GI bill of rights.

It is necessary legislation; it is simple, single-purpose legislation; it will actually put money into the Treasury of the United States, rather than drain out funds in the form of subsidies. I shall explain briefly what this bill (S. 2927) proposes and why it is needed. I trust this great body will pass this bill with a minimum delay.

In what were literally the closing minutes of the last session of this Congress, some 6 weeks ago now, we passed legislation designed to reestablish secondary markets for GI home-loan mortgages. This was necessary because, after the Government's secondary market for these mortgages had been allowed to lapse in 1947, there was a marked and alarming decrease in the number of GI home loans. The veterans simply could not find lenders when the lenders could not find a secondary market.

The action of 6 weeks ago established a secondary market in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, where it had existed prior to midsummer of 1947. Actual working experience with the legislation has shown, however, that it is unnecessarily restrictive and that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is tending to handle the problem in a way which underlines the restrictions.

The present bill (S. 2927) establishes a secondary market for GI home-loan mortgages in the Veterans' Administration, where we originally had intended it should be, where the veterans want it and where the operating personnel is primarily concerned with veterans' needs and rights and not with banking technicalities.

S. 2927 would authorize the Veterans' Administrator to purchase GI home-loan mortgages at par within 5 years of the date of issuance. Where such a loan had been guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration prior to September 1, 1948, the amount of unpaid principal, plus accrued interest, could not exceed $12,000. The original amount of any loan guaranteed on or after September 1, 1948, could not exceed $7,500. The service fee established under the bill would not be more than 1 percent. S. 2927 provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide the Administrator with the funds necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill; that these shall be kept in a special deposit account with the Treasurer of the United States; and that the Administrator shall pay interest to the Treasurer at a rate to be established by the Secretary of the Treasury. This is a type of operation with which we are all familiar.

Nothing is wrong with the GI bill of rights, as such, but the veterans' home-loan program has declined alarmingly because of the lack of a proper secondary market. S. 2927 has the single purpose of again making the GI bill of rights effective. It is the kind of housing legislation which this extraordinary session can, and should, pass because it is not involved in the great disputes which rage around other suggested housing legislation. The market operation which it proposes will not cost the Government a cent; the record shows that the Government actually has made money on all such mortgage operations in the past.

This proposal has the backing of veterans' groups. Its benefits to the veterans are obvious. It should be noted that the building industry, building labor, and the community as a whole also would benefit since increased GI home-loan activity obviously will mean increased veterans' home building all over the United States. This bill provides a simple key to opening up a great volume of housing for a great number of veterans. This bill should be passed.

The following reasons may be cited for the enactment of the bill:

1. Public Law 864, Eightieth Congress, second session, (S. 2790 introduced by Senator JENNER) established a secondary market in the Federal National Mortgage Association for loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. As the bill was passed by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this authority would have been placed in the Veterans' Administration. However, by an amendment submitted by Chairman WOLCOTT in the House the authority was placed in the Federal National Mortgage Association. In this bill it is proposed to end the authority of FNMA to purchase GI loans and place the authority in the Veterans' Administration. The VA guarantees the loans and should be authorized to purchase them when offered by the original lender. Such loans should not be tied up with big banking operations of the type handled by the RFC and its subsidiaries.

2. As passed by the Senate, Public Law 831 would have allowed the purchase of 66⅔ percent of all GI mortgages offered by any one mortgagee. As changed by the House and subsequently confirmed by the Senate this authority was reduced to 25 percent and as now interpreted by the FNMA that 25 percent is based on those mortgages made after April 30, 1948. This bill would allow the purchase of 66⅔ percent of all GI loans made by any one mortgagee regardless of the date on which they were guaranteed. The restricted authority of FNMA as contained in Public Law 864 is no more than a drop in the bucket and would not even approach a solution of the problem of providing an adequate secondary market for GI loans. The institutions now holding a great volume of these loans need liquidity such as is afforded by an adequate secondary market in the Federal Government.

3. Public Law 864 as interpreted by FNMA does not allow for the purchase of any mortgages made before April 30, 1948. This bill would provide for the purchase of a percentage of any GI loans guaranteed prior to September 1, 1948 provided the outstanding obligation does not exceed $12,000. Under Public Law 864 loans made after April 30, 1948, could be purchased provided they did not exceed $10,000. Under this bill we would limit the amount of such mortgages to $7,500 guaranteed in the future. The reason for these provisions is that we cannot unreasonably restrict the purchases of mortgages heretofore made because the veterans already have them. The institutions already have them in their portfolio and they need a market for them in order to make new loans to veterans for lower priced houses in the future. We are definitely limiting future loans to lower priced houses for the veterans.

4. Under Public Law 864 the lending institution from which the FNMA purchased GI loans could be allowed not more than one-half of 1 percent for servicing the loans for the FNMA. In this bill we would leave it to the Veterans' Administration to determine the amount of the service fee provided it did not exceed 1 percent of the unpaid principal.

5. Under Public Law 864 the FNMA was authorized to purchase loans of both the FHA type and the GI type up to $300,000,000. Under this bill we authorize the Veterans' Administration to procure necessary sums from the Treasury and directs that he shall in turn deposit in the Treasury in a special deposit account any funds received by the Veterans' Administration. According to past history of such home-guaranty actions of the Federal Government, it is indicated that this provision of the secondary market in the VA will not cost the Federal Government any money but rather that the Government will make money.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this morning I made the statement that there would not be a night session and that a statement with reference to recessing or adjourning the Senate would be made at the appropriate time.

I want to state at this time for the RECORD that it has become crystal clear that until the Senate's rules on cloture are amended it is impossible to take action on House bill 29, the anti-poll-tax bill. Therefore, the holding of a night session in which to attempt to do the impossible is hypocrisy in its rankest form. I think we should be honest and truthful not only to ourselves but to the American people in making our decision. It was determined this morning by the majority conference that a vote on cloture is out of the question, apparently, until the rules of the Senate are amended so as to provide that a cloture petition may be filed not only on a bill or measure, but on motions, so that all barriers, including dilatory motions, which prevent the Senate's proceeding to the consideration of important legislation, may be outlawed, so to speak.

I was a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration when it reported the so-called Knowland resolution to change the cloture rule so as to eliminate dilatory motions in connection with a bill. It is my understanding that it is the intention to appoint a committee to study remedial amendments to the rule, and it is our feeling that at the beginning of another session, the session next January, if possible, we should proceed in good faith to change the rule, and should make that subject the first order of business, so that we may be able to apply cloture in connection with a motion as well as the subject matter of a bill.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I make this statement only for the reason that I made the announcement this morning that there would not be night sessions, because it is thought that continued night sessions would accomplish nothing, that they would be futile. We therefore decided that the proper course is to adjourn so that we may have a morning hour tomorrow for the consideration of legislation which may be reported under the unanimous-consent order which has been entered today, and which otherwise might have to lie over. I hope we may be able to consider such important legislation as I hope will come from the Committee on Banking and Currency dealing with anti-inflation and other matters which are now before the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just one other matter. I shall yield to the minority leader, because I think it is a courtesy which should always be extended. I regret to state to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] that I have told many Senators that there would be an immediate adjournment, and asked them to delay offering routine matters or inserting articles in the RECORD until tomorrow morning, if they would agree to that, and all to whom I spoke did agree. Therefore I yield to the minority leader, and I beg other Senators not to ask me to yield to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desired to have the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is correct in what he says; he did request that I not ask him to yield. I thought he might appreciate confirmation of his statement.

Mr. WHERRY. I do; I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BARKLEY. My reason for suggesting the absence of a quorum, which I do without taking the Senator from the floor, although under the rules it would deprive him of the floor, is that I may want to ask him a question or two or make a statement with regard to what he has said. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for that purpose. I say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and also to the other Members of the Senate, that I would rather the Senator would ask me his questions now, because I intend to make a motion that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would rather have a larger attendance.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I merely wanted the Senate to know that I intended to make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that, and it was in connection with that that I suggested the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bricker	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Wyo
Brooks	Jenner	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Byrd	Kem	Sparkman
Cain	Kilgore	Stennis
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Taylor
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	
Hatch	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the minority leader for an observation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that without taking the Senator from Nebraska from the floor I may not only ask him a question, but make a brief observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Nebraska, the acting majority leader, has said in regard to the present status of the rules of the Senate. There is no need to reiterate what has happened here in the past. When I was confronted with the same situation which confronts him I repeatedly stated that I favored an amendment to the rules of the Senate so that it would not be impotent when a well-organized group of a few Senators, or many, as the case might be, could, if they wished, tie up legislation indefinitely.

The other day when the Chair ruled against the cloture petition filed by the Senator from Nebraska, I then took the position, which I felt was justified, that when the Senate adopted rule XXII it really thought it was bringing about the termination of debate on any matter which was pending before it, which was the subject of extended debate, which has come to be known as a filibuster. I still entertain that viewpoint. But the Chair ruled otherwise, and there is now an appeal from that decision pending.

I do not know how long it will take to amend the rules of the Senate. There has been a resolution on the calendar for 17 months to amend the rules of the Senate. So far as I recall, no effort has been made to bring that resolution before the Senate for consideration, and no motion has been made to take it up. I realize that on such a motion the same course could be pursued as on the motion now pending. But sooner or later the Senate, it seems to me, must determine that it must lift from itself the pall of impotence in which it finds itself now, and in which it may find itself even when a motion is made to take up a resolution to amend the rules.

Surely, the Senate of the United States, which is regarded here and throughout the world as the greatest, and sometimes I have said, the most deliberative body in the world, which has come to be the last remnant of real democratic action in a legislative sense, cannot forever go on and admit that it is impossible for it to adopt rules under which it may proceed. Therefore I not only am now, but have been in the past, and shall continue in the future, so long as I am a Member of this body, to be earnestly in favor of an amendment of the Senate rules that will make it possible for the Senate to function under any conditions which may arise in the deliberations of this body and in the consideration of legislation. It is a situation and a condition which does not prevail in any other legislative body in the world. No State legislature is handicapped by any such impotence as that which now afflicts us.

I recognize the sincerity and the good faith of those who have precipitated this situation by exercising the right given to them under the rules of the Senate. Yet in spite of the sincerity which we accord to them, I think they themselves must admit that we cannot forever go along as a deliberative body without some halter upon unlimited debate or unlimited delay in the consideration of legislation.

So I wanted to say to the Senator from Nebraska, that, notwithstanding the fact that for 17 months there has been on the calendar a resolution to amend the rules—and no effort has heretofore been made to bring it up—and I presume no effort is to be made to bring it up at this session—whenever it comes up, at this session or at the next session, I am in favor of such an amendment of the rules as will make it possible for the Senate of the United States to function as an ordinary legislative body. So much for that.

Now the Senator from Nebraska is proposing to move to adjourn this day's session. I wanted to make this observation before he moved to adjourn, because it would be impossible to make it after such a motion. We have been here now several days debating the motion to proceed to the consideration of House bill 29. The cloture petition was filed, or an attempt was made to file a cloture petition on Monday. The Chair held it could not be filed under the rule because it was not a "measure" within the meaning of the rule. From that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] appealed. That appeal is debatable no less than the motion itself is debatable, and theoretically we are now debating the appeal from the decision of the Chair. If the motion to adjourn prevails, the motion to take up the bill lapses, and the appeal of the Senator from Ohio from the decision of the Chair also lapses, and what we have been doing here for now nearly a week will end in futility, because the whole thing lapses and goes down in defeat, since the motion itself to consider the anti-poll-tax bill will lapse on a motion to adjourn, if it is adopted. For that reason I felt the Senate ought to know the effect of its vote to adjourn today.

So far as I can see, the situation is just the same as it was when the Senator from Nebraska made his motion last week. There is no business now on the calendar which was not on it then. The Senator, I think, hopes that there will be something on the calendar, maybe tomorrow. But it is not on it now. We have heard rumors that a joint committee has been appointed—not a bipartisan committee, but a joint committee of the Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses, a joint Republican committee of those two committees—to survey the situation to see whether some kind of legislation might be brought forth. It is probably not within my mouth to question the propriety of calling a partisan subcommittee, instead of a bipartisan subcommittee, as frequently and usually is done. But be that as it may, we do not know what will come out of that joint Republican committee.

I understand the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate has proceeded today to hold further hearings on the question of inflation and the cost of living. We do not know how long the committee will consider that subject, nor what they will bring here tomorrow or any other day. So that today, so far as the calendar is concerned, the situation is precisely what it was when the Senator from Nebraska made his motion last week. I wanted the Senate to understand that if we vote to adjourn today, we vote to nullify all we have done up to now on H. R. 29, and we go right back to where we were when we started. There will be a morning hour tomorrow, and it will be in order, for any Senator who feels it his duty to do so, to question the approval of the Journal, and that is debatable. Whenever it is brought in question, no other business can be performed by the Senate until the Journal is approved. So we find ourselves again tied into a bowknot in respect to the procedure of the Senate; all of which, in my judgment, without regard to politics or predilections, the American people will regard as a travesty upon free enterprise in the way of legislation before the Senate of the United States.

I do not believe any Senator can gainsay the suggestion that the American people do not understand all the maneuvers and all the parliamentary devices the Senate may resort to in order not to transact its business. Regardless of who may be responsible for it, I think the whole Senate of the United States will lose in the esteem of the American people if we do not find a way by which to legislate in any circumstances that may arise in the Senate of the United States. Therefore I wish to say that when the Senator makes his motion to adjourn, in view of the effect of an adjournment I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote upon the motion.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yielded with the firm commitment that I would yield only to the minority leader. Fifteen or twenty Senators have asked me for time to make insertions in the RECORD, and they very graciously have consented to wait until tomorrow. For that reason I am foreclosed from yielding to any other Senator at this time. I regret it; but in view of the fact that that announcement has been made, I must stand by that agreement, because I want to be absolutely fair so long as I am the acting majority leader.

Mr. TOBEY. I was merely going to help the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly want help, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. I think the Senator needs it.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps I do. I am not through yet.

Mr. President, I was one member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration which reported the resolution to which the minority leader has referred. I am in total agreement with what he said about the rule. He emphatically has brought to the attention of the American people the fact that when 15 or 20 or 30 Senators unite in an effort to prevent a vote by endless debate, we cannot do a thing; and that the present rules of the Senate relative to cloture do not apply to a motion.

At least we have done one thing this week. We have demonstrated to the American people that until the rules of the Senate are changed there can be endless debate if a sufficient number of Senators band themselves together to thwart a vote by the use of the rules. I think the American people know that. I hope they do, because I think they should know the truth about the situation which confronts us in this special session. I think they should know that we knew when we started that in a special session of 12 or 15 days it would be an absolute physical impossibility to break endless debate on a question so controversial as is the poll tax.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, until I finish my remarks.

I agree with the distinguished majority leader that in times gone by, while I have been a Member of this body, he has done the very thing which we are attempting to do now. We are telling the people of the country that we are not going to hold night sessions. To my way of thinking, to do so would simply be hypocrisy.

I am going back to my State, and to the city of Omaha, and tell those who are interested in the anti-poll-tax legislation that I did my level best to bring it to a vote, and that we could not obtain a vote because of the rules of the Senate. I want to be honest about it. I do not want to say that I instituted night sessions for 2 or 3 nights when I knew when I did so that we would have to abandon the effort because we could not accomplish our purpose. Let us be honest. Let us tell the American people the truth. I am not going to be the one who moves for night sessions. This question arose because of requests that there should be no night session tonight. I will not subscribe to a policy which deceives the American people. We are going to tell them the truth, and that is the truth.

With respect to adjournment, I agree with the minority leader that when the motion to adjourn is agreed to we shall get back to the unfinished business. In the morning hour motions may be made. Senators may do as they please about adjournment. Senators who wish to offer amendments to any legislation, including the poll-tax amendment, may offer such amendments to any legislation which is considered by the Senate.

Mr. President, my firm belief is that the majority in their conference this morning took the right course. I subscribed to it. In fact, I advised it. So I am ready now to make the motion to adjourn.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I agreed not to yield to any Senator other than the minority leader. He was on his feet a moment ago. If he wishes me to yield again, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is too late now.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow at noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is unavoidably detained, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	Fulbright	Morse
Baldwin	Gurney	O'Conor
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hayden	Revercomb
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Hill	Robertson, Wyo
Brooks	Hoey	Russell
Buck	Holland	Saltonstall
Butler	Ives	Smith
Byrd	Jenner	Sparkman
Cain	Johnston S. C.	Stennis
Capper	Kem	Stewart
Connally	Knowland	Taft
Cooper	Langer	Thye
Cordon	Lodge	Tobey
Donnell	McCarthy	Tydings
Dworshak	McClellan	Umstead
Eastland	McFarland	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	Martin	Wherry
Feazel	Maybank	Wiley
Ferguson	Millikin	Williams
Flanders	Moore	Young

NAYS—16

Barkley	Lucas	Pepper
Downey	McGrath	Taylor
Green	McMahon	Thomas, Ok'a.
Hatch	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Colo.	Murray	
Kilgore	Myers	

NOT VOTING—11

Bushfield	McCarran	Wagner
Capehart	Malone	White
Chavez	O'Daniel	Wilson
George	Reed	

So Mr. WHERRY's motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 5, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. Howard Lambdin, pastor of St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal and everlasting Father, we invoke Thy divine guidance upon us as we begin the official duties of this day. Enable us, we pray Thee, in a world of many voices, to hear now and always the "still small voice within"; not only may we hear it, but may we heed it as well.

The demands made upon our lives are many and our responsibilities are great. Help us, dear Father, to remember that we are Thy children and also that we are Thy workmen. Thou art depending on us to be "laborers together with Thee" for the building of Thy kingdom on earth.

Save us from selfishness, which would keep us from such sacred service, and increase our devotion to the highest good that we may become the servants of righteousness.

We pray Thy blessing on our land and our Nation, on the President of these United States, and on the Members of the Congress, and on all others who help to carry the responsibilities of leadership. May a great integrity of character be with all of our leaders, and may they be men and women after Thine own heart.

Hasten the day, O Lord, when a just, honorable, and desirable peace shall come to all nations on our earth, when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Bless us this day and every day; and when, good Father, our days of labor are over, grant to each of us safekeeping with Thee. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 2, 1948, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Post Office Department.
6. Housing and Home Finance Agency.
7. Office of Selective Service Records.
8. Veterans' Administration.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, in June 1947, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was much disturbed about the shipment of oil to Russia from this country because we knew there was a shortage of oil to take care of the needs of the Army and Navy and the civilian needs of last year's very cold winter. Consequently, the committee held hearings at that time to inquire into the situation.

There were then loading on the Pacific coast three tankers flying the Russian flag. These were American-owned tankers loaned to Russia under lend-lease and which she refused to return to us. Yet here they were in our waters, and we were filling them with our own much-needed oil for shipment to the same country which refused to return these ships to us.

One of the witnesses called at the hearings was Mr. William C. Foster, Under Secretary of Commerce. The amazing part of his testimony was the utter disregard which he displayed of a request of the chairman of the committee made to him by telephone that the ships be not licensed to sail. The Commerce Department seemingly expedited the licenses because they were issued the same morning that the chairman requested they be held up. The testimony on the point is as follows:

Mr. BRADLEY. In relation to the ships we have loading out in my district, Long Beach, San Pedro, and so on, for Russia, did I understand you to say that it is the intention of the Department to grant the export licenses so that those ships can load and get away?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir; there are three ships out there at the moment, and we have actually issued the licenses on those three.

Mr. BRADLEY. I was interested because I have had a great many inquiries along that line, and there is nothing confidential in that information.

Mr. FOSTER. Nothing. No, sir.

Mr. BRADLEY. Thank you.

Mr. FOSTER. That was licensed this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. That was licensed this morning; after I made a request on behalf of this committee that they not be licensed to go you licensed them to go this morning.

Mr. FOSTER. That's right, sir. I still have no official request from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You have a telegram, don't you?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Didn't you get that?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not had any telegram from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

Mr. FOSTER. I have had no telegram from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You received one signed by the chairman, didn't you?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I called you about it.

Mr. FOSTER. You called me and told me over the phone that you were sending one.

The CHAIRMAN. And I told you I was making a request then.

Mr. FOSTER. And I said I would be very glad to take it into consideration, as we do all such requests.

The CHAIRMAN. The consideration you gave was that after the request was made you licensed it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is correct, sir.

This morning's news clarifies the picture. William W. Remington, accused of giving Government information and material to Elizabeth T. Bentley, erstwhile Russian spy and Communist, is the director of the Commerce Department's export-programs staff. Now the reason for the haste in licensing these oil-bearing ships is apparent. We have a

tie-up between the Commerce Department and Russia and a cabal to sell America down the river to Russia and to use our own ships to do it.

I respectfully suggest to the House Committee on Un-American Activities that it undertake an investigation of the licensing of those ships by the Commerce Department in the light of what has come to view in the last few days.

Last winter the veterans in my district living in Quonset huts were very cold from lack of fuel oil. Now they can understand the reason.

DALLAS COUNTY'S FIRST 1948 BALE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, it should be of interest that the first bale of the 1948 cotton crop was the best ever produced and prepared for market in Dallas County, Ala., and was sold at auction July 28, at $1.14 per pound, or $525.54 for the bale.

Of course, the sale of the first bale of each new crop is quite an event, and the price bid is no criterion of the regular market, but when the market history records millions of bales that have been sold in the routine way on the regular market for 5 cents a pound, or $20 a bale, or less, the record price paid for this first bale must have thrilled the hearts of the grower and ginner because of the tribute to their skill and diligence. It is also strong incentive for emulation.

May I read you the gist of the first-page article from the Selma Times-Journal:

Dallas County's first bale of 1948 cotton was auctioned at 10 a. m. Wednesday at the Cotton Exchange at a record-breaking price of $1.14 per pound, paid by Anderson Clayton Cotton Co.'s representative, Ned Culverhouse. The bale was classed as strict middling with a 1.31-inch staple and weighed 460 pounds. It was consigned to the Dallas Compress.

Bidding opened at 73 cents by I. J. Hix, representing the Selma Retail Merchants Association, the compresses, cotton buyers, and other friends of the farmer who stated that a premium price had been assured by these groups. The bid leaped to 75 cents on Culverhouse's nod and R. B. Woodfin of the R. B. Woodfin Cotton Co. entered the bidding, continuing neck and neck with Culverhouse until the bale finally touched the $1.14 mark, unprecedented in local cotton history. Other bids were recorded as the cotton buyers pushed the bale upward.

W. P. Welch, auctioneer, called attention to the fact that it was produced on the J. A. Minter place, 12 miles east of Selma, by Andrew Harrison, Negro tenant, who received $525.54 for the bale. It was ginned on one of the latest and finest gins in the State, and the only gin in Alabama having a lint cleaner through which cotton passes after being ginned, to remove all trash.

BEST NEW BALE

Cotton men said that the bale was the best new bale ever brought to Selma as to grade and staple.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Ralph H. Cameron, a Biographical Sketch," by James M. Barney, Arizona historian.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY FUNDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 1948, when the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 was before the House for consideration, I asked the following question of Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM, chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways of the Committee on Public Works, who was in charge of the bill on the floor:

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $500,000,000 as Federal aid to the several States for fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is right.

Mr. WELCH. Is there anything in this bill that would preclude a State highway commission from allocating any part of the funds allocated to a State to be used within an incorporated city and county?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Not at all (there is) the portion allocated for the counties and the portion allocated to the urban areas.

Mr. WELCH. I desire to congratulate the Committee on Public Works, its splendid chairman, and committee for bringing this constructive measure to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of this clear and concise answer on the part of the Committee on Public Works which reported this bill to the House, the State Highway Commission of the State of California has interpreted the law so as to prevent the city and county of San Francisco from receiving benefits under this act.

San Francisco is a city and county. The city and county embrace identically the same territory and are one. That San Francisco is a county in every sense of the word has been so decided by the Supreme Court of the State of California.

In this bill Congress authorized a total of $1,500,000,000 to be allocated to the several States over a period of 3 years. The State of California is receiving its proportionate share annually. Therefore the city and county of San Francisco is entitled to its proportionate allocation of the sums allocated to the State of California.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, can it be possible that this Congress will yield to the importunate pressure that is being exerted upon it to divert a huge amount of building material and labor from the home-building industry to be used for the construction of a palace for UN to house Stalin's agents, and thus deprive the families of our veterans of many thousands of vitally needed homes, and to still further fan the flames of inflation?

It is now beyond dispute that Stalin has a horde of agents in the UN, and all the other international organizations, but particularly the UN, directing American Communists to overthrow the United States Government. Read the testimony of Robert C. Alexander, Assistant Chief, Visa Division, Department of State, before the Revercomb committee. There is much other evidence.

Do you suppose that Stalin would have nominated, through his representative, Trygve Lie for Secretary General of UN if Stalin had not been sure that Trygve Lie is a dyed-in-the-wool Communist and supporter of his?

Mr. Marriner Eccles, for many years Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and one of the best informed men in the United States on our national finances, disapproved before the Banking and Currency Committee yesterday the spending of any money for housing the UN at the present time. He further stated that this matter should be delayed until we see what develops in the international situation.

In talking with the Members about this proposal, I am convinced that the vast majority of them are opposed to it. Many of them, however, have indicated they intend to vote for it merely for political reasons.

America will rue the day that this bill passes, if it should pass.

Who is bidding for the radical vote now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan.

Mr. McGARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief letter and statement.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, under the GI bill the Congress gave the veterans of World War II credit to the amount of $120,000,000,000 by the provision granting each veteran a $4,000 loan guaranty. Of this huge sum only $7,000,000,000 has been used.

I charged President Truman with failure to use the powers vested in him to see that this bill worked and I charge the Veterans' Administration with deliberately side-stepping and ignoring their duty to aid the veteran in securing housing or homes. The Veterans' Administration has made it practically impossible to secure loans from local banks because of their unnecessary red tape.

The President says that the T-E-W bill is the answer to the veterans' housing problem. This bill will only supply low-cost-rental housing for the low-income group and, therefore, will not supply any houses for the public to purchase.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my own remarks in the RECORD entitled "Truman's Misrepresentations to Veterans," and I hope that all of the Members of this House will read these remarks because they do show up the failure of this administration and the truth about the T-E-W bill.

TRUMAN'S MISREPRESENTATION TO VETERANS

I have with due respect restrained myself from more than passing comment on President Truman's previous messages to the combined Houses of Congress, but this I can no longer do and keep my self-respect in the eyes of my folks back in Pennsylvania.

Patiently I listened Tuesday, July 27, for some words of wisdom upon which I could rally, with my colleagues, to the Chief Executive's suggestions to solve some of the Nation's ills. All I heard was the same buck-passing charges aimed at Congress in an anemic effort to cover his own shortcomings and failures as President of the United States.

What sheer demagoguery was the President's words in a continued effort to fool the veteran about housing. Listen to what he said:

A good housing bill, Senate bill 866, known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, passed the Senate on April 22. This bill would provide aid to the cities in clearing slums and in building low-rent housing projects. It would give extensive aid to the private home-building industry. It includes provision for farm housing and research to bring down building costs. It contains many other provisions, all aimed at getting more housing at lower prices and at lower rents.

He continued:

This is the bill we need. We need it now, not a year from now.

If this legislation is passed this summer, it will be possible to start immediately the production of more houses of the kind our families need, at prices they can afford to pay. If it is not passed now, the Eighty-first Congress will have to start all over again with a new housing bill. In that case, we might lose a full year in meeting our national housing need.

Those words constitute a despicable misrepresentation of fact to the veterans of this Nation.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act, better known as the GI bill, was passed by the Congress in 1944. It provides $120,000,000,000 credit for housing of veterans and the Veterans' Administration says to date only $7,000,000,000 has been contracted for, leaving a balance of $113,000,000,000 still there for the use of veterans.

Oh, I know, charges will be made that the bill has not worked. That prices are too high. That the banks will not lend the money without substantial down payments.

All of these charges may be true and contribute to an existing condition, but for more than 2 years President Truman has had it within his power to make the bill work and he has not done one thing about it.

Under the War Powers Acts and under the Constitution, the President is charged as Chief Executive to see to it that our legislation does work, or do something about it.

I charge that the Veterans' Administration is and has deliberately sidestepped and ignored the veterans' housing problems and furthermore that the President of the United States has failed to see to it that the multi-billion-dollar housing provision of the GI bill has functioned properly.

Have you ever heard of the West Virginia housing plan? The President has. The Veterans' Administration has. I admit it is only one of many good plans now being employed to give the veteran housing, but it is working today in West Virginia and several other States where enterprising corporations have taken an aggressive step. This plan calls for corporations to construct housing for their veteran employees to whom it is sold without profit through facilities of local financing institutions, using GI guaranties. The housing is constructed by private enterprise.

I have tried vainly to get the Veterans' Administration to seek the help of corporations in solving their veteran employees' housing problems. I have been told that the VA is solely an administrative office and that it cannot promote any one part of the GI bill. But every day on the radio I hear a tremendous propaganda program promoting the retention of war insurance by vets.

I am advised that there are more than 4,000,000 veterans employed by corporations. The West Virginia plan is not suggested as a cure-all, but it is working successfully in several States. In the 3,000-word rehash of New Deal tripe that I endured Tuesday I did not hear one practical suggestion to solve the housing problem.

The T-E-W bill, last session known as the wet bill and currently referred to as the T-E-W-WET bill, was declared to be the bill to do the job. Let us look at the record. On page 159 of the T-E-W bill hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee one of the sponsors of the bill, Senator TAFT, in reply to a question said, and I quote:

May I say this T-E-W bill has nothing to do with the shortage of houses. The public housing has nothing to do with the emergency or the present shortage of houses. It is solely a social-welfare program like the long-term educational program.

Thus Senator TAFT, one of the authors of the bill, repudiates the President's contention that the T-E-W bill will alleviate the housing shortage.

You will remember the President said this bill will start immediate production of the kind of houses our families need. Yet Senator TAFT during the debate on the T-E-W bill in the Senate said, and I quote:

It takes a long time to buy land and decide where houses are to be built and to get together all the parties concerned, both local and Federal. I should guess that it would take nearly 10 years to complete this program.

Is that immediate housing for veterans?

At another point in the debate Senator TAFT said, and I quote:

In public housing there must be a metropolitan housing authority, contracts must be worked out, and plans must be drafted and shown to the Federal authority before a contract can be made. So I should say it would require a full year to get started on any public housing project.

Thus on Senator TAFT's own statement low-rent housing under the T-E-W bill could not be started until late in 1949 or early in 1950. Is that immediate housing for veterans?

Then, during the debate on the Senate floor we find in the RECORD admission that the extension of title VI of the FHA, the private enterprise section of the bill, was tacked onto this omnibus monstrosity to insure passage of the federally subsidized public housing section of the bill.

Members of Congress who have been closest to this legislation recently issued a report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Senator TAFT was chairman of that committee, and my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Michigan, Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT, able chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, was vice chairman. On page 34 of the report I find, and quote:

So far as stabilization is concerned, it would be better to concentrate publicly promoted housing construction in periods of low employment.

Senator TAFT said on May 17 during debate on the public-works bill, and I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

We cannot add $7,000,000,000 worth of houses in a year to all the other programs and still hope that finally we shall be able to prevent inflation.

He continued to say that if we do follow a plan of public spending during a period of high employment and maximum use of materials it would result in a general increase in all costs, a general increase in the price of every kind of material for which industry competes, and a competition of labor and materials which would seriously embarrass the country.

In his very opening statement President Truman said that he had called this special session to curb inflation and to do something about housing. We all know that materials and workers are

being employed to the maximum. We know that we are starting new houses at the rate of about 1,000,000 a year right now. If we accede to the President's demands we defeat the very purpose for which he says he has called this special session. I am confident the learned gentlemen who comprised the Joint Committee on the Economic Report weighed much more carefully their conclusions than did the President his contentions.

I recently saw a documented statement showing that 6,000,000 persons have been housed with new construction since the end of the war. This figure was arrived at by multiplying the number of new permanent housing units constructed since the end of the war—2,000,000—by the average family of three.

Last year 840,000 new housing units were completed. In the first 6 months of this year, 449,700 have been started. This figure is 23 percent more than the first 6 months of 1947. That is pretty potent proof that housing is being constructed in the good old American way, by private industry.

I find that the FHA reports that the average cost of a house insured by that agency is $7,900. With a $1,000 down payment that would cost about $50 a month to finance, including all carrying charges, interest, and amortization. If the average cost was $7,900 then considerable of this housing must have been at a cost less than $7,900.

I find in the joint committee's report, on page 34, this statement:

> The report contains an unsupportable statement that "most of the housing is being built for families in the higher income brackets." The Bureau of Labor Statistics has just released information concerning new nonfarm one-family homes for which construction was started during the second quarter of 1947. Half of these homes cost less than $6,700 to build and 20 percent of them cost less than $3,250. Only 10 percent cost $9,250 or over. While these are building costs, not selling prices, it is clear that the situation they depict does not even remotely resemble that suggested by the report.

The President said that most of the housing now being built for sale or rent is priced far out of reach of the moderate-income family. This does not seem to be borne out by facts.

Now, what about this T-E-W bill that the President has recommended? My study has revealed:

First. It will increase the cost of government and the tax burden in conflict with the announced policy of the Congress to reduce Government costs and taxes—involves expenditures and commitments totaling $9,602,500,000, $6,400,000,000 of which is direct subsidy for Government-owned housing. It will cost each man, woman, and child in the United States $68.

Second. It bypasses the Appropriations Committee of the Congress. The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is authorized to draw in excess of $9,000,000,000 from the Federal Treasury without prior appropriation by Congress. Of this, $6,950,000,000 could be drawn without prior appropriation by Congress under terms which commit the Congress to subsequent approval. Two billion six hundred and ten million dollars would be made available without any appropriation procedure whatsoever. This is a wholly unprecedented and unthinkable departure from the principle of congressional control of public purse strings.

Third. It makes the Administrator of HHFA virtual dictator over the home-construction industry, and gives him dictatorial powers with respect to housing over the lives of millions of American families.

Under the powers conferred on him in title III and with money made available ostensibly for housing research under that title, he will have the power to develop a great political propaganda machine to control completely the housing industry and home ownership in this country. It opens the door wide for perpetuation and enlargement of this bureaucratic control. Scientific research should be placed in the hands of scientifically trained and scientifically minded men and should never be trusted to the domination of a political agency.

Through his power as supervisor of the Home Loan Bank Board and as president and sole repository of all the powers of the National Home Mortgage Corporation, created by the bill to support the secondary market, he has unlimited power to expand or contract home-mortgage credit. He can strangle the industry at any time it suits his fancy. He can deny the privileges of home ownership by arbitrarily restricting mortgage credit.

His power to allocate 500,000 units of public housing to the various States would give him great political power and patronage.

Fourth. Socialized Government-owned housing does not clear slums. Although the original United States Housing Act required that an equivalent number of slum houses be removed for every public housing unit constructed, less than one-third of the 155,000 units of public housing built to date were constructed in slum areas.

Areas of our metropolitan cities which have become blighted with slums which can be rehabilitated by enforcement of local sanitary and building laws should be improved in this fashion. The city of Baltimore has, in a short time, improved more than 8,000 units in this fashion, at a cost to the city of less than $50,000, and made them available at monthly rentals substantially lower than public housing rents and with no subsidy by the Federal Government.

If there are other areas in which the process of physical deterioration is so advanced as to render it impractical to rehabilitate them, local government has the power to condemn such areas, promulgate a plan for their redevelopment, and resell to private individuals or corporations for redevelopment in accordance with the building restrictions established. It is not necessary to substitute a paternalistic government-ownership ideology for the American way of life in order to clear slums.

Fifth. Contrary to the claims of its proponents, the bill does not in fact serve the housing needs of the lowest income group. Senator TAFT said on the floor of the Senate that families in need of welfare relief assistance would not be eligible to live in public housing. Only those who have steady employment will be eligible to occupy the public housing units contemplated by the bill.

Sixth. It is highly inconsistent for the Congress, which has appropriated $5,300,000,000 for European relief program in order to fight the "isms" abroad, to consider seriously spending $6,400,000,000 or more for the introduction of a socialistic idea imported from Europe.

I have given considerable thought and study to veterans' housing and I am firmly convinced that the laxity of the President to use existing legislation and powers already granted him has worked to the disadvantage of the veteran. His message is pretty good evidence that he plans to continue these deplorable tactics in the coming campaign.

If the President really means business about getting housing for veterans let him instruct the Veterans' Administration to vitalize their home-loan-guaranty section and make workable such plans as the West Virginia plan. Vets want houses, not buck-passing excuses.

Proof has been offered here to show that the President apparently hasn't the slightest idea what is in the T-E-W bill. Every evidence indicates it will not and cannot build houses until late 1949 or 1950. That kind of legislation has no place in a special session of Congress.

Further evidence substantiates the charge that the T-E-W bill is inflationary and if passed by this special session would be diametrically opposed to the reasons advanced by the President for calling this session.

Construction materials and manpower are being used now to the utmost. Public construction must be deferred until periods of low employment and abundance of materials.

I would be derelict in my duty as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee if I did not expose the political chicanery of the President's speech in his obvious attempt to woo the veteran vote.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PENSIONS FOR THE AGED

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the subject of pensions for the aged is, in my opinion, one of the most important matters which this session of the Congress might give its attention.

I found, on my recent visit to my district, that a great number of people, both old and young, are interested in this matter. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is one of the subjects that was called to my attention, and I might say that there seems hardly anybody but who would be most happy to see this Congress provide a respectable old-age pension.

The American people are interested in this very vital problem because they have many who are near to them, friends, neighbors, and relatives, who are aged and who are sorely in need of help because of their inability to carry on with the amount now being granted. They know of our generosity in appropriating and scattering our billions all over the world for the relief and support of others. And the American people are asking why is it that we do not take care of our own distressed aged people.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the American people are unanimously in favor of a respectable and decent pension being provided for those who, in the declining years of their life, need our help, and this thinking represents the high character standard of our American citizenship, and, thank God, most Americans are of such high standard.

So today I am calling upon the Congress to bring out legislation at this special session to grant an increase in old-age pension. I do insist that the dire situation existing among many of our old people constitutes one of the important matters that could be considered at this extraordinary session.

I, for one, am pleading with the leadership and the membership generally to enact now a generous old-age pension. There has been too much conversation about it already, and certainly if we can attempt to iron out the problems of all the world, we surely can spend some time on the problem of our aged people. Our performance in providing funds for other causes is abundant proof that it can be done. The need for such a program is known to all of us.

Our duty, therefore, in this crucial matter is inescapable. The time for action is now. And I know the American people will applaud any action taken by this Congress to provide aid to those who need our help, and are trying to exist on the pitiful amounts that are now granted. This is one piece of legislation that I feel certain will meet with the hearty approval of all of our people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Johnstown Tribune.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in the first to include a radio address delivered by the Speaker of the House over the American Broadcasting Co. on Friday, July 30; and in the second to include a statement by Hon. Clare Boothe Luce, former Member of the House, before the Republican Convention in Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that the speech in which Clare Boothe Luce attacked me at the Republican Convention?

Mr. ARENDS. I would not know.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a radio speech by Senator CAPPER, and in the other an editorial.

PRICE OF DAIRY FEEDS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently I noticed a vivid and graphic picture, a news photo, which showed the granaries of the country are so filled with wheat that it is flowing all over the streets, and they are piling it in the fields out in Nebraska and Kansas.

Also, has come the announcement that there is to be a record corn crop which will overshadow everything that has ever been heard of before in American farm production.

In view of these facts, there can be no excuse from this time on for high prices of dairy feeds in the northeastern section of the United States. Our farmers have to pay outrageous prices for grain in order to produce milk and dairy products for the big cities of the country.

The Northeast must be allowed to participate in some of the benefits that should be expected to come as the result of all this surplus wheat and corn.

The big grain manipulators of the country have made millions from the exorbitant rates our dairy farmers are paying for grain they have not time to raise themselves. The farmers I represent are at the mercy of these wheat and corn barons and that is why we are having so many forced sales of farms in my section.

The wire pullers on the grain market may think New York State dairymen can afford high feed prices but they cannot. Unfortunately the farmer has to meet the terrific cost of production. While his milk check is better than it used to be, he still has not surplus money enough to pay tribute to the boys who dictate the high grain prices out in the Middle West.

I have said this before and I am saying it again that the cost of dairy feeds is too high. Bring that down and the farmer will benefit by a decent margin of profit, the consumer will benefit by a reasonable price for bottled milk and the profiteers will scurry for cover.

Lower grain prices will bring down the cost of meat, too. In fact the entire cost of living will be favorably affected by the action, if it is taken, of those who have thus far succeeded in keeping grain away out of reach of the pocketbooks of all our farmers who so desperately need it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is most encouraging and gratifying to see the splendid progress which is being made in some sections of the country in providing special housing for wheel-chair veterans. I wish to include at this point a dispatch I have from Needham, Mass., telling of the fine work which is being done in providing a community of houses for wheel-chair veterans in this suburb of Boston. As you well know, the Congress passed Public Law 702 this year, which provides for a grant up to $10,000 toward the purchase of a house specially constructed to meet the needs of these cases. The cost above that figure may be financed under the regular provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. I am happy to know that this work, which is so important to these handicapped men, is going forward so promptly.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that I could say the same for housing for our able-bodied veterans. There has been pending on the Union Calendar for some months the so-called veterans' housing bill, H. R. 4488, which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and which has the sponsorship of the American Legion.

This bill will provide housing for veterans at prices they can afford to pay, and at the same time will involve a minimum cost to the Federal Treasury. If we solve the housing problems for veterans, we will have solved 90 percent of the general housing problem. I would like to summarize the provisions of this bill and urge once more that Members give most careful consideration to it:

First. Relies on initiative and individual effort of the veteran.

Second. Will provide housing at prices veterans can afford to pay; limits average cost per dwelling unit to $10,000.

Third. Rental and multiunit housing as well as construction of individual homes is provided.

Fourth. Applies to all veterans of World War II, urban or rural.

Fifth. Makes provisions for community facilities where not otherwise furnished.

Sixth. All expenditures except those for community facilities are on a reimbursable basis.

Seventh. Interest rates at 4 percent or less, with amortization periods as long as 40 years.

Eighth. Channels funds to lending institutions which need money to make GI housing loans.

Ninth. Gives special attention to needs of veterans on the farm.

Tenth. Includes the incontestability clauses to encourage participation of lenders.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about passing housing legislation for veterans. Let us pass this—the only bill that gives veterans houses.

[From the New York Times of August 1, 1948]

"WHEEL-CHAIR TOWN" RISES NEAR BOSTON

NEEDHAM, MASS., July 31.—A community of houses built around a wheel chair is springing up in this suburb of Boston.

The houses are designed so the veterans can maneuver about unhampered by the usual architectural restrictions. Doors are a foot and a half wider to permit free passage of wheel chairs, and there are no thresholds.

A concrete ramp leads into the house instead of steps, and another ramp connects the kitchen and garage. The garage attached to the house, is about 5 feet wider and longer than the usual one-car stall. That enables the veteran to wheel right up to his specially equipped automobile.

The bathroom wash bowl and mirrors are set low so the occupant can shave while seated in his chair. The shower stall is extra wide.

The idea for the community project originated after Charles A. Cimino, a builder, sold a house, constructed for normal use, to Joseph Villa, a crippled veteran, then noted it was impossible for him to get around without assistance.

"I saw if the house ever caught fire while he was home alone he would never get out," Mr. Cimino said. "So we got together with an architect and planned a house best suited for paralyzed veterans."

Two houses are occupied and five others are under construction. Lots are staked for about 23 more houses.

Mr. Cimino said that cost of the houses ranged from $15,000 to $20,000, adding:

"We're trying to keep it a community just for these boys. I'm going to give them an acre of land on the project where they can build a gymnasium."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after any other special orders that may have been entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, your Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda in the Executive Departments, of which I am chairman, has recently completed an exhaustive investigation of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. Investigators for the committee have gone carefully into the records of the Bureau's activities, and your committee has conducted extensive hearings, in the course of which a considerable volume of evidence has been adduced.

I shall insert in the RECORD a copy of the report which a majority of the committee is returning, for I consider it urgently important that every Member of this body be immediately informed of the amazing facts which our inquiries have disclosed.

The evidence clearly reveals shocking bureaucratic intrigue, willful violation of Federal law, withholding of vital information from committees of Congress, and deliberate intimidation of private citizens where sheer propaganda alone has been insufficient to direct public opinion. As an incident to the main purpose of the inquiries I believe it has been shown that high Federal officials who have no practical qualifications, but who were apparently appointed for their socialistic leanings and ability as political propagandists, have proved grossly incompetent in their assignments.

The reclamation service since its inception has played an indispensable part in the development of the vast arid and semiarid areas of our Western States. Until the advent of the present clique in power which undertook to make the service a tool for the further entrenchment of bureaucracy that agency enjoyed the highest reputation for competence and integrity. In recent years, however, experienced engineers, qualified to administer the service efficiently, have been supplanted by propagandists who have prostituted the agency for their own selfish bureaucratic ends.

I know every Member of this body will insist that the Reclamation Bureau direct its energies and the public funds which Congress entrusts to it not for the expansion and entrenchment of a power-hungry bureaucracy, but for the development of our great western empire. I urge, therefore, that every Member study this report thoughtfully with a view to undertaking immediately the complete house cleaning in the agency which is indicated.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the majority report of this committee may be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The report referred to follows:)

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AUTHORIZED TO INVESTIGATE PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA AS IT RELATES TO THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION OF THAT DEPARTMENT

Based upon extensive field investigations your committee has been conducting hearings since April 27, 1948. Upon the evidence adduced the most shocking and amazing story of bureaucratic intrigue has been unfolded. Incompetency, evasion of the intent of the Congress, disregard for the truth, deliberate withholding of material information from the committees of Congress, willful violation of Federal law, are a part of the sordid story thus far presented to your committee. Many charges and countercharges had been made in relation to the Bureau of Reclamation and high officials within the Bureau. Your committee gave careful study to these charges before embarking upon the investigation which is the subject of this interim report. We were concerned lest such an investigation might be injurious to the great reclamation projects of the West. Your committee at that time and now recognizes the contribution that has been made by the West to the economy of the Nation, and also it recognizes the contribution of reclamation to the advancement of the welfare of that segment of our Nation.

Also, the committee recognizes the need that reclamation projects be expeditiously completed as they have been authorized and planned by the Congress and that further planning and construction are necessary in the immediate future if the resources and productive potentialities of the West are to be fully realized and contribute further to the welfare of our people; not only for those who live within the 17 reclamation States, but the Nation as a whole.

However, if the vision of those who have planned the development of the resources of our Western States is to become a reality, then drastic changes in personnel, planning, and ideologies must be effected in the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior. Let it suffice to say that many of the career employees and engineers within the Bureau of Reclamation have contributed much to the reputation in the past of this department of Government as an outstanding and successful construction and operating unit. These same men today fight against heavy odds to maintain that reputation and many have left, or are now threatening to leave, the Department unless changes are made to restore the original concept of reclamation. We shall not burden this report with the conception or history of reclamation. Conceived in 1902 during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, its history until recent years has been one of great accomplishments.

Recognizing the need for the development and completion of projects in the 17 reclamation States, the Eightieth Congress appropriated the largest sums ever made available to the Bureau of Reclamation (see exhibit No. 1 attached).

FALSIFICATION OF CARRY-OVER

Deliberate falsification by a high Government official, Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, is apparent from the records of official hearings before committees of Congress. The testimony had to do with carry-overs in the Central Valley project for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947. So that the testimony may be understood, the term "carry-over" should be defined.

"Carry-overs," as referred to herein, means those funds appropriated in one fiscal year for reclamation projects and unspent at the end of the fiscal year and available as free money to carry on and pay for actual work to be performed in the next fiscal year. (See letter, Michael W. Straus, Senate hearings, pt. 2, H. R. 3123, p. 29, 1948.)

The Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation had admonished the employees of the Bureau of Reclamation on frequent occasions against large carry-overs. We cite but a few of the admonitions.

At the Salt Lake City conference held in July–August of 1947 Secretary Krug made the following statement:

"However, we are going through a period now when we will have to take that risk. We will never get them to understand that very large carry-overs are a necessary part of our program because when they look at that ten, fifteen or twenty million dollars whatever it is, they will have their mouths watering and they can't help but say, 'Well, you birds have got that in the kitty; you go out and use that this year and then come in and ask for more.'

"Mike and the rest worked hard and the boys are sitting back there on the fence now, waiting and saying, 'I told you so.' And they will be after us when we go in there again.

"That means that every regional director is going to be responsible for laying out his program for spending the money he has and the carry-overs and if he has money he has not spent he is going to have to have one hell of a good excuse. Just any excuse in the world is not going to be any good, or even a good one."

At the same Salt Lake City conference Commissioner Michael W. Straus made the following statement (p. 33):

"So the watchword and the policy upon which we will embark today will be to drive forward on all of the multiple phases of our program and without compromise of standards, go ahead and build until we go broke."

Upon request of the Bureau of the Budget in its preparation of the President's Budget for the fiscal year 1948, region 2 of the Bureau of Reclamation advised that the estimated carry-over for the Central Valley for the fiscal year 1947 would be $10,722,162. The figure of $10,722,162 was adopted by the Bureau of the Budget and was contained in the President's budget.

It should be borne in mind that these were the figures furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The President's budget asked for $20,000,000 new money which, together with the free money in the estimated carry-over, would have provided $30,722,162, for performance of additional work during the fiscal year 1948. Under the date of April 9, 1947, the Commissioner's office requested by teletype from Sacramento an estimate of the unobligated balance available for the Central Valley project as of July 1, 1947. We quote from the teletype:

"The following items are requested for each project for which construction is programed in 1948, whether or not appropriation for 1948 was requested:

* * * * *

"(4) Your estimate of unobligated balance available July 1, 1947."

The Sacramento office replied that the amount of the unobligated carry-over for Central Valley would be $25,000,000.

The amount of $10,722,162 had been testified to by the Bureau of Reclamation officials before the Appropriations Subcommittee of the House prior to the receipt of the adjusted figure of $25,000,000. However, the revised figure was received by Commissioner Straus prior to the report of the Interior bill by the House subcommittee. It is the opinion of your committee that proper administrative practice, if not common honesty, should have impelled Commissioner Straus to have communicated the new figure to the House committee. Such steps, however, were not taken.

The action thus far related raises grave doubts as to the administrative integrity of the Commissioner. However, the most glaring example of deliberate distortion of the truth in an apparent attempt to mislead the Congress is that which appears in the records of the Senate hearings regarding the same item.

Commissioner Straus testified before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on May 19, 1947, after having received the teletype advising him that the estimated carry-over would be $25,000,000. But again, with utter disregard of the information furnished him by the only source from which it was obtainable, Mr. Straus testified the estimated carry-over would be $10,722,162. We quote from the record in the Senate proceedings (pp. 1062 and 1063).

"Senator KNOWLAND. As I get the picture, on page 51 of the hearings, they show estimated unobligated balance June 30, 1947, $10,722,162.

"Mr. STRAUS. That is right."

Page 1063:

"Senator KNOWLAND. All right, Mr. Straus, we will start and continue only for a very short time because I am interested in the other members of the committee getting the story.

"I would like to pursue this for the record: Is the figure which we had previously quoted of $10,722,162 the unobligated balance as of June 30, 1947?

"Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir."

Your committee, without reservation, condemns this act of Commissioner Straus in withholding full information from the Congress. It should be noted this testimony was followed by corroborative statements by other Bureau officials.

If the Congress is to function as the controller of the purse strings of Government it must, and should, be able to rely upon representatives of the executive branch to present full, true, and complete facts to its committees. Disregard of the Congress, such as is here exposed, reveals the tendency to supplant the legislative branch of Government with a dominating bureaucracy.

That officials, the subject of investigation by your committee, hold the Congress in contempt can best be evidenced by their own statements.

At the same Salt Lake City conference, Secretary Krug made the following statements:

Page 555:

"This program is probably closer to my heart than any other in the Department of the Interior, and as Mike pointed out to you, for some strange reason people up in Congress don't trust us like they used to, so both of us took quite a beating on the Bureau of Reclamation program this year.

"We put days and days and days in of explanation as to why there should be carry-overs on these projects and how much they were and why we didn't spend the money and why we were asking for money and would we be able to spend what we were asking for plus the carry-over, and we looked at them with a bland face and said, 'Sure, we will be able to spend our carry-over and we are asking for more.'"

Page 556:

"Of course, going along with those limitations will be a loss in personnel we can never replace. Those are the sort of obstacles they throw in your face when they expect you to do a job.

"It occurs to me it is like the days of the war in Washington, when perhaps a businessman would come to town to find out something or try and get something done. He had a job to do and he would say this is the damnedest place he had ever been in.

"They get a target for you to shoot at and then they proceed to throw a lot of obstacles in your path so you can't hit it and then to top it off, they tie a hundredweight on your foot and tell you to get over there the shortest possible way you can find."

Page 558:

"When you try to explain these matters to some 'jassack' from across the river who has never had anything to do with such a construction program in his life, why you really got to have an excuse, and then I doubt it will do any good."

Commissioner Straus made the following statement at the Salt Lake City Conference:

Pages 38 and 39:

"Also, I know that we've got some restriction on force account and other unsought handcuffs from the Congress, and we will be talking a lot about them this week."

Page 682:

"Mr. STRAUS. I mind such an occasion before the Appropriations Committee, when there was a lot of questions asked and no matter what the question was we said we could do it. There were some asinine questions."

Statements such as quoted above, made by high executive officials including a member of the President's Cabinet, are most reprehensible.

There can be but one conclusion as to the purpose and the effect of such conduct. We believe their objective was to instill in the minds of the employees and supervisors of the Bureau of Reclamation a contemptuous disregard of the Congress.

They endeavored through Bureau propaganda to place responsibility of the failure of the Bureau of Reclamation upon the Congress. Here truly is Federal thought control in operation with sinister motives.

CENTRAL VALLEY SHUT-DOWN

The Congress has authorized the development and construction of the great Central Valley project in California. Two hundred million dollars appropriated by the Congress have been spent in the development of the project. It is estimated that at least $200,000,000 additional will be spent before it is completed. The completion of the project at the earliest possible date has been the will and intent of the Congress, based upon estimates of progress anticipated during fiscal years.

On the basis of the best estimates obtainable, the Congress appropriated funds to carry the projects through the fiscal year 1948. The total made available to the project was approximately that requested by the President's budget, based upon estimates from the Bureau of Reclamation. In spite of this, in sheer defiance of Congress and the Budget Bureau, the Bureau of Reclamation shut down five important contracts as of November 30, 1947, because of alleged exhaustion of funds, and with only 4 days' prior warning that the projects were in any difficulty. Chairman KENNETH WHERRY, of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, was formally advised on December 1 by Commissioner Straus that no funds were available for the contracts.

All previous reports from the Bureau of Reclamation regarding the finances of the project had been optimistic in nature.

That these projects were shut down as a result either of gross mismanagement or in a deliberate attempt to embarrass the Congress, or both, is shown in Commissioner Straus' own testimony. Under questioning before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Commissioner Straus admitted that although the five contracts were closed down on November 30, 1947, on the pretext that no further funds were available, no one outside the Bureau was advised prior to November 26, 1947, that the alleged exhaustion of funds was impending. (See hearings, Senate Appropriations Committee, 80th Cong., 2d sess., Bureau of Reclamation, p. 193.)

Further evidence that the shut-down was a deliberate and premeditated attempt on the part of Bureau officials to embarrass the Congress, rather than being a matter of real necessity, is shown by the testimony of the committee's chief auditor that at the time of the shut-down there was some $7,000,000 in unexpended balance available for the contracts (see Watson's exhibits A and B), and that Bureau books had been juggled, either intentionally or otherwise, so that the funds would appear to be exhausted, when in fact they were not. The $7,000,000 which had been juggled away from the projects would have been sufficient to carry them to February 1, 1948, or beyond.

Furthermore, in bringing about this exhaustion of funds, the Bureau violated the apportionment of the Bureau of the Budget, and stands accused by that agency of having given it insufficient data on which to base its apportionment. This is borne out in testimony of James E. Scott, Bureau of the Budget, in joint hearings before the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations, Eightieth Congress, first session, on the Bureau of Reclamation appropriations, pages 29 and 30, which read as follows:

"Senator CORDON. Now let us carry that thing on. Is it your reasoning that the Bureau of the Budget in the case of continuing contracts, such as exist in substantially all public works, has no obligation whatever to apportion those funds either monthly or quarterly inasmuch as the funds are to be

expended on account of a contract authorized by law?

"Mr. SCOTT. We hold that it is the duty of the Bureau of the Budget to apportion these funds.

"Senator CORDON. Under what law?

"Mr. SCOTT. Under that law.

"Senator CORDON. You just said it did not apply, it was an exception.

"Mr. SCOTT. No; I did not say that. I think Senator O'MAHONEY said that.

"Senator WHERRY. What do you say, Mr. Scott?

"Mr. SCOTT. I say this law applies to the funds of the Bureau of Reclamation and accordingly we apportioned them as promptly as we could secure from the Bureau of Reclamation sufficient information to enable us to do at least a half-baked job of apportioning them.

"Senator WHERRY. This was a half-baked job.

"Mr. SCOTT. It certainly was, because we did not have the supporting data upon which we could do an intelligent job.

"Mr. JENSEN. From where do those data come?

"Mr. SCOTT. The Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.

* * * * *

"Senator CORDON. And that being a mandate, then it is up to the Department, if I understand you, to so arrange the work and to so control the contracts as to make no greater expenditure of money within any quarter or other allotment than the amount allotted by the Bureau of the Budget; is that correct?

"Mr. SCOTT. That is right.

"Senator CORDON. In your opinion has the Bureau of Reclamation followed your allotment and apportionment?

"Mr. SCOTT. That is not a matter of opinion, that is a matter of fact; they have not."

Upon the shutting down of the projects the Bureau of Reclamation propaganda machine went into action. The Congress was vilified, and charged with failure to provide sufficient funds for construction, in a studied attempt to divert blame from themselves. These attacks were made in spite of the fact that in excess of $7,000,000 was available for construction (see Watson's exhibits A and B); in spite of the fact that the Congress had made available substantially the amount of funds requested by the President; in spite of the fact that Richard L. Boke, regional director in charge of the Central Valley projects himself had on November 1, 1947, stated sufficient moneys were on hand to operate until February 1, 1948.

Representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation disagree with your committee auditors in regard to the freezing of funds in the amount of $4,000,000 for salaries of employees.

It is the claim of the Bureau of Reclamation that such was a proper action under the Antideficiency Act.

Testimony of competent witnesses before the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations is in conflict with that of the officials of the Bureau of Reclamation and in agreement with your committee auditors. We quote from the Senate hearings.

Floyd D. Peterson, budget examiner, Bureau of the Budget, testified, as is shown on page 852, as follows:

"Senator DOWNEY. As a matter of moral obligation, would you not think it would be highly absurd to freeze $4,000,000 to pay employees up to July 1 while you were closing down all your contracts?

"Mr. PETERSON. It would appear so.

"Senator DOWNEY. And you do not know anything in the antideficiency law that would require that in any event, do you?

"Mr. PETERSON. No, sir. As long as they complete the service of the fiscal year as intended by Congress in making the appropriation.

"Senator DOWNEY. And as long as they did not violate any limitation imposed by the Congress, and as long as they kept within the moneys appropriated by whatever methods would be necessary if the contracts were put on a custodial basis, and also as long as they took care of the item that would be due each of these employees if they were discharged to cover their vacation allowance; is that right?

"Mr. PETERSON. That is right."

Arthur B. Focke, attorney for the Bureau of the Budget, testified as is shown on page 870, as follows:

"Mr. FOCKE. My name is Arthur B. Focke.

"Senator DOWNEY. Will you please state your official position in the Bureau of the Budget?

"Mr. FOCKE. I am chief attorney in the Estimates Division of the Bureau of the Budget.

"Senator DOWNEY. Do I understand you are one of the only two attorneys who carry the legal burden in the Bureau of the Budget?

"Mr. FOCKE. That is correct.

"Senator DOWNEY. Mr. Focke, I assume you are entirely familiar with the history and data making up this transaction that we have been discussing here this morning?

"Mr. FOCKE. In general, Senator; yes.

"Senator DOWNEY. Do you agree with Mr. Peterson that under the apportionment that was made by the Bureau of the Budget on those funds—referring to the apportionment of $2,000,000 for each of the last three quarters—that was only a general appropriation or a general apportionment and did not apply to any particular funds?

"Mr. FOCKE. Yes, sir, Senator, if enough money was reserved to take care of the obligations, such as terminal leave and such employees as might have been necessary to operate the project in whatever condition it was to be maintained.

"Senator DOWNEY. Do I understand from your opinion to us that there was no obligation under the antideficiency statute to retain any particular sum for pay roll for the last 7 months, so long as sufficient amounts were retained to pay vacation leaves and to provide for the payment of such employees as would be required if the project was shut down?

"Mr. FOCKE. I know of nothing in the Antideficiency Act which would require maintaining any more funds than that in reserve."

Stephen E. Rice, legislative counsel, United States Senate, testified as follows, as shown on page 872:

"Senator WHERRY. Will you give your full name to the reporter, please.

"Mr. RICE. My name is Stephen E. Rice, legislative counsel to the Senate.

"Mr. Chairman, Senator DOWNEY asked me to express my opinion, as legislative counsel, as to whether there would have been a violation of the Antideficiency Act if they had not set aside this $4,000,000 for pay roll.

"In view of the fact that $2,000,000 was set aside for the last two quarters without being earmarked for salaries, or any other particular thing, I know of nothing in the Antideficiency Act that requires the Bureau of Reclamation to set aside this $4,000,000 for salaries.

"It seems to me that a more common-sense interpretation of the Antideficiency Act would be that they would set aside a sufficient amount for salaries for custodial employees only if they were going to shut down the project, and the rest of the money that was available would be available generally for whatever the appropriation was given for.

"In other words, I agree with Senator DOWNEY's construction and Mr. Focke's construction.

"Senator DOWNEY. Are there any questions?

"Mr. O'BRIEN. I will agree too, if we were going to shut down the project. That would have been the proper procedure, but the Bureau of Reclamation certainly was not getting ready to shut down the Central Valley project.

"Mr. RICE. I was not talking about the procedure. I am talking about the technical and legal interpretation of the Antideficiency Act.

"Mr. O'BRIEN. I will subscribe to that.

"Mr. RICE. The statement has been made that it would have been considered a violation of the Antideficiency Act if this money had not been set aside for these salaries I disagree with that statement. I do not think that is correct."

It is interesting to note that Mr. O'Brien, who agreed with the testimony of Mr. Rice, is Thomas J. O'Brien, one of the legal staff of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The record is replete with the facts and details of the accomplishment of this costly fiasco.

As stated above, on November 1, 1947, Mr Boke, regional director, according to his own testimony, estimated that sufficient funds were on hand to carry the Central Valley project until February 1, 1948. However, about the middle of November 1947 conferences were held relating to the exhaustion of funds for construction. On November 20, 1947, with apparent knowledge of the alleged critical condition of funds for project construction, Richard Boke, regional director of region 2, with utter disregard of his responsibilities to the Bureau of Reclamation, the Government, and the people of the valley, left Sacramento for a vacation. We are hard-pressed to comprehend how long a manager of a $400,000,000 industry would retain his position if under a similar alleged precarious situation he would walk out from the business for the purpose of vacationing at Carmel-by-the-Sea. However that may be, the responsibility of this debacle lies largely with Mr. Boke.

Much has been said in relation to delays in completion of the Central Valley project. Let us examine the record. In 1947 the shutdown by the Bureau of Reclamation on five major contracts on the baseless theory that funds were exhausted, has occasioned a delay of months in providing water to the thirsty lands of the Central Valley, with perhaps a loss to water recipients of millions of dollars. Claims by contractors resulting from the shut-down amounting to $1,900,000 have been filed against the Government. In 1946, by reason of a Presidential freeze, these projects were shut down between August and November. Regarding the shut-down by the President, Commissioner Michael W. Straus said at that famous Salt Lake City conference (p. 37, Salt Lake City conference):

"Mr. STRAUS. I know perfectly well that there was a Presidential freeze order imposed on reclamation that lasted from August 2 into November, through the best part of the construction season in many reclamation areas last summer. And the Bureau and I also denounced it and cried out against it until it was lifted. But, nevertheless, I know it set us back."

The shut-down of the projects in 1947 climaxed what in the opinion of this committee is a most dangerous practice and the precedent is condemned in the hope that in the future the administrative heads will heed the condemnation.

On June 10, 1947, Regional Director Boke sent a memorandum to R. S. Calland, his Assistant Regional Director, which read in part as follows:

"This morning I spoke to you concerning Secretary Krug's last-minute instructions to me on the construction program. He stated very clearly that he would like to see us spend our available funds by January 1. He also stated that he wanted a personal report from me in the immediate future. I shall leave it up to you as to what date you feel we can give the Secretary a construction personal report. However, I imagine we might count on doing so about July 1."

Thereafter Mr. Calland on June 17 sent a memorandum to all concerned which read in part as follows:

"JUNE 17, 1947.

"Memorandum for all concerned (R. S. Calland).

"Subject: Means of effectuating the regional director's responsibilities for construction on programing and execution, region 2.

"1. For reasons valid or otherwise, the construction program in the region has fallen far behind schedule. Because of failure to meet estimated progress large amounts of appropriated funds have remained unspent at fiscal year ends. This fact has brought severe criticism upon us from the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner, from members of congressional appropriations committees, and from others.

"2. The heavy carry-over from the current fiscal year (1947) plus an appropriation in the order of amounts recently passed by the Senate and House of Representatives will give us a total of funds available for fiscal year 1948, which is far above that required to meet our current rate of spending. The Secretary and the Commissioner are insistent that 1948 funds be spent early in the year—by January 1, if possible. We are concerned here lest we end the fiscal year with another carry-over. The situation represents a challenge to our construction ability. The Bureau's reputation as a construction agency is literally at stake. As local custodians of this reputation all means at our command must be employed to meet this challenge."

It should be noted from the above "the Secretary and the Commissioner are insistent that the 1948 funds be spent early in the year—by January 1, if possible."

Here are instructions to dissipate the funds 6 months prior to the end of the fiscal year; a direct violation, in the opinion of your committee, of the spirit and the letter of the Antideficiency Act. Also, this is a wilful disregard of the admonition of the Appropriations Committee which was well known by the Bureau of Reclamation, as is found in the records of the Salt Lake City conference of 1947. Commissioner Straus made the following statement at that conference:

Page 69, Salt Lake City conference record:

"Mr. STRAUS. The House committee did say, as an expression of opinion and as a piece of legislative history, but did not write down into law, that they did not want to entertain deficiencies and could not entertain deficiencies."

We are of the opinion that the action taken was in utter defiance of the Congress as evidenced by the testimony of Richard Boke before your committee (appearing in testimony of June 9, 1948):

"Mr. WADSWORTH. One other thing. Do you think that the sending out of this appeal to the effect that the money should be spent, all of it, the new appropriation and the carry-over, by January 1, do you think that in doing that you were carrying out the intent of Congress?

"Mr BOKE No, sir, I do not."

The record shows that on August 31, 1945, Mr. Straus, then Assistant Secretary of the Interior, prepared for Secretary Harold L. Ickes a statement of Mr. Boke's education and experience. This statement was intended to persuade Mr. Ickes as to Boke's fitness for the job of director of region 2. Mr. Straus' ultimate purpose in this is also clear, namely, to place the vast Central Valley project in the hands of a propagandist for the Bureau's socialistic policies. Despite this recommendation of Mr. Straus to Secretary Ickes, as contained in the following letter, your committee has reached the conclusions, based on incontrovertible evidence, Mr. Boke does not possess the qualifications necessary to administer the gigantic Central Valley project.

The following is a copy of the letter referred to:

OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT SECRETARY, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, August 31, 1945.

Memorandum for the Secretary.

For your convenience in appraising and interviewing Richard L. Boke, who has been mentioned in connection with our Central Valley problem, I provide this biographical sketch.

Richard Lathrop Boke, a native-born Californian, is 36 years old. He specialized in economics, biology, and literature (at Antioch College, 1927 to 1931). He is of good family with some independent means.

He engaged in forestry work for the Ohio State forestry department and engineering construction work for G. A. Fuller Construction Co. He did some publicity work prior to his first Federal employment which happened to be for you in the Office of Indian Affairs, laying out of a Mexican Springs erosion-control station on the Navajo Reservation. Subsequently his Federal employment went forward with the Soil Conservation Service until he became its regional director, with headquarters at Albuquerque. When the war came, he joined the Nelson Rockefeller Inter-American Affairs Committee and worked through South America on procurement and land resource and food work, later going to the Foreign Economic Administration as chief program director for the purchase of food supplies for import into the United States, and as administrator in budget work. He returned to the Department of the Interior at the end of last year, through my efforts, when Director Charles Carey, of California, stated that he could find no man in the Bureau of Reclamation qualified to head up the regional operation and maintenance and land-use planning work in the Central Valley.

He has devoted over 10 years primarily to resource and land-use planning (virtually our biggest Central Valley problem), and, as a section chief in Sacramento, has intimate knowledge of over a year's standing on our current problems. He is definitely a strong personal believer in acreage restriction, for I have examined him on that score. I know that he is a public-power advocate, but I have never examined him on that policy, as his position gave him no administrative responsibility for power policy.

His outstanding accomplishment, as one of the new school of thought that we are injecting into the Bureau of Reclamation, is that he succeeded where others either failed or were unwilling to make an attempt, in coming to an agreement with at least some districts in the San Joaquin Valley for selling water with acreage restrictions. Until on his own initiative, under Carey's guidance, he made this attempt, the Bureau and the Department had accepted the frequently proclaimed thesis that Central Valley water could not be sold with acreage restriction. After 5 months of personal contact with some irrigation districts, he negotiated the southern San Joaquin municipal utility district proposed contract, which will be a pattern under which a half dozen similar contracts may be entered. This effectively shatters the California solid front against acreage restrictions and, in my opinion, is the only positive progress in recent years, policywise, in the Central Valley.

Boke is distinctly not one of our regulation reliable, noncrusading reclamation engineers, and his original arrival in the Bureau of Reclamation was accomplished with considerable difficulty in one of the better jobs (present salary $6,750). He has demonstrated determination, as well as tact, in his position to date. He has had wide Federal administrative experience and has never held a position of comparable responsibility to that now being discussed. We have no other regional director in the Bureau of Reclamation as young or with as short a background in the Bureau; or, to my knowledge, no other person in the Bureau qualified for the position now being discussed.

MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
Assistant Secretary.

It is the conclusion of this committee after full hearings and careful study of the record that:

1. There was a clear design to exhaust the funds of the project in the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1948;

2. Such a design—spelled out and promulgated by high officials of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, at the Salt Lake City conference—to spend until we go broke, is a direct, deliberate, and premeditated violation of the Antideficiency Act;

3. There was serious mismanagement of the Bureau's accounts and gross errors in the statement of accounts payable;

4. From the record we cannot escape the conclusion that the shut-down was a deliberate conspiracy to discredit the Congress of the United States without regard to the consequences;

5. Such acts by Bureau officials were a deliberate attempt to put pressure on the Congress for deficiency appropriations although not needed at the time;

6. The shut-down has cost the residents of the valley and the Government of the United States millions of dollars, and materially delayed the vital project;

7. The shut-down was unnecessary and sufficient funds were available to carry the projects forward until February 1, 1948.

PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA

In consideration of the dissemination of propaganda by the Bureau of Reclamation it is well to consider section 201, of title 18, United States Code, passed July 11, 1919, which reads in part as follows:

"No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, either before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation."

It is the opinion of your committee that the Bureau has deliberately and willfully gone beyond its proper and lawful public information function. It has expended undetermined sums in propaganda designed to generate public approval of official policies. It has disseminated material craftily planned to smear and discredit its critics and to undermine the influence of Members of Congress who, in the performance of their duty, would expose questionable practices of the Bureau. The evidence strongly indicates that the Bureau's entire public relations policy has been designed to influence and coerce Congress on pending legislation dealing with the powers, objectives, and ideology of the Bureau.

Your committee has assembled a voluminous file of publications, releases, speeches, and other propaganda material prepared and distributed by the Bureau, or printed by its supporting groups and distributed through regular Bureau channnels. A large number of pamphlets on technical subjects have been carefully written in laymen's language with clever emphasis upon the complexity of the problems involved. The implication is clear that the Bureau should be given blanket

authority without inquiring too closely into what the Bureau does or how it affects the real interests of the Nation.

One of the many publications to come to the attention of your committee is entitled "They Subdued the Desert." The publication was prepared by Barrow Lyons while serving as Chief Information Officer of the Bureau of Reclamation. Mr. Lyons toured the 17 reclamation States during October and November of 1946, writing this story as told to him "by the men who apply water, till the land, and feed their flocks and herds."

A close examination of the publication leads your committee to the conclusion that it was sheer propaganda and not even of the subtle variety generally encountered under similar situations.

Articles were written in a manner that would influence class against class, liberal against conservative, and inject into the minds of readers ideologies sponsored by some of the planners within the Bureau.

All this was done at Government expense.

Commissioner Straus testified as follows regarding the volume:

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it the function of the Government of the United States to furnish information to the public about a man's reputation? A private citizen?

"Mr. STRAUS. The effort in that publication—well, wait. I don't want to appear to dodge that question.

"Mr. HARNESS. Why don't you answer that question?

"Mr. STRAUS. I think I am trying to now.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. What have we come to?

"Mr. STRAUS. No; I do not think it is a prime function. I do not think it is a function; let me just state that. I do not think it is a function.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Why did you do it?

"Mr. STRAUS. That was done—I do not know whether it was a criticism of him, but it was done in an effort to get a cross-section view of the thinking of the water users in 17 States. That was the endeavor, the target.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. I would criticize it just as much if it had praised this man to the skies. What have we come to when the Government of the United States publishes far and wide estimates of individual citizens and does it at public expense? What have we come to?

"Mr. STRAUS. I have had some experience with that end result, Mr. WADSWORTH.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, have you any observation to make about the soundness of such a governmental activity?

"Mr. STRAUS. I have been criticized at great length as an individual by the Government of the United States.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly; we all have. I have been criticized at great length, but, to my knowledge, I have never been criticized at the expense of the taxpayer.

"Mr. STRAUS. I have.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. What have you got to say about this? Do you think that is a proper function of Government?

"Mr. STRAUS. I think the effort, the overall effort, of that publication is a proper function of Government. I regret that there is any criticism of any individual in it.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. I am glad to hear you admit that much. Would you regret some of these observations about citizens had they been in the tone of glorious praise?

"Mr. STRAUS. Well, my primary control point would be whether it was factual or not.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. That is not the point. You may believe that the thing may be a fact, but should the Government publish it?

"Mr. STRAUS. I think the Government should know the thoughts of——

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Itself?

"Mr. STRAUS. Of itself, yes; and of the people it is serving, too—the water users in my case.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, that opens up a remarkable vista. If that policy may be pursued without criticism by the Government of the United States, then every citizen of the United States may be subject to analysis as to his character and reputation in governmental publications. Isn't that right?

"Mr. STRAUS. That has been my experience.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at public expense.

"Mr. STRAUS. I think at public expense. My qualifications have been examined rather thoroughly—broadcasted——

"Mr. WILSON. You mean before you became a public servant?

"Mr. STRAUS. And since.

"Mr. WILSON. Not since, before. You are subject to public talk when you get to be a public servant.

"Mr. STRAUS. I was thinking of 'since,' Mr. Wilson.

"Mr. WILSON. Well, did your Government ever spend any money advertising you around, before you got into public office?

"Mr. STRAUS. Not that I recall; no.

"Mr. WILSON. Good or bad?

"Mr. WADSWORTH. Remember. These people are private citizens.

"Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. They do not hold public office. We all admit—you admit, I admit—that we are subject to criticism——

"Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. By anybody.

"Mr. MANASCO. Everybody.

"Mr. WADSWORTH. But here we have the Government of the United States, at the expense of the taxpayers, publishing estimates of the characters of people who are private citizens.

"Mr. STRAUS. Don't you think, Mr. WADSWORTH, that the fact that my understanding was that clearly it was agreed to and accepted and corrected by those individuals has a bearing on this?"

Page 2237:

"Mr. WADSWORTH. We have reached a pretty turn when the Government of the United States, in official Government publications, presumes to estimate or analyze the character and reputation of a private citizen, whether with his consent or not.

"I could not suspect such a case, but some bureau of the Government might say that 'WADSWORTH is a pretty good fellow,' and would ask me had I any objection to that being published in a governmental publication. I might be tempted to say, 'No, I have no objection,' but would it be right?

"Mr. STRAUS. Under those circumstances——

"Mr. WADSWORTH. It would not."

We find that Government employees on Government salary and at Government expense have prepared highly controversial material for private organizations. One such document (American River Development) contains the statement: "If you want a multiple-purpose dam at Folsom, with canals, power plant, and related works to insure maximum benefits, write your Congressman and Senators."

The Bureau denies its employees attached this statement to the pamphlet which otherwise was fully written by Bureau employees. Nevertheless, the pamphlet in great numbers has been distributed by the Bureau of Reclamation in direct violation of the Criminal Code above cited. Commissioner Straus in several addresses in California by clear implication urged that pressure be put upon the Congress to bring about legislation favorable to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Governor of the State of California criticized the Bureau of Reclamation for issuing propaganda in an attempt to confuse the people of that State about Folsom Dam.

In expressing himself regarding the controversy between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, over the construction of the reservoir, Governor Warren declared:

"The Army has authority to build the dam. And we are coming right up to the time in a couple of months when we will go before Congress to ask for appropriations and the Bureau is telling the people we will be robbed of our birthright.

"This gets the people confused until they don't know what is best for them. It is outrageous. We don't care who builds the dam as long as it is built."

The conflict between the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in regard to Folsom Dam is not consistent with proper administrative practice. The Congress has acted and has authorized construction by the Army engineers. Any change in that program should be suggested directly to committees of the Congress. It is highly improper to inflame the citizens of the American River District against the Army engineers in the hope that they should by bitter protest prevail upon the Congress to transfer that Department's function to the Bureau of Reclamation. Sound government and legislation cannot be predicated on such a basis.

Throughout the Bureau of Reclamation in key administrative posts, not only in Washington but in the regions, are men whose backgrounds are in the field of publicity and public relations. "Selling" the public on social theories and ideologies rather than construction of great engineering projects is apparently high on the agenda of this agency of Government.

Such a fact is revealed in the testimony of Leon Hostetter, a former employee of the Bureau.

Mr. Hostetter, a competent and highly trained engineer, resigned his position to enter into employment with private enterprise. He had been disillusioned by activities within the Bureau. He testified that when he attempted to discuss his engineering problems with the Fresno office, he would find Bureau personnel "out making speeches." This fact, he said, delayed the projects.

In discussing his resignation with one official of the Bureau in California, Mr. Hostetter testified as follows:

"Mr. HOSTETTER. Mr. Nordholm expressed amazement that I would resign from the Bureau of Reclamation.

"Mr. BOW. Will you tell us just what the conversation was?

"Mr. HOSTETTER. I said I didn't know why anyone would be surprised, especially in view of the fact that I was accepting a position which was much more to my advantage than staying with the Bureau. He said that he thought that it was peculiar to him, and he could not do it because he wanted to be a member of the organization which would preside over the social changes in Central Valley. I told him, Mr. Nordholm, that I had no interest under heaven in such business; that I am an engineer, and that I expected to continue to be an engineer, and if I could not be that in the Bureau, I would have to go elsewhere. The unfortunate thing is that I have no witness for that, but you just have my statement.

"Mr. HARNESS. Did this man elaborate on what social changes he had in mind?

"Mr. HOSTETTER. No, sir; I didn't give him any opportunity to state it. I am an engineer, and, as I told him, I am not interested in social changes of any kind.

"Mr. HARNESS. He wanted to belong to the organization when the social changes took place?

"Mr. HOSTETTER. As I remember his words, the organization which would preside over the social changes in the Central Valley.

"Mr. HARNESS. Do you have any idea what he had in mind?

"Mr. HOSTETTER. No, sir; I don't, other than the fact that on a previous trip he expressed great admiration for the progress made in Russia."

Your committee further reports its concern regarding the employment of Robert Burns Read. Mr. Read, describing his qualifications

in his application for employment, stated: "I developed a style of newswriting which contrived to present fairly subtle ideas in simple language."

Mr. Read also submitted the fact that he had for 5 years, on a voluntary basis, prepared publicity material for the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee at 68 Post Street in San Francisco, Calif.

This group, with which Mr. Read stated he was officially associated, has been certified by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive, in his report in the loyalty investigation.

The House Un-American Activities Committee reports on the organization in part as follows:

"The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited as a Communist front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report No. 1311, dated March 29, 1944. Attorney General Clark included the group on his list of 'subversive' organizations furnished for use of the Loyalty Review Board. The executive secretary and members of the executive board of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee were cited April 16, 1948, for contempt of Congress; they were indicted April 1, 1947, and convicted June 27, 1947."

Mr. Read is still on the Bureau pay roll and Mr. Boke testified that he, Mr. Boke, was undisturbed.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Read as well as Sam Woods, another information man, served in an executive position with an organization which openly supports all Bureau activities.

There is a strong implication from the record before us that the Bureau of Reclamation has been active in the organization and operation of propaganda-front conferences. The committee staff has been directed to further investigate the subject.

Commissioner Straus openly admitted that statements for outside witnesses have been prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation staff. These witnesses appeared to influence legislation.

From the records of the Salt Lake City conference we find that the Bureau not only has prepared statements but has stimulated outside witnesses (p. 314, Salt Lake City conference):

"Mr. MARKWELL. We not only made it clear and made as strong an indication and appearance as we could, but we also stimulated outside witnesses to do that."

Even though the Appropriations Committee of the Congress sought to eliminate much of these improper activities, the Bureau has regarded the limitations of the committee as a "name plate" function and has carried on, evading the intent of Congress and distorting the law to meet their own ends, by shifting the information personnel over to other portions of the pay roll. Just how this was accomplished, was explained by Commissioner Straus at the Salt Lake City meeting, as follows (p. 89 of the Salt Lake City conference):

"The Senate put in a limitation that applies to a function under the label of 'Information,' by reducing the language in the previous last year's bill that put a limitation of $150,000 and cut that to $50,000, making a national limitation on information work, so announced and so labeled and so set up administratively, of $50,000.

"Pursuant to that limitation that prevailed when the bill was passed there was a radical reduction in the size of the Office of the Director of Information and parallel reductions in the field.

"The reductions were not spread to the over-all money, the salaries and expense money in the bill, but the limitation was put specifically on that name-plate function.

"There were two regional officers of information who were preserved on salary and expense accounts. Regions 1 and 2, and the other regions were informed of the legislation, the appropriation action, and were instructed to make what disposition they saw fit of their regional information agents that heretofore had been charged to salaries and expense, it being pointed out to them that it would not be enough to merely put the same information on a centralized project roll, that they would have to change the description and carry it in some other way that came within the limitation."

Further evidence of the manner in which the Bureau willfully evaded the evident intent of Congress to curtail the agency's publicity activities is seen in the statements of Acting Chief Information Officer Leonard Mosby, at the same meeting. This is illustrated by the following extract (pp. 447 and 448 of the Salt Lake City conference):

"Mr. VERNON. Were there any limitations, such as paralleled the Personnel Act?

"Mr. MOSBY. We have been unable to find them. So far as I can see; I have not had an opportunity to examine the entire bill. I believe the restriction is in the first section on salaries or administrative expense and it says that no more than $50,000 shall be spent in connection with information out of this appropriation.

"Related to that is the appropriation of $3,500,000 for administrative expense.

"Mr. VERNON. Can we consider we are free to expend whatever funds are necessary for information out of project funds?

"Mr. MOSBY. Yes, sir; I think so.

"Mr. VERNON. I have in mind particularly in the opening preamble to the reclamation section which says what these funds are being used for, which goes for information and making recordings and so on and so forth and yet with that limitation further on down.

"Mr. MOSBY. It turns on the word, what this appropriation means, and that means $3,500,000."

The extent to which officials of this agency of Government have gone to legislate for themselves is best found in the statement of one of the high officials (Chief Engineer) in the Salt Lake City conference, and we quote:

"Mr. YOUNG. There was a legal procedure involved there and we even went so far as to perjure ourselves to get ourselves out of the woods. It didn't amount to anything in money, but the principle is there."

Your committee expresses amazement that in an open conference of Bureau officials attended by the Commissioner and his staff and by a member of the President's Cabinet, the Secretary of the Interior, there should be an admission of perjury. In spite of this admission your committee staff found no action either to prosecute or discipline.

Your committee has directed the committee staff to vigorously continue investigation of the propaganda activities within the Bureau. Violations of the Criminal Code to date will be called to the attention of the Attorney General. All future violations will also be reported to the proper authorities in an effort by the committee to put an end to these practices.

The committee deplores, but will not be deterred by, attempts of Commissioner Straus to obstruct its investigatory efforts, through intimidation of Bureau employees. Examples of such attempts by the Commissioner are seen in the following teletypes which Commissioner Straus sent to the Denver office when it was learned that committee investigators were active in that region. The teletypes follow:

Washington to the following:

MAY 3, 1948.

To Chief Engineer; attention, Young, regional director; attention, Batson.
W-DN 411.
W-DN 217.
Subject: Interviews with Harness committee investigators.

Please air mail attention 400 two copies of a brief report of each interview with Bureau employees by HARNESS or other congressional committee investigators. These reports should have attached copies of any tabulations or other material furnished investigators.

The Chief Engineer will please advise all other office heads in Denver of this request.

STRAUS, *Commissioner.*

Washington to the following:

MAY 4, 1948.

W-DN7 220.
W-DN 414.
To Chief Engineer; regional director, Denver.
Subject: Interviews with Harness committee investigators.

Re W-DN 411 and W-DN 7: Supplementing my teletype of yesterday, all employees of the Bureau of Reclamation are expected to make full disclosure of factual information to authenticated investigators of the Harness committee or other congressional committees.

The reports of interviews requested are to be brief and factual and to high light the information requested so as to enable us to coordinate properly all information and data given the investigators.

STRAUS, *Commissioner.*

Similar instructions were sent to the Sacramento office when it was learned investigators were active in the California region. Investigators who had worked in both areas testified that Bureau employees who had been cooperating in the investigation were frightened by the teletypes, with the result that the investigators' efforts were seriously hampered, and their work of obtaining evidence made much more difficult.

This is considered but another example of bureaucratic intrigue to hamper and frustrate the Congress in its attempt to perform its constitutional function.

CONCLUSION

In this interim report your committee has outlined but a few of the matters of which it feels it must take cognizance.

Full opportunity was given to Bureau officials to answer charges made against them. Some attempts to answer have been made and appear in the records. However, the findings in this report are based on incontrovertible facts.

Witnesses appeared before the committee who are presently employed or who are retiring from the Bureau. Some were critical of the operations of the Bureau and its officials. The committee wishes to commend those persons who, through pride of their organization and through patriotic motives, risked personal retribution in presenting these facts.

Other witnesses employed by the Bureau engaged in evasion, double talk, and distortion in an apparent effort to conceal facts from your committee. Such conduct by Government employees cannot be tolerated.

In the hope that this committee may through its efforts and subsequent reports to the Congress assure the proper use of appropriated funds and bring about the efficient and economical management of the Bureau of Reclamation we shall, as indicated, continue our investigation.

Approved:

FOREST A. HARNESS (Indiana), *Chairman.*
JAMES W. WADSWORTH (New York).
HENRY J. LATHAM (New York).

NOTE.—Exhibits referred to in this report will be a part of the printed hearings.

MINORITY VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE MANASCO

In my opinion, the charges that have been made against the officials of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation are not sustained by the evidence. On the contrary, the record discloses that many obstacles were placed in the way of the Bureau carrying out the laws as prescribed by the Congress. It is clear that there is intense opposition to the 160-acre limitation

and public-power provision of the reclamation laws that have stood unrepealed for more than 45 years. The propaganda that has been spread by that opposition throughout the Central Valley of California has, unfortunately, necessitated the Bureau to spend considerable time and effort in combating erroneous and misleading statements concerning the applicability of the laws. Gov. Earl Warren, the Republican Vice Presidential nominee, pointed out an example of such propaganda to the Senate Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations. At page 1014 of the transcript of the hearings on H. R. 6705, before that subcommittee, Eightieth Congress, he testified as follows:

"It was recognized in 1933 by the proponents of the Central Valley project in California that the sale of electric power from the project to only one possible customer would not result in the best financial return; and, in the long run, this is bound to be true. Although, at the present time, the private company is desirous of obtaining project power and is no doubt willing to pay a fair price for it, this has not always been the case and may not be so in the future. For example, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. circulated a letter, dated December 12, 1933, to stockholders and bondholders of the company, which stated in part as follows: 'At present there is a surplus of power in all California. This company has 10 powerhouses shut down, and its engineers report enough power available to take care of all growth until 1945. This means that there is no market for additional power and that the revenue which the proponents so freely predict cannot possibly be earned.'

"Contradictory to the foregoing claim of the company, it should be pointed out that nearly 500,000 kilowatts of additional capacity were installed by 1945 and that over 600,000 kilowatts of additional generating capacity have been installed since December 1933 and are presently in operation to meet still growing power demands in its service area.

"It should also be pointed out that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., in appearing recently before the Federal Power Commission for a license to construct additional hydroelectric facilities, put in evidence its construction program of new generating capacity for the ensuing 3 years, amounting to 1,439,700 kilowatts. In view of this large addition of generating capacity, it is quite evident a corresponding increase of main transmission facilities will be required.

"The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has consistently opposed Federal appropriations for transmission lines claiming, among other things, that it has ample facilities to transmit the power generated at Shasta and Keswick power plants to points of utilization. Studies by the engineering staff of the State engineer show that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. does not now have sufficient primary transmission-line capacity to dependably transmit south from Shasta substation the power output from the Shasta and Keswick plants of the Central Valley project and the output of the Pitt River plants of the company. Additional primary transmission facilities are required for such purposes."

Many assertions are made throughout the record that the Bureau officials engaged in dishonest and false propaganda. The substantive proof, however, is totally lacking in that respect. No specific instances have been shown where any false or misleading statements were issued by the Bureau of Reclamation or its officials. In fact, an adverse witness, testifying with respect to an article written by a Bureau information official, stated that the article was factually correct. This same witness, when questioned by the chairman as to whether he ever heard any Bureau official urge people to support or object to any pending legislation said that he had not, and that the only thing he heard in that respect was a statement by Regional Director Boke to the effect that the 160-acre limitation was the law and that it would be enforced.

After listening for many weeks to testimony presented to the committee investigating the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, it is most difficult to draw a line as to what is true and what is propaganda. Thousands of pages of testimony and documentary evidence were presented to the committee, voluminous reports were submitted by the committee staff, ample opportunity was afforded those who were opposed to the conduct of the Bureau of Reclamation in carrying out the obligations imposed upon it by the Congress to present their views.

Many charges were made against representatives of the Bureau that they were flagrantly violating the laws of the Congress. However, it is my opinion that the principal objection to the conduct of Bureau employees was based on the fact that they were carrying out the duties imposed upon them by acts of Congress to see that the 160-acre limitation and the public power provisions of the law were observed in the Central Valley of California.

Differences of opinion were expressed as to whether or not the acts of Congress restrict furnishing water to the family-sized farm unit. I gathered from the statements of some of the witnesses in the early part of the hearings that about the only hope they had of correcting the 160-acre limitation was to change the national administration from the office of Chief Executive down to the Bureau heads in the Department of the Interior. Since the hearings were concluded, with the exception of the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior, the great Republican Party held its convention in Philadelphia and in its platform instead of going on record as favoring repeal of the 160-acre limitation the platform endorses the principle of family-sized farm units, which in some instances could mean farms of 30 acres or less. When the selection for the position of President and Vice President was made, the hope of those who would like to see the public power policies of this administration and the 160-acre limitation removed must have been dashed upon the rocks of political oblivion.

Governor Warren, the candidate for Vice President, has been outspoken in public statements and in statements before congressional committees supporting the family-sized farm units to be furnished water by the Bureau of Reclamation and also in favor of the public power policies of the Bureau as directed by acts of Congress. Governor Dewey is also on record as approving the family-sized farm units as evidenced by his complete endorsement of the Republican platform. I point out these things because of the fact that the major part of this record is devoted to testimony concerning the carrying out of those laws, and the insistence of Bureau officials that they be enforced. I think anyone could draw the conclusion upon reading the hearings that the principles involved in this controversy are not personalities but policies laid down by the Congress. Any Bureau head or subordinate who faithfully carried out the provisions of law as laid down by the Congress would have met with the same difficulties and would have had the same opposition as the present Bureau representatives, whether he be engineer, lawyer, accountant, or what not. A large amount of testimony dealt with the question of whether or not the head of the Bureau of Reclamation and his principal assistants should have been engineers. To my mind these positions should be filled with capable administrators. Having a degree in engineering, law, or any of the arts does not necessarily qualify a person for an administrative position. The presidents of some of the greatest industrial corporations in our Nation today are lawyers, yet under the contention of many of the antagonists of the Bureau, if carried into effect in private industry, only engineers would be qualified to head manufacturing firms. The record also shows that administration of the reclamation laws is a tremendous task in itself, there being over 803 pages of laws which govern the operation of the Bureau and it might well be said that the head of the Bureau should be a lawyer. Since a lot of bookkeeping and accounting is involved it might well be said that the head of the Bureau should be a certified public accountant. In view of the fact that lands must be classified under the law and repayment to the Government is dependent, to some extent, on the value of the crops, it might be said that the head should be an agriculturist.

Due to the enormous cost of these reclamation projects some taxpayers might wonder if it would not be advisable to turn the project back to the States and let them complete construction and administer the program. The Central Valley project will eventually cost over $100,000,000 for the benefit of the owners of approximately 1,000,000 acres of land. I am wondering if the taxpayers of New York, Indiana, and Michigan are willing to continue to appropriate huge sums of interest-free money for the benefit of a few.

The opponents of the Central Valley project will not be satisfied by merely removing certain personnel in the Bureau of Reclamation. They will not be satisfied until the law under which the ideologies here involved have been repealed, or nullified by failure to carry them out by the heads of the Bureau. The ideologies are written in the law. The removal of these officials for enforcing the law may tend to intimidate future officials and if the precedent were carried into other bureaus of the Government those who do not like to pay taxes might, by intimidation and otherwise, get the collectors of internal revenue to nullify the acts of Congress.

Much ado has been made over the question of whether or not representatives of the Government falsified the carry-overs in the 1948 budget. After hearing all the testimony, I think a person who wanted to take either side could find testimony to back up his belief.

To my way of thinking, the principal difficulty encountered by members of this committee and other committees of the House and Senate arose from the question of whether or not carry-overs meant additional appropriations, or whether it meant completion of work previously authorized. Apparently, many people have been misled to believe that the carry-overs were hidden appropriations to be used any way the bureau heads could, or any way they so desired.

The truth is, the carry-overs represented appropriations for work previously authorized and which should have been completed, but due to material shortages, weather conditions, and manpower shortages, were not completed as scheduled and had to be carried in the next fiscal year. The cost of the work, however, remained the same. These carry-overs in no way affected the proposed completion dates of the projects, or the total amount of work involved. If the contractor could complete the work that is scheduled to be completed in 1952 by the latter part of this year without any additional cost to the taxpayers of the United States, it is difficult to see how anyone could oppose such rapid completions. The estimates made some 8 or 9 months before the end of the fiscal year as to the amount of work that will be unfinished at the end of the fiscal year, can only be a guess, and the evidence shows that when the Bureau officials were testifying before the Senate subcommittee, they knew that the money which constituted the carry-overs would be required to pay contract earnings, in addition to the moneys needed for new work that would be undertaken. The money was actually used

up in the next fiscal year, and I do not believe any falsification has been shown.

I realize that the Congress should be diligent in following the appropriations made for the executive branch of the Government, and oppose a government by bureaucracy as much as any member of the committee. However, I think we face a grave danger from the Congress itself if we fall into the philosophy of administration of laws by the Congress itself under our democratic system of government. Of necessity, the executive departments must execute the laws passed by Congress, and if they fail to execute these laws properly, Congress should take cognizance of that fact and try to bring them in line; but, if the Congress itself attempts to administer the laws we are headed down the highway of totalitarianism.

Much of the evidence presented by the committee's investigators was hearsay and highly opinionated, but even a considerable portion of this was successfully refuted by the Bureau's witnesses. A statement was offered for the record entitled "Fifty Statements and the Facts," and although it was not placed in the record, it was orally presented by Bureau witnesses and points out some of the erroneous statements that were put in the record.

It developed in the hearings on June 29, that there is an unfortunate fight, which up to now has been kept under cover, between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineers, which was very disturbing. It was most unfortunate that two agencies of the Government, charged with the obligation of preserving natural resources, should be fighting each other. Instead of fighting each other, I think they should both be working for the common good. It is somewhat refreshing to know that Congress is now trying to resolve those difficulties, and I sincerely trust that the Congress will be able to do so without undue pressure from each agency.

Considerable testimony was offered concerning the so-called shut-down of the Central Valley project on November 30, 1947. The earlier testimony in the RECORD left the impression that all work on the project had stopped and that the Bureau of Reclamation was maintaining its full pay roll while everything was at a standstill. As the testimony developed, however, it was conclusively established that the Bureau of Reclamation did not order any shut-down of work, but expected all work to continue on the project even though the funds were exhausted. In fact, it was on this basis that the principles of the antideficiency law were applied. Only four contractors did shut down, all the others continuing work in anticipation of supplemental appropriations, which the Congress very expeditiously provided. The charge was made that this shut-down was planned so as to embarrass the Congress and that work was speeded up by the Bureau to effect that result.

My impression from the testimony is that the work continued in its normal course, in the most economical and efficient rate of construction. The invalidity of those charges is evidenced by testimony elsewhere in the record that the Bureau instead of speeding up construction was slowing down construction in order to enforce the signing of repayment contracts. Evidence was offered by the Bureau, which to me seemed quite conclusive, to the effect that the Bureau had to continue its organization to supervise the work that had not stopped. That constituted a substantial amount of work, and I believe the Bureau would have been grossly derelict in its duty if it disbanded its organization and closed the project down. In fact, I do not believe it would have been authorized under the law to do so.

It seems to me that the facts are simply this: That the Bureau needed $20,000,000 of new money for the fiscal year 1948 to carry out its program. Its carry-over funds which remained from the previous fiscal year were needed to complete the work previously programed for that year. When Congress appropriated only $9,000,000 instead of the $20,000,000 needed, it was obvious that the work could not continue throughout the whole fiscal year. The record here also shows that the Congress was advised of that fact prior to the time it made its appropriations. It is interesting to note that Congress later not only made up the difference, but appropriated nearly $2,000,000 more than was originally requested.

Some testimony was presented to the effect that there was some $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 available on November 30, 1947, to pay contractor earnings on the Friant-Kern canal after that date. The Bureau's witnesses, however, point out that even if there were no statutory restrictions on the use of that money, which apparently there was, work elsewhere on the project would have had to be stopped. True, some misjudgments were made in the hurried efforts to get out the required notices as to the status of funds, but, even with the hindsight now available, it is evident that work could have continued only a few days longer.

As to the statements concerning claims against the Bureau by contractors arising out of the exhaustion of funds, the record does not show any such claims. It appears that the four contractors who stopped work sought to obtain relief legislation from the Congress, but as yet that has not been granted. The Bureau denies any legal liability.

The reclamation laws are so voluminous and complex that no fair appraisal of the activities of the Bureau can be made without a thorough understanding of those laws. The reclamation program, in accordance with authorized laws and the annual appropriations, provides aid in the development of western land and water resources for the primary purpose of increasing opportunities to develop family-sized irrigation farms, and for improved family livelihood to rural and urban population in the irrigated areas of the 17 Western States. Those policies of the Congress have been implicit throughout 46 years of legislative history. While the great dams, canals, power plants, and transmission lines which the Bureau of Reclamation has designed and constructed are monuments to engineering skill, they are but the instruments by which the Congress has made possible the administration of its policies for extending the human opportunities which are reflected in the rapidly expanding population of the West in both the rural and urban areas.

As reported to the committee of the Congress, more than $1,000,000,000 has been invested, to date, in the construction of Federal reclamation projects. Authorized projects require for their completion more than 3.3 billion dollars additional. On the 58 projects in operation, serving some 5 million acres with irrigation water, including 21 projects with power facilities having in excess of 2 million kilowatts of capacity, there are 95,000 farm families. The authorized program under construction will extend irrigation services to an additional 10 million acres, which will comprise 70,000 family-sized farms. Those projects will provide 4¾ million additional kilowatts of hydroelectric power capacity. In recent large appropriations for reclamation, the Congress has evidenced its desire that the Bureau drive this work rapidly to completion. Especially is this true of the Central Valley project.

Since 1902 the laws enacted by the Congress to regulate the Federal reclamation program properly and wisely have provided in such a manner that this great program will result in engineering works so designed and so operated as to effect the human purposes which are fundamental in our democratic way of life. The Bureau of Reclamation, by law, is made responsible for many aspects of the program, in addition to the strictly engineering construction activities, and the Bureau, by law, is authorized to employ personnel qualified to meet these nonengineering responsibilities. Among such nonengineering activities are the settlement of projects and, in cooperation with agricultural agencies, aid to project settlers in developing new irrigation farms. Another important nonengineering responsibility is securing the repayment of project costs in keeping with the water users repayment ability.

The laws of the Congress require that the Bureau of Reclamation so plan and administer the projects and the facilities constructed as to comply with our basic democratic objectives of encouraging family-sized farming and preference to public bodies in the marketing of electric energy.

Although the chairman, from time to time, advised the witnesses against the Bureau that the hearing was not concerned with the merits or demerits of the statutory provisions of the reclamation law, a very substantial portion of the record is devoted to discussions of the views of individuals in that respect. It was not until about June 4, 1948, more than a month after the hearings began, that the record was furnished with a factual description of the statutory functions of the Bureau of Reclamation. The so-called social activities against which some witnesses testified as propaganda turn out actually to be the administration of the declared policy of every Congress, Democratic and Republican alike, since Theodore Roosevelt first sponsored the reclamation law in 1902. Moreover, it was made plain that the information activities under criticism are conducted under substantive directives from the Congress and with public funds made available for the dissemination of information.

I am of the view, however, that one particular publication merits the censure of the committee and the Congress. This publication is a 162-page mimeographed document entitled "They Subdued the Desert," by Barrow Lyons, then the Chief Information Officer of the Bureau of Reclamation. The publication consists of reports of a series of interviews with irrigation farmers throughout the West, together with editorial comment by the author. The fact that the author has included reports from persons both favorable to and critical of the Bureau of Reclamation does not justify the expenditure of public funds for gratuitous reports and analyses of the social philosophies of private citizens.

Also, a large amount of testimony was devoted to speeches made by the Commissioner of Reclamation, particularly to certain speeches made at Richmond and Sacramento, Calif., concerning the American River development. While there is little or no evidence that these or other speeches were in violation of the Antilobbying Act, I am of the view that responsible public officials should maintain a higher degree of alertness with respect to the implications of their public appearances, in order that their vulnerability to possible censure be minimized.

It is quite apparent that most of the criticism of the Bureau of Reclamation has had its inspiration in two sources. One source is opposition to the steadfast insistence of Bureau officials in carrying into effect the excess-land and public-power provisions of existing law. The other source is a not unnatural professional prejudice on the part of some engineers against a reorganization which had had to be geared to a highly expanded program of water and power development and which quite properly has included some nonengineers in certain top positions of administrative supervision and direction.

The record of these committee hearings supports the view that officials of the Bureau of Reclamation generally have been doing their work as directed by the Congress. The publicity may, at times, have been indiscreet, but it was not unlawful. There is no evidence that Federal funds were wasted or misspent, that accounts were falsified,

that financial conditions were misrepresented, or the Bureau officials engaged in any unlawful acts.

It is important that the Congress view these charges and the evidence presented in the light of their political implications. If the Congress believes that the laws should be changed or repealed, such action should be taken in accordance with the constitutional methods prescribed. Ours is the greatest Government on the face of the earth, and we should keep it that way. We should not sacrifice its great principles to the wishes of any particular group. The Halls of Congress should not be used to avenge disappointed expectations, to forward schemes of personal ambition, to gratify private malice, to strengthen or destroy the power of a political party, or to punish the opposition or to repress its dissensions.

Over a period of many years there has been a growing tendency in our country for the people, the States, and local political subdivisions to come to the Federal Treasury to solve all problems and pay for all domestic improvements. Until recently a great number of our people thought that Federal money came free and not from the pockets of those who were to benefit by its use. Our people are now groaning under a heavy tax burden and unless they slow down on their requests for Federal assistance the tax burden will get higher. For a long time many of our citizens have labored under the delusion that Federal funds and air were the only free things on the earth. We now begin to realize that even the air is not free, for someone has to work to provide the food to furnish the body energy to inhale air. Thus nothing under the sun is free, and the sooner all our people learn this truth the better off we will be.

There has been a lot of complaint in the Central Valley area about the acreage limitation and the contracts that force excess landowners to dispose of their land if the land is to receive supplementary water. These people should know by now that if they are to water at the Federal trough, they must be governed by Federal control. Regardless of what we preach, wherever Federal funds go, Federal control is not far behind, and if our State governments are sincere about opposing Federal control they had better awaken to the true situation and start solving some of their own problems, or sooner or later the Federal Government will have taken over all their functions, and the taxpayers will insist in doing away with State government altogether in order to reduce the cost of government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the National Association of Chambers of Commerce entitled "Federal Spending Is the Greatest Single Cause of Inflation."

SHALL WE REENACT THE EXCESS-PROFITS TAX?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, President Truman today recommends the Congress reenact the wartime excess-profits tax, repealed in 1945 by a Democratic Congress and signed by President Truman. He says we made a mistake then and we should correct that mistake now in order to check inflation. Was the Congress right when it repealed the wartime excess-profits tax, or is the President right now? The answer to this question is to be found in the results obtained by repealing that tax. What were those results?

Mr. Speaker, when we repealed the wartime excess-profits tax we permitted American business corporations generally to retain $4,000,000,000 that the Government had been collecting each year from them, and to plow that amount back into business expansion. This proved a stimulating shot in the arm for American business and resulted in—

First. A tremendous business expansion, almost a boom, where a recession had been predicted by the President and his advisers.

Second. Five million three hundred thousand new jobs were created by this business expansion, boosting employment levels to an all-time high, reaching the 60,000,000 job goal that F. D. R. had set for 1950, almost 3 years ahead of the time set.

Third. Our national production index was boosted 15 points. This great increase in production should have resulted in decreased prices, but it did not, largely because we exported to Europe last year $14,000,000,000 worth of scarce goods—steel, farm machinery, tractors, food, coal—instead of our normal exports to Europe of $4,000,000,000 worth of goods.

Fourth. This business expansion also resulted in an actual increase in Treasury receipts, ending the fiscal year June 30, 1948, with the unprecedented Treasury surplus of eight and one-fourth billion dollars.

Now, Mr. Speaker, should we reverse the trend we started in 1945? Do we want to undo the good we accomplished then? Shall we now bring on the depression we anticipated but avoided in 1945, with its consequent unemployment, reduced production, lower wages, business failures, and so forth—all of which are part of a depression? I say this Congress can give but one answer to the President's request to reenact the wartime excess-profits tax, and that answer is "No."

THE RISING SPIRAL OF INFLATION

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my urgent hope that Congress will not adjourn this special session without first having done something to curb the rising spiral of inflation and to halt the soaring cost of living. The people of this country are watching to see what we will do. They are entitled to expect that we will do something. While they may be interested to know who or what is responsible for the present high cost of those things which they need, they are much more interested in finding a solution to the very vexing problem which confronts them. It is all very well for members of each political party to point the finger of blame at the other—and in that connection I do not contend that the factual background of the present condition should not be made known. Our people should be informed so that they may draw their own conclusions. But in the few remaining days of this special session the people want positive action which will afford them relief. If Congress does not act it will have been derelict in its duty. It is my understanding that legislation restricting the easy flow of money and credits will be introduced. If that is so, I trust that we shall have an opportunity to vote upon such legislation and I sincerely urge my colleagues to support it.

THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty, as it is certainly my pleasure, to call to the attention of the Congress that today, August 4, has been formally designated as Coast Guard Day. Appropriate celebrations are being held throughout the country to mark the anniversary of this organization, which is almost as old as the Nation itself.

The Coast Guard, or rather its ancestor, was instituted by Alexander Hamilton in 1790. Through all the years since, it has served the Nation gloriously in war and faithfully in peace.

The United States is, and should be, the world's leading maritime nation. Its need for the various services of the Coast Guard continues to grow. Its dramatic character is frequently emphasized in the daily press; its day-by-day routine is sometimes overlooked. It is fitting, therefore, that a special day should be set to emphasize the importance to the welfare of our country of the loyal and patriotic service quietly and effectively given us by 20,000 of our finest citizens.

I am including by your permission a brief editorial appearing in the New York Times of August 3, 1948:

COAST GUARD ANNIVERSARY

The First Congress in 1790 approved the expenditure of $10,000 for the securing of 10 cutters which, manned by "respectable characters," would enforce the Tariff Act of 1789. This Revenue Marine or Revenue Service, as it was variously called, was merged in 1915 with the Life Saving Service to form the Coast Guard. Through the years it has

taken over other functions, including lighthouse work, and marine inspection and navigation.

This week, on the 158th anniversary, the 17,000 men and 2,500 officers who make up the Coast Guard complement, are still the "respectable characters" called for by Alexander Hamilton in his recommendation as Secretary of the Treasury. The Guard's wartime strength was nearly 180,000, and each one knew pride in the oldest of the Nation's armed services that has functioned continuously since its founding.

They knew pride in the service's heritage and they were in turn the object of the Nation's pride, for the Guard's combat war record was splendid. Then, as now in peace, the men of the service honor the pledge in their motto, Semper Paratus.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have observed, as a member of the Agricultural Committee, the fact that the Department of Agriculture, as well as other agencies of the Government, are tremendously in favor of the school-lunch program in order to get rid of surpluses. I have consequently accused them for some time of using the children's stomachs as garbage cans to get rid of a lot of surpluses that the Government has on hand.

I now find that my charges are confirmed by the fact that a lot of schools are turning back their aid from the Federal Government for school-lunch programs for the very good reason the Government is supplying them with a lot of old stuff, with a lot of surplus commodities that they are purchasing on the open market in order to keep the prices up.

Let no one dispute the fact that this administration is doing everything humanly possible to keep prices high. The responsibility should be placed where it belongs—on the present administration. What we need down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue is just plain horse sense and common honesty.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Sunday Bulletin]

SOME OF PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOLS COOL TO LUNCH SUBSIDIES—NOT SURE THEY WANT UNITED STATES FUNDS DOUBLED OVER LAST YEAR'S

Pennsylvania's public schools can get twice as much Federal money for school children's lunches this year as they spent last year—but school officials by no means are sure they want it.

This situation emerged yesterday following announcement from Harrisburg that the Federal lunch program in the coming term will pour $3,372,863 into Pennsylvania.

The amount made available last year was $2,000,000, but so many school districts failed to take part in the program that approximately $350,000 was returned to Washington.

WANTS RATE INCREASED

Announcement of the increased Federal funds for the State was made by Miss Frances L. Hoag, head of the lunch program for the State department of public instruction, who deplored the fact that the 9-cent rate for individual lunches has not been increased.

The money is used, she explained, to help defray the costs of nutritious meals for school children. For example, the average cost of a luncheon platter approved by the Federal Government for the lunch program is 23 cents. The Government will pay 9 cents toward the meal, leaving a balance of 14 cents to be paid by the individual child.

Even though the cost is lowered by Federal aid, including gifts of food in addition to the money, many school districts take no part in the program.

Other districts, including Philadelphia, participate 100 percent.

CITY SCHOOLS GET BULK

"Philadelphia schools probably get the bulk of the Federal funds coming to Pennsylvania," said Add B. Anderson, secretary of the board of education.

"All our schools that have cafeterias take part in the program," he said, "and all schools, even those without cafeterias, take part in the program whereby the Federal Government pays 2 cents toward the cost of every half pint of milk bought by school children.

"We serve 29-cent lunch platters in our cafeterias at a cost to the pupils of 20 cents—the 9-cent difference being paid by the Government," Anderson said.

Asked about the possibility of higher meal costs, mentioned by Miss Hoag in suggesting that the 9-cent Federal payment be increased, Anderson replied:

"The school board would be extremely reluctant to raise cost of meals to children. We are studying methods by which we hope to be able to effect economies."

MANY PREFER OTHER FOOD

Where Federal lunch money aid has received a cold welcome, in some other school districts the reason frequently given is that pupils themselves pass up the wholesome meals prepared with Federal aid and prefer to spend their money on such items as hamburgers and soft drinks. Many children refuse to drink the plain milk provided with Federal aid, insisting on chocolate milk.

Most frequently heard of all is the complaint about the food that the schools must accept from the Federal Government if they sign up for the lunch-fund program. It is good and wholesome food, but sometimes not what children would order.

Much of the food is surplus. Some of it is bought by the Government to maintain farm prices. Huge shipments of walnuts, raisins, or potatoes arrive at the schools and must be used. Then there are powdered eggs, familiar to all veterans and still being disposed of as war surplus.

"Imagine our country schools trying to serve powdered eggs to farm children who can get all the fresh eggs they want right at home," one county school official said.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

FEDERAL JUDGE J. WATIES WARING

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for me to break my silence on the high-handed, unjudicial, ungentlemanly, outrageous, and deplorable conduct of a member of the Federal bench in South Carolina. His name is J. Waties Waring. I have had an almost irresistible impulse to make a statement long before but have feared that my motives might be misconstrued as favoring some particular candidate in the Senate race now being heatedly waged in South Carolina.

However, since this matter has now been brought into the open, I feel that I can safely discuss the man. He is as cold as a dead Eskimo in an abandoned igloo. Lemon juice flows in his frigid and calculating veins. By means of the FBI and the United States marshals, he has lampooned, lambasted, and vilified with unparalleled vituperation the comfort and ease of the outstanding members of the bar of South Carolina. At times he has literally banished some of them from his court by force. He should be removed by the force of a boot, if necessary, from office, because he is a disgrace to the Federal judiciary of the United States.

Every lawyer in South Carolina lives in mortal fear of this monster and everyone who reads this speech will thank God that I made it because I am speaking for the vast majority of the bar of South Carolina.

Vast numbers of lawyers have abandoned practice in the Federal court because of this individual.

I am not complaining about his decision permitting Negroes to vote. I think anybody, whether he is a lawyer or not, could see that the Federal courts were going to permit the Negroes to vote in South Carolina primaries. The Awkright case was the signal for this. And, personally, I have felt for many years that we have had thousands of qualified Negroes in South Carolina who should be permitted to vote in our primaries. However, I did not feel then and I do not feel now that illiterates, white or black, should be permitted to vote, and I have on many occasions advocated an educational requirement for the right to vote. I was the first person that I know in South Carolina pubic office to advocate a secret ballot in general elections, and as everybody knows, Negroes have always voted in general elections in South Carolina and everywhere else in the Nation.

However, in the interpretation of what a judge considers to be law, whether he is right or wrong, he does not have to go through a metamorphosis and become a monster. The law should be interpreted with dignity. The law should be interpreted so that people will have a respect for law. Judge Waring's miserable conduct in issuing orders has been nothing short of star-chamber procedure. But his clumsy handling of a delicate situation has hurt the case of the Negro in South Carolina. This is unfortunate and I trust will not long obtain. Unless he is removed, there will be bloodshed. I prophesy bloodshed because he is now in the process of exacting a pound of flesh from the white people of South Carolina because through his own actions he has been ostracized from their society.

I charge that Waring's decisions are so political, he is hopeful for a promotion to the circuit court of appeals if

by some curious twist Lightweight Harry Truman should slip into the White House for another term.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Who appointed this judge?

Mr. RIVERS. Do not ask me that. I will answer in this way, however: We have an organization now and we do not have to follow the screwballs who stole the Democratic Party.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

WANTED: SIGNATURES ON DOUGLAS T-E-W HOUSING DISCHARGE PETITION

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the first to sign the Douglas petition to discharge the House Banking and Currency Committee and the Rules Committee and to force the consideration of the T-E-W long-range housing bill that is so badly needed at this time. The passage of this bill is point No. 2 on the President's "must" program.

There should be no doubt in any Member's mind that the only way that we can bring this bill up for consideration is by signing the discharge petition. The signatures on the discharge petition will reveal the true friends of low-cost housing in the Eightieth Congress.

It should be plain to every one of us that the people of the Nation will get relief on housing in no other way except by forcing the issue and obtaining the 218 signatures that are required to force a vote. Our veterans and the people in the low-income groups are disappointed and disillusioned over the shortage of houses and apartments for rent. The crisis in rental housing is here now—the people are tired of listening to the housing lobbyists: they will ask each one of us "What have you done about housing?" It will do no good for any Congressman to give these people a harangue based on real-estate-lobby propaganda. The real-estate interests complain that the T-E-W bill is socialistic, communistic, and subsidization of a small group of our citizenry, and therefore it is un-American and uneconomical.

To answer that argument I can simply state that for many years we have been subsidizing the farmers, and is it any less American to bail out industrial workers and city dwellers?

The T-E-W bill authorizes the construction of 50,000 low-cost housing units annually for 10 years, and has a provision for public assistance in large-scale building developments.

The Eightieth Congress was quick to give relief to big business and to the big profit makers by reducing income taxes. They were also quick to peddle out billions of dollars for relief for Europeans under the European recovery plan, but now when it comes to giving relief to our own American citizens who are in the low-wage earner group and must rent because they cannot afford to buy these high-priced and inflated houses, they are being shunted aside with the cry that "it is subsidization, socialistic and communistic, therefore un-American."

We have appropriated billions of dollars for the country's defense system and for security of our Nation. Is it not just as important and vital for our security internally to provide housing for our citizens?

If any Member of the House has any doubts as to the need of low-cost housing, then I invite him to come to the cities of Detroit, Hamtramck, Highland Park, and Dearborn, Mich., and see for himself the slums in which our people are forced to live. Let him see if he can find a house or an apartment for rent at a price that the low or middle income groups can afford. Let him see how three and four families are cramped together in an old dilapidated one-family shack, and then they will understand why we have so much juvenile delinquency, and why there is such an increase in crime, disease, and civil and labor unrest.

We who have signed the discharge petition are not dreamers, crackpots, or do-gooders. There is a crisis in the national housing situation. These are real conditions, inescapable conditions, which confront a substantial portion of our population. You cannot close your eyes to the facts.

America's housing situation has become a national emergency, and the time for debate, for knuckling under to private real-estate interests has long passed. We need only 60 more signatures to the discharge petition; we must not leave here without solving the housing problem.

The American Legion, by official mandates of the national conventions and national executive committee, has recommended this legislation. From the Legion's letter of July 27, 1948, I quote the paragraph on housing:

H. R. 4488, the American Legion bill to create the Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948, was reported to the House May 3, 1948, and is on House calendar. This bill would greatly relieve the chaotic housing conditions faced by veterans in their desperate efforts to secure by rental or purchase housing at prices they can afford to pay. At its meeting in May 1948 the national executive committee of the American Legion adopted a mandate supporting the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill provided the provisions of H. R. 4488 were included as an amendment to that bill. Any housing legislation enacted during this session of Congress should be amended to include the provisions of H. R. 4488, as presently on the House calendar.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States on July 28, 1948, wrote as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1948.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: During the second session of the Eightieth Congress the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in accordance with resolutions adopted by national conventions in 1946 and 1947, strongly urged favorable action by the House of Representatives with respect to a housing bill, S. 866, or a companion bill, H. R. 2523. It was the belief of our officers and delegates in national convention that this legislation offered the greatest encouragement toward the development of a program that would help to solve the shortage of low-cost and low-rental housing.

In the absence of favorable committee action, the Veterans of Foreign Wars joined with other groups in attempting to bring this legislation out on the floor of the House through use of the discharge petition. Letter appeals were addressed to Members of the House of Representatives requesting their signatures on discharge petition No. 6, which would relieve the House Banking and Currency Committee from further consideration of the bills. Approximately 160 signatures were obtained before the second session adjourned June 19, 1948.

Congress has now been called back into special session to consider, among other things, housing legislation. In view of the housing situation, and the failure of Congress to reach a decision on housing legislation during the second session, the Veterans of Foreign Wars again solicits your cooperation with respect to S. 866 or H. R. 2523 by signing discharge petition No. 6, if you have not already done so.

We remain of the same opinion that this legislation is the best proposal yet advanced toward solving the shortage of low-cost and low-rental housing.

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

The letter that I received last Friday from the city of Dearborn, Mich., and a statement made by the mayor of Detroit, the Honorable Eugene I. Van Antwerp, should be read and seriously considered by every Member of Congress. I herewith enclose the letter and the statement:

CITY OF DEARBORN,
HOUSING BUREAU
July 27, 1948.

Hon. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, *Congressman,*
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SADOWSKI: One of the reasons for which the President of the United States has called a special session of Congress is to enact some sort of legislation affecting housing throughout the United States. The wisdom of calling a special session at this time has been questioned by many honest Americans, but no one in my opinion can honestly question the wisdom of working on the problem of alleviating the critical housing shortage which now exists and has existed for the past several years throughout the United States. The State of Michigan is no exception. In all of our industrial areas and most of our rural areas, there is and has been an unusual shortage of homes, especially for rental purposes. Many of our veterans of World War II who have returned home have found themselves without a proper place to live. Many

of these young men and women while fighting our shooting war had the hope of returning home and living the American way of life. Today these people are disappointed and disillusioned. Compelled by the shortage of homes they have doubled up with friends and relatives; they have sought refuge in basements, attics, temporary and inadequate housing of various kinds. Private industry has done a magnificent job in building, but in spite of its tremendous work it has not approached the solution of our shortage; and as we all know, the houses that have been built so far are price-tagged so high that the average veteran and, I daresay, the average wage earner finds it beyond his ability to purchase. Something must be done and done very quickly to restore the confidence of our people, particularly the veterans, in the integrity of the Government.

During the Eightieth Congress there were several bills introduced whose aim was to meet this crisis. The Veterans' Homestead Act of 1948 (H. R. 4488) and the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill were two of the outstanding ones in the opinion of this writer, either of which would have at least made an honest effort to defeat the continuing shortage. As you gentlemen know, both of these bills failed to pass.

May I urge you now, as a citizen, a taxpayer, and a public official of the city of Dearborn, Mich., that you give your utmost consideration to the problem of housing, and for God's sake and for the sake of our returned war heroes and the families of our heroes who will never return, that some desirable housing will be passed during this special session.

Very truly yours,

PETER KARAPETIAN.

MAYOR VAN ANTWERP SUPPORTS TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to testify in favor of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

I am here today because I consider the severe housing shortage Detroit's most serious unsolved problem.

The failure of this productive Nation to provide an ample supply of standard housing units for its returned war veterans and other homeless citizens is illogical and inexcusable.

The housing shortage in Detroit is worse today than at any time since VJ-day, 2½ years ago.

The Federal housing survey of Detroit a year ago showed a vacancy rate for rental units of one-tenth of 1 percent.

Although no survey has been taken since that time, all indications are that we have a zero vacancy factor today.

The Detroit Housing Commission, with more than 12,000 rental units under its control, is in a position to judge the severity of the shortage.

A special study of the turn-over rate in three temporary war housing projects shows clearly that the pressure for housing has been increasing steadily right up to the present moment.

The three projects selected consist of 1,568 units of poorly constructed, temporary apartments heated with coal stoves and equipped only with coal-fired cooking stoves and hot-water heaters.

There is a serious fire hazard at these projects. They are of flimsy construction, drab and uninviting in appearance, and stand on barren mud flats. Although constructed by the Federal Government as part of the war effort and now operated by the city, these units are pretty close to the level of slum housing.

They are the least desirable public housing units in Detroit and the first ones in which a vacancy factor would be noticed in the event that the housing shortage eased even slightly.

Total turn-over in these three projects were as follows:

1945	867
1946	332
1947	240

For the first 4 months of 1948 the rate has remained at the 1947 level.

Total turn-over for the 12,000 units of public housing in Detroit has been less than 100 units per month for the past year and a half.

In addition, there has been a sharp increase in applications for housing at the commission's tenant selection office, in spite of efforts by the department to discourage applications.

With a total of 3,651 qualified applicants for public housing now on file with the housing commission, the department could lock up the doors of its tenant selection office and still have a backlog of prospective tenants that would take three full years to accommodate.

The backlog of applications would top 5,000 except for the fact that 2,365 were canceled out 3 months ago because they had remained inactive in the files for periods of 2 to 4 years.

Applications for housing are only accepted from the very lowest income group and from veterans of World War II.

There has been a wide distribution of pamphlets designed to discourage applicants for public housing and the tenant selection office has been moved to a remote address near the edge of the city.

In spite of these steps, the flood of applications continues and seven out of every eight qualified applicants for public housing in Detroit at the present time are being turned down.

The department cannot even consider the plight of the average nonveteran factory worker in Detroit whose income makes him ineligible for public housing.

The tremendous cost of this housing shortage in terms of money and also in terms of human suffering is not easy to estimate.

The city is now looking for a large vacant store or factory for the establishment of its seventh emergency housing shelter to care for the homeless families that find themselves on the street with their furniture in a pile.

In spite of primitive sanitary facilities and communal living quarters, these emergency shelters have filled up rapidly and taken on the character of permanent housing projects.

May I cite the case of one typical Detroit factory worker to show how costly the present housing shortage is?

Andrew Adams is the head of a family of nine and is employed at the Chevrolet Motor Car Co. at a weekly wage of approximately $65.

Mr. Adams was a self-supporting citizen who had received no welfare assistance or charity until his eviction from a rented home on December 15, 1946. The family was evicted because the home was purchased by a veteran.

For the past year and 5 months the Detroit Welfare Department and several private social agencies have worked continuously trying to find a place for the Adams family to live. All these efforts have failed because there were no vacancies for a family of this size.

The situation of the family today is this: Mrs. Adams and four of the children are living with a sister at one address. Mr. Adams and the oldest son are living in a room at another address. Two of the daughters are being boarded out at two other addresses.

The complications due to breaking this family up into four segments because of their housing problem made welfare assistance by the city of Detroit necessary.

The taxpayers of Detroit are now paying a total of $134 a month in rent alone to keep this family going in four separate establishments.

Due to this unusual arrangement other costs were added to the family's budget and further supplementary financial aid was required from the welfare department.

Due entirely and exclusively to the Adams family's housing problem, the taxpayers of Detroit during the past 17 months have had to provide a total of $2,446.30 in welfare assistance.

The official report of Mrs. Viola Wickstrom, the welfare department case worker, has this to say:

"The separation of this family into four separate units has had serious consequences. Mrs. Adams talks of suicide and Mr. Adams visits his wife less and less as their visits result in constant quarreling over the lack of a home. The entire family have been growing farther and farther apart. Mrs. Adams, who is a motherly and very domestic person, has keenly felt the loss of her home and family."

I cite this case for the purpose of illustrating the double-barreled effect of the housing shortage—first, the cost to the public in dollars and cents, and second, the demoralizing effect on one of the city's productive factory workers.

Many instances come to mind of husbands who have been forced to ship their wives and children to distant parts of the country and take up residence in a hotel or rented room.

Every sort of shack, shed, and trailer has been pressed into service in Detroit by families who are struggling to maintain some semblance of a home.

Hundreds of applicants for public housing bring signed statements by competent medical authorities stating that the health of one or more members of the family is in serious jeopardy. Yet the city is powerless to help them.

A sizable portion of the absenteeism from the city's factories has been attributed to the long, fruitless efforts of families to find rental housing vacancies.

An instance was brought to my attention a few days ago of an unfortunate truck driver who lost his job because of the housing shortage. He had the temerity to permit his wife and three children to use his employer's truck as a place to sleep at night. They had no other home.

The official census figures show that 37,360 families in Detroit are living doubled up or in makeshift housing.

So much for the picture as it exists today.

What are the prospects that the problem will cure itself without any Federal assistance?

They are very dim.

In Detroit during the 14 months ending March 1, 1948, a total of 6,900 new dwelling units were completed as compared with a total of 25,175 new families created by marriage.

Thus we are moving toward a solution of the problem in reverse gear, leaving entirely untouched the job of unscrambling the 37,000 Detroit families that are living doubled up and providing standard housing for the 46,000 Detroit families living in slum conditions.

The sad postwar record of the private home building industry hardly needs amplification from me.

The industry as a whole is seriously sick, just as any industry is sick when it fails in its primary purpose, namely, the sale of an acceptable product in sufficient quantity and at a price within the reach of a majority of its potential customers.

In the face of the most serious housing shortage in the Nation's history, the home building industry is producing in small quantity for the higher income groups only. The complete facts about this unfortunate condition have been described in detail by

analysts of such publications as Fortune magazine and the Wall Street Journal.

Very few of the new home buyers in Detroit during the postwar period are happy about the transaction they have made.

The typical comment of the man in Detroit who has just purchased a new home goes like this:

"I shouldn't have bought the house because I cannot afford it. But what else could I do? I didn't have any place for my family to live."

Most of the new home buyers in Detroit have acted under pressure of serious personal housing problem.

A worker at the Dodge plant came to me about his housing problem last week. He was spending $45 a week out of a $65 weekly pay check to keep his family of five in two rooms of a second-class hotel.

He was in an extremely upset frame of mind and could easily have been led into making an unwise purchase of a home priced far beyond his means.

New homes being built in Detroit, therefore, represent only about a third of the current demand, and with prices at their present high level it appears likely that the needs of most of the potential customers will never be satisfied.

There are several other factors that will make our housing emergency particularly critical during the years immediately ahead.

The Housing Commission operates over 6,000 units of temporary war housing which is rapidly wearing out and under the law must be torn down starting July 25, 1949.

The impossibility of turning these families out in the street under present conditions should be obvious. Very few of these families have accumulated the funds to make a down payment on a new house.

Another problem that haunts us is the plight of the 7,220 families that will be made homeless in Detroit during the next 3 years by the construction of the Lodge and Ford Expressways and other public improvements that have been programed and money appropriated for.

It seems almost incredible, yet entirely within the bounds of possibility, that our great $60,000,000 expressway construction program might have to be called off or postponed because of the housing shortage.

A large percentage of the 7,220 families to be displaced by public improvements are low-income tenant families for whom public housing would appear to be the only answer.

Condemnation awards paid for slum properties in the path of the expressways go to the absentee landlords. The tenant families that are evicted are simply left standing on the sidewalk with no place to go and no funds with which to provide themselves with shelter.

In the face of a severe housing shortage any municipal government that ignored the plight of these evictee families would be morally bankrupt.

Bad as things are today, Detroit would appear to be heading into much more serious trouble if we allow the housing problem to drift and rely on the vague hope that the shortage will cure itself.

Private enterprise left entirely to itself is not doing the big job that needs to be done.

In what way will the Taft-Ellender-Wagner law hurt private enterprise?

The small speculative home building has plenty of work to do today and always will have.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner law, attacking the problem from a half dozen different angles, will bring into the field the big insurance firms and encourage the growth of large housing corporations.

Also this carefully thought out, bipartisan housing measure will permit cities to continue the all-important slum-clearance job that was begun under the United States Housing Act of 1937.

Under its provisions, private enterprise will also be given an important share of the slum-clearance and urban-redevelopment task.

Sound community planning in Detroit and every other large city of the United States hinges to a large extent on the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

It would appear that the enactment of this law is being delayed largely because the small home builders and real-estate interests are obsessed with a phobia relating to public housing.

The only people who will be hurt by the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and by public housing are those real-estate interests who are reaping excessive profits due to the housing shortage.

The slum landlord and the speculative home builder will suffer only insofar as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill expands the construction of homes and increases the total supply of homes.

These interests will then no longer be able to charge for their product "all that the traffic will bear."

To that extent they will suffer.

The real opposition to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill comes from those real-estate interests that have a direct financial stake in prolonging indefinitely the present housing shortage.

Otherwise, private enterprise has nothing to fear from the law and, in fact, those builders who are really interested in serving the needs of their country will thrive under it.

They have said that public housing does not pay taxes and that it acts as a burden on the taxpayers who live in private housing.

This particular fairy story has been so widely circulated that I suppose there are some who actually believe it.

As far as Detroit is concerned, the facts are these:

During the current fiscal year the Detroit Housing Commission has paid a total of $170,456 in taxes to the city of Detroit, or $50.86 for every dwelling unit of public housing.

This makes the Detroit Housing Commission the tenth largest taxpayer in the city of Detroit.

A survey of 162 typical slum dwelling units in Detroit shows that the average local tax payment per unit was $24.68, or less than half the amount of taxes paid for each public housing unit.

Average rent for a Detroit housing project unit is $33.02 per month, including heat and utilities, as compared with an average $40 to $60 per month which the typical slum dweller pays to house his family in a single room.

Slums are an expensive luxury for any city. They fall far short of paying their own way in terms of tax revenue and they make it possible for landlords to extract extortionate rents from our citizens who are least able to pay.

Let's take a typical slum rooming house at 4264 Orleans Street, Detroit.

According to the records of the Detroit welfare department, the 35 single rooms in this ancient structure rent for an average of $11 per week per room. Most of the rooms are occupied by families with children.

Thus a rooming house with an assessed valuation of $12,490 brings in gross revenue to the landlord of $18,480 per year.

Is it any wonder that some real-estate interests are opposed to slum clearance?

There is nothing unusual or new about the exploitation of human misery for profit by slum landlords.

It simply bears repeating at a time when the objectives of the Federal low-rent public-housing program are under attack.

They have accused public housing of sloppy and inefficient management.

This is another myth promulgated by the real-estate interests and without any foundation in fact.

The financial balance sheet of the Detroit Housing Commission over a period of 10 years of operation should be sufficient answer.

For the current fiscal year the balance sheet shows an average shelter rent for public housing in Detroit of $24.98. Without any Federal subsidy payments at all, this would have been $25.60.

The Detroit Housing Commission's record on collections of $19,500,000 of rent has been 99.83 percent perfect.

That hardly sounds to me like sloppy administration

I see no reason for any public official, Federal or local, to make any apologies for the job done by public housing.

It was intelligently planned and carried out and now has behind it a proven record of 10 years of successful operation.

It has been said that public housing is the gateway to socialism or communism.

Let me ask you one question.

If an agent from Moscow was looking for recruits for the Communist Party where could he spend his time to the best advantage?

Would it be at a public-housing project where low-income families pay a reasonable rent for adequate, sanitary housing and are putting away a nest egg against the day when they will be able to buy their own home?

Or could he work to better advantage in the slums of our cities where large families live amid filth and disease and where an extortionate rent is collected for damp, dark, ramshackle dwellings?

Public housing does put slum families on the road to home ownership.

Even at present-day prices, more than 39 percent of all families that moved out of Parkside project in Detroit during the past year purchased their own homes.

Is it likely that an agent from Moscow would have found any Communist recruits among those families?

The answer is clear.

Communism could take over in America some day.

Communism feeds on misery and on the failure of governments to meet the needs of their people.

Our failure to meet and solve this critical housing shortage would help communism. Our failure to clear the slums and put our municipal finances on a sound basis would gladden the hearts of the Communists. Our failure to hold families together and provide a cheerful, healthy environment for our children would meet their approval.

We can stop the spread of communism in America easily—we can help do it by giving every American a decent home to live in and at a fair price that he can afford to pay.

I hope that you will report promptly and favorably on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill.

Also I wish to enclose a letter that I received from G. Mennen Williams, Democratic candidate for Governor of Michigan.

JULY 29, 1948.

The Honorable GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SADOWSKI: As you undoubtedly know, men, women, and children are sleeping in automobiles or other makeshift shelter. Husbands and wives are breaking up because they can't find a single roof to cover them. Children are sick and dying because of inadequate housing.

These things are happening right here in Michigan, United States of America, to people who can afford to pay the rent.

While the President has presented many important matters for your consideration, the matter of housing is as pressing as any, and immediate action can be taken. The House of Representatives has before it the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which the Senate has already passed. There have been

full hearings on this bill, including testimony on the Michigan situation. Everything is ready to go.

As a veteran, as a citizen, and as a candidate for Governor, I urge that you do everything in your power to see that this bill is enacted into law during the present session.

Very truly yours,

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include excerpts.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Gail Sullivan.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a letter from a constituent, and in the other a newspaper article on housing.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Denver Post.

Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two different instances and include extraneous material and a bill he has introduced.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech he made.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an article from the Washington Daily News and in the other a speech by Peter Campbell Brown, executive assistant to the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. LUDLOW (at the request of Mr. MADDEN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. LUSK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping from the New York Democrat.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

FEDERAL BARGE LINES

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a companion bill to S. 2912, introduced by a group of bipartisan Senators; namely, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FEAZEL, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. SPARKMAN.

This bill provides for adequate financial capitalization of the Federal Barge Lines and the Inland Waterways Corporation by increasing the capitalization in the amount of $18,000,000. This legislation is most vital since it affects the entire Mississippi River, its tributaries and subsidiaries for barge and river transportation service.

Unfortunately for thousands of businesses and millions of people, due to lack of funds, the Federal Barge Lines has had to curtail operations on the Mississippi River, has gone further by removing barge service on the Warrior River in Alabama, on the Missouri River from Kansas City to Omaha.

Along the same line, even greater damage has been done, by an embargo being placed by the Federal Barge Line on the city of Baton Rouge, one of the most important industrial centers in America; on Greenville, Miss.; and on Helena, Ark.

All of this adds up to but one thing—that through lack of funds the Federal Barge Line and the Inland Waterways are dying a slow but sure death. This will mean, Mr. Speaker, an increase in freight rates and that thousands of thousands of small businesses will go out of business because they will be unable to compete due to lack of water barge service, together with prohibitive freight rates.

Every Congressman and Senator in the entire Mississippi Valley, and even going to the East and to the West is affected by this, because his constituents are suffering today, and will suffer a great deal more as this slow but creeping paralysis kills one of the most vital and necessary transportation facilities of this Nation; namely, the Federal Barge Lines.

I call on the Congressmen on both sides of the aisle to get behind this urgent and immediate legislation in a bipartisan effort in order to overcome this calamity in our vital transportation system.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on Senate Joint Resolution 157.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, we can help end the filibuster which is going on in the Senate if the Judiciary Committee will report out House Joint Resolution 229, which has been in committee since July 7, 1947.

I introduced this resolution last year because it carried into effect a covenant made with the people of our Nation in the Republican national platform adopted at Chicago in 1944 which reads:

> The payment of any poll tax should not be a condition of voting in Federal elections, and we favor immediate submission of a constitutional amendment for its abolition.

If there is a sincere desire to abolish the poll tax as a condition of voting this is the most feasible way of doing it.

This question has been filibustered for 20 years and now is the time for us to pass an anti-poll-tax bill that the Senate will accept. I am certain 36 State legislatures will promptly make this law a part of the Constitution.

HIGH PRICES

The President wants price ceilings, rationing and limited wage controls. We have tried these controls before. Most of us remember the empty shelves and meat counters. Many could buy no meat and some could not even buy lard to fry potatoes. Many articles entered the black markets. Production fell off because producers would not produce at a loss. We had a difficult time making price controls and rationing work in wartime, let alone making them work in peacetime.

Who really wants price controls, and all they involve? Does the farmer want price controls? Does he want the Government to roll back his income to whatever level the bureaucrats deem sufficient? Does the worker want price controls? Does he want the Government to set a price on labor, freeze his wages and prevent collective bargaining? Does the businessman want price controls? Does he want to have a Federal official tell him that he must sell his products below cost or that he must stop producing or

go in the red, lay off workers, or cut their wages? This is what we had in 1945 and 1946. This is what the American people protested against in 1946 when they could not buy the things they needed and wanted because farmers and businessmen refused to produce at a loss.

Who wants price controls? The black marketeer is the only one who really wants to return to the days of easy profits from greedy people who were willing to break the law to get what they wanted.

Exports are booming and are one of the chief reasons for the shortage of goods. Money and materials going to aid Europe are basically responsible for today's inflation. The American people could have more autos and more housing if the steel and other building materials and manpower were not being used to supply Europe under the Marshall plan. Therefore we should stop exporting goods to foreign countries of which we have a short supply.

Congress gave the President powers to control exports. But he has not seen fit to use these powers.

HOUSING

Congress took the housing problem from the bungling New Dealers; freed the building industry of stifling rules and regulations; stimulated construction through Federal guaranties of building loans; assumed a large part of the responsibility for veterans' loans; and gave war veterans priority in home building and rental of new houses.

In 1946, under New Deal regimentation and confusion, we only completed 437,800 dwelling units. Mr. Wilson Wyatt was placed in charge of the housing problem. Congress armed Mr. Wyatt with broad powers and an abundance of money. However, he quickly learned a lot of things. He learned that it takes lumber, soil pipe, doors, flooring, and plaster to build houses and that they cannot be built by red tape and directives. He found that the OPA stood in the way of getting building materials. Three hundred brick plants shut down because they were unable to get manpower unless they raised wages. They had similar experiences with soil pipe and flooring. Well, Mr. Wyatt's home-building program died a natural death, and they only produced less than one-half of what private industry will build in 1948 and private industry placed no special burden upon the Public Treasury.

In 1947, under Republican free enterprise and sound Federal aid, 835,100 units were completed, and in 1948 a million dwelling units will be completed in the biggest building boom of all time. Under private industry, in the month of May, we had 2,064,000 building tradesmen at work, which exceeds the month of May 1947 by 200,000.

If we return to socialized housing with the Government controlling all of the building materials, prices will rise. Most of the building materials will go to the cities for slum clearance and there will be very little materials left for us who reside in small cities and towns. Our carpenters, bricklayers, and painters will have to go to the cities to get work.

The President asks for more housing legislation involving a 40-year commitment of the public credit which cannot produce any houses for a long time to come. The houses which private industry is building are real. They are not paper houses. They are not built of Federal red tape. They are substantial, and people live in them.

If by any mismove or mistaken course on our part we should bring the economic house tumbling down around our ears, do not forget that it will not only affect those who are seeking homes now but the millions who are home owners at the present time. If by mistaken action, hasty and emotional judgment on the part of Congress we should jeopardize the values of this country, it will affect not only the millions of home owners but the millions of owners of business properties and the millions of owners of farms as well, and could be a disaster that would shake the country to its very roots.

Yes, I am genuinely concerned about the present and future conditions in this country, and I shall do nothing that will jeopardize its fiscal integrity and loosen the rock that might bring on the avalanche.

The housing shortage cannot be overcome by increasing the competitive pressures on scarce supplies of materials and manpower. They are the limiting factors on the volume of construction. When more materials and manpower are available we will be able to build more houses and not until.

Emphasis has been placed upon construction of homes within the ability of veterans generally to pay. The average sized veteran home mortgage guaranteed by the GI bill is $5,756 and over 1,000,000 veterans have secured mortgage loans aggregating more than $7,000,000,000.

We are licking the housing shortage in the American way. If free enterprise system has a fair chance it will meet this housing need and raise its constructive level year after year until the job is done.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SOUTH DAKOTA'S NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to do one little bit toward correcting a popular misconception. I suppose in the minds of many people South Dakota is thought of as the State without very many trees and without mountains.

In the Rocky Mountain area of the National Forest Service there are 17 national forests. Two of them are in the magic mountains of South Dakota, the Black Hills. In the report for the fiscal year ending June 30, the Harney National Forest in South Dakota ranked first of all forests in the Rocky Mountain region in receipts, turning into the Federal Treasury $168,434.72 for the sale of stumpage and grazing fees.

In second place was the San Juan Forest of Colorado, with $161,000. But in third place was South Dakota's other national forest, the Black Hills National Forest, with $145,548.99.

Thus, within the 17 national forests in the Rocky Mountain region the 2 forests of South Dakota ranked first and third in receipts of the entire 17.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I congratulate the gentleman as a member of the Committee on Appropriations for knowing what is going on in these national forests and for seeing to it that they pay their way, or at least try to.

Too many people in this country are expecting everything for nothing.

I commend you and your associates out there for trying to see that South Dakota's national forests pay their way in this country, because if other States would do likewise we would not have the great national deficit that we now have.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. It will be noted that these two forests contributed $313,000 in receipts to the National Treasury for the fiscal year ending June 30, which is many times their cost of operation.

THE PAPER AND PULP INDUSTRY IS OF GREAT IMPORTANCE IN THE ECONOMY OF OUR COUNTRY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the fact that on Thursday the minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK, in a speech on profits being made by corporations took it upon himself to single out and criticize the paper and pulp industry as one of two industrial groups was wholly unwarranted.

Let us look at some of the facts in connection with the paper and pulp industry:

First. There is four times as much newsprint imported each year into the United States as is produced in the United States. This newsprint is imported free of duty. Then, just how is our Democratic minority leader going to lower the profits of the producers of paper in foreign lands?

Second. The profits of the paper and pulp companies were very small for many years and in some years losses were experienced.

Third. The profits of the paper and pulp companies have not been anywhere near as high as the profits of many other companies, so why single this industry out for criticism? Business reports show these profits and anyone interested can easily find out the facts. The paper and pulp industry is one of the important industries of our Nation.

Fourth. The paper and pulp industry is an industry that has had most excellent

labor-management relations in our district.

Fifth. The commercial use of paper and pulp has been greatly expanded. New uses in the line of cartons, wrappers, and paper boxes to replace wooden boxes have increased the volume of the paper and pulp business. The use of byproducts of the paper and pulp industry is constantly being expanded.

Sixth. The question then is, Do you think it is fair to be putting the economic strait-jacket on one industry like the paper and pulp industry, and not ask the rest of the corporations of our country to follow the same formula? Do you wish to lower the wages in the paper and pulp mills of our country?

Seventh. It appears rather ridiculous to see the minority leader complain about the price of a commodity where over 80 percent of it is being imported. We may not like the price of bananas that are all imported, but are we in a position to tax the banana grower?

Eighth. The paper and pulp people made a great contribution to the war effort and are entitled to the same legislative consideration given other industries. The industry is one of the large industries of our Nation.

All prices are high. This includes the cost of government. So long as over 80 percent of the newsprint is imported something besides talking about the American paper and pulp industry will have to be proposed.

I again repeat, the paper and pulp people and the thousands of people working in this industry should not be subjected to any legislative action that is not accorded to the employees of and to every and all other industries of our country. Newsprint is now only 5 percent of the total paper and paperboard produced in the United States.

In report No. 22 of the United States Tariff Commission we find the following table which shows that over 80 percent of the newsprint is imported:

TABLE 5.—*Newsprint paper: United States consumption, production, and imports for consumption, 1925 and 1927–46*

Year	Consumption	Production		Imports for consumption		
		Quantity	Percent of consumption	Quantity	Percent of—	
					Consumption	Production
	1,000 tons	*1,000 tons*		*1,000 tons*		
1925	3,031	1,563	51.6	1,448	47.8	92.7
1927	3,447	1,517	44.0	1,987	57.7	131.0
1928	3,565	1,415	39.7	2,157	60.5	152.4
1929	3,708	1,409	37.1	2,423	63.8	171.9
1930	3,505	1,226	35.0	2,280	65.0	185.9
1931	3,280	1,203	36.7	2,067	63.0	171.8
1932	2,881	1,047	36.3	1,792	62.2	171.2
1933	2,673	928	34.7	1,794	67.1	193.2
1934	3,094	990	32.0	2,210	71.4	223.3
1935	3,340	948	28.4	2,383	71.4	251.5
1936	3,658	938	25.7	2,752	75.2	293.3
1937	3,968	976	24.6	3,317	83.6	339.9
1938	3,396	832	24.5	2,275	67.0	273.3
1939	3,548	954	26.9	2,615	73.7	274.0
1940	3,746	1,056	28.2	2,763	73.7	261.5
1941	3,934	1,045	26.6	2,982	75.8	285.3
1942	3,751	967	25.8	2,921	77.9	302.0
1943	3,525	811	23.0	2,637	74.8	325.0
1944	3,190	721	22.6	2,491	78.1	345.7
1945	3,394	725	21.4	2,669	78.6	367.9
1946	4,190	771	18.4	3,492	81.6	452.8
1947	4,682	826	17.7	3,957	82.3	479.1

The following table is from report No. 22 of the United States Tariff Commission:

TABLE 3.—*Newsprint paper: Summary of United States supply and consumption, 1925–46*

Year	Population	Production	Imports for consumption	Exports	Total year-end inventory [1]	Apparent consumption	
						Total	Per capita
	Thousands	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*1,000 tons*	*Lbs.*
1925	114,867	1,563	1,448	23	181	3,031	52.8
1926	116,532	1,687	1,851	19	241	3,459	59.4
1927	118,197	1,517	1,987	12	286	3,447	58.3
1928	119,862	1,415	2,157	11	282	3,565	59.5
1929	121,526	1,409	2,423	19	298	3,789	62.5
1930	123,091	1,226	2,280	10	289	3,505	56.9
1931	124,113	1,203	2,067	10	269	3,280	52.9
1932	124,974	1,047	1,792	8	218	2,881	46.1
1933	125,770	928	1,794	11	256	2,673	42.5
1934	126,626	90	2,210	23	336	3,094	48.9
1935	127,521	948	2,383	22	304	3,340	52.4
1936	128,429	938	2,752	15	321	3,658	57.0
1937	129,257	976	3,317	17	629	3,968	61.4
1938	130,215	832	2,275	6	334	3,396	52.2
1939	130,878	954	2,615	13	341	3,548	54.6
1940	131,948	1,056	2,763	44	370	3,746	56.8
1941	133,212	1,045	2,982	70	393	3,934	59.1
1942	134,228	967	2,921	42	489	3,751	55.6
1943	136,684	811	2,637	35	378	3,525	51.6
1944	138,101	721	2,491	31	350	3,209	46.5
1945 [2]	139,621	725	2,669	44	273	3,428	49.1
1946 [3]	141,229	771	3,490	31	312	4,190	59.3
1947 [3]	143,500	826	3,957	28	385	4,682	65.3

[1] As of Dec. 31. Published in U. S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business. Includes stocks at mills, in publishers' warehouses, and in transit.
[2] Preliminary.

Source: All years except 1926 from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce. 1926 production from News Print Service Bureau.

Another excerpt from the same report No. 22 reads as follows:

SUMMARY

Since the time when wood became the most important raw material for the manufacture of paper, the United States has been the world's largest producer and consumer of paper of all kinds taken together. Its output has far exceeded in volume the output of any other country, and for many years its consumption of paper has been greater than production, the deficit imported consisting almost entirely of newsprint.

In 1904 newsprint formed about 30 percent by weight of the total paper and paperboard produced in the United States, but by 1923 this proportion had dropped to 20 percent and by 1943 to less than 5 percent. The quantity of newsprint consumed in 1943 was nearly four times domestic output, approximately 77 percent having been imported; the proportion was 82 percent in 1946.

The following table on page 11 of report No. 22 of the United States Tariff Commission presents the facts as to the world sources of newsprint:

TABLE 1.—*Newsprint paper:* [1] *Production, by principal producing countries, 1927, 1929, and 1931–46*

[In thousands of short tons]

Year	Canada	United States	United Kingdom	Finland	Germany	Newfoundland	Sweden	All other	Total
1927	2,083	1,517	615	200	565	203	239	942	6,364
1929	2,725	1,409	637	217	623	256	275	1,117	7,319
1931	2,227	1,203	719	241	540	295	265	1,312	6,622
1932	1,919	1,047	790	254	450	272	257	1,287	6,276
1933	2,022	928	830	285	412	271	266	1,407	6,421
1934	2,605	990	940	316	446	316	272	1,457	7,342
1935	2,765	948	970	329	464	336	298	1,518	7,628

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Newsprint paper:* [1] *Production, by principal producing countries, 1927, 1929, and 1931–46*—Continued

[In thousands of short tons]

Year	Canada	United States	United Kingdom	Finland	Germany	Newfoundland	Sweden	All other	Total
1936	3,225	938	1,004	402	525	328	282	1,513	8,217
1937	3,674	976	1,033	449	521	353	303	1,652	8,961
1938	2,669	832	954	457	512	288	278	1,585	7,555
1939	2,927	954	848	519	415	308	305	1,516	7,792
1940	[2] 3,504	1,056	(3)	(3)	(3)	353	132	(3)	(3)
1941	[2] 3,520	1,045	(3)	(3)	(3)	345	(3)	(3)	(3)
1942	[2] 3,257	967	(3)	(3)	(3)	277	(3)	(3)	(3)
1943	[2] 3,046	811	(3)	(3)	(3)	236	(3)	(3)	(3)
1944	[2] 3,040	721	(3)	(3)	(3)	273	(3)	(3)	(3)
1945	[2] 3,324	725	(3)	(3)	(3)	333	(3)	(3)	(3)
1946	[2] 4,143	771	(3)	(3)	(3)	363	(3)	(3)	(3)
1947	[2] 4,447	826	288	297	72	373	302	1,048	7,651

[1] Figures for countries other than the United States may include grades and kinds of newsprint paper which differ from "standard newsprint" made in the United States or imported into it.
[2] Preliminary.
[3] Not available.

Source: Canada—Dominion Bureau of Statistics; United States—U. S. Bureau of the Census; all other countries—News Print Service Bureau.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have the honor of serving as chairman of a select committee of this House on newsprint and paper supply. While it is my opinion that the manufacturers of newsprint and paper at the present time are in a profitable business and are making a profit which compares with the profits made by other corporations, the truth is that for many, many years the manufacturers of newsprint and of other papers, not only in the United States but in Canada as well, operated without profit, and at great loss to many of those concerns. A great many of them went through bankruptcy and liquidation. The average price over the years has been fair, to say the least. I think the gentleman's remarks are well taken.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

As a newspaperman, if you are satisfied with the situation, I am sure everyone else should be satisfied with it. The only point I make is that it is a big industry in many parts of the United States. It is a big industry in my own district. I do not like to see it singled out. If anyone wants to approach the problem, the only thing to do is to do something somewhere else, because 82 percent of our supply last year came from outside the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include official tables from the United States Tariff Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

There was no objection.

PROFITS IN THE NEWSPRINT BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we all agree with the observation made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] about bankruptcies, but we do not agree that they have been happening in recent years. The bankruptcies to which the gentleman refers occurred between 1929 and 1932, and they occurred in tens of thousands of businesses, and many small independent businesses were wiped out, whereas the large ones were able to reorganize and come forward now to where they are earning tremendous profits. But it is the effect which their business now has on other businesses, to which I referred in my remarks the other day, particularly our newspapers. Between 1929 and 1932, tens of thousands of farms were foreclosed. Tens of thousands of homes and tens of thousands of independent small businesses were completely wiped out. People lost their entire life savings. Over 6,000 banks closed their doors. So we all agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] who is one of the outstanding leaders in the Republican Party in the country, and particularly in this body, but we Democrats further assert the truth, lest the people forget, and lest the gentleman from Ohio forgets that these wholesale bankruptcies took place while the Republicans were in control. It was under a Democratic administration that this country was brought back to health and prosperity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed very much the comments made by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who evidently has not spent as much time as he usually does in checking his figures and facts. Otherwise, he would learn that the most difficult period in the entire history of the newsprint and paper manufacturing business, and especially the period of bankruptcies and low prices, was not between 1929 and 1932, but during the Democratic Administration of a man by the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in 1933 to 1939. The real reason why newsprint prices went up so rapidly was because of the war, and a reduction in production, not only in Canada but a complete reduction of all sorts of newsprint in Europe.

I would also like to say, in behalf of our Canadian friends to the north, that while American publishers are able to purchase their newsprint supplies at from $96 to $100 a ton f. o. b. New York, the world market price is approximately $200 per ton.

Much of this production could be diverted and sold in the world market, instead of being shipped to the United States; and I think that the Congress of the United States and the publishers of this country should be appreciative of the fair treatment we have received from our friends to the north, the Canadians.

CAUSE OF THE DEPRESSION

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, in the discussions that we are having this morning, I think we should be fair and stick to the facts. The depression was not caused by Mr. Hoover, neither was it accentuated by Mr. Roosevelt; rather, the depression was caused by the war that the Democrats promised to keep us out of back in 1916.

Let us be fair.

THE GREAT DEPRESSION

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well to remind our good friend and colleague from Massachusetts, the Democratic whip [Mr. McCORMACK] of certain facts which seem to have slipped his mind.

I am sure the country has not forgotten, if the gentleman from Massachusetts has, that more farm foreclosures and more foreclosures of American homes and businesses occurred during this New Deal administration than at any time while the Republicans were in power. The rich men were saved by the New Deal, but the common men by the hundreds of thousands lost their homes and farms and their businesses, while the New Dealers were shedding elephant tears about them but did very little for them except to give them a job on WPA at starvation wages in order to garner their votes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE F. O. B. MILL PRICE SYSTEM

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, once again a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States has resulted in the overruling of established precedents which will have a very decided effect upon our economy. I refer to the Federal Trade Commission, Petitioner against Cement Institute, et al., cases, decided April 26, 1948, the majority opinion being by Justice Black in which Justice Douglas and Justice Jackson took no part, and to which Justice Burton dissented. The effect of this decision has been forcibly called to my attention by W. Adam Johnson, executive vice president of the New Haven Chamber of Commerce, and by Charles M. A. Costello, president of C. Cowles & Co., of New Haven, manufacturers of motorcar hardware, mountings, and lamps. This decision has already resulted in changes in the selling practices of a number of producers of steel and the United States Steel has promised changes from the multiple basing point system to an f. o. b. mill price system. This would make it impossible for the Connecticut manufacturers to compete on a price basis with concerns located near steel mills, and with the present shortage of steel, the steel mills will be inclined to supply the manufacturers much closer to them than those removed from them. The situation applies not only to Connecticut concerns but to all fabricators of steel that are not favorably geographically located with regard to the steel source, with the result that they may face extinction at the hands of more favorably located competitors.

The Hon. Lowell B. Mason, of the Federal Trade Commission, in a speech made May 14, 1948, before the Marketing Club of the Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University—although careful to state that he is talking as an individual, and not uttering the official views of the Federal Trade Commission—discussed this matter but undoubtedly his views as such individual are no different than as a member of the Federal Trade Commission. Commissioner Mason makes some rather illuminating statements wherein among other things he says:

> I believe that freight absorption is out. By that I mean it will be a violation of the merchant law for anyone to use a systematic pricing system which allows him to pay the freight out of his own pocket in order to sell in a competitor's territory. This affects every basic industry in the United States.

The Commissioner also indicates that the Government will probably attack the pricing system of heavy commodities where the freight is a large percentage of the cost of the article to the purchaser such as iron, steel, lime, rubber, glass containers, builders' supplies, farm equipment, ice, road machinery, paint

and varnish, business furniture, liquefied gas, auto parts, ladders, paper and pulp, structural clay products, china and porcelain, reinforcing materials, vitrified clay, sewer pipe, antifriction bearings, wholesale food and grocery products, end-grain strip wood blocks, construction machinery, paper bags, lye, and wholesale coal. It appears also as though this principle may be extended to most every commodity. The Commissioner further ventures the opinion that—

> There will be a decentralization of users of basic products. Fabricators will gravitate to the points of production of their basic materials.

Senator HOMER CAPEHART, on May 20, 1948, introduced a resolution—Senate Resolution 241—which was agreed to on June 12, 1948, providing that the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete inquiry into, first, the existing legislation concerning Government policy affecting the activities of the Federal Trade Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission and the impact of these policies as interpreted by the Supreme Court with particular relation to the basing point or freight equalization system of pricing and the impact upon small and large business and upon the consumers of the United States of the maintenance or discontinuance of said system; and, second, into the status of business enterprise in the United States, seeking to determine the extent and character of economic concentration and the effect of such concentration, and the status of free competitive business enterprise as affected by transportation and Federal trade regulations.

The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 15, 1949.

The purposes of the Capehart resolution directly affect the welfare of broad segments of our population whose special knowledge and particular interest require full consideration in the investigation. To insure access to such knowledge and interest, the committee shall consult with persons representing industry, agriculture, labor, and consumers' problems.

The Senate committee under the chairmanship of the Indiana Senator, has already had an organization meeting and the chairman has explained that since the Supreme Court decision there has been confusion among businessmen all over the country as to the meaning of the decision as applied to them and this confusion has been extended to economists, lawyers, and financial writers. Out of this confusion, manufacturers of all types of products are anxiously seeking answers to questions such as: "Will the Supreme Court decision make it illegal for a seller to pay any part of the freight charges to the buyers' destination—which he may consider essential to meet competition?" Or, stated another way, "Did the Court outlaw a universal delivered price by a manufacturer?" "Is it illegal for a candy-bar manufacturer to sell his product so that it will retail throughout the entire United States for a nickel a package? Or should the candy bars sell at varying prices according to freight charges?" "Will the Supreme Court decision help or cripple small business?" "Will the evils of monopoly be aided or impeded?" Also, "Will the Court's decision increase or decrease the price the consumer must pay for finished goods?"

The Senate committee proposes to study these and similar questions from every angle and to ascertain what price-fixing policies will best serve the competitive forces of free enterprise and the economic stability of the Nation.

To assist in making this inquiry, the committee has set up an advisory council of 25 members representing labor, agriculture, buyers, and sellers in both heavy and light goods industries, under the chairmanship of Dr. Melvin Thomas Copeland, director of business research for the Harvard University School of Business Administration.

It is my intention to introduce a resolution calling for an investigation of this matter, but in view of the situation, I believe it would be mere duplication and additional unwarranted expense for the House to create such a committee, in view of the fact that the Senate has launched this hearing under the able direction of Senator CAPEHART, and expects to do considerable preliminary work this summer and hold hearings at various points in the early fall. It is the opinion of responsible businessmen in my congressional district that this new pricing policy if continued in force and with legal bars against absorbing transportation charges, will eliminate competition from more distant points and actually create monopolies in the sections surrounding the sources of supply thus protected. It will practically limit the sales of each company to points near its own plant which will finally result in the closing and relocation of many mills and factories. Furthermore, that this pricing policy will arrest the development of low-cost production and distribution and deprive consumers of a free choice of suppliers because of higher transportation costs on purchases from more distant sources. It will cost consumers more money, and as these costs vary according to the distance, consumers will be unable to compute their costs in advance.

I believe that this is a matter in which all Members of the House should be vitally interested, for if this new price policy is to be pursued it will undoubtedly bring about a serious dislocation of our economy and imperil the future of business in the New England area as well as other sections of our country which are not located near a strategic point.

CORPORATE EARNINGS AND RESERVES

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in discussing the question of bankruptcies and profits of corporations, I must not let this opportunity pass without reminding the House that a very big force is now at work in connection with corporate procedure which ties directly into wage negotiations, where the negotiators representing organized labor call for the balance sheets and operating statements of the company which is being negotiated for wage increases. Corporate management is up against a force with which it never had to deal before. If wages are to be advanced from time to time purely on the basis of the current earnings of the corporation, then I raise the question, where are the reserves to come from which will tide corporate industry over in times of low prices or of red figures? This is something we can well afford to pay some attention to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

BANKRUPTCIES

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the remarks made here today in reference to the number of bankruptcies that have occurred during the Republican and Democratic administrations. I have not read for a long time of any of the penny auctions being had on any of the farms of the country while the hangman's noose hung ready for those who bid over 1 cent. In my opinion, it is well that our good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] called attention to the change that has occurred during the Democratic administration.

During the twenties and the early thirties the only person who had a lucrative job in my district was the referee in bankruptcy who became fat and well to do. Finally and in due time we had a Democratic referee in bankruptcy and the poor fellow almost starved to death. Congress, realizing the situation, changed the law, and in my district as in yours we no longer have referees in bankruptcy, and a roving referee working out of Cleveland makes infrequent trips to my district covering Akron and vicinity to handle the few bankruptcies that occur.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day in the life of a very able man who is so modest as not to disclose in his biography when he was born. I refer to LOUIS GRAHAM, Republican, of Beaver County, Pa., whose anniversary this is.

I am sure all of us hope that he is not any older than he looks, that we may long have the pleasure of his company and the benefit of his advice and counsel, than which there is no better, as is recognized to be a fact on both sides of the aisle. Many happy returns, Louis.

NEWSPRINT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was amusing to me to listen to the discussion in reference to the high cost of newsprint. I happen to live next door to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], in whose district are located a lot of paper mills. Going up through there I found mountains of old newsprint stacked up. A couple of weeks ago when I was driving back home all that newsprint was burned up. I was told that the reason for burning up the old newsprint was to keep the price of that commodity up.

Now, talking about farms and farming, my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] must admit that when the Democratic Party came into power the farmers in Wisconsin were broke in 1932 but since then they have made a lot of money, by reason of prosperity under the Democratic administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

STOP THE INFLATIONARY SPIRAL NOW

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I know that the farmers of New York State, like the farmers of the rest of the country, will be very interested to know that the cause of the last depression was World War I; but I assure you that none of the people of New York State are interested in who is responsible for what. They do not care where the blame should be placed.

They would like to see this session of Congress do something and enact some positive legislation which will stop the inflationary spiral that now exists and legislation which will cause the housing that we need for our veterans and for the people of this country to be constructed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why does not the President exercise the power that he now has? If he did, we would not have such high prices. If he would do something instead of going around the country and blowing a lot of hot air, he could remedy the situation.

Mr. MULTER. The President has indicated to this Congress what he needs to implement his powers and to give to the people of the country what they need. It is up to us to give it to them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on Federal thought control by his colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

MISSISSIPPI DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Democrats of Mississippi, in convention assembled, ratified the nomination of Governor Thurmond, of South Carolina, for President of the United States and Governor Wright, of Mississippi, for Vice President,

They called on the Members of Congress from Mississippi to state whom they would vote for in case no one gets a majority of the electoral vote and the election is thrown into the House of Representatives, in which case we would have to vote for one of the three highest ones.

I am glad to answer that question now. In such a case, I shall vote for Governor Thurmond. He is not only the ablest man in the race, but he is the only one who is pledged to oppose and to veto the Communist program with which Congress is now being annoyed, including the FEPC and other measures covered by the so-called civil-rights program. Mr. Truman has agreed to sign it, Mr. Wallace is pledged to sign it, and Mr. Dewey has already signed it as Governor of New York—thereby imposing on the people of New York a program of Communist regimentation that is literally dreaded by real Americans throughout the rest of the country.

I know that some will try to tell you that Governor Dewey would not sign a national FEPC bill, but in the words of Brann, the great iconoclast, "You cannot explain a dead cat out of the family cistern."

The same man from New York who piloted this vicious measure through that legislature is now a Member of the other body, has introduced the same bill there, and got it reported out of the committee. It is now pending before the Senate; and my opinion is, if it were passed and Governor Dewey were President, he would sign it.

Now, let me show you what it means. We are investigating certain Communists before the Committee on Un-American Activities. When chased out of Washington they invariably gravitate into New York.

If they seek employment, their employer cannot ask one of them where he came from, under the laws of New York.

They cannot ask him what his name was—before it was changed by court order or otherwise—under the laws and regulations in force under the Dewey administration in the State of New York. They cannot ask him what his wife's name was, although he may have married a Russian Communist or a Russian spy, as some of these individuals have that we have had before the committee. You cannot ask him that question under the laws and regulations of the State of New York.

You cannot even tell him that this organization celebrates the Fourth of July, under the laws and regulations of the State of New York.

You cannot ask him what organization he belongs to, although he may be a member of the Communist Party.

Governor Thurmond would veto that measure and guarantee to the American people that we are not going to adopt this communistic program, known as the civil-rights program, including this vicious FEPC with which the people of New York are now being punished and with which the people of the United States were being punished a few years ago under an Executive order that was placed on them here in Washington and would be in force today, perhaps, if it had not been that we killed the appropriations and prevented its being perpetuated. I say it is about time that we join hands, support Governor Thurmond and Governor Wright in this battle to save America for Americans.

SUSPENSION OF RULES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 707 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the second session of the Eightieth Congress it shall be in order for the Speaker at any time to entertain motions to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1, rule XXVII; it shall also be in order at any time during the second session of the Eightieth Congress for the majority leader or the chairman of the Committee on Rules to move that the House take a recess, and it shall also be in order at any time during the balance of the second session of the Eightieth Congress to consider reports from the Committee on Rules as provided in clause (2) (b), rule XI, except that the provisions requiring a two-thirds vote to consider said reports is hereby suspended during the balance of the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for suspension of the rules as provided under clause 1, rule XXVII, which requires a two-thirds vote to consider a bill under suspension, and will permit, during the balance of the session, upon recognition by the Chair, any report to be brought up, and considered, by a majority vote.

I think the resolution speaks for itself. It is the customary action in the closing days of any session. The adoption of this resolution is necessary in preparation for adjournment.

LEGISLATION IN THE SPECIAL SESSION TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER A GAG RULE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is before us is one of the

worst gag rules that has been brought to the floor of the House. It even surpasses in viciousness the rule you passed in the last session of Congress.

I do not know whether the Members have listened to the reading of this obnoxious, yes, reprehensible rule and understood what it aims to do. The resolution that was originally introduced and considered by the Committee on Rules yesterday, provided "that during the remainder of this week it should be in order for the Speaker at any time to entertain a motion to suspend the rules, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 1 of rule XXVII. That was for the remainder of this week. But after the great Committee on Rules started to consider conditions, they felt that it did not go far enough, so they insisted that the rule be amended and that it provide not only for suspension of the rules for the remainder of this week but to apply for the balance of this session. Bear in mind—for the remainder of this session regardless as to how long it will continue.

Under this rule the Members of the House will be deprived of their rights under the regular rules, and any bill that comes in here that is approved by the big four of the House and approved, of course, by the National Association of Manufacturers, cannot be taken up under the 5-minute rule and considered under the usual procedure as any bill that the Constitution and the rules of the House provide and it is our right to consider.

I fully appreciate that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and other Republican gentlemen will call attention to the fact that similar procedure has been followed in the past but invariably the action was on minor legislation and not on legislation of such great import as that which the public is demanding today.

Any bill that is taken up under suspension of this rule naturally will have to be voted upon as is. We will not have the right or privilege of offering any amendments whatsoever. Not only that but the rule providing for the suspension of the rules will permit only 20 minutes' debate on each side, and even precludes a motion to recommit, a motion which never in my recollection the minority never has been deprived to make. The rule, in fact, completely gags the minority.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the House of Representatives in the Sixtieth Congress. That was 42 years ago. At that time Mr. Joseph Cannon, known as Uncle Joe, was the Speaker of the House of Representatives. He was known as the czar. He was the House. He was the Congress of the United States.

But with all his power, somehow or other the Republican powers that be in the present House of Representatives are trying to exceed his ruthlessness in depriving the membership of their rights.

When the country was informed of Speaker Cannon's usurpation of power and that it was used for the purpose of protecting the special interests, the country was aroused, and his party, your party, the Republican Party, in the election for the Sixty-second Congress was defeated, and the people called upon the Democratic Party to serve so that legislation in the interest of the masses and in the interests of the country would receive consideration.

With your activities and your ruthlessness today I am satisfied that what happened to your party then will happen to you again. The same fate awaits you in the coming election.

Of course, from time to time I try to advise you as a friend not to go so far, not to get drunk with power or completely ignore the rights and interests of the American people, and not to be controlled by the vested interests as represented by the National Association of Manufacturers.

I try to urge you that you should legislate in the interests of the American people, at least at times.

In desperation the President has called a special session for the purpose of bringing about a reduction in the high cost—yes, the criminally high cost—of living. At the same time he wants us to provide decent low-cost housing for ex-servicemen and the millions of American citizens who are seeking homes, who are homeless and cannot obtain a decent place to live.

You are ignoring the President's recommendation to legislate to curb and reduce the high cost of living, to control inflation, to provide low-cost housing, to increase social-security benefits, to increase minimum-wage levels, to carry out the civil-rights program, and to strengthen the antitrust laws. What are you going to do? You are going to consider only legislation that carries the approval of the vested interests, the National Association of Manufacturers, its affiliates and so-called institutes, who seem to completely control you and that are secretly agreeing on the prices they will charge the public for their commodities and products. You will not consider legislation that does not carry the stamp of approval of the manufacturers, contractors, housing and real-estate lobbies that have been infesting the Capitol for the last 2 years, delaying the consideration of and seeking to defeat the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill and thus deprive the American people of decent homes at decent prices and rentals.

Now, I am candid and honest in my belief that you are making a serious mistake in your failure to give consideration to the important measures recommended by the President, in the interest and welfare of our Nation and for the relief of the milked and mulcted people.

I am not in the confidence of the big four in this House. I do not know what legislation you will bring out, but judging the future by the past, I have a strong suspicion that you will ignore these appeals of the President and appeals on the part of suffering consumers and the public in general, and that you will not pass any relief legislation that would bring about the reduction of the high cost of living that has gone up 40 percent since you came into power. You will not pass legislation to reduce the cost of food, which, in many instances, has increased from 100 to 200 percent, nor will you be permitted to pass a real housing bill that would provide homes and rentals at reasonable prices to the people in the lower-income brackets.

REPUBLICANS HAVE PLACED THE INTEREST OF WEALTH ABOVE HUMAN NEEDS

It appears to me that instead of doing something to reduce the high cost of living and to provide food for people of low income, you are devoting your time in feeding them with scares and buncombe as to food shortages and communism, notwithstanding the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, and a Federal grand jury, according to press reports today, after spending over a half a million dollars and the grand jury having called over 200 witnesses, have failed to find any cause for alarm or evidence justifying any indictments, with the exception of a few of the officers of the Communist Party. Five of your investigating committees are extremely busy seeking to prejudice the minds of the American people with these nonexistent scares for the purposes of distracting their attention from the pledges and promises you made in 1946 to reduce the high cost of living and the failure of the builders and the contractors to erect decent low-cost homes and to provide low-rental housing. No, you cannot make them forget despite the extraordinary efforts you are making not in a three-ring but in a five-ring circus. People will realize that it is clowning in an attempt to take their minds from the real serious conditions that have been inflicted upon them by reason of your giving the industries the privilege to do as they pleased and to charge the public as much as they pleased. The sad fact is that you have placed the interest of wealth above human needs and the people know it in your failure to legislate to alleviate the distressing conditions.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman what provisions of the Constitution would be violated by the adoption of the pending resolution.

Mr. SABATH. The Constitution gives the House the right to adopt rules for its guidance and orderly procedure in the consideration of legislation. Under this rule, that right is taken away from the membership of the House, because they are deprived of any right whatsoever to try to improve, change, or modify any legislation that may be brought in here under this vicious gag rule that is now before us.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not true that legislation can be brought before the House by the adoption of the ordinary rule? We are not limited to considering legislation which may come up under suspension only.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, yes. If the gentleman will familiarize himself with the rule, the rule provides that the Speaker will have the right to call up any bill under suspension, without the two-thirds vote which is generally required under

the rules of the House. That is a thing the gentleman should bear in mind.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from South Dakota has read the pending rule.

Mr. SABATH. I do not yield any further to the gentleman. I may yield later on.

I have promised some time to others. How much time have I consumed, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 12 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if time would permit, I would be delighted to answer some of the reckless statements made earlier in the day by many of you Republican gentlemen that the bankruptcies and foreclosures that took place in 1933, 1934, and 1935 were during a Democratic administration. With this statement you may be able to mislead some uninformed people, but not the intelligent voters who know that these foreclosures and bankruptcies started in 1932 and continued during 1933, and even in 1934, as a result of the Republican Hoover panic which lasted up to 1933. Yes, businesses and plants went into bankruptcy and a majority of them were closed, homes and farms were foreclosed, but this was all remedied as speedily as possible after President Roosevelt was sworn in and a Democratic Congress was able to begin legislating.

You have tried in many ways to unload your guilt for the high cost of living upon the President. You failed and deliberately omit that in 1946 you and the National Association of Manufacturers assured the American people that there would be plenty of everything and at a much lower price if the Price Control Act was repealed. The National Association of Manufacturers, through paid page advertisements, directly assured the people they would voluntarily reduce the prices on meats and all necessities of life if the Price Control Act was repealed. You do not call attention to the fact that these pledges and promises made by you and the various associations and institutes have not been carried out, nor do you deny that instead of reducing the prices as you promised when you came into control of the House you have, as I stated before, increased the cost of living by 40 percent and the cost of food from 100 to 200 percent.

To justify the continuous, outrageous, ever-increased cost of living the manufacturers, the suppliers, the lobbyists and propagandists are from time to time creating a scare of shortages on meats and meat products, steel, oil, lumber, sugar, and soap notwithstanding that the warehouses are bulging with surpluses, which gives these combines an excuse to continuously increase their prices. Personally, I feel that if all your sins of omission and commission, your smears and mud slinging could be wiped out it would create a shortage of soap.

The fact is, as many of you Republicans have admitted, we have greater production and greater crops than ever before in the history of our country. Consequently, your charges that the high cost of living and the prevailing high prices are due to our exporting are foolhardy and without foundation because it is absolutely necessary for our country to export in order to get rid of the tremendous,—yes, extraordinary—surpluses we have on hand in nearly every line.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Chicago Times and a telegram from the commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and also two additional letters bearing on the high cost of living and the shortage of housing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me, I insert a telegram from Henry L. Warner, commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Chicago, Ill, calling attention to the desperate need of housing by Illinois veterans, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 28, 1948.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Illinois veterans desperately need decent housing. Your attention directed to our letter May 15 including report on shameful housing conditions in Illinois. State organization Veterans of Foreign Wars seriously perturbed over stubborn opposition of group in Congress against adequate housing legislation. Request you get Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill on floor and vote for it. Thousands of veterans will retaliate at polls unless housing legislation is enacted at special session.

HENRY L. WARNER,
Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, national legislative director, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in a letter addressed to me on July 28, 1948, advises of the steps taken by his organization in its effort to obtain the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, and presently urges that additional Members of the House sign the discharge petition which would permit the consideration of the bill at the special session of Congress. Approximately 160 signatures were obtained before the House adjourned for the second session of the Eightieth Congress. I include Mr. Ketchum's letter for the record, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 28, 1948.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: During the second session of the Eightieth Congress the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in accordance with resolutions adopted by National Conventions in 1946 and 1947, strongly urged favorable action by the House of Representatives with respect to a housing bill, S. 866, or a companion bill, H. R. 2523. It was the belief of our officers and delegates in National Convention that this legislation offered the greatest encouragement toward the development of a program that would help to solve the shortage of low-cost and low-rental housing.

In the absence of favorable committee action the Veterans of Foreign Wars joined with other groups in attempting to bring this legislation out on the floor of the House through use of the discharge petition. Letter appeals were addressed to Members of the House of Representatives requesting their signatures on discharge petition No. 6 which would relieve the House Banking and Currency Committee from further consideration of the bills. Approximately 160 signatures were obtained before the second session adjourned June 19, 1948.

Congress has now been called back into special session to consider, among other things, housing legislation. In view of the housing situation, and the failure of Congress to reach a decision on housing legislation during the second session, the Veterans of Foreign Wars again solicits your cooperation with respect to S. 866 or H. R. 2523 by signing discharge petition No. 6 if you have not already done so.

We remain of the same opinion that this legislation is the best proposal yet advanced toward solving the shortage of low-cost and low-rental housing.

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM, *Director.*

Mr. Speaker, the great Chicago Sun-Times, a people's newspaper, carried a very factual editorial in its issue of July 28, 1948, entitled "Priorities for Congress" which I am sure will be very informative and enlightening to the people of the country. It gives real facts and I recommend its reading to place the responsibility for the lack of legislative action to relieve the people from the high cost of living and the housing shortage. It is as follows:

PRIORITIES FOR CONGRESS

President Truman in his message to Congress yesterday set up a table of priorities which he thinks the special session should observe in considering legislation.

First of all, he wants Congress to act on inflation and on housing. Several times he repeated that these were the principal reasons for calling Congress back. He urged Congress "not to be distracted from these central purposes."

The people, staggering under the highest cost of living in the American record, will certainly agree with Mr. Truman. Many would be willing to settle for these two programs alone.

If Congress acts to check inflation and to counteract the housing shortage, the special session will have been justified even if nothing else is done.

On the other hand, unless Congress does act on these two critical problems, no other legislation that may be passed, or speeches made, or political maneuvers executed, can compensate for a cynical neglect of the matters closest to the average citizen's interests.

So it is important, in judging congressional behavior, to keep the table of priorities in mind.

If, for example, Republicans and southern Democrats carry out the strategy which some are reported to be considering—if they seek to tie up the session immediately with a battle royal over civil rights—they will be ignoring the people's most urgent needs just as surely as if they returned a flat "no" to the request for action on inflation and housing.

Civil rights are important. Mr. Truman made no bones about his uncompromising stand for an antilynching law, an anti-poll tax law, and other measures previously recommended. He proved his sincerity by issuing two epochal executive orders initiating a vigorous attack upon racial discrimination in Federal employment and the armed forces.

But civil rights are not important to the exclusion of everything else. While this legislation ought to be passed, nobody should be fooled if an ostensible move to pass it becomes the means by which the critical problems of inflation and housing are shunted on a sidetrack.

Next to inflation control and housing, Mr. Truman ranks three welfare measures: Federal aid to education, a 75-cent minimum

wage, increased social-security benefits. In a sense, these three proposals are part of the inflation problem. Those concerned—our schools, low-income workers, and retired persons—are all victims of inflation.

Next on the list come three measures affecting foreign policy: a decent bill for the admission of displaced persons, a loan to finance construction of the United Nations headquarters, and ratification of the international wheat agreement.

In the fourth category of urgency Mr. Truman places civil rights, public power appropriations, and revision of Federal salary scales.

Finally, he flings back at Congress the rest of his program, including a national health bill and revision or repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. This is for the record. Mr. Truman evidently doesn't expect or demand action in these fields at the current session.

The President's anti-inflation program is essentially the same one which he recommended 8 months ago and which the Republican leadership of Congress rejected as unnecessary. What has happened during these 8 months proves conclusively that the Republicans were wrong.

They said free-wheeling prices would stimulate production, that high production would bring prices down. It didn't.

They said businessmen could be counted on to hold prices in check by voluntary restraint. They haven't.

Now it is being argued that price control won't get at the true causes of inflation, such as the state of the budget and the heavy demands, foreign and domestic, upon our output.

There is some truth in this, no doubt. But when a doctor is called to attend a patient with a raging fever, the first thing he does is try to check the fever. America has a raging fever of inflation. The first job is to check it.

Governor Dewey is making a studious effort to keep aloof from events in Washington. He should be warned that in the long run he can't do it. As the leader of his party, he bears an inescapable responsibility for the actions of that party in Congress.

Should the Republicans again turn their backs on the people's struggle with high prices and inadequate housing, the voters will rightly conclude that the Republican nominee for President was an accessory before the fact.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 30 contains some timely language which I commend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. TOBEY] addressing the Senate, pleaded for an abandonment of party politics until something could be done about the tragic burden of high prices. I subscribe whole-heartedly to the thoughts expressed by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and I implore the leadership of this House to permit the reporting of legislation which will help the families of the United States to rid themselves of a gnawing worry.

It is true that no one is starving. But the great bulk of American families are sorely pressed and are finding great difficulty in maintaining their existence. They have a right to expect that we shall do something in their behalf.

When the President called this special session, I entertained the same doubts with regard to legislation as many of you did. I am ready to admit there are controversial issues in which the Democratic Members and the Republican Members honestly differ.

But, I say in all sincerity, I did feel confident this special session would seriously consider the issue of high prices, and I hoped constructive action would be forthcoming. Now, with the days passing and the talk of early adjournment growing louder, I feel frightened.

I have heard Members express the wish to get back to their districts in order to campaign for reelection. On what issue can you campaign, if you have done nothing about the most pressing problem of the hour?

This session of Congress has been preoccupied with what appears to be efforts to fix the blame for the present high prices. For myself, I can assure you I entertain strong feelings on this point. However, I do not believe it is fair to state that the American people at this moment are not too much concerned over who is to blame—and we waste precious time standing here screaming denunciations at each other.

What the American family man wants—and what he has a perfect right to expect—is that we—representatives of the people—will do something about it and now.

I can well recall the great pleas which were made in behalf of free enterprise and individual initiative; the great results which were promised if the laws of economics were allowed to function unrestricted. It is quite true that many American wage-earners and housewives were lured by those siren songs and wished for an end of all controls.

Controls were abandoned, but the tragic fact is that prices then did not seek a lower level. Prices soared higher and are still on the way up. Where they will stop no one can predict with any degree of certainty.

In Providence, the capital city of my State, food prices—the all-important item in the family budget—have soared to unbelievable heights. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has informed me that prices of all foods combined have risen more for Providence since 1935–39 than for any New England city or for the United States as a whole.

The Bureau uses the prewar period, 1935–39, as a base period and considers this period as 100 in its index. In Providence, as of June 15, 1948, the index for all foods stood at 220. Consider that for a moment—over 100 percent. The 1939 dollar worth less than 50 cents in purchasing food for the family table.

If you consider that fact soberly, how can you feel we have any right to waste our days in political bickering, or return home without having acted?

We have been able to work out a plan for securing a bipartisan foreign policy. That it is working is a credit to both great parties. But why in the name of heaven cannot we abandon party politics long enough to work out a bipartisan program for reducing prices, at least in the cost of food?

Our neighbor to the north, if my memory serves me correctly, during the war adopted a system of price controls patterned after the price-control set-up in the United States. After hostilities had ceased, Canada inaugurated a selective decontrol program, but here under the tremendous pressure of the NAM and others, the Congress threw out all controls. The results speak for themselves.

Our people are now reading news stories containing food prices in Canada. They are substantially lower than food prices in the United States. As a result our people are aroused, and rightly so.

A great trust has been placed in us. The American people want more than a lot of high-sounding phrases and handshaking during the coming political campaign.

They expect us to measure up to the claims we have made on the subject of our ability and honesty in representing our constituents. If this Congress fails to do something about prices—it is going to be mighty hard for many Members of this House to face those constituents during the weeks before November 2.

I mentioned a while ago the bipartisan foreign policy with which we are striving to maintain the dignity of the United States abroad and promote the peace and prosperity of the world.

I think all of us are in agreement on the vital importance of that foreign policy—and on the need for promoting stability abroad.

All Americans are conscious of the very important position this Nation occupies in world affairs and the part it is playing in determining the destiny of millions throughout the world.

We seek to sell democracy abroad through every possible means. But, it has always been my sincere conviction that we can best win the world to the democratic way of life by demonstrating that true democracy works here in the United States.

To be convincing to the people of other nations—our foreign policy must be supported by the confidence of the American people.

I would call the attention of the House to the serious threat to that policy which is engendered by the present concern over high prices.

Many people in the United States are becoming confused. Their confusion stems from the difficulty they are encountering in providing adequate food for their families. It is a fact that many families are unable to maintain an adequate diet. And these people are reading stories charging that our present foreign policy is responsible for high food prices.

If both political parties are willing to support our present foreign policy; then I submit to you the leaders of both parties must put forth an extraordinary effort to dissolve the confusion which is growing in American families.

I insist that the present high cost of living is not a purely domestic problem. It threatens stability at home; it endangers our efforts abroad. It plays smack into the hands of Communists who, I honestly believe, gloat over the prospects of still higher prices—believing they will one day soon bring on a bust which will disillusion the great army of average Americans and make fertile soil for the growth of ideas of government which we distrust.

If we fail in this—our greatest responsibility—I fear the results will be tragic.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Illinois did not see fit to yield a little further when I was interrogating him, so I have asked for this time to follow through the line of thinking he has suggested.

In the first place, the gentleman from Illinois suggested that some constitutional rights were being violated by the adoption of this resolution, but when I asked him what rights he was not able to point out how any constitutional provision was being violated.

It is true, of course, that we are here proposing to make it in order during the remainder of the session for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules for the consideration of bills but they will require passage by a two-thirds vote. If the membership of the House wants by a two-thirds vote to suspend certain rules, that is clearly within the privilege of the membership.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. This resolution may be adopted by a majority vote.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true but any legislation brought up under suspension will require a two-thirds vote for passage.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; it would take a two-thirds vote under suspension.

The thing that the gentleman from Illinois missed completely, of course, is that all during the session, twice a month suspensions may be called in the discretion of the Speaker and the leadership, and certainly he must recognize that if an adjournment resolution is adopted, under the rules of the House, for the last 6 days of the session suspensions are in order. It is contemplated at the time this resolution is here presented that the session will not last any longer than the 6 days contemplated in the rules.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So the adoption of this rule merely supplements the established procedure of recognizing suspensions at the end of the session and is in keeping with the ordinary principles of the House and is a practice which has been followed for many, many Congresses.

It should also be pointed out that the rule is not exclusive. The rule does not say that no legislation may be considered except under suspensions of the rules; legislation can come in by the adoption of an ordinary rule. This merely makes it possible for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules. It is not exclusive, so the House is not forfeiting the right to consider legislation in the normal fashion.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, there is not anything arbitrary about this resolution. The rules of the House are strictly adhered to and the House will be permitted to work its will. If a majority of the House does not want to do this it will not be done.

My friend from Illinois, former chairman of the committee with whom I had the honor of serving for many years, and I served as a member of the committee under him when he was chairman, he knows this is not an unusual proceeding.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan in his long service on the Committee on Rules, did he never experience a situation where the members of the Rules Committee on the minority side, then the majority, brought in many matters under suspension of the rules during the closing days of a session?

Mr. MICHENER. Oh, yes. When we wrote the rules and provided that the last 6 days should be suspension days, the matter was thoroughly argued, and it was considered that those last days should be suspension days, in order to meet the exigencies which arise during the last days of a session.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman name, during the 6 years I was majority leader, one controversial bill or one bill of general interest, even during the last 6 days of a session, that we considered under suspension of the rules, thereby denying the author of an amendment the right to present it and denying the minority the right to present their views, and the inherent right of a motion to recommit? Name one bill of importance or of a controversial nature during the 6 years I was majority leader.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, I do not have all that material here, but it is obtainable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a list of the bills considered under suspension of the rules during the 6 years that the gentleman from Massachusetts was majority leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

(The list referred to follows:)

SUSPENSIONS, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

(Numbers in parentheses refer to pages in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD)

H. R. 6999. Pipe line and barge channel across Florida. Failed to pass House under suspension of rules. June 1, 1942 (4774). The vote was: ayes 85, noes 121.

H. J. Res. 319. Declaration of war against Bulgaria. Passed.

H. J. Res. 320. Declaration of war against Hungary. Passed.

H. J. Res. 321. Declaration of war against Rumania. Passed.

H. R. 4. Compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans. Passed.

H. R. 5726. To amend the Sugar Act of 1937. Passed (9286).

H. R. 6682. To suspend processing tax on coconut oil. Passed (4774–4779).

H. R. 6128. To amend act to expedite housing in connection with national defense. Failed of passage under suspension of rules (9281) December 1, 1941. The vote was—ayes 83, noes 70.

S. 1840. To supplement Federal Aid Road Act. Amended and passed House under suspension (8121–8137).

H. R. 7349. Making appropriations for Department of Agriculture for month of July. Passed (5953–5960).

H. J. Res. 254. Declaration of war against Japan. Passed (9520–9537).

H. J. Res. 256. Declaration of war against Germany. Passed (9665, 9666).

SUSPENSIONS, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

H. R. 1366. Temporary additional compensation in postal service. Passed (2002), March 15, 1943.

H. R. 1860. Overtime compensation to certain Government employees. Passed (2911–2922), April 5, 1943. The vote was—yeas, 224; nays, 107.

H. R. 2703. More uniform provisions in veterans' laws. Passed (6207–6216), June 21, 1943.

H. R. 2798. To amend act relating to Federal aid for post roads. Passed (5496–5504), June 8, 1943.

H. R. 2936. To authorize $200,000,000 to expedite housing for national defense. Passed (6202–6207), June 21, 1943.

H. R. 3646. To amend Canal Zone Code. Passed (5337–5340), June 5, 1944.

H. R. 4115. Employment preference for veterans, widows and wives of disabled veterans. Passed (3501–3507), April 17, 1944.

S. 972. To amend section 7 (c) of act of May 21, 1920, relating to the Navy. Passed (6200–6202), June 21, 1943.

S. 1432. To extend Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939. Passed (6195, 6211, 6213, 6215), June 19, 1944.

H. J. Res. 147. To continue Commodity Credit Corporation and increase its borrowing power. Passed (7059–7035), July 2, 1943.

SUSPENSIONS, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

H. R. 6890. To amend First War Powers Act of 1941. Passed (10218), July 26, 1946.

H. R. 1654. Trade marks, registration and protection. Passed (1725), March 5, 1945.

H. R. 3118. Priorities for Veterans' Administration. Passed (5513–5521), June 4, 1945.

H. R. 4230. Circuit Court of Appeals and district courts. Passed (2362), March 18, 1946.

S. 191. Hospitals and public health centers. Passed, amended (10204–10215).

S. 619. Vocational education. Passed, amended (10221), July 26, 1946.

S. 938. Emergency flood control. Passed amended (4840–4846), May 21, 1945.

S. 2085. To amend title V, Housing Act. Passed, amended (10219), July 26, 1946.

H. R. 6917. To provide site acquisition for Federal buildings. Failed (debate 10199–10204), July 26, 1946. The vote on division was—ayes 65, noes 58; on roll call—ayes 160, noes 129.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, this particular action today is a most unusual proceeding, in spite of all the allegations that it is very customary for the Congress to vote to suspend the rules at the close of a session.

In the first place, under the resolution adopted by this House before the recess last month, this session does not end until about the 31st of December. Therefore, we are a long way from 6 days before the close of this session.

In the second place, every one who has sat in this Chamber for any length of time knows that under all custom and precedent we never suspend the rules and gag the minority and limit debate to 20 minutes to a side on the passage of highly important or controversial bills.

It has been widely announced in the press by the Republican leadership that there will only be one bill taken up at this session. They refused to do anything about considering the general housing bill that is now pending before the Rules Committee and can be brought before this House in 30 minutes.

So the only purpose of this gag-rule method limiting debate to 20 minutes on a side, denying amendments to any Member of the House and preventing the minority from offering a motion to recommit, is to take up the inflation-control bill under suspension of the rules.

I believe the soaring cost of living to more than $1 a pound for meat and 80 cents a pound for butter, and the record high cost of all food, clothing, and other things, requires more than 40 minutes of the Congress' time to find a solution to the problem.

Yet if you vote for this resolution at the present time you will be voting to give only 40 minutes' time without amendment, modification, or recommittal to the most important subject—inflation—that is in the minds of everybody in our country.

The matter of inflation control should not be a partisanship matter. It is not going to be only the Democrats who are going to be hurt if the cycle of inflation continues to run, it is not going to be just the Republicans who are going to be hurt; it is going to be 135,000,000 people, many of whom do not know or care nothing about party politics.

When this Congress, by passing this obnoxious gag resolution, limits to 40 minutes discussion on the Nation's No. 1 problem, then I think you ought to go on record and state emphatically that you are unwilling to give any reasonable amount of this Congress' time to attempting to help solve this great problem. Mr. Speaker, the record vote on passage of this gag resolution will clearly show which Members, and which party is unwilling to take the required amount of time to work out fair and effective legislation to deal with the pressing problem of inflation.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. In addition to many of the fine points that the gentleman from Oklahoma makes with reference to this resolution, it will do another thing: It will put the stamp of approval of this Congress on adjourning within 6 days' time, whether or not anything is done.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I remark at this point that the pending resolution, of course, does not limit the congressional session to 6 days. I regret very much that the gentleman has not read the resolution. Of course, the argument that it will stifle the action of the House is wrong, because it permits the House to work its will by a majority vote instead of a two-thirds vote.

I am not at all certain that the gentleman who has just spoken, the gentleman from Oklahoma, is in position to speak for the Republican leadership as to what legislation may or may not be presented to the House for consideration. I am sure that some of the bills which he has fostered, which he has supported, and which he is, in a way, responsible for bringing before us in the past, have resulted in the unpleasant condition which is responsible for the inflationary situation which exists today. I am sure that same type of legislation will not receive the approval of this Congress or of the thinking people of America any longer.

Every citizen of this country, every Member of Congress, is just as much interested, let me say to the gentleman, in doing something about present high prices and in reducing the high cost of living as he may be. But, there are a great many people in America who know why we have high prices, and one of the great reasons is the enormous cost of maintaining the Federal Government which now takes nearly 25 cents out of every $1 of the American people's income in taxes to support it; this gigantic, sprawling bureaucracy which the gentleman helped to create, and which he wants to now expand by enacting the legislation that the President has requested.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Under the privilege the gentleman from Massachusetts has granted me, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio, who has mentioned my name several times in debate, if he intends to bring in the inflation-control bill under suspension of the rules?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know. The bill has not been reported out. I am not a member of that committee, but the gentleman is. He ought to know whether that committee reported any legislation out or not; at least, I hope he knows what is going on in his own committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman said he could not speak for the Republican leadership, but he ought to be able to answer that question.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The committee has not acted at all, but I am not a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. McCORMACK. He says he does not know about the 6 days. The majority leader clearly intimated by his observations that this was brought up because the session would not last longer than 6 days, so the gentleman from Ohio challenges the statement made by the majority leader of his own party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this resolution is introduced for the purpose of preventing any amendment being offered to any bills that might be brought up this week, or during the remainder of the session, which bills will depend upon the agreement made by the Republican leaders, and also to take away from the minority party its inherent right to a motion to recommit which, from time immemorial, this body has recognized resided in the minority party in order for the minority party to make its record on which to go to the people of the country. We had a spectacle in the closing week of the last session only several weeks ago when, for all practical purposes, representative government in this Chamber was suspended. I sat, elected as a Member of this body, as did all other Members, and the majority in this body, the Republican Party, put through the same kind of a resolution, as a result of which all I or any other Member could do was vote "yes" or "no," no matter what bill was brought up, and no matter how important it was, and no matter how wide might be the interest in this body, or among the people. No Member of this body could rise in his seat and offer an amendment. We were denied that opportunity.

Furthermore, the minority party was denied during that week its inherent right to offer a motion to recommit. What were some of the bills that were considered during the last week of the last session under suspension of the rules? H. R. 6777, relating to the social-security law. Many members wanted to offer amendments to broaden coverage and to increase the benefits set in 1939 to offset, at least partially, the drastic increase in the cost of living since then. Social security under present Republican-NAM high prices is little more than hollow mockery. The Democratic Party wanted to offer a motion to recommit. We were denied that opportunity under the suspension of the rules.

Another bill passed under suspension was H. R. 3748, relating to veterans' dependents. Many Democratic Members wanted to offer amendments to improve that bill. We were denied the opportunity.

In the case of H. R. 5588, relating to disabled veterans' compensation, the same thing applied.

Other bills passed under suspension of the rules, thereby depriving the membership of the House of the opportunity of offering perfecting amendments, included:

Senate Joint Resolution 117, relating to the International Labor Organization.

H. R. 6247, relating to United States Air Force.

S. 418, relating to stream pollution.

Senate Joint Resolution 203, relating to mineral land purchase.

House Joint Resolution 412, relating to the merchant marine.

House Joint Resolution 413, relating to the merchant marine.

H. R. 6527, relating to school enrollments.

S. 1322, relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation. There was a deep interest in this bill. Every Member was denied the right to offer an amendment, and the Democratic Party was denied its right to offer a motion to recommit.

H. R. 6959, the housing bill. We know the phony housing bill that was passed. Every Member was denied the right to offer an amendment, by this device, never intended by the House to be used in that way. It has a proper use, but not an improper use as was made during the last week of the last session.

On the housing bill we were denied the opportunity of offering any amendment—even those sponsored by a Republican leader of the other body and approved by a majority of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The Democratic Party was denied the opportunity to offer a motion to recommit.

H. R. 6916, the postal employees' pay raise bill. We know the inequities contained in that bill. None of us was afforded an opportunity to offer an amendment, and the Democratic Party was denied the right to offer a motion to recommit.

Other bills passed under suspension were:

S. 2281, relating to air parcel post.

S. 2376, relating to agricultural commodities.

H. R. 6501, relating to prototype aircraft.

H. R. 5904, relating to the Virgin Islands.

S. 1260, relating to motor carriers.

Then there was H. R. 6712, the Revenue Revision Act of 1948, which was long advertised as the Republican contribution toward a major overhaul of the wartime tax structure. The folly of this procedure, as used by the Republican majority is that this technical tax revision bill making 80 important changes in the tax laws passed with only 40 minutes of debate.

I agree that this resolution has a proper purpose. There is no question about that, and nobody challenges it, but it has been improperly exercised, and abused in such a manner that, as far as the last week of the last session is concerned, for all practical purposes representative government in this Chamber was suspended.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, I thank the gentleman for pointing out that in the last session of Congress we passed so much constructive legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did I say "constructive"?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; all of those measures.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the gentleman's word. He has the right to use it, but he should not put into my mouth words I did not use.

Mr. HALLECK. All right; now may I say to the gentleman——

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not consider the ersatz Republican housing bill constructive. I consider it represensible. If the gentleman wants me to go into that, I will do so, but if he will use that as his own word and make it an expression of his own thought, all right.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman is referring to certain measures that were acted upon under suspension.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am referring to the unreasonable exercise of the right of suspension.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will permit me, may I say that before that resolution was adopted in the last session I asked unanimous consent for the accomplishment of the same thing, to which the minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] reserved the right to object, and then he went on to say this.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does not the gentleman believe he had better have this discussion with the gentleman from Texas? I do not even know what the gentleman is going to say.

Mr. HALLECK. This is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I just happen to have it here before me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman ask me a question? Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] give me some of his time?

Mr. HALLECK. I thought the gentleman had yielded to me. I shall proceed in my own time and shall enlighten the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, there is no question about yielding my time. The gentleman from Indiana knows that himself.

I will yield the balance of my time to the gentleman. Go ahead. Take my time. If you think that I have not been acting within my rights, I am big enough to let you place your own construction on the situation.

But the gentleman knows that when we yield it is usually for a question or a brief observation, and not to take up another gentleman's time.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman and I always get along very well, and I certainly would not transgress on your prerogatives, so I will say what I have to say in my own time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield for a question to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] so as to keep my two friends on an equal basis.

Mr. MONRONEY. Not only would I say that they are gagging every Member on the floor of the House by limiting debate to 20 minutes on each side on two important measures, but this morning it was announced that they were refusing to hear the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Commerce on the inflation-control program being considered in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

So the committees, as well as the House itself are being gagged.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to inquire—What is the purpose of this particular resolution? Is it not the intention that, if a bill comes out of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to take it up under suspension of the rules? Is it not the purpose to take up whatever legislation may be acted upon at this session under suspension of the rules?

Suspension of the rules has a definite and legitimate purpose. Where a bill comes up and only a small group is opposed to it, and the great majority are in favor of it, suspension of the rules is resorted to on unanimous-consent day. Even in the last 6 days of a session it is very seldom resorted to with reference to a matter of general import to the people, and where there are honest and substantial differences between the Members.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at least under such circumstances the minority party is given the right to offer a motion to recommit. If a closed rule is brought in, the right to make a motion to recommit is not taken away.

Lest we forget, let us go back 2 years ago when the National Association of Manufacturers and the Republican Party promised the people of America that, if price controls were removed, within 60 days everything would be in plentiful supply and we would have prices lower than under OPA. Time passed.

It is now 2 years later. Are the people paying less than they did 2 years ago? Has the cost of living declined during the last 2 years? Has the Republican Party kept its promises to the people which they made 2 years ago?

The answer is strongly and emphatically "No." The over-all increase in the cost of living is now 40 percent higher than it was 2 years ago, and in the case of foodstuffs, it is from 60 to 100 percent higher than it was 2 years ago.

Yes, lest we forget—let me show you an advertisement which appeared in the Chicago Sun of February 18, 1946, signed by the National Association of Manufacturers, in which they say "You don't want your savings to melt away! Or the value of your life insurance to dwindle!" I wonder what the people think today as to whether or not there has been a dwindling in their savings and in the value of their life insurance.

Here is another advertisement, one of these big paid ads by the National Association of Manufacturers, which appeared in the Washington Post of April 18, 1946, "Paging Mr. Bowles." I wonder if now they would put an advertisement in paging Mr. Bowles, who at that time said that the removal of price controls would sharply increase the cost of living.

Here is another advertisement on "Why legitimate packers cannot buy cattle," signed by the American Meat Institute of Chicago. Here is what they say:

> Only removal of OPA pricing and related regulations, including subsidies, will put cattle and beef back into normal channels—from the farm to the table—at fair, competitive prices for all.

I wonder what the people think now as they look back, about the increase in the cost of living, particularly the price of meat, which has gone up nearly 100 percent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have only a couple of minutes left. If the gentleman will yield me some of his time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman talks about 2 years ago. My memory goes back to 2 years ago. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not remember when they were serving horse meat in the hospitals in Boston and the gentleman from Massachusetts protested

and asked that something be done about it; that these laws under which we were operating, which were done away with by a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President, were producing this shortage of meat. Are they still using horse meat in the hospitals?

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman admit that the over-all increase in the cost of living has gone up over 40 percent in the past 2 years?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are prices lower now than they were 2 years ago?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, speaking of blackmarket prices that the American people had to pay 2 years ago to get the food and the goods they wanted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, my, my! I cannot imagine——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Are they still eating horse meat in the hospitals in Boston?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman cannot outtalk me. He can outtalk others but he cannot outtalk me. The greatest brain of the Republican Party, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], admits now that prices are lower than they were 2 years ago. Well, every housewife is an expert economist on the fact that the cost of living has gone up perceptibly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will you answer the question that I asked you?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want to say anything other than nice things about my friend. Personally, when I am down here talking, I talk about his party and my party, but the gentleman knows I have such an affection for him that if we must have a Republican from his district again, I hope it is the gentleman from Ohio. Of course, we prefer a Democrat, but if we must have a Republican, I want him.

Here is another full-page ad in the New York Times of July 3, 1946, by the National Association of Manufacturers, in this campaign of 2 years ago, whipping up the public against these controls. This advertisement promises:

If OPA is permanently discontinued, the production of goods will mount rapidly and, through free competition, prices will quickly adjust themselves to levels that consumers are willing to pay. * * *

Then, as production gets rolling again, supply will catch up with demand * * * prices will be fair and reasonable to all * * * quality will be improved * * * black markets will disappear * * * and America will enter the period of prosperity that everyone has been hoping for.

I have here another full-page ad of the National Association of Manufacturers from the Washington Post of May 4, 1946, with a caption in 2-inch block letters, "Would you like some butter or a roast of beef?" The ad then goes on to suggest this answer:

Remove price controls on manufactured goods, and production will step up fast. Goods will then pour into the market and, within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally and competitively, as they always have, in line with the real worth of things. This is the way you can get the goods you want at prices you can afford to pay. Write your Congressman your views today.

The NAM, and the other high-pressure groups, did not limit their endeavors to stimulating correspondence against OPA. They carried their fight for immediate end of price controls directly to the congressional committees.

Mr. Robert Wason, president, National Association of Manufacturers, told the House Committee on Banking and Currency on March 18, 1946:

Remove price controls on manufactured goods, and production will step up fast. Goods will then pour into the markets and, within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally, as they always have, in line with the real worth of things. Competition has never failed to produce this result. * * *

Prices are fixed by competition in free markets, not by the money supply. And what is this competition in free markets?

It is the effort of every manufacturer to meet the wishes of the American housewife, the effort to give her what she wants, at a price she thinks is fair. That is real price control.

Price control by the American housewife: This is the kind of price control that assures that the right things get made in the right quantities.

Price control by the American housewife: This is the kind of price control that assures maximum production, jobs, and prosperity for all.

Price control by the American housewife: This is the kind of price control that has made America great, and the only kind that can keep America great.

In a radio address on February 26, 1946, this same gentleman assured the American people:

Historically we have never gotten run-away prices on a rising production. * * *

Prices should be returned to American housewives.

The ceilings the housewife sets, everyone in industry and agriculture must get. * * *

Stripped of all economic prattle, what we are contending for, therefore, is that you, and not the OPA, should be putting the ceiling prices on the things you want.

Another spokesman from the joint high command of big business and the Republican Party, Mr. J. Howard Pew, president of Sun Oil Co., testified before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on April 4, 1946:

Price increases will stimulate increased production, which quickly will bring prices back into balance. If prices go up too fast, consumer resistance will check them.

Mr. Speaker, what has actually happened? Since April 1, 1946, the price of crude oil at the wells in the United States has gone up from $1.20 a barrel to $2.65.

Many other assurances of the good faith of industry in keeping prices down, and promises not to charge all that the traffic would bear, were then made.

On March 3, 1946, Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, said:

We've got a gang in power who thinks solely of the consumer, and usually in terms of protecting him.

On March 28, 1946, Nelson said that if Wyatt's veteran-housing program were dropped, the home-building industry would—

produce a home, not a fox hole; a house you can afford, not a remodeled barracks.

According to the Baltimore Sun of September 11, 1946, Mr. Ira Mosher, of the NAM—chairman of the board of NAM—said:

We have quite completely failed in convincing the public that our aims are for its good as well as for ours.

The doubts of the people about the NAM aims now have been amply clarified and fully justified.

Al Guckenberger, executive secretary, New York State Food Merchants Association, after OPA price controls were lifted, on October 14, 1946, stated:

Prices * * * will level off shortly as they had begun to do last August before controls were reimposed.

Arthur Bruce, president National Lumber Manufacturers Association, in testimony before a congressional committee, said:

I am personally of the opinion that we would be better off if the Office of Price Administration were to die a natural death June 30.

Need I remind the House that lumber in July 1947 had swept upward 73.4 percent over the 1945—price control—average? When Mr. Bruce said we would be better off it is quite clear the "we" did not include the homeless veteran.

Mr. Richard Colgan, executive vice president, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, in congressional testimony urged:

I think the flow of [lumber] production would be so great so soon that there would be a competitive price on the market.

Yet a year and a half later we find Mr. Colgan's "competitive price" two and one-half times the 1939 average.

On February 3, 1946, Mr. John E. Jaeger, president of the National Association of Retail Grocers, told the American Wholesale Grocers Association:

We [retail grocers] feel that the time has arrived when * * * action must be taken * * * to prevent renewal of the Price Control Act * * *. [Competition] will * * * benefit the consumer by making available ample food at reasonable prices.

On July 9, 1946, Robert R. Wason, president of the NAM, said:

If OPA is finally dead, women * * * will now use the canned meats and other goods they have on their shelves to see them through any temporary period of price rises.

Also said:

If OPA is eliminated entirely, prices of automobiles may be expected to reach normal within 6 months, while rents might take at least a year.

The business and financial editorial writers were advance scouts in the battle to wipe out OPA.

The Wall Street Journal, one of the principal mouthpieces for big business and high finance, started as early as 1945 for outright repeal of OPA, and carried on its campaign to its successful conclusion.

On September 24, 1945, an editorial stated:

This newspaper does not believe that the lifting of price controls will be followed by any horizontal price rise.

A month earlier the Journal editorialized on August 29, 1945:

So we think the choice must be to get rid of price control and to make a beginning on that riddance by throwing out the formulas.

On December 14, 1945, the Journal restated its opposition in terms remarkably similar to the slogans of the National Association of Manufacturers:

As we have said and repeat, the immediate removal of Government control from both prices and wages is the only practical way out of this dangerous impasse. Their removal would unquestionably mean temporarily high prices for many varieties of goods but temporarily only, for there is no more effective price regulation than production in volume.

On January 9, 1946, an editorial of the Wall Street Journal suggests that manufacturers would have a moral responsibility that has been found so deficient in actual practice:

Industries and trade cannot evade price responsibility when they escape the clutches of OPA, whether that happens 6 months too soon or 6 months too late. (Our own belief is that the ceiling prices have already survived too long.)

On January 31, 1946, the Journal announced its unequivocal opposition to all attempts to retain modified price controls:

It is to be hoped that no modification of the price-control law, which its misguided friends may offer, will persuade Congress to extend its life. A much better alternative would be to make an end of it at once.

Ralph Robey, writing in Newsweek of April 29, 1946, said:

Let's put an end to the OPA and get rid once and for all of the creeping inflation which is certain to continue so long as the OPA remains in existence.

There certainly is nothing creeping about the racing inflation of today—more than 2 years after Mr. Robey offered his advice.

Nor could even the academic world remain detached from the anti-OPA fray of 1946. The following prize piece of price nonsense is taken from an article in the Consumer and Financial Chronicle of March 21, 1946, by Mr. Harley L. Lutz, professor of public finance, Princeton University:

The most effective remedy for high prices is high prices, when they are established in a free and open market.

Republican Members of Congress echoed these views of business leaders over countless pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It would be unfair for me to select any one, or even a few, of my Republican friends for quotation without giving proper credit to them all for the demise of price controls. Perhaps the best proof of the truth of my observation is the following statement from an address by a ranking Republican Member of the other body on February 5, 1948—only a few months ago—before the Middle Atlantic Lumbermen's Association:

I do not need to remind the membership of this association that it was the Republican leadership in the Senate and the House that was responsible for ending OPA, so that we could once more get our production machinery into gear.

Mr. Speaker, in direct contrast have been the solemn and prophetic pleas of President Truman that the Congress take the required steps to protect the people from inflation. In his state of the Union message of January 21, 1946, the President warned:

Today inflation is our greatest immediate domestic problem. * * * If we expect to maintain a steady economy we shall have to maintain price and rent control for many months to come.

In an extraordinary appeal to the Senate on May 23, 1946, President Truman again urged:

I earnestly repeat my earlier request that the Congress quickly re-enact the stabilization laws without amendments that would jeopardize economic stability.

After trying diligently to administer a basically defective statute, the President finally took the only course. In his statement on wage and price control on November 9, 1946, he said:

There is no virtue in control for control's sake. When it becomes apparent that controls are not furthering the purposes of the stabilization laws but would, on the contrary, tend to defeat these purposes, it becomes the duty of the Government to drop the controls. * * *

The real basis of our difficulty is the unworkable price control law which the Congress gave us to administer.

A few months later, President Truman again warned of the dangers of exorbitant prices in an address before the Associated Press annual luncheon, in New York, on April 21, 1947:

There are some who say that prices are not too high, so long as buying stays at high levels.

From the human standpoint, I reject this argument. It provides no answer to those living on fixed incomes such as teachers, civil servants, and widows.

There is one sure formula for bringing on a recession or depression. That is to maintain excessively high prices. Buying stops; production drops; unemployment sets in; prices collapse; profits vanish; businessmen fail.

Maintaining his watchful eye over the Nation's economy, the President called Congress back into special session and on November 17, 1947, presented a nine-point program to halt rising prices with the following reminder of what failure to act might mean:

If we neglect our economic ills at home, if we fail to halt the march of inflation, we may bring on a depression from which our economic system, as we know it, might not recover.

When the Republican Congress failed to respond to the urgency of the times, the President again appealed for action in his state of the Union message on January 7, 1948:

High prices must not be our means of rationing.

We must deal effectively and at once with the high cost of living.

We must stop the spiral of inflation.

I trust that within the shortest possible time the Congress will make available to the Government the weapons that are so desperately needed in the fight against inflation.

Speaking in the interests of the people, President Truman—when the Republican Congress again refused to heed his warning by adjourning without taking action to halt skyrocketing prices—again fulfilled his constitutional duty by summoning the Congress into special session. He patiently and earnestly and modestly reminded us last week how right he has been all along on this vital problem. The President said:

There are still some people who repeat the old argument which was used by those who killed price control 2 years ago. They said that if we would only take controls off, production would increase, prices would go down, and there would be more for everybody at a lower cost.

The record shows unmistakably that this argument was false. * * *

Positive action by this Government is long overdue. It must be taken now.

Mr. Speaker, this is a summary of the record on price control and the present soaring cost of living. Responsibility is clear—not only with regard to the premature end of OPA, but also for the failure now to correct that original mistake by giving the American people the relief from high prices which they so sorely need, and which their President has sought for them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of discussing the resolution which is before us, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the majority leader.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I assure the House that I am not going to use 20 minutes. After all, my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is just engaging in a lot of shadow-boxing in which he likes to indulge and which we always enjoy.

The gentleman referred with some vigor to the suspension of representative government. I might say to him that I saw representative government suspended here for 14 years, under the New Deal. In that era measures were sent up here by the Executive and given approval when they were not yet even in print. It was under the New Deal that we had suspension of representative government. The people of this country now have a Congress that is responsive to their will, a Congress that really represents them and is subservient to no one man or group of individuals. The people are glad they have such a Congress. They are very happy that it is a Republican Congress. We have restored representative government in the United States. In the course of his remarks the gentleman undertook to upbraid the majority leadership for calling up a certain number of measures under suspension of the rules in the closing days of the last session. I would remind the gentleman that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD discloses that I asked the minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] about the adoption of that particular resolution, and indicated to the gentleman from Texas that I was going to ask unanimous consent for its adoption. He suggested to me that I tell him as nearly as I could what measures we had in mind to call up under suspension of the rules or

might possibly be called up in that manner. I went to the minority leader's office and I gave him that list. When I subsequently asked unanimous consent for the adoption of the resolution, the gentleman from Texas reserved the right to object and said—and it is in the RECORD of June 17, page 8634:

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Indiana was good enough this morning to state to me generally, and I think rather fully, the bills that the Speaker would in all probability recognize for suspension. They are all agreeable to me except one. Since the action of the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning, and the high-handed manner in which that committee acted in not allowing a Member of the minority, as I understand, to even make a motion or say anything, I could not agree to this request, if it involves a bill of the far-reaching significance as the so-called housing bill.

If that is to come in the list I shall be constrained to object, and if I did not there would be another who would.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it comes with poor grace to complain of action that was taken under suspension of the rules when the minority leader was informed in respect to every one of them and he had said for the RECORD that they were all agreeable to him insofar as calling them up under suspension was concerned, except one.

Furthermore, the present session is supposed to be an extraordinary session of Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] objected because the gentleman brought in a rule that would kill and did kill the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill and substitute for it a fraudulent housing bill?

Mr. HALLECK. I read the RECORD as to why the gentleman from Texas objected and certainly the gentleman can understand it as well as I. There was nothing in the list of bills which was just read by the gentleman from Massachusetts that led him to object.

Whether or not the majority of the Members of this body are going to vote for the adoption of this resolution I do not know, but I think they will. As a matter of fact, there is nothing new in this procedure. I read the RECORD before. I hesitate to take the time of the Members to read it again, except that there has been such an attempt to arouse a lot of excitement here that I feel I should make further reference to it.

The gentleman from New York, Mr. O'Connor, was chairman of the Rules Committee in 1938 and presented this same kind of resolution for adoption on that occasion and there was not even a record vote. The now Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] raised some question about it.

Mr. O'Connor said:

Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution brought in toward the close of a session. Its purpose is to expedite the business of the House. It provides that suspensions shall be in order on any day instead of on the first and third Mondays and during the last 6 days of a session.

All during a session bills are called under suspension, as the established rules of the House provide.

Some question was raised as to whether or not the Republicans had ever followed this procedure. The gentleman from New York, Mr. O'Connor, said:

The Republican Party took the same course we are taking today. I served with the gentleman on the Rules Committee and the gentleman may trace back the history of this Congress for many years and I doubt if there can be found a year in which an identical rule was not brought in.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I should like to conclude my statement.

As I say, I do not know why there should be all this excitement over this proposal to expedite the business of Congress. Even the President himself said that we could do all that was needed to be done in 15 days. That makes this kind of resolution all the more necessary. I do not, however, see why it was that it was not until a full week after we had been called into session that any of the President's advisers came up to tell us about the particular bills the President wanted. He called this an emergency situation. The President said this was an emergency situation. If that be true, then certainly there is more reason for the adoption of this resolution in this kind of session than there would be in a regular session. Why then is the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] complaining about the committee's not hearing a lot of witnesses he said they should hear? What does he want—a filibuster in his own committee against legislation dealing with prices? It would seem that he does. I can hardly believe that, however. In any event, you could not hear all of those witnesses and get through in the 15 days that the President said ought to be time enough to do all that he thought needed to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one thing further. There has been talk here about important bills being called up under suspension of the rules. Why, one of the bills that raised inquiry in 1938 when this type of resolution came up was the so-called reorganization bill—the same reorganization bill that stirred this country to its very foundations, a reorganization bill which was subsequently defeated by a then Democratic Congress. At that time the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] pointed out that resolutions of this sort generally came at the end of a session. And he said he would like to know if the session was going to last 2 days, 2 weeks, or 2 months. The then Democratic majority leadership would not even tell him that much. So do not get so excited about it. It is the same old story. As long as you are on the "giving out end," you kind of enjoy it, but when you get to the point where the same procedures you followed all through the years are invoked by the Republican majority in order to try to bring about expeditious consideration of the matters before us, you cry out until you can be heard clear across the country. I do not think any one will be very much impressed.

Mr. Speaker, there has been talk about the price-control measure and statements to the effect that it is contemplated it will be brought up under suspension of the rules. Now, I do not know at this moment what is going to be brought up under suspension. Even if this resolution is adopted, the price-control matter could be brought up under a rule. When we came here at the opening of the last session and Mr. Truman came up here with that long program of his, I made the statement then—and I never heard anyone dispute it since—that if you wrapped them all up in one package and sent it down to the White House there would not be 25 Democratic votes to send it there and what is more, if we did send it down there the President would probably veto it. I do not know whether you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle would have courage enough to try to bring OPA back under a motion to recommit or not. I have heard you talk about it, but, if I understand the sentiment that exists, you would not have enough votes for that sort of a police-state proposal to make a corporal's guard. Why then all this shadow-boxing?

We Republicans said that we were not for the police-state method that the President himself decried at one time. That is where we stand. We make no apology for it, and we need make none. The people overwhelmingly approve our position.

The committee is holding hearings on these matters that have been stated to us to be most important. I have confidence in the committees and, beyond that, I have confidence in the ultimate judgment of the Congress of the United States as to what ought to be done. You can talk all you want about the merits of these various proposals and you can talk about how debate will be limited. The fact is that the debate has been raging for days, weeks, and months in the Congress, in the press, and over the radio. Everyone has been talking about it.

When we decide what needs to be done within the contemplation of the necessities of this special session, the measures will be brought out here and you will all get a chance to vote on them.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I was called from the room while the able gentleman from Massachusetts was delivering his keynote speech for the opposition. Did he call attention to the fact that when we had price control it was impossible to buy meat, potatoes, eggs, butter, shirts—in fact everything? You could not buy anything and people were queueing up in line all over the country trying to get food and buy enough to keep body and soul together.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman neglected also to point out that it was the President himself who took off the OPA

controls just before the last election. He took them off in the face of an aroused electorate. But I am not going to get into a debate about the merits of the various things that have been and may be proposed. This is not the time nor the place for it. I might point out that when some of these statements were made, and some people thought that prices would be dropping, it was expected that national defense would cost from three to five billion dollars a year. Now it is costing $14,000,000,000 a year, with the resulting impact that such expenditures has on our national economy. I do not think it was in contemplation that we would be engaging in various aid programs running into billions and billions and billions of dollars, involving the export of tremendous quantities of goods of all kinds in this country, having, as that has, its impact upon our whole economy. As I say, one could go on at great length arguing these issues, but this is not the time for it.

This resolution is in order; it is properly here; it follows time-honored practices in the House of Representatives, and after the gentlemen on the other side have had their opportunity to try and make another political speech to the country, and get a chance to vote, the smoke will all clear away and we will go on to accomplish the best that we can in the best interest of the country. Whatever we bring in here you can be pretty sure there will be a lot of votes on the other side of the aisle for it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is the majority leader, and he is being credited with being the real leader of the Republican Party, of course. He states that he does not know what legislation will be considered. Now, I presume that is due to his modesty. Can he tell us whether he will bring in that legislation that will bring about a reduction in the high cost of living?

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the gentleman from Illinois, for his enlightenment, that there are 245 Republican Members. There is no one man, no two or three men, who run the affairs of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives. We have Members on the legislative committees, and they are able men and women, who are doing a good job in the interest of the country. They have a voice, an important voice, in what is done. It is not up to me to dictate to them what they should do, and I am quite sure the Speaker would fully agree with me in that respect, because that is the way we operate. There is no dictatorship over here. We get together, we talk things over, and then we decide what to do, and generally we go ahead and do it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 216, nays 122, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—216

Abernethy	Gamble	Merrow
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Meyer
Andersen, H. Carl	Gearhart	Michener
Anderson, Calif.	Gillette	Miller, Md.
Andresen, August H.	Gillie	Miller, Nebr.
Angell	Goff	Mitchell
Arends	Goodwin	Muhlenberg
Arnold	Graham	Mundt
Auchincloss	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
Bakewell	Griffiths	Nicholson
Banta	Gross	Nixon
Barrett	Gwinn, N. Y.	Norblad
Bates, Mass.	Gwynne, Iowa	O'Hara
Beall	Hagen	Patterson
Bender	Hale	Phillips, Calif.
Bennett, Mich.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Potter
Bennett, Mo.	Hall, Leonard W.	Potts
Bishop	Halleck	Poulson
Blackney	Hand	Ramey
Boggs, Del.	Harness, Ind.	Rankin
Bradley	Harvey	Reed, Ill
Bramblett	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Brehm	Herter	Rees
Brophy	Heselton	Reeves
Brown, Ohio	Hill	Rich
Buck	Hinshaw	Riehlman
Buffett	Hoeven	Rivers
Burke	Holmes	Robertson
Busbey	Hope	Rockwell
Butler	Horan	Rogers, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hull	Rohrbough
Carson	Jenison	Ross
Case, N. J.	Jenkins, Ohio	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Calif.	Sadlak
Chadwick	Johnson, Ill.	Sanborn
Chenoweth	Jones, Wash.	Sarbacher
Chiperfield	Jonkman	Schwabe, Mo.
Church	Judd	Schwabe, Okla.
Clason	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Clevenger	Kearns	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Coffin	Keating	Scrivner
Cole, Kans.	Keefe	Seely-Brown
Cole, Mo.	Kersten, Wis.	Simpson, Ill.
Colmer	Kilburn	Simpson, Pa.
Corbett	Knutson	Smith, Kans.
Cotton	Kunkel	Smith, Maine
Coudert	Landis	Smith, Ohio
Cox	Larcade	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	Latham	Snyder
Crow	LeCompte	Stefan
Cunningham	LeFevre	Stevenson
Curtis	Lemke	Stockman
Dague	Lewis, Ky.	Stratton
Davis, Ga	Lewis, Ohio	Sundstrom
Davis, Wis.	Lichtenwalter	Taber
Dawson, Utah	Love	Talle
Devitt	McConnell	Tibbott
D'Ewart	McCowen	Tollefson
Dolliver	McCulloch	Towe
Dondero	McDonough	Twyman
Ellis	McDowell	Van Zandt
Ellsworth	McGarvey	Vorys
Elsaesser	McGregor	Vursell
Elston	McMahon	Wadsworth
Engel, Mich.	McMillen, Ill.	Weichel
Fellows	Mack	Whittington
Fisher	Macy	Wigglesworth
Fletcher	Maloney	Williams
Foote	Manasco	Wilson, Tex.
Fuller	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Fulton	Mason	Wolverton
Gallagher	Mathews	Woodruff

NAYS—122

Albert	Boggs, La.	Burleson
Allen, La.	Boykin	Byrne, N. Y.
Andrews, Ala.	Brooks	Camp
Battle	Brown, Ga.	Carroll
Beckworth	Bryson	Chelf
Bell	Buchanan	Combs
Blatnik	Bulwinkle	Cravens
Crosser	Jones, Ala.	Pace
Deane	Jones, N. C.	Passman
Delaney	Karsten, Mo.	Patman
Dingell	Kee	Peden
Donohue	Kelley	Peterson
Doughton	Kennedy	Philbin
Douglas	Kilday	Pickett
Durham	King	Poage
Eberharter	Kirwan	Preston
Engle, Calif.	Klein	Price, Fla
Feighan	Lane	Price, Ill.
Fogarty	Lanham	Rains
Folger	Lea	Rayburn
Forand	Lesinski	Redden
Gordon	Lodge	Rogers, Fla.
Gorski	Lusk	Rooney
Gossett	Lynch	Sabath
Granger	McCormack	Sadowski
Grant, Ala.	McMillan, S. C.	Sheppard
Gregory	Madden	Sikes
Hardy	Mahon	Smathers
Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield	Smith, Va.
Harris	Marcantonio	Somers
Harrison	Miller, Calif.	Spence
Hart	Miller, Conn.	Teague
Havenner	Mills	Thompson
Hays	Monroney	Vinson
Hedrick	Morgan	Walter
Hobbs	Morris	Welch
Holifield	Morrison	Wheeler
Huber	Multer	Whitten
Jackson, Wash.	Murdock	Winstead
Jarman	O'Brien	Worley
Johnson, Okla.	O'Toole	

NOT VOTING—91

Abbitt	Flannagan	Norton
Allen, Ill.	Garmatz	O'Konski
Andrews, N. Y.	Gary	Pfeifer
Barden	Gathings	Phillips, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Ploeser
Bland	Hartley	Plumley
Bloom	Heffernan	Powell
Bolton	Hendricks	Priest
Bonner	Hess	Regan
Buckley	Hoffman	Richards
Canfield	Isacson	Riley
Cannon	Jackson, Calif.	Rizley
Celler	Javits	St. George
Chapman	Jenkins, Pa.	Sasscer
Clark	Jennings	Scoblick
Clippinger	Jensen	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Tex.	Short
Cooley	Kean	Stanley
Cooper	Kefauver	Stigler
Courtney	Keogh	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kerr	Thomas, N. J
Dawson, Ill.	Lucas	Thomas, Tex.
Dirksen	Ludlow	Trimble
Domengeaux	Lyle	Vail
Dorn	MacKinnon	West
Eaton	Meade, Ky.	Whitaker
Elliott	Meade, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Evins	Morton	Wood
Fallon	Murray, Tenn.	Youngblood
Fenton	Nodar	
Fernandez	Norrell	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk anounced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Gary against.

Mr. Clippinger for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Mr. Nodar for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. Priest against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Hartley for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Andrews of New York for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Sasscer against.

Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Cooper against.

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. Gore against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Isacson against.
Mr. Gathings for, with Mr. Chapman against.
Mr. Vail for, with Mr. Bland against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Rizley with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Youngblood with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Wood.
Mr. Morton with Mr. Johnson of Texas.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Whitaker.
Mr. MacKinnon with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Flannagan.
Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Fernandez.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Riley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 737)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems covering its operations from October 1, 1947, to March 31, 1948, and describing in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

Previous reports of the National Advisory Council were transmitted to the Congress on March 1, 1946, March 8, 1946, January 13, 1947, June 26, 1947, January 20, 1948, and May 18, 1948, respectively. In addition to the First Special Report on the Operations and Policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, submitted on May 18, 1948, previous reports on the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank were included in the reports of January 13, 1947, June 26, 1947, and January 20, 1948, respectively.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 3, 1948.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement in support of the tax bill he introduced this morning.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD regarding a bill he introduced today to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

Mr. McMAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a communication from a civic association.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HOUSING

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the existence of a critical housing shortage throughout our Nation is well known to each of us. I have been deeply concerned about the failure of the House to give consideration to this matter.

Early in June I called attention to the urgency of the need and it was generally understood then that the committee would report to the House a comprehensive housing bill. Subsequent developments are well known. A so-called housing bill was presented, but in a form which miserably failed to constructively approach the problem and in a manner which prevented any amendments to broaden it or improve it.

There is a pressing need for permanent extension of title VI of the National Housing Act and for a better secondary mortgage market. However, there is wide divergence of opinion concerning the propriety of Federal assistance in connection with slum clearance and subsidized housing for low-income families. While the elimination of slums and decent housing for American families are clearly matters of public interest, the opponents of public housing point to the fact that new construction is now proceeding at a rate which fully utilizes our production of building supplies.

It has long been my feeling that the entire House membership should be given an opportunity to participate in and listen to full debate on all the various proposals for coping with the housing problem. To keep housing legislation bottled up in committee deprives the House membership of any opportunity to work out constructive legislation which is so vitally needed.

I have today signed the petition to discharge the committee from further consideration of the matter. I hope that a sufficient number of my colleagues will join with me to bring this matter to the floor so that it may be debated and disposed of during the current special session.

SOMETHING MUST BE DONE TO PROTECT SOCIAL - SECURITY BENEFICIARIES FROM THE FIRES OF INFLATION

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the President in his message to the joint session of the Congress on July 27, described the people who depend upon the benefits being paid under the old age and survivors' insurance system as victims of inflation. Truer, more forceful words were never spoken. It is ridiculous to suggest, yes it is cruel to say that an elderly man and his wife can exist on the average old-age retirement benefit of $39 a month, or that a widow with two children can keep body and soul together with $49 a month.

Since the present level of benefits was set in 1939, we have had this fantastic rise in the cost of those basic necessities which social-security recipients could barely afford even before the price rise. Immediately after the delivery of the President's message I introduced H. R. 7044, to increase old age and survivors' insurance benefits by approximately 50 percent and to make certain other noncontroversial liberalizing changes in the social-security system.

Mr. Speaker, it can be taken for granted that the Republicans in control of both Houses of Congress can expect to reap the fury of an enraged and unsympathetic electorate far greater in numbers than the 2,000,000 recipients now actually receiving benefits under the Social Security Act. There can be no argument against the President's recommendations since everybody knows that the present high cost of living admittedly weighs heaviest on those who are subsisting on social-security benefits and old-age pensions. These people are the lowest on our economic scale and their need for relief is most pressing, since they are in distress and unable otherwise to help themselves.

Indeed, the 63,000,000 employed persons at the present time doubtless includes a great many people who are eligible for social-security retirement benefits, but who simply cannot afford to leave their job—despite age and poor health—under the present inadequate benefits and the Republican NAM high prices.

The healthy financial condition of the old-age and survivors' insurance fund, together with the strengthening provisions in the bill I have introduced, clearly make possible these adjustments in the Social Security Act. Mr. Speaker, although this bill was introduced more than a week ago, as yet there has not been a single meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means for the consideration of this pressing problem. I am sure that the old people of the country, as well as those who are now contributing toward a more pleasant and secure old age, will be justly indignant at the neglect of this

Republican Eightieth Congress responsible for their minimum welfare.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona, and Mr. MITCHELL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CROSSER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of enforcing peace.

THE ISSUES OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, Congress has been reconvened in special session for the purpose of solving a number of important problems which directly affect the people's welfare and America's national security.

The issues which confront us may be classified under the following major categories: First, inflation; second, housing; third, labor legislation; fourth, civil rights; and, fifth, social welfare. Each of these five problems has a direct bearing on our economic well-being and on the future of democracy. Each of these problems was grossly neglected by the Eightieth Congress during its two regular sessions.

It is my hope that Congress will accept its responsibilities to the Nation during this special session and take courageous and constructive legislative action—action which is long overdue.

The record of the Eightieth Congress to date has been one of miserable failure and broken campaign promises. The Republican majority failed the people during both regular sessions; it failed the worker, farmer, small-business man, veteran, and consumer. It refused to formulate a program of prosperity and security for the people, choosing instead to cater to corporate wealth and vested interests by adopting class legislation and granting tax hand-outs to the wealthy.

The special session now gives to the majority party an opportunity to redeem itself by doing something constructive for a change. I hope that the Republican leadership has the wisdom to utilize this chance, and I am sure that the American people share my views.

I will use the few minutes at my disposal to discuss briefly each of the big issues of the special session, and urge what in my opinion seems to be the logical course of action to follow. I will begin with the question of inflation and the need for adequate legislation to control it.

CHECK INFLATION—PREVENT DEPRESSION

Mr. Speaker, the present economic situation is dangerous and pregnant with economic disaster. There is much uneasiness among the people, and they have ample cause for alarm. Ever-rising prices, swollen corporate profits, declining mass purchasing power, the increase in credit buying, and dissipation of wartime savings are the forerunners of depression—of another 1929 economic catastrophe which will cause untold suffering and misery for the people.

The danger signals of depression are all around us, as the Midyear Economic Report of the President—July 1948—clearly indicates. Prices are still rising—the cost of living is now 75 percent higher than in 1939. Food prices have increased 123 percent. Clothing costs have doubled. Rents are up 13 percent.

Corporate profits continue to increase, and have now reached the all-time high of $30,500,000,000 before taxes and $18,600,000,000 after taxes. Consumer purchasing power has declined, under the impact of this inflation, to the point where over 25 percent of all families are spending more than they earn. Credit buying has now reached the record high of $14,000,000,000—the people's savings of the war years have been dissipated in a majority of cases in order to enable them to buy the necessities of life.

This depression-breeding situation is a double-edged sword which is wrecking our economy. On one hand, inflation is reducing the worker's take-home pay, squeezing the small-business man, lowering the farm parity ratio between money received and paid out, and undermining the people's living standards. At the same time, the fires of inflation eating at vital parts of the Nation's economy are paving the way to depression, which will mean malnutrition, hunger, unemployment, broken national health, and human misery.

My colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have told us time and again that inflation-control legislation is unnecessary. They still repeat that unsound argument that was used when they killed price and rent control. They argue that no control means more production, and this in turn means lower prices.

It is true that more production is the eventual and only permanent answer. However, the present emphasis upon production is of such a nature that controls are necessary.

American industry should be reorientated toward the production of houses, cars, refrigerators, radios, schools, highways, hospitals, and consumer goods to raise living standards and provide security for our people, instead of being mobilized for a world armament race.

But we are spending over $14,000,000,000 a year for national defense, and over $6,000,000,000 for foreign economic and military aid. In other words, we are using over half of the National Budget for armament and foreign assistance, and three-fourths of the Budget for war and the effects of war. Until we reduce our expenditure for armaments and foreign grants, some inflation-control legislation is imperative. Otherwise, the result will be depression and economic collapse.

The situation requires swift and statesmanlike action, and it is later than we think. As Marriner S. Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, told the Senate Banking Committee on July 29 of this year:

> We certainly are going to have a bust. When, I cannot say. You can only moderate it now.

Congress cannot afford to follow its usual do-nothing policy with respect to this grim threat to our economy. We should adopt a complete program of inflation-control legislation during this session, including legislation to control credit, to allocate scarce commodities and control prices of such commodities. We should pass a genuine rent-control law and reimpose the excess-profits tax.

One or two of these things alone will not do the job. We must enact this entire program, and any half-way measures will not serve.

I wish to make my position absolutely clear on this question. Inflation has produced enormous corporate profits, but has undermined the people's purchasing power. This means shrinking markets and eventual depression. I have supported price and rent control in the past, and today urge anti-inflation legislation and the reimposition of the excess-profits tax as measures to prevent depression and to promote national security.

ADOPT T-E-W HOUSING BILL

Housing has become the number one social problem in the United States—in fact, the situation is today so bad that it has become a national disgrace. There are still nearly 3,000,000 families in this country who are living doubled up with friends and relatives; 50 percent of these homeless families are veterans' families. Two-thirds of all rural dwellings are classified as substandard, and 40 percent of all city homes fall into the same category.

The only solution to this problem is the adoption of a constructive and workable long-range housing bill to remedy the present acute housing shortage and meet our long-term housing needs. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, which has been bottled up in committee during the whole life of the Eightieth Congress, is a sound measure. More than a year ago I signed the discharge petition on this bill which still remains on the Speaker's desk, and I call upon the House today to bring this measure to the floor and pass it during this special session.

REPEAL THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

The Republican majority could make a real contribution to the cause of industrial peace and American democracy during this session, if it would lay aside its lynch-labor attitude and repeal the Taft-Hartley antilabor law. This measure, written and crusaded for by the National Association of Manufacturers, is one of the most vicious measures ever adopted by the Congress of the United States.

The Taft-Hartley Act is contrary to American ideals and the principles of

our Constitution. It has restricted the rights of labor which were earned over half a century of struggle—the rights to organize, bargain collectively, and strike as free men and women. It has opened the way to the use of injunctions and the National Guard as well as units of the Regular Army to break strikes. It has served to handcuff the working men and women of America in the interests of big business, has created labor unrest, caused unnecessary strikes, and retarded industrial production.

The Republicans justified the adoption of this law on the grounds that it was necessary to preserve industrial peace. Events have proved that this argument was false—a fact that most reasonable and unbiased persons recognized during the debate in Congress over the Taft-Hartley law. The road to industrial peace is to be found, not in repressive antilabor legislation, but in measures which eliminate the conditions that create labor unrest.

In the interest of friendly labor-management relations, Congress should strike from the statute books the Taft-Hartley law, and direct its efforts toward the formulation and adoption of a comprehensive program to benefit labor.

We should raise the minimum wage to provide at least 75 cents per hour and strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. We should expand and liberalize the provisions of the unemployment compensation laws to cover all workers, and provide payments in the amount of at least $25 for 26 weeks. We should extend the Social Security Act to cover all workers, and adopt an adequate pension law to give workers security in their old age. Congress should adopt a labor-extension program of education and strengthen our labor conciliation services.

With respect to my stand on labor issues I want to make the record clear. The NAM-sponsored Taft-Hartley law is a vicious and un-American measure. I opposed it from the beginning and I now demand its repeal. I condemn strike-breaking by injunction and the use of the National Guard and other Army units in labor disputes. Congress can best promote industrial peace by raising the minimum wage, by liberalizing unemployment compensation, and by providing economic security to the worker.

EXTEND CIVIL LIBERTIES AND ENCOURAGE DEMOCRACY

America has a great heritage of freedom and equality, and the individual liberties guaranteed by the Constitution are precious American rights. Yet we must admit that the American ideal still awaits complete realization. As the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights points out, millions of Americans are denied the right to vote today, minorities are discriminated against with respect to employment, education, and economic opportunity on account of race, color, and religious creed. Racial segregation exists in the armed forces and in many large cities. Minority groups are victims of lynching and other forms of mob law.

Neither can we ignore the fact that today efforts are being made to curtail civil liberties in America. The House has cited 10 prominent Hollywood artists for their personal political beliefs rather than any overt acts. The eminent atomic scientist Dr. Edward U. Condon, has been slandered and persecuted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as have many other prominent Americans. The so-called subversive activities control bill, which is one of the most dangerous measures ever seriously considered by Congress, passed the House. Only strong public protest has prevented its passage in the other body.

In the name of Americanism, Congress should exercise calm judgment in the face of public hysteria, and refuse to be stampeded into passing legislation to restrict civil liberties. In the name of democracy, we should adopt legislation to guarantee full political, economic, and social rights to every American.

My stand is in accord with Thomas Jefferson, who said:

> I swear on the altar of God eternal hostility to all forms of tyranny over the minds of men.

Congress must reject all legislation which curbs civil liberties—Congress must extend civil rights by adopting anti-poll-tax, anti-lynching, and FEPC legislation during this session.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION NEEDED

There is a vast amount of sound social legislation pending before the Congress which deserves consideration. Millions of old folks in America are living under conditions of poverty and near starvation, and a comprehensive and liberal old-age pension law is needed.

Recent reports show that there are 10,000,000 illiterates in America, and that many children are denied educational opportunities. Passage of the Taft Federal-aid-to-education bill would help correct this situation.

Two-thirds of our people are not receiving adequate medical care, and the Murray-Wagner health-insurance bill offers a practical solution to this problem. The social-security law should be extended to cover every person in America, including the farmer and self-employed. Positive action on these and many other social problems are long overdue, and Congress could contribute much to the future welfare of the Nation by placing such measures on the agenda.

These are the issues, Mr. Speaker, which now confront the special session of the Eightieth Congress. They are vital issues which demand constructive action. They are issues the Republican majority has chosen to dodge and sidestep since January of 1947. These issues which affect the people's interest must not be dodged or ignored any longer. It is no longer a question of saving face on the part of some political leaders—it is a question of prosperity or depression. The well-being of our people and the health of our economy are at stake.

It has been said that the special session is putting the majority party "on the spot" in that they are faced with the dilemma of fulfilling the campaign promises in their platform or repudiating them by inaction. Actually, it is the bipartisan coalition which is on the spot—the coalition which adopted the Taft-Hartley law, the Knutson tax law, and other reactionary measures during the regular session. But the question of prosperity or depression is more important than partisan or bipartisan politics, and I call upon my colleagues in both parties to take action now to guarantee prosperity, civil liberties, economic security, and democracy to all the people.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, from the press, I observe that since there is at present no housing law in this country, this session of Congress will probably enact the National Housing Act, which passed in the closing days of the regular session of the House. This bill, H. R. 6950, now being considered by the Senate, is inadequate and insufficient to meet the country's housing needs, especially in those States which are experiencing marked increases in their population.

The housing problem deserves top priority in our Congressional agenda. If the Federal Government fails to face this problem by providing adequate housing legislation at this time, it is incumbent upon the States to pass legislation to encourage the construction of houses at a State level. So desperate is the lack of appropriate housing in many of our States today the various States can no longer wait and hope for action by the Federal Government, when Congress gives no indication of constructive activity.

In my own State of Arizona, we are faced with a very real problem of providing housing for the thousands of veterans who have come to our fast-growing State to lay the groundwork for their futures. I sincerely hope that Arizona will enact a State housing law which will encourage the construction of homes especially for veterans and their families. I, for one, shall continue to stress the need of a State housing authority backed up by laws which will encourage the construction of private homes. If necessary, I believe the State should guarantee loans in the nature of mortgage insurance in a similar manner as is provided by the Federal Government in the contemplated national housing act.

If the housing problem is to be left largely to the initiative of the States, I believe it necessary that the Federal Reserve Board relax its rules and regulations in order to facilitate discounting on mortgage loans for homes, particularly for veterans, thus making it possible for the States to carry out their programs.

I had hoped, but apparently in vain, that Congress would tackle the serious task of enacting a sound and workable law that would guarantee homes for our citizens. If we are merely to go through the motions of passing a law which merely scratches the surface of the problem, as a last resort before adjourning, we must at least take steps to make it

possible for the States to take care of the problem and supplement the work of the Federal Government. I am sincerely hopeful that Arizona will take the initiative on her housing problem where this Congress has left off. For every dollar invested by the State in providing houses for her residents which are adequate to the American standard of living, the returns will be multiplied in terms of continued progress, prosperity, and happiness. Without decent homes within their financial possibilities, Americans cannot enjoy nor contribute in a full measure to the benefits of our way of life.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

STATE RIGHTS VERSUS TOTALITARIANISM

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years, it has become highly popular for public officials in certain sections of our country to point the finger of scorn at the white people of the South.

This has become such a politically profitable pastime in other sections that both major political parties have been persuaded to write into their party platforms antisouthern planks, and to dedicate themselves to the complete destruction of southern economic and social institutions.

We say to them:

> Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eyes, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast the mote out of thy brother's eye. Matthew 7: 3.

It is a sad commentary on American politics when the Democratic Party—saved from oblivion more than once by the South, and led by a man who owes his position to the white people of the South—places its best friends on the altar of political expediency.

The South will not—it cannot—go along with the vicious platform adopted by the National Democratic Convention at Philadelphia. We have been betrayed in the house of our fathers. We, who have been most faithful of all to the Democratic Party, felt the indignities of the present party's ingratitude, when our interests were subordinated to permit the adoption of a resolution offered by men from States in which not even the justices of the peace are Democrats.

The National Democratic Party leadership has joined the Dewey and Wallace crowds, and is playing cheap politics with public welfare.

Both major parties have unconditionally surrendered to selfish Negro and alien minority groups of the so-called doubtful States, and are both screaming for passage of legislation which they know to be unconstitutional per se, and contrary to the best interests of the United States.

I, of course, have reference to the so-called civil-rights legislation.

The enactment of any or all of these vicious proposals—with which we are all familiar—could have no effect other than to again fan into flames the expiring embers of racial hatred, and to create sectional divisions among our people at a time when national unity is synonymous with national self-preservation.

Passage of these measures would cut the heart from our Constitution. Yet they are advocated by many good and patriotic Americans. This is not difficult to understand, because those who would force this crown of thorns down upon the heads of the white people of the South have resorted to trickery, deceit, and misrepresentation in their efforts to destroy the meaning of the Constitution.

They have so colored the barbs that they would thrust into the flesh of constitutional government that all who dare take issue with their vicarious arguments are promptly labeled as demagogues, bigots, and race baiters.

Nothing, of course, could be more alien to fact. These arguments were answered for all time by the immortal Georgian, Henry W. Grady, who said:

> The future holds a problem, in solving which the South must stand alone; in dealing with which she must come closer together than ambition and despair have driven her; and on the outcome of which her very existence depends. This problem is to carry within her body politic two separate races, and nearly equal in number.

And further:

> This burden no other people bears today—on none has it ever rested. Without precedent or companionship, the South must bear this problem, the awful responsibility of which should win the sympathy of all mankind and the protecting watchfulness of God alone, even unto the end.

Mr. Speaker, these are not merely the beautiful words of an idle dreamer. They carry with them the awful significance of the burden which has been that of the South since the shameful days of reconstruction and will continue to be the problem of the South alone. We neither need, seek, nor desire assistance; nor do we welcome interference which we know will only revive old hatreds, and will set us back a hundred years in our progress.

The greatest of all Negroes, Booker T. Washington, pointed out that:

> Brains, property, and character for the Negro will settle the question of civil rights. The best course to pursue in regards to the civil-rights bill in the South is to let it alone. Let it alone, and it will settle itself.

It cannot be denied that the Negro has made great progress in the South—perhaps more than any other people in a like period of time anywhere. We of the South are proud of these great strides which our Negro friends have made. But, Mr. Speaker, they have accomplished this solely with the aid and understanding of the southern white man. Permit me to point out that none of their progress has been due in any way or to any extent to any help or contributions from the crowd that today is posing as friends of the Negro by advocating this un-American legislation.

None of this progress was due to the NAACP, the Civil Rights Congress, the National Negro Congress, or any other of these self-styled crusaders. Their only love for the Negro is based upon his political value at the moment.

Apart from the disastrous effects upon the South and her people, as well as upon the Nation as a whole, the legislative monstrosities which make up the so-called civil-rights program are of much more and further-reaching consequence.

Those who agitate for the passage of this program speak in glowing platitudes of human rights, individual dignity, and civil liberties.

It seems that they never get around to paying tribute to the document which has, through the years, preserved the dignity of the individual, and guaranteed human rights and civil liberties to all of our citizens—the Constitution of the United States. For its preservation the blood of thousands—even millions—of patriotic American citizens has been spilled; yet, by these acts those agitators would deny that democratic heritage to our people.

The founding fathers of our great Nation embodied in their Constitution a system of checks and balances—a division of governmental power—between the individual States and the Federal Government which they thought would preclude for all time to come the consequences of nationalization. To avoid the possibilities of power concentration and usurpation, they very wisely and deliberately delegated certain specified powers to the Federal Government and reserved the balance of authority to the individual States. Nowhere in the Federal Constitution did its framers provide for Federal intervention into private or social affairs, nor did they ever intend that the States be divested of their sovereignty.

It is provided by the Constitution that—

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

Yet, in utter disregard of this clear-cut statement of intent on the part of the framers of our Constitution, the President of the United States and both major political parties today demand the destruction of individual State sovereignty, and the invasion of private lives by governmental order.

Chief Justice Marshall once said:

> No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States, and of compounding the American people into one common class.

In his farewell address, George Washington, the first President of the United States, stated the case against Federal intervention into State affairs:

> The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Step by step, Mr. Speaker, organized minorities with selfish interests are striving to break down the lines which separate the States.

No representative government since the birth of civilization has existed successfully for so long a time as has the democratic constitutional Government of the United States, though we are still young in the sisterhood of nations. The system under which we live—the division of powers under our Constitution between the States and Federal Government—has been the chief contributor to the continuation of our democratic form of government, and our Constitution is the pillar on which that system rests.

In 1922, Mr. Speaker, the German Government was built upon a constitution patterned largely after that of the United States. Her people enjoyed a democratic representative form of government, and she had begun to bid for her proper place in world society. But gradually minority groups began to infiltrate into the organisms of her Government, continually working to undermine the local self-government of her people, and to centralize all authority in Berlin. We are, of course, familiar with the manner by which Hitler seized control of the federal police system and set up a totalitarian state there. The sequel to that story has been written in the blood of 40 nations.

Thomas Jefferson, in his first inaugural address, stated the creed of the Democratic Party, to which it has adhered consistently until this very day, in these words:

> The support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-Republican tendencies.

Abraham Lincoln, the great emancipator, and father of the present day Republican Party, held:

> To maintain inviolate the rights of the States to order and control under the Constitution their own affairs by their own judgment exclusively is essential to the preservation of the balance of power on which our institutions rest.

And again:

> No man who has sworn to support the Constitution can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it.

No, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party headed by President Truman is not the party of Thomas Jefferson; nor is the Republican Party of Thomas Dewey the same party that was founded by Abraham Lincoln. Their parties are now in the hands of power-hungry usurpers and pretenders.

It has been argued that Truman is carrying out the policies of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt. But, Mr. Speaker, I challenge anyone to show that Roosevelt or any other American President ever sent to the Congress any such message as the so-called civil-rights proposals of President Truman. Franklin Roosevelt, on the contrary, joined his illustrious predecessors in warning his people against over centralization of government. He said:

> We are safe from the danger of * * * departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever it seems in danger.

How different are the views of the little man who succeeded him.

No, the Democratic Party of Harry Truman is not even the Democratic Party of Franklin Roosevelt.

We of the South who refuse to follow these political backsliders are not party bolters or rebels. We who balk at being continually trampled underfoot by the so-called leadership of the Democratic Party are not bolting the Democratic Party; we have waited too long for that. We were read out of that party at Philadelphia by power-crazed demagogs grappling for the support of selfish minorities. For the first time since the war for southern independence, the South is asserting her full political self-determination.

Be not deceived, the South will not support Harry Truman, Tom Dewey, Henry Wallace, or any other candidate for President who has deserted the principles of orderly, local self-government, guaranteed by the Constitution of our forefathers.

There is but one ticket for those who wish to see the continuation of constitutional States' rights government—and the Birmingham convention gave us that ticket.

The South will vote Democratic. She will vote for the only Democratic ticket offered which has endorsed and advocated the principles of the Democratic Party. Governors Thurmond and Wright are real Democrats who recognize the constitutional rights of local self-government free from bureaucratic interference. They, and they alone among the candidates, advocate a return of State capitols and county courthouses to the States and away from the banks of the Potomac. They, and they alone, advocate the continuance of the kind of democratic government which has made this Nation the world's citadel of freedom and guardian of liberty.

The States' Rights Convention in Birmingham offered a challenge to all lovers of freedom and self-determination. It offered a challenge to all who have the courage to place principle above expediency, and to Democrats and Republicans alike who wish to support the structure of constitutional government. I am confident that the people of the South, as well as those who live in other sections, still have the courage of their forefathers, and will fight to the end for the preservations of the fundamentals in which they believe.

In closing, I would like to recite to you the words of a distinguished American and defender of constitutional liberties, Daniel Webster, who stated:

> Other misfortunes may be borne or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should sweep our commerce from the ocean another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still, under a new cultivation, they will grow grain again, and ripen to future harvests. It will be but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with States' rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Colosseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them, than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for a very fine address. He has distinguished himself in his first term in Congress and is a credit to his constituency and to the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I wish to say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that he has made a timely talk on the need for returning to constitutional government. True, the aisle divides us on many things, but on the question of maintaining constitutional government and the need for doing so if we are to remain a free people, there is no difference between us. I recall how the people of the South, after Appomatox and the Boys in Grey—returned home in tatters—took up the task of building anew and repairing the devastation resulting from one of the greatest wars of all time and that they did not receive a single cent from the Federal Government in order to accomplish that great task. They did it through their own perseverance. I have great admiration for the South. I have said on more than one occasion that I consider the agricultural South and the agricultural Midwest to be the backbone of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman, and want to state to him that I am familiar with the splendid fight which he has made over the years since he has been in Congress for the preservation of constitutional government.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I want to add to others in congratulating the gentleman on one of the best presentations of the subject I have heard in this House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE of South Dakota). The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after disposition of the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the Republican policy in China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

DO SOMETHING TO HALT RISING PRICES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, do something to halt rising prices before the bubble bursts, while there is still time in this special session of the Congress.

The people will surely take it out on those who are supposed to represent them but who spend their time trying to pass the buck instead of fighting shoulder to shoulder to hold the line against inflation.

Far more important than any political consideration is the threat to the economic well-being of the Nation.

Experts have warned us that a crash is inevitable if the hands-off policy is continued.

The breadwinners and the housewives of the Nation knew this long ago. In every kitchen of the working people, after the children have gone to bed, husbands and wives sit up late struggling with the job of bridging the widening gap between the conservative pay envelope and the runaway cost of living.

It just cannot be done without the help of Congress.

Businessmen who should know better, because they went through the whole terrifying experience of boom and bust once before, cry to the heavens at the mere suggestion that the Congress try to help the ailing patient.

"Let the fever run its course," they say, having no constructive suggestions to offer.

They will cry even louder when the purchasing power of the people falls so far behind that business suffers.

A little corrective action now can save the situation and prevent the more drastic measures which will be required if we permit the problem to get completely out of control.

Make no mistake about it, some form of control, voluntary or imposed, is needed. Some people would have us think that our economy is absolutely free, which it is not. There are degrees of control and there is a difference between private and public controls, but some control is essential.

The subtle admission of that primary fact came to light when Secretary of the Treasury Snyder testified before the Senate Banking Committee on July 30 that:

I have always believed that our chief reliance for the control of inflationary bank credit lies in the good judgment of the individual bankers in the 15,000 banks in the United States.

In order that the Secretary's remarks of that day be placed in their proper perspective, may I add that he also said:

I believe that it is urgent in the national welfare that consumer credit control legislation be enacted as soon as possible.

On October 30, 1947, a United Press report from Washington stated:

Representative THOMAS J. LANE, Democrat, of Massachusetts, today urged the administration to exert every influence on the Nation's bankers to get them to make only sound loans after Federal credit controls expire Saturday.

LANE said that the United States is on the road to boom-and-bust which will wreck both the domestic economy and the foreign-aid program unless prompt steps are taken.

We are nearer to that disastrous showdown than we were on October 30, 1947, and what has been done to avert it?

Twice the President has called special sessions to enact such legislation as would be necessary to alleviate the distress of the American people.

And yet, no sooner was this present session called to order than a few Members pressed for an immediate adjournment, in complete defiance of public opinion.

The people are worried and angry. Something must be done to bank the fires of inflation before the mounting pressure causes an explosion which would rock the foundations of our constitutional government.

A war, a boom, a depression, another war. This has been the "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness" enjoyed by a generation of Americans.

Can they take another depression?

Gentlemen, this is a serious moment. Forewarned as to reefs toward which our economy is drifting, this Congress must take the helm. It cannot adjourn. It cannot turn its back on its responsibilities. A job remains to be done.

It would be easy for me, as a Democrat, to spend all of my time in fixing the blame for our present woes on the Republican majority of this House. I know full well that they in turn would engage in the same political maneuver with an eye not to the national welfare but to the spoils of a political victory in November.

This is no time, however, in which to play politics.

The stability of the United States and the peace of the world depend upon our willingness or our refusal to take immediate and decisive action on inflation.

Shadow-boxing with this issue will not solve it and such tactics will not fool the people.

Some blame our aid to Europe or the appropriations for defense.

Most people blame the war for inflation. Others blame big business or labor. This is begging the question. We must find not scapegoats but a remedy.

The President has suggested certain selective controls over prices and allocations. Others prefer a tightening up on bank credit and curbs on installment buying. Total consumer credit in June 1948 reached an all-time peak of over $14,000,000,000. The opposition calls for a free market in which prices would be able to find their own level through the operation of the so-called law of supply and demand. But the American economy is virtually working at capacity, and any further increase must be a slow and gradual process.

Meanwhile, rising prices are taking their human toll in lowered standards of living, in the inability to finance education, in the deterioration of housing, in the sacrifice of necessary dental and medical care; and, in the case of those who must live on pensions, fixed incomes, and social-security payments, actual denial of life-sustaining foods.

The wholesale price index has broken through the record ceiling for inflation which was reached in 1920, after the end of the First World War.

Last year the purchasing power of the dollar was only 68 cents. Today it is down to 60 cents, even a shade less as of this moment.

This bears most heavily on the millions of Americans in the lower income brackets.

The frantic bidding of the people with money for the things which were not available during the war, or for the replacement of durable items which have been used longer than they were meant to be used, is pushing the cost of living sky high and out of the reach of millions.

There are tens of billions of dollars in new money and new savings that can be cashed quickly demanding goods that are not available in sufficient supply. With three times as much spendable money, and only one and a half as much to buy, prices threaten to double. They have not yet but they are on the way.

And that can lead to bust and ruin.

Look at the facts:

The amount of paper money and metal coins in circulation has increased from $7,600,000,000 in 1939 to $28,900,000,000 in 1947. There is $21,300,000,000 more cash on the loose than there was before the war, $3.80 in cash now for every $1 then.

Time deposits or bank accounts on which we can draw amount to $56,300,000,000 contrasted with $27,100,000,000 in 1939. This represents an increased reserve of $29,200,000,000 available when and if ready cash becomes exhausted.

Very few people owned Government bonds in 1939. At the end of 1947 they possessed $31,000,000,000 of E bonds.

In cash, time deposits, and bonds, the American public had only $34,700,000,000 in 1939. By the end of 1947, this total had increased to $116,200,000,000. This is a jump of $81,500,000,000. In terms of dollar purchasing power, the American people have $3.06 for spending for every dollar they had in 1939. Even if this figure is modified in order to compensate for the lowered value of today's dollar, the increase in demand, as represented by money, is considerably greater than it was in 1939.

This money demand, as posed against supply of goods and services, is pushing the cost of living far, far too high. The

white-collar worker, the salaried worker, the older person retired and living on dividends or pension or annuity, is in desperate straits.

These reserves are being used up and installment buying is on the increase. If this continues, the end of the line is in sight. But credit keeps up the pressure on prices just as much as cash did. It must not reach the point of exhaustion, for then the whole Nation will plummet to a crash in an economic tailspin. In the absence of thrift and frugality on the part of those earning $3,000 a year and more, pressure on prices will go on to the breaking point. Far better to impose gradual restrictions on credit now as a means of holding the line until supply nears demand than to leave all to chance.

The average American is not versed in the intricacies of economics.

But from his own practical experience as a worker and as a consumer who is trying to keep a home and family together, he knows that something must be done.

Apart from his own difficulties in making both ends meet, even with the best management on his part, he senses with unerring instinct that economic anarchy threatens his Nation and the peace of the world.

He holds that Congress is responsible for constructive leadership to solve the situation.

He will not be satisfied with inaction or half-hearted, token measures designed to deceive him.

He wants national unity on this serious domestic problem. I believe that he is right in his insistence on bipartisan teamwork to bring down the cost of living at this special session of his Congress.

Only in this spirit can it be done.

The American economy is dangerously close to the edge of the spiraling road where the drop is sharp and deep.

It is essential that we control this wild and irresponsible joy ride before it leads to disaster by applying the brakes of credit control.

Not as the back-seat drivers called Democrats and Republicans, but with the single and united purpose of saving the people of the United States from being carried over the precipice of inflation to depression.

We cannot afford a repetition of 1929 in 1949.

The people are watching and judging the actions of this special session. They will not accept excuses for failure.

Halt inflation or the roof will fall in.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes, to discuss the question of the loyalty of Government employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

INFLATION CONTROL

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Banking and Currency at this moment is in executive session to report out a bill covering some form of inflation control. For the purpose of the RECORD, in view of the fact that the matter may come before the House tomorrow, I should like to present some of the arguments that have been made in our committee up to this point, together with some statistics that will bear out the answers, so that this material will be available for the ready reference of the Members tomorrow.

CONSUMER-CREDIT CONTROL

Republican attack: The President has power to control consumer credit. When Executive Order 8843 was repealed by Congress, power was left to the President to revive regulation W if he would declare a state of national emergency. The President has given an emergency as the reason for reconvening Congress, so why does he not issue a proclamation declaring a state of national emergency and revive regulation W?

Answer: Consumer credit control is only a relatively minor point in the overall inflation-control program. In times of peace the President should not be asked to declare a national emergency for a relatively minor matter like this. The Republicans have always criticized the President for abusing his emergency powers. Do they now propose a reversal of this policy question?

The President has requested authority to reestablish consumer-credit controls on numerous occasions. His request has been endorsed by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, headed by Senator TAFT. Following the President's request of last November, a bill to give the Federal Reserve Board the necessary authority passed the Senate, but is buried in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

BANK-CREDIT CONTROL

Republican attack: The President has the power to increase the rediscount rate of the Federal Reserve banks and to stop the Government's support of the bond market and thereby check inflation.

Answer: The President has no such powers.

The rediscount rate is set by the boards of directors of the 12 Federal Reserve banks with the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The President has no power to determine their decisions.

The decision whether the open-market policy is to be continued or not is made by the open-market committee of the Federal Reserve Board, consisting of all the Board members and the presidents of five Federal Reserve banks. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board is chairman of this committee, and the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York is vice chairman of the committee. The committee's policies are determined in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury.

The members of the Federal Reserve Board are appointed by the President, but the President has no right to recall them during their stated terms of office.

It is an outright misrepresentation of facts to say that the President has the power to increase the rediscount rate or to stop the Federal Reserve Board from supporting the bond market.

The proposal to discontinue Government purchases of Government bonds is dangerous and irresponsible. Approximately $70,000,000,000 in Government securities are held at present by the 15,000 banks in this country. If market support would be discontinued, there is no way of telling how far bonds would drop. An end of the open market policy would not only effect negotiable (larger) bonds, but would spread inevitably to the E, F, and G bonds also, which are redeemable at par, because it would undermine confidence in all Government securities.

An increase in the rediscount rate alone would not stop the present credit inflation. Most industrial corporations are making such exorbitant profits at the present time that a small increase in the discount rate would not stop them from borrowing money on which they can earn a much higher rate of return.

The following is an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, July 30, 1948:

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator to say that he thought the President had power to enforce sound anti-inflationary policies, and one of the powers which he mentioned was the power to abandon Government bonds in the market and let them go down in value. Does the Senator from Ohio recommend that policy?

Mr. TAFT. I would rather have that done than to place price controls on the American people; yes. I do not think it is necessary. * * * As to a choice between that and the reimposition of price controls, I should prefer Government bonds to go below par.

EXPORT CONTROLS

Republican attack: Our large exports are one of the two main reasons for inflation. The President has powers to control exports but does not use them properly.

Answer: To blame the inflation on our exports is ridiculous. In 1947 we exported only 4.1 percent of our total national product and in 1948 we will export only 2.5 percent.

While our exports are substantially larger than they were before the war, our total national product is so much larger that we have, on the average, almost twice as much available for domestic consumption as we had before the war. All critical materials and foodstuffs are now under export control.

The tables on the attached sheets show how little of total production we are exporting in some critical fields. Moreover, a large part of exports is required under the Marshall plan, the keystone of our foreign policy. Do the Republicans propose to abandon the Marshall plan, which was adopted by an overwhelming

majority of both parties in the Eightieth Congress?

United States gross national product, exports including reexports, general imports of merchandise, and the net export-import surplus in relation to gross national product, 1936–38, 1946, 1947, and first quarter 1948 at annual rate

[In billions of dollars]

	Gross national product	Exports	Imports	Net export-import surplus	Ratio of net export-import surplus to gross national product
					Percent
1936–38	85.8	3.0	2.5	0.5	0.58
1946	203.7	10.2	4.9	5.3	2.6
1947	231.8	[1] 15.3	5.7	9.6	4.1
First quarter 1948	244.3	[1] 13.2	7.1	6.1	2.5

[1] Including civilian supplies to our armed forces overseas for distribution in the occupied areas.

Exports of scarce commodities

Commodity	1939		1947		1948 estimate	
	Total supply	Percent exported	Total supply	Percent exported	Total supply	Percent exported
Lumber (billion board feet)	25.7	4.1	37.9	3.0	37.1	1.8
Motor fuel (million barrels)	64.0	6.0	745.0	4.3	791.0	3.2
Heating fuels (million barrels)	162.0	18.9	316.0	8.2	372.0	4.8
Finished steel (million tons)	35.0	7.1	63.0	10.3	65.0	7.6
Soil pipe (1,000 tons)	417.0	3.2	577.0	1.0	570.0	.9
Hardwood flooring (million board feet)	505.0	2.4	687.0	.3	830.0	.2
Meat (billion pounds)	18.3	1.2	24.7	1.1	22.7	.6

OPA HISTORY

Republican attack: The President and the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress are responsible for having removed price controls in 1946.

Answer: The President and the large majority of Democrats in the House and Senate fought a last-ditch battle in the summer of 1946 to retain adequate price control. More than 90 percent of the Republicans under the leadership of TAFT, WHERRY, WOLCOTT, and HALLECK made an all-out effort to destroy price control.

The President vetoed the first OPA extension bill, passed on June 29, because it presented not a choice between continued price stability and inflation, but only a choice between inflation with a statute and inflation without one. The President stated:

The bill continues the Government responsibility to stabilize the economy and at the same time destroys the Government's power to do so.

The President signed the second OPA extension bill on July 25, 1946, with reluctance. The President signed the bill because, as he said:

I am advised that it is the best bill Congress will now pass.

He warned:

If it appears that all the efforts of the Government and people will not be sufficient under the present legislation, I shall have no other alternative but to call the Congress back in special session to strengthen the price-control law.

The act as passed tied the President's hands completely and made it impossible to continue effective price control.

The meat incident: The act decontrolled, among other things, meat and livestock until August 20, but allowed reimposition of controls if the Price Decontrol Board so decided. In the face of soaring meat prices, the Decontrol Board reestablished ceiling prices in August, but the only result was that meat disappeared completely from the markets, and Congress had given OPA not enough money to wipe out the black markets into which meat disappeared. The President's decision to remove all meat controls on October 14, 1946, was forced by the combination of an unworkable law, a conspiracy on the part of the industry, and the lack of funds to enforce controls.

In his radio address on the night of October 14, 1946, President Truman said:

The responsibility (for the meat shortage) rests squarely on a few men in the Congress who, in the service of selfish interests, have been determined for some time to wreck price controls no matter what the cost might be to our people. * * *

The real blame * * * lies at the door of the reckless group of selfish men who, in the hope of gaining political advantage, have encouraged sellers to gamble on the destruction of price control.

This group, today as in the past, is thinking in terms of millions of dollars instead of millions of people. This same group has opposed every effort of this administration to raise the standard of living and increase the opportunity for the common man. This same group hated Franklin D. Roosevelt and fought everything he stood for. This same group did its best to discredit his efforts to achieve a better life for our people.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that on these matters it is not so important to try to assess the blame at this time as it is to come out with effective controls that may be able to do the job. I am just a bit leery as to whether or not the rather flimsy measures that have been proposed in our committee will be sufficient to meet the task.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WHAT ABOUT THE LOYALTY PROGRAM OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, within the past several days the Nation's attention has been directed to allegations that during the war certain Federal employees carried on subversive activities and furnished Russian agents with confidential or restricted material. In view of these and other recent developments in the foreign situation, I think it is well to review the record and determine whether Government officials now employed approved such persons for appointments with the knowledge that there was a reasonable doubt as to their loyalty. The American people are also entitled to know whether the present loyalty policy of the executive branch is designed to adequately protect our national security.

I am particularly interested in these Federal employees loyalty matters because of my responsibility as chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. While it is not within my province to determine whether Federal employees are guilty of espionage or sabotage, I am most concerned regarding the policy which permits employees to remain on the pay roll or be employed when there is reasonable doubt as to their loyalty. I believe it is in the public interest to illustrate the policy of the Federal Government with respect to employee loyalty matters by documented evidence which is in the possession of the Government and which was ignored at the time these Federal employees were appointed. The reason I am addressing the House at this time and giving these facts is to allow the people of the United States to judge whether the present Federal employees loyalty policy meets with their approval.

In testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, Elizabeth T. Bentley mentioned Nathan Gregory Silvermaster as leader of the largest group of alleged disloyal Government employees. I am not in a position to know whether these charges regarding espionage can be supported but I can say that several of the former Government employees she named were good prospects for such activities, and this was known to Government officials at the time these employees were on the Federal pay roll.

Silvermaster was a former employee of the Maritime Labor Board, Department of Agriculture, Board of Economic Warfare, Treasury Department, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and War Assets Administration. On April 3, 1942, he applied for a position with the Board of Economic Warfare, subject to the approval of the Civil Service Commission, which is the agency charged with the responsibility of determining the loyalty of applicants for Federal positions. Exhaustive investigations were conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Civil Service Commission. Evidence submitted in the Commission's investigation covered several hundred pages, and it is too lengthy to review here in detail. However, on May 22, 1942, an official of the Civil Service Commission, after reviewing the reports of investigation, made the following recommendations:

It is my conclusion that Silvermaster is definitely either an active member of the Communist Party or so directly alined with their leaders and interests in the San Francisco Bay area, if not on a national scale, as to color and affect his service for the Federal Government. It is felt that by reason of these attachments, his continued employment in his present capacity or at all by the Federal Government can only serve to advance the cause of the Communist Party in its ultimate design to disrupt America's political and economic texture.

The investigation of Silvermaster covered a period from 1916, when he entered the United States from Russia, up to the year 1942. Scores of competent witnesses were interviewed at a half dozen places in the United States. Almost without exception those who themselves were not Communists or identified with Communist front organizations stated that he was an enthusiastic supporter of the Soviet Communist order to replace the American form of government. A good share of these witnesses identified him variously as a radical, a Communist, an active member of the Communist Party, or as active in a San Francisco unit of the Communist Party under the party name of "Serge Komov." His close friends and acquaintences, including his lawyers and doctors, according to the investigation, were either known Communists or known to be active in organizations labeled by the Attorney General as subversive. He made several material incorrect statements on his application designed to conceal his activities. This is only a part of the evidence reported in the investigation, but that which reflected on Silvermaster's questionable loyalty is documented and the testimony well corroborated. On July 1, 1940 he transferred to the Department of Agriculture from the Maritime Labor Board. The confidential files of the Agriculture Department during his employment there contained correspondence between officials of the Resettlement Administration and officials of the San Francisco section of the American Legion.

The American Legion reported that Silvermaster had close associations with Sam Darcy, west coast Communist functionary. Further, that he was a member of the Fillmore section of the Communist Party. Also that he was active in protesting the discharge of California State employees who had been dismissed because of radical activities. The Legion reported that many of his associates are of doubtful loyalty and that one of the American Legion officials had reviewed Mr. Silvermaster's doctoral thesis and found it to be extremely pro-Soviet.

The Commission's investigation shows that at the time Silvermaster's present wife received a divorce from her former husband, a question arose as to the custody of their child. Mrs. Silvermaster's former husband apparently believed she would marry Silvermaster, and because he apparently doubted Silvermaster's loyalty the following stipulation was incorporated in the interlocutory decree, which was entered on July 10, 1929:

> Both parties agree that neither shall remove the child from the United States without the consent of the other party given in writing, and the parties agree that the child shall be educated in the accepted American principles in the spirit of American freedom and democracy, and that he shall not be exposed to communistic or antireligious teachings.

This is a rather strange stipulation in a divorce decree, unless there was a reasonable doubt as to whether Silvermaster was a loyal American.

While the Commission's investigation was in progress, Military Intelligence investigated Silvermaster who was then on detail from the Department of Agriculture to the Board of Economic Warfare. G–2 was interested in Silvermaster because of his access to confidential information which the Board of Economic Warfare received from the Military Establishment. After its investigation, G–2 recommended the Board of Economic Warfare to remove Silvermaster from their offices. Officials in the BEW handed G–2's investigation to Silvermaster to answer, and then advised G–2 that the charges against Silvermaster were unfounded. Meanwhile, Silvermaster was called before the Civil Service Commission to explain his activities which had been uncovered during the investigation. Much of the evidence he admitted.

At this point the investigation was dropped. Silvermaster remained at the Agriculture Department. Later, however, in December of 1944 top officials presently employed in the Civil Service Commission, over the objections of subordinate officials, approved Silvermaster's transfer to the Treasury Department because, in the words of the Commission:

> There was no reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the United States.

From here on Silvermaster transferred from one agency to another with relative ease, and his salary rapidly increased from $6,500 per annum to $10,000 a year at the War Assets Administration, from which he finally resigned voluntarily in November 1946. In all, Silvermaster worked for the Federal Government approximately 11 years, for which the people of the United States paid him more than $50,000. At retirement age he will be eligible to receive from the Government an annuity of approximately $500 a year.

This Silvermaster case is typical of many of those employees mentioned before congressional committees recently. For all the good these investigations did, they might as well have not been conducted. I do not care how much evidence of disloyalty is obtained by our Government investigators, if the policy-making officials and appointing officers do not have the courage to remove or refuse to employ persons about whom there is a reasonable doubt as to their loyalty, such investigations are a farce and the hundreds of millions of dollars spent for them by the American people have been wasted.

Testimony before the Un-American Activities Committee also included Donald Niven Wheeler, an employee of the Office of Strategic Services, who was a member of the alleged spy ring headed by Victor Perlo. Over the adverse recommendations of officials of the Civil Service Commission which were based upon evidence that Mr. Wheeler had followed the Communist Party line to such an extent as to affect adversely his suitability for Government employment, the Civil Service Commission, in October 1942, found Wheeler eligible for Federal employment. During the course of the investigation, it was established that he was a member of several Communist front organizations, one of which was identified by the Attorney General as subversive, and that he was admittedly sympathetic to such organizations, and further, that he had followed the Communist Party line during its various shifts prior and subsequent to the Hitler-Stalin pact.

Various competent witnesses identified Wheeler as extremely radical and not fit for any responsible or confidential position in the Federal service. It is interesting to observe that one of the witnesses contacted during the investigation of Wheeler was William Ludwig Ullman, in the Treasury Department, who was also alleged to have been a member of a spy ring. Mr. Ullman stated the following concerning Mr. Wheeler:

> I think he is a loyal American citizen. I do know, however, that his name appeared on the Dies list which was publicized some time after he left here, but I never knew of any reasons to doubt his loyalty. I never heard him offer any views on world politics or discuss such matters at all.

On the basis of this kind of evidence, Mr. Alfred Klein, chief law officer of the Civil Service Commission, recommended Wheeler's eligibility and stated:

> His activities and associations which are listed on the unfavorable side are characteristic of many liberals and does not necessarily mean that he is a Communist or Communist sympathizer.

Mr. Farrar Smith, another official of the Civil Service Commission, agreed with Mr. Klein's recommendation. The Civil Service Commission reviewed the case and unanimously agreed that Mr. Wheeler was eligible for Federal employment.

I have talked with many persons who appear to be surprised to learn that William W. Remington, an employee of the Commerce Department, could be considered for, or actually transferred to, other strategic positions in the Federal Government while under investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for subversive activities.

This has been the policy ever since the Federal Employees' Loyalty Program began in 1939, and exists at the present time. I have called attention to this situation on numerous occasions. In fact, it was one of the principal reasons that prompted me to introduce the Federal employees' loyalty bill, which passed the House by a big majority on July 15, 1947. Under that legislation, it would be impossible for a person to be appointed to a Federal position while under investigation for subversive activities. The Commission and the executive branch at the hearings on this measure objected to that provision in the bill and stated that it had always been the practice to employ persons or transfer employees subject to investigation, even when there was derogatory information concerning the loyalty of such persons.

Testimony before the Civil Service subcommittee in July 1946 showed that employees remained for years in strategic, confidential, and responsible Government positions although their loyalty was seriously questioned.

Time and time again these matters have been brought to the attention of the executive branch. Beginning in

1944, I repeatedly urged the then chairman of the House Civil Service Committee to investigate derelictions of duty by officials in the executive branch in employing persons of doubtful loyalty. Finally, in the summer of 1946, a three-man subcommittee was appointed to study the Federal employees' loyalty program. I was designated as a minority member of this subcommittee. Hearings were rushed and secret, evidence was glossed over, testimony of some competent witnesses ignored, and a rather superficial report was made, to which I took strong exception.

These hearings were made available to the Department of Justice. Competent witnesses mentioned critically Government top-level handling and clearing of many Federal employees, some of whom were then on the Federal pay roll. At the time of the hearing in July 1946, at which a representative of the Department of Justice was present, witnesses testified that Nathan Gregory Silvermaster was still employed by the Federal Government, and that he had been appointed over the objections of officials of the Civil Service Commission, whose conclusions had been based upon the evidence I have mentioned above. One witness stated that Mr. Silvermaster insisted upon an investigation of his suitability prior to his transfer from the Department of Agriculture. It was pointed out that if the Civil Service Commission cleared him, he could transfer without losing his position with the Department of Agriculture. However, even if a strong loyalty case were made against him and he stayed with the Department of Agriculture, the Commission would have no authority to remove him. Since Silvermaster appeared to be satisfactory to the officials of the Department of Agriculture he could probably remain there as long as he desired. It happened, however, that his precautions were unnecessary. The Civil Service Commission cleared Silvermaster and he was at liberty to transfer to any department or agency of the Government.

On the basis of these hearings the President appointed a committee to study the problems of Federal employees' loyalty. Did he name outstanding and recognized authorities on subversive activities such as J. Edgar Hoover or one of his assistants? Did he name a Member of Congress on the committee? He did not. He began by naming as Chairman a special assistant to the Attorney General who had little qualifications. He named as other members of his committee various Federal officials who were responsible for the then existing Federal employees' loyalty policies. After months of delay the committee filed its report which stated in effect that everything was fine. The American people could rest easy. There were no employees of doubtful loyalty on the Federal pay roll. The Canadian Government spy case could never happen in the United States.

In March 1947 the President issued his Federal Employees' Loyalty Executive Order. The only new feature was the creation of a host of loyalty boards within the agencies. Also, a Loyalty Review Board was created. Was it a strong independent Board? Was its existence based on legislation outlining congressional policy? No; it was to be under the Civil Service Commission and its officials, whose do-little-or-nothing policy on Federal employment loyalty matters prompted the first congressional investigation back in 1946. We were right back where we had started.

The question has been asked me many times how persons like Silvermaster and his kind get on the Federal pay roll. Let me give you several examples of what happened during the war and what is happening today.

In 1941 the head of a war agency publicly stated that he would abide by the decisions of the Civil Service Commission with respect to loyalty matters concerning employees in his agency. Mrs. Rose Eden applied for a position in this war agency. I shall not go into detail as to the information obtained during the investigation. However, in his opinion on the case, Mr. Alfred Klein, chief law officer of the Civil Service Commission, made the following statement:

> A reading of the record leaves the reader with the strong conviction that Mrs. Eden has been an almost religious follower of the Communist Party line and may even be a member of the Communist Party.

These are strong words from Mr. Klein. The Commission held that Mrs. Eden was unsuitable on loyalty grounds for Federal service and suggested to the head of this war agency that this employee be removed. The director of personnel of this war agency wrote to the Civil Service Commission and stated the following:

> This is in reference to your letter of August * * * in connection with the case of Mrs. Rose Eden. We have also a previous letter from you addressed to our agency in which you suggest that Mrs. Eden's employment be terminated. After careful consideration and examination of the facts concerning this case, we have decided to retain Mrs. Eden in our employ.

Thus, the loyalty investigations become window dressing to lull the American people into a false sense of security.

Another example. During the war, an employee, Alice Dannenberg, was appointed to a position in a Federal agency, subject to investigation. Without reviewing in detail the evidence which was in the possession of the Government, Mr. Alfred Klein, chief law officer of the Civil Service Commission, stated:

> Miss Dannenberg has, by her own admissions, placed herself in radical and communistic company. In the light of all the information in the record relative to Miss Dannenberg's activities and associations, most of which was obtained directly from Miss Dannenberg herself, it is apparent that, if not actually communistic, she has marked Communist sympathies and many Communist associations which raise considerable doubt concerning her entire suitability for Government employment. I, therefore join with the Investigations Division in recommending her ineligibility and removal.

Two other top staff officials, including the chief examiner, agreed with Mr. Klein, and the Civil Service Commission unanimously ordered her removal. The Commission then requested the employing agency to terminate Miss Dannenberg's employment. Did the agency take appropriate action? It did not.

Two months later under pressure from top officials in the agency concerned, the Civil Service Commission reviewed the case, and the same Civil Service Commissioners who had approved Miss Dannenberg's removal now reversed themselves and approved her appointment. No additional evidence had been obtained.

A new statement prepared for the Commissioners contained the following:

> The report of the personal investigation is overwhelmingly in favor of this employee.

Of course, this change of policy may have been affected by the fact that according to a note attached to the memorandum the head of the agency had requested that this case be reviewed.

In its second letter to the agency, the Commission stated:

> On reconsideration, it is the conclusion of the Commission that the questions involved in the case may be resolved in favor of Miss Dannenberg, and no objection will be made to her continued employment.

Of course, I had always thought the American people desired that in loyalty matters involving Government employees, questions of doubt be resolved in favor of our Government. This I consider quite important. On the basis of this incident, the entire policy of the Civil Service Commission was changed and all subordinate officials of the Commission were advised by a confidential memorandum that in the future the head of this agency was to be furnished "a report of information on every investigated case prior to final decision of the case." This, in my judgment, reflects seriously upon the integrity of the Civil Service Commission in its relationship with Federal agencies on employee matters, and becomes a device to nullify loyalty investigations. I wonder how many other such agreements are in existence at the present time?

Another example. During the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Civil Service Committee in 1946, testimony corroborated by competent witnesses who were personally familiar with the situation cast further doubt upon the integrity of some Government officials. It appears that upon several occasions an agency's investigators not connected with the Civil Service Commission reviewed the confidential files of the Commission and then confronted witnesses with their testimony in an effort to get these witnesses to change their statements.

Some time ago a personnel director in one of the Federal agencies conferred with Mr. Alfred Klein, chief law officer of the Civil Service Commission, in an effort to determine what the Commission's policy was with respect to the loyalty of Federal employees. According to an interoffice memorandum in the files of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Klein stated:

> In the course of our conversation, the personnel director took occasion to remark that the Commission is not consistent in its actions. As illustration he pointed to cases

in which there is a voluminous pro-Communist or fellow-traveling history and we nevertheless find the individual eligible, perhaps because the individual is in an important position. At the same time, he says, the Commission will order the dismissal of an individual who happens to have signed a Communist petition in 1939 at the request of someone, the record of the individual being otherwise clear in all respects.

I agree with this personnel director, but it is an understatement of the facts to say that the Commission's loyalty policy is inconsistent. To say the least, it is confusing, haphazard, and almost completely irresponsible.

Several months ago I called attention to Mr. Jesse Epstein, a regional director of the Federal Public Housing Authority on the west coast. Mr. Epstein assumed his position in June 1945, and is still employed by the Federal Public Housing Authority. The FBI conducted an investigation of him in 1942, which revealed that at least eight reliable witnesses stated while in college and subsequently he was a member of the Communist Party or was actively associated with Communist-front organizations and publications. A subversive check at a metropolitan police department shows him on a list of known Communists. Subsequent to 1942, he has been investigated several times by Government agencies. These reports were and are available to the Civil Service Commission and to the FPHA. More recently the joint legislative fact-finding committee on un-American activities of the Washington State Legislature held hearings in January and February 1948 with respect to subversive activities in the State of Washington. Two former self-avowed Communist Party members identified Jesse Epstein as a member of the Communist Party with whom they had close association.

These witnesses stated that they had been to Communist Party meetings with him, and that he was introduced at such meetings as Comrade Epstein. One witness in particular stated:

> Jesse Epstein was down there on what was explained to me as a functionary of the Communist Party trying to guide us.

According to the latest information the Loyalty Board of the Federal Public Housing Authority has cleared Jesse Epstein, and the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission has rendered an advisory opinion that there was no reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the United States. At any rate, despite all of the derogatory information which raises a reasonable doubt of Epstein's loyalty to the United States, he has remained on the Federal pay roll since 1945, at an average salary of about $9,000 a year.

Recently I have found other cases involving employees of doubtful loyalty, which further illustrates what the executive branch is withholding from the American people. For example, some time ago the Civil Service Commission, which is generally responsible for determining the loyalty of Federal employees, received information raising a question regarding the loyalty of an employee. Several Government officials recommended that this employee be removed from her position. The report on the case reached Washington and the Investigations Division of the Commission also recommended the employee's removal. Later, the Commission reversed these findings, rated the employee eligible and closed the case.

A few months later the loyalty of another employee who works in the San Francisco office of the Civil Service Commission was questioned. This employee, Mrs. Evelyn Crawford, was investigated and a report forwarded to Washington by the regional director. He stated that it would not be advisable to take a more drastic action in the case of Mrs. Crawford than was taken in the previous case, because the evidence was no more damaging, and the Commission would have extreme difficulty in vindicating itself if Mrs. Crawford were removed and the other employee retained. After reviewing the evidence, the Investigations Division recommended that Mrs. Crawford be removed on the basis of the following information.

In September 1929, this employee married Matthew H. Crawford, reputed to be an active Communist in California. Among the organizations of which he was a member were the executive committee of the National Scottsboro Action Committee and the advisory counsel of the San Franciso Communist Workers School.

At one time it was reported he was the treasurer of the Communist Party in San Francisco. His associates in these and other Communist-front organizations included such well-known Communists as Joseph Brodsky and William Z. Foster, the latter presently under indictment by a Federal grand jury in New York for activities against the United States. Further, the information in the possession of the Commission contained a police department record showing that Mrs. Crawford attended Communist Party meetings with her husband in San Francisco. The records of the highly reliable Office of Naval Intelligence indicated that Mrs. Crawford was an active Communist member who keeps under cover.

The investigation further showed that Communist meetings were held in the Crawford home and neighbors stated they believed the Crawfords to be Communists and that Communist literature urging the election of Browder for President was circulated from their home.

Carrying a recommendation for removal from both the Investigations Division and the Director of Personnel, the case of Mrs. Crawford then went to the Commission's top staff men. Mr. Klein stated:

> So far as Mrs. Crawford is concerned, I do not think the record justly supports the conclusion that she is a Communist or Communist sympathizer. The real question then is whether the association with her husband is in itself sufficient to raise a reasonable doubt as to her loyalty. * * * In the present case we have no showing that Mrs. Crawford is anti-Communist or that her views on political questions differ from those of her husband's.

On the basis of this reasoning, this Commission official concluded that the record merited an eligible rating. The case then went to Mr. Smith, assistant to the Chief Examiner, who agreed that Mrs. Crawford should be declared eligible, but he devoted most of his comments to criticisms of the regional director in San Francisco. He stated:

> Your attention is called to the district manager's recommendation. I am amazed by its contents, because this is the first time I have seen a recommendation from a responsible subordinate official of the Commission which included a statement that reflects seriously upon the very integrity of the Commissioners themselves.

Apparently what amazed this top staff official was the fact that the regional director had stated:

> I cannot guarantee Mrs. Crawford's dependability from the standpoint of loyalty any more than I can guarantee the dependability of the other employee in this respect. Therefore, so long as the other employee is retained in our service without regard to the information obtained through the investigation of her record, I would recommend that Mrs. Crawford be retained in our service without regard to the information obtained through the investigation of her case.

The Commissioners then agreed that an explanation was required from the regional director for his letter to the Commission, so at Government expense the regional director was brought to Washington to show cause why he had expressed an honest opinion to the Commission.

Meanwhile, the Crawford case was referred to the head of the Legal Division of the Commission, who recommended that she be removed. In view of this difference of opinion, it was agreed that the case would be returned to the regional director who was to interview her. However, Mrs. Crawford's memory had not improved. She did not know whether her husband was a Communist or not. She had never seen any evidence that would indicate that he was a member of the Communist Party. She stated that Louise Thompson, a well-known Communist, was an old friend of 20 years' standing, and that she had visited Louise Thompson in her home in Chicago, but she did not know whether Mrs. Thompson was a Communist. Mrs. Crawford stated that Langston Hughes had been a recent visitor in her home. The record shows that William Patterson had been a visitor in the Crawford home. All these associates are well-known Communists.

The case of Mrs. Crawford eventually arrived in the Investigations Division and again her removal was recommended. Finally, despite the information raising considerable doubt concerning her loyalty, and the adverse recommendations of subordinate officials, the Commission reached the absurd conclusion that she was suitable for Government employment.

One Commissioner stated:

> There is little if any real evidence that Crawford is a Communist.

The 1948 report of the Joint Fact Finding Committee of the California Legislature on Communist Front Organizations states that a reception was held in honor of a reputed Communist leader, and among those sponsoring the reception which was for the benefit of the Communist California Labor School were Mr. and Mrs. Matthew Crawford.

Mrs. Crawford has been employed by the Civil Service Commission at San Francisco for the past 8 years, and at present is Assistant Chief, Placement Services Section. She occupies an important position in which she exercises control over the selection and placement of Federal employees. She has access to confidential information relating to employment and investigation of Federal employees.

Now the question is: What was the policy of the Civil Service Commission in approving for Government employment persons whose loyalty to the United States is questionable? In my judgment, the reasoning of the Civil Service Commission and its final action in this case is typical of its policy during the past 7 years. We find the Commission ignoring evidence and disregarding information contained in reports of investigation which raises a reasonable doubt with respect to the loyalty of certain Federal employees.

In these and other cases we find Commission officials stating that there is little if any evidence to justify the removal of employees whose investigations contain little if any favorable information. It has always been my opinion that where there is a reasonable doubt regarding the loyalty of a Federal employee, the question should be resolved in favor of the Government.

But over this period of time what has the Civil Service Commission told Congress with respect to its policies? One of the Civil Service Commissioners testified before a House appropriations subcommittee as follows:

> In connection with all our investigations we are keeping this policy in mind; if we find anybody who has had any associations with Communists or the German Bund, or any foreign organization of that kind, that person is disqualified immediately. All doubts are being resolved in favor of the Government.

Upon other occasions when this Commissioner has been questioned about this policy of the Civil Service Commission, he has replied:

> It is absolutely sound today, and is the same fundamental policy we are following. * * * We do not conceive it to be our function to ask the people of this country to take a chance on an individual employee because it has not been established that he really belongs in jail instead of in a Government job.

The cases which I have submitted are examples of how this alleged policy is put into operation. Apparently the real policy of the Commission and the executive branch is to tell Congress one thing and do another.

This is the record. These are the facts which have been withheld from the American people and more recently been denied the Congress through a Presidential directive ordering the departments and agencies to refuse congressional requests regarding reports, records, and files relating to the loyalty of Federal employees and prospective employees. With or without charges of espionage and spy rings the performance to date is one of which the American people cannot be proud.

With the foreign situation in a highly inflammable state, we can ill afford the luxury of employees of doubtful loyalty on the Federal pay roll, and we can less afford a policy in the executive branch which I have demonstrated has existed for the past several years.

On the other hand, we must not become hysterical and discharge everyone who has had a liberal thought or who has talked with a Communist or who has been seen with a Communist, but certainly we must not turn our faces away from the facts. Government employment is a trust and privilege. We must give more than lip service to the principle that American people are entitled above all to have in Government service only those loyal to the United States with doubts resolved in favor of the Government.

In my opinion, the record requires an explanation. In the near future I shall request the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to conduct hearings with respect to present policies, procedures and activities of the various department and agency loyalty boards. Those top Government officials who have ignored the facts contained in reports of investigation raising serious doubts regarding the loyalty of Federal employees should explain their actions.

The real answer to these Federal employee-loyalty problems is both an effective removal procedure in the case of employees of doubtful loyalty and adequate means of preventing the initial employment of such persons.

Let me not be misunderstood. I realize this is a serious matter. I am in favor of seeing to it that every person suspected with subversive activities or views, is given adequate consideration. No one would deny them of every right to which they are entitled. On the other hand the hundreds of thousands of loyal employees in the Federal Government, as well as the American people to whom all Government employees are responsible for their services, are entitled to protection against any and all persons of doubtful loyalties and subversive views.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorials from the Christian Science Monitor, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and the Washington Daily News.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Messrs. MACKINNON and LUCAS (at the request of Mr. GWINN of New York), on account of official business for the Committee on Education and Labor, at the request of Hon. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR., chairman.

VETERANS' FLIGHT TRAINING

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been enormous interest among the Members of Congress in the subject of flight training, and the regulations, issued by the Veterans' Administration, which they believe are too strict and not in accordance with the law.

Because of this interest I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and give a short résumé of what has been done by our Committee on Veterans' Affairs in this regard. I think the Members will get a good deal of solace from the promises of General Gray. We will have to take further action if the change of policy does not help the veterans receive this flight training to which they are entitled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I wish to inform the Members of Congress—and a great number of them have asked me about it—that our committee has held two closed hearings in the past 2 days, at which time the subject of aviation flight training under the so-called GI bill of rights was gone into most thoroughly.

As witnesses we had before us Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. H. V. Stirling, Assistant Administrator for Vocational Rehabilitation and Education, and other officials from the Veterans' Administration under whose direction the flight-training program is handled.

The specific matter under consideration was the interpretation of Veterans' Administration Instruction No. 1, dated June 30, 1948, which dealt with the application of the provision of Public Law No. 862, Eightieth Congress, prohibiting expenditure of Government funds for courses avocational or recreational in character.

This Public Law No. 862, Eightieth Congress, contained the following proviso and limitation:

> *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation for education and training under title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, as amended, shall be expended for tuition, fees, or other charges, or for subsistence allowance, for any course elected or commenced by a veteran on or subsequent to July 1, 1948, and which is determined by the Administrator to be avocational or recreational in character. For the purpose of this proviso, education or training for the purpose of teaching a veteran to fly or related aviation courses in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation, shall not be considered avocational or recreational.

The instruction sheet when received in the various regional offices of the Veterans' Administration became the subject of varying degrees of interpretation, with a resultant lack of approval of many applications for flight training.

General Gray testified that he had just returned from an extensive trip across the country and that he was unaware, until he reached Washington, of any divergence among his regional managers in their interpretation of the instruction, and he did not know heretofore that there had been instances where additional instructions over that particular directive had been issued by certain branch offices. In this regard, General Gray stated:

If there are instructions contrary to these instructions—and I learned possibly that there had been this morning—I will rescind them at once.

Continuing, General Gray said:

Let me say again, as I have said before, and I would like to reiterate it for emphasis, that it is most unfortunate that in this trip of mine across the continent twice since this instruction was issued no one has brought it to my personal attention in the field, and, therefore, I was not cognizant of the fact that there was this difficulty until I was advised a couple of days ago of your desire that I be up here at 10 o'clock today, and when I asked what it was all about I was told yesterday that it was along these lines, and in order that I might become acquainted with what you had questions on I asked Mr. Stirling to meet me here this morning. I have found that these conditions did exist. They were not brought to my attention in the field, and I am going to do my level best to correct them.

During the discussion before the Committee a great deal of consideration was given to a phrase in the instruction sheet which provided that an elementary flight or private pilot course elected by a veteran in an approved school shall not be considered avocational or recreational in character if the veteran submits to the regional office complete justification that such course is in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation. It was maintained by members of the Committee that the term "complete justification" was entirely too all-embracing and that its application by the regional managers had resulted in a virtual stoppage of new entrants in flight training courses.

Assistant Administrator Sterling disclosed that the key officials from the various regional offices of the Veterans' Administration were being brought to Washington for a meeting on Sunday, August 8, at which time General Gray and his officials will present the viewpoint of the Administration regarding flight training.

BLAIR HOUSE AND BLAIR-LEE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, Blair House and Blair-Lee House comprise one of our Government's whitest white elephants as they stand today. These two beautiful buildings are now used by our State Department to accommodate guests visiting our shores from foreign countries. They serve this useful purpose only about one-fourth of the year, and the greater part of the year they simply stand idle.

Meanwhile, one of the most important of our public offices has no place available for living quarters. Our Vice President must scramble for living accommodations where he can find them. He has no regular residence provided for him by our Government. I am certain that most of our people are completely unaware of this fact.

If there were an official residence for our Vice Presidents, this would make for far greater dignity and importance for the Vice Presidency than we have achieved at any time in our history.

One of the candidates for the Presidency has already stated publicly that he will give his Vice Presidential running mate a larger share in the handling of Government problems than any previous Vice President has ever received. If this candidate is elected, and there is some reason to believe that he will be, the location of the second in command directly across the street from the White House will be a splendid step. It will make possible an effective two-man team doing the hard work of the Presidency and Vice Presidency without undue effort.

If it were possible to utilize either the Blair House or the Blair-Lee House by establishing an official residence there directly across the street from the White House, the Vice President would be in a position where he could really participate in the planning and counseling which might be most valuable to the Nation. In fact, such a residence in close proximity to the White House might well contribute to the establishment of closer relations between the two responsible heads of our executive department and make possible a continuity of policy in the event of a Presidential disability.

I believe this is entirely feasible and have asked the State Department to furnish me with the number of persons housed and the number of man-days during which housing was provided in connection with that number of persons at each of the two houses during 1947 and 1948. They are as follows:

Fiscal year 1947

Category	Number of official visits	Number of persons involved	Man-days of housing provided
1. Heads of state and ranking foreign officials:			
Blair House	11	75	310
Blair-Lee House	6	31	103
2. Foreign guests invited to the United States under the program for the international exchange of persons: Blair-Lee House		57	126
Total number of persons involved and man-days of housing provided during the fiscal year 1947		163	539

Fiscal year 1948

Category	Number of official visits	Number of persons involved	Man-days of housing provided
1. Heads of state and ranking foreign officials:			
Blair House	3	19	67
Blair-Lee House	8	46	205
2. Foreign guests invited to the United States under the program for the international exchange of persons: Blair-Lee House		38	133
Total number of persons involved and man-days of housing provided during the fiscal year 1948		103	405

The State Department has stated that these two houses are utilized for miscellaneous official functions such as luncheons, dinners, and receptions. The following table shows the number of these during the years 1947 and 1948:

	Fiscal year 1947	Fiscal year 1948
Functions for foreign officials other than those given specifically in connection with the program for the international exchange of persons	65	76
Functions specifically in connection with the program for the international exchange of persons	22	23
Total	87	99

The general upkeep of the property is already an item on our taxpayer's list as are the salaries of the help who take care of the houses as is seen from the following:

MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL AND THEIR SALARIES

The following is a list of the regular personnel employed for maintaining the houses and the annual salaries of each for each of the fiscal years 1947 and 1948:

Title of employee	Annual salaries	
	Fiscal year 1947	Fiscal year 1948
Housekeeper-hostess (Blair and Blair-Lee Houses)	$4,400.40	$4,560.68
Cook (Blair and Blair-Lee Houses)	2,400.00	2,190.00
Assistant housekeeper (Blair-Lee House)	1,954.00	2,030.54
Janitor-houseman	1,954.00	2,030.54
Parlor maid	1,455.00	1,633.00

In addition to the regular employees listed above, butlers, chambermaids, kitchenmaids and waiters are hired by the day as required.

From the above, it is reasonable to assume that one house can serve the purpose for which both are being used now. In addition to utilizing our resources to the best advantage, this is an opportunity for our Government to take a step forward in the development of our governmental techniques. If the Vice President is to be a regular member of the team instead of a utility outfielder, he ought to be sitting right there on the bench instead of up in the grandstand. And we certainly should consider him to

have housing priority over our visiting dignitaries.

Let us put one of these houses to good use by taking it from the Department of State and getting it ready for regular "War-r-en-Tear."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 5, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1713. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting copies of a resolution adopted by the Guam Congress on May 1, 1948, concerning land acquisition for military purposes in the Tumon Bay area, and a letter of transmittal signed by the Honorable Simon A. Sanchez, secretary, House of Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1714. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of recoveries collected by the United States for damage caused to naval vessels that were settled under the act of December 5, 1945 (Public Law 246, 79th Cong., 1st sess.) during the fiscal year 1947–48; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1715. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of claims for damage caused by naval vessels which were settled under Public Law 417 during the fiscal year 1947–48; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1716. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1717. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control covering the period January 1 to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 707. Resolution making in order motions to suspend the rules, motions for a recess, and the consideration of reports from the Committee on Rules; without amendment (Rept. No. 2451). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 2452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2453. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2454. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. Senate Joint Resolution 157. Joint resolution to provide for the regulation of consumer credit for a temporary period; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7098. A bill to amend section 2 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 7099. A bill relating to actions in the District of Columbia for breach of promise to marry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. R. 7100. A bill to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7101. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 the qualifying age for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7102. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act by liberalizing benefits, by increasing amounts beneficiaries may earn without loss of benefits, and by lowering the age of eligibility of women beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGARVEY:

H. R. 7103. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 7104. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOTTER:

H. R. 7105. A bill to exempt admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 7106. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 7107. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of Stonington, Conn.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 7108. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 7109. A bill to reimpose the excess-profits tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 7110. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgages of certain veterans housing corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7111. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence; to provide for the notification thereof to foreign governments; to provide for the assumption by the government of Puerto Rico of obligations under the treaty with Spain on December 10, 1898; to define trade and other relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the calling of a convention to frame a constitution for the government of the island of Puerto Rico; to provide for certain mandatory provisions of the proposed constitution; to provide for the submission of the constitution to the people of Puerto Rico and its submission to the President of the United States for his approval; to provide for the adjustment of property rights between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the maintenance of military, coaling, and naval stations by the United States on the island of Puerto Rico until the termination of the war between the United States and Germany and Japan; to continue in force certain statutes until independence has been acknowledged; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 7112. A bill to provide emergency relief for livestock farmers in drought-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 7113. A bill to promote the development in the area of the Central Valley Federal reclamation project, California, of reasonably sized, owner-operated farms; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7114. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. J. Res. 442. Joint resolution on recognition of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 7115. A bill for the relief of August Henrikson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7116. A bill for the relief of Egon Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7117. A bill for the relief of Peter I. Tirbak, Ekaterina Tirbak, and Igor Tirbak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 7118. A bill for the relief of Jack Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2140. The SPEAKER presented a petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 16, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1948

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all goodness, we are again coming unto Thee in prayer, encouraged by every gracious invitation in Thy holy word and compelled by many needs which Thou alone canst supply.

Wilt Thou bless in some special way the chosen representatives of our Republic who have been entrusted with the affairs of Government. May they daily come to the sacrament of public service richly endowed with clear judgment and wise decision.

Help us to believe that it is our high calling as a nation to bring the blessings of democracy and freedom to all mankind. Hasten the day when the chasms which divide the numbers of the human family shall be bridged by friendship and good will.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 4, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader will be kind enough to give the Senate some idea of what is contemplated in the way of business today.

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as the Senate adjourned last night, we are proceeding in the morning hour. There will not, of course, be a call of the calendar. There are several matters which I think should be taken up. I have been informed almost hourly that there would be ready a bill from the Banking and Currency Committee, and I had hoped it would be here by this time and that it could come up immediately for consideration and discussion. I think that will happen before long. So it was my idea that the Senate should proceed with the business of the morning hour, such as the introduction of bills, insertions in the RECORD, and short statements which Senators might like to make. There are one or two Senators who would like to make speeches, but I hope that we may be shortly able to take up the bill, which I am satisfied will be reported, provided unanimous consent can be obtained for its consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to have the acting majority leader, if he will, enter into a unanimous-consent agreement as to the order of business at the conclusion of the morning hour. I have no desire whatever to delay the business of the Senate; indeed, I am anxious in every way to expedite it, and I think we could expedite it greatly if there were a unanimous-consent agreement as to the status of business under the application of the Senate rules upon the conclusion of the morning hour.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to proposing a unanimous-consent agreement if it will expedite the business of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the morning business, or at not later than the hour of 1 o'clock, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and that the Presiding Officer thereupon lay before the Senate the unfinished business; namely, Senate bill 2644, the civil transport aircraft bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I inquire, What is the effect of the unanimous-consent agreement? Does the bill referred to become the pending business?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; at the conclusion of the morning business, or not later than 1 o'clock.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to make a further inquiry, if the Senator will permit me. Then that bill will have the status of any other bill that comes before the Senate as the unfinished business.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; it will be the pending business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the request, but I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. At the conclusion of the morning business, would not the unfinished business be automatically laid before the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. Ordinarily it would at 2 o'clock; but if the agreement is entered into, then it would come before the Senate at not later than 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is correct.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

REPORT ON LABOR DISPUTE IN BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 738)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Lester Giffen, of Wendover, Utah, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by AMVET Post No. 14 of World War II, of Macon, Ga., favoring the enactment of legislation providing adequate housing for veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Serena Flavin, of Glen Carbon, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing relief for the teachers and the Glen Carbon Public School, Illinois; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A cablegram in the nature of a petition from the Council of Voluntary Agencies, United States Zone, APO 407, urging immediate action to implement the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTROL OF PRICES, ETC.—PETITIONS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference numerous petitions signed by sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation relating to rising prices, rent control, housing, minimum wage, social security, and labor, and I request that one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petitions will be received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and one of the petitions will be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached.

The petition is as follows:

We, the undersigned, members of local 181, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, Hazleton, Pa., urge that the special session of Congress take action on the following important issues:

1. Cost of living: Measures should be adopted to control rising prices, which have increased 30 percent since the end of OPA in June 1946.

2. Rent control: The present rent-control law should be strengthened and extended beyond the present deadline.

3. Housing: Congress should provide Federal aid for low-cost housing and local slum clearance by passing the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill.

4. Minimum wage: The minimum wage, which has not been changed since 1938, should be raised from 40 to 75 cents an hour.

5. Social security: The social-security law of 1935 should be amended to increase the amount of benefits paid and to extend the number of workers covered by the law.

6. Labor legislation: Congress should take action immediately to repeal the vicious Taft-Hartley Act, which has needlessly complicated union-management relations at the expense of organized labor.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF FRANKLIN, N. H.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a telegram signed by Eugene S. Daniell, Jr., mayor of Franklin, N. H., embodying a resolution adopted by the council of the city of Franklin relating to the high cost of living.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANKLIN, N. H., *August 3, 1948.*

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution relating to the present high cost of living

Whereas the cost of food (particularly meat), clothing, and the other necessities of

life has risen so rapidly as to sharply reduce the living standard of the citizens of this city, and to seriously endanger the welfare and health of many; and

Whereas Congress is now in session and both major political parties have pledged a remedy to this situation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Council of the City of Franklin unanimously urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to take immediate and effective steps to remedy this situation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by telegram to Senators CHARLES W. TOBEY and STYLES BRIDGES and Congressmen CHESTER E. MERROW and NORRIS COTTON for whatever action they deem most expedient.

Approved.

EUGENE S. DANIELL, Jr., *Mayor.*

Passed August 1948.

A true copy.

Attest:

MILDRED S. GILMAN,
City Clerk.

REQUEST FOR HEARING ON HOUSING AND ANTI-INFLATION MEASURES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a telegram which I have received today from H. W. Fraser, chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association, asking to be heard on any new housing measure or anti-inflation measure which may be considered at the special session.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. J. J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Railway labor regards as imperative the passage of adequate housing and anti-inflation measures before the special session adjourns. I urge you and your associates on behalf of a million and a quarter railroad workers to press for action on these two basic problems. We must have good laws on both if our economy is to avoid increasing difficulties in the months immediately ahead. Our people desire to be heard on any new housing measure or any anti-inflation measure which this special session may consider. Please address reply to 1412 East Pikes Peak Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo. Same telegram to the Honorables CHARLES W. TOBEY and J. J. SPARKMAN of the Senate and JESSE P. WOLCOTT and BRENT SPENCE of the House.

H. W. FRASER,
Chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association.

RELATIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE ADDITIONAL REPORTS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Relations With International Organizations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is presently engaged in a study and analysis of all legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress, first and second sessions, dealing with United States relations with international organizations.

The subcommittee expects to present this material in the form of a report to the Senate within the next 6 weeks. Inasmuch as we do not now know definitely what additional legislation of this type may be enacted by the present special session, and inasmuch as the duration of the special session is still uncertain, I request unanimous consent to file additional reports of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during the recess period.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 2928. A bill for the relief of Seweryn Cajtung, Masza Cajtung, Ryszard Cajtung, Stefa Pizyc, and Frania Goldberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2929. A bill for the relief of Victor A. Gorenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2930. A bill for the relief of Miklos Kenedi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BALL introduced Senate Joint Resolution 239, to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS TO FILE REPORT

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations this morning, the committee agreed unanimously that in view of the over-all situation it would be wise to ask for an extension of time for that committee in which to make its final report on the Taft-Hartley Act. The present requirement is that we make our report by January 2, 1949. It was unanimously agreed that that would not give us sufficient time, and that it would be difficult to get the members of the committee back in December of this year. We have agreed unanimously to ask for an extension until March 1, 1949. It does not require additional funds. The committee has sufficient funds with which to carry on for the extra 2 months. I am sure we can make a better report if we do not have to proceed with only a partial committee working on it here in December. I send to the desk a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent that the rules be suspended so that it may be immediately considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 239) to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 403 of Title IV of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out the words "January 2, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "March 1, 1949."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXPOSURE OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of the exposure of Communist activities in government, which appears in the Appendix.]

JAMES E. WATSON

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem in tribute to the late Honorable James E. Watson, former Senator from Indiana, by Mark E. Winings, of Elwood, Ind., which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPHUS DANIELS BY L. P. McLENDON

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to the late Josephus Daniels by Mr. L. P. McLendon, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL-TAX FILIBUSTER—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Poll-Tax Filibuster," published in the New York Times of July 31, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SPECIAL SESSION OF CONGRESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Week on Capitol Hill," from the New York Times of August 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

FILIBUSTERS IN THE SENATE—EDITORIAL FROM THE TAMPA (FLA.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Filibusters in the Senate," published in the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR PEPPER, OF FLORIDA—EDITORIAL FROM THE JEWISH FLORIDIAN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator CLAUDE PEPPER," published in the Jewish Floridian (Miami, Fla.), July 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTES TO KENNETH W. SIMONS, LATE EDITOR OF BISMARCK (N. DAK.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him and a statement by M. J. Connolly, secretary of the North Dakota Automobile Club, and assistant secretary of the Greater North Dakota Association, in tribute to the late Kenneth W. Simons, editor of the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, which appear in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT—STATEMENT BY FARM LEADERS

[Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement

signed by A. S. Goss, master of the National Grange; Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; and James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, relative to the International Wheat Agreement, together with a synopsis of questions and answers relating thereto, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE LIBERTY BELL—ARTICLE BY FRED BRENCKMAN

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Liberty Bell" written by Fred Brenckman, and published in the National Grange Monthly, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRATIC PARTY PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY DORIS FLEESON

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Impulse to Suicide," written by Doris Fleeson and published in the Washington Evening Star of August 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSUMER CREDIT OUT OF HAND—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Consumer Credit Held 'Out of Hand'," written by Greg McGregor, and published in the New York Times of August 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

REIMPOSITION OF CURBS ON CONSUMER CREDIT—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "One Inflation Check," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of July 23, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

RUSSIAN PROPAGANDA FEEDS ON AMERICAN FEUDS—LETTER FROM W. J. LITTRELL

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by W. J. Littrell of Laurel, Miss., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE THIRD PARTY—ARTICLE BY ALFRED BAKER LEWIS

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Truman Following F. D. R.'s Policies; Third Party Hit," written by Alfred Baker Lewis, a member of the American Federation of Teachers, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED NOMINATION OF WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS TO BE PRESIDENT

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD telegraphic correspondence between Chester Bowles, Leon Henderson, and Walter Reuther, and Mrs. Elliott Dexter, of Encino, Calif., regarding the proposed nomination of William O. Douglas as Democratic nominee for President, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT—STATEMENT BY ALVIN A. BURGER

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Alvin A. Burger entitled "Federal Civilian Employees Keeps Going Up," which appears in the Appendix.]

HIGH PRICES AND THE COST OF LIVING

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain letters and telegrams addressed to him relating to proposed anti-inflation and other legislation as well as a letter addressed by him under date of August 3, 1948, to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], which appear in the Appendix.]

STATES' RIGHTS AND CIVIL RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY J. A. THIGPEN

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "States' Rights—Civil Rights. What Is It All About?" written by J. A. Thigpen, member of the House of Representatives of Mississippi, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE J. WATIES WARING

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on August 3, 1948, there appeared in the Charleston News and Courier, in my native city, an article which says that a statement by me in connection with the appointment of Judge J. Waties Waring was not correct. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"COTTON ED" SMITH'S SON SAYS MAYBANK NOMINATED WARING

LYNCHBURG, August 2.—There may be some confusion in other parts over the currently hot question of "Who recommended Judge Waring?", but not the slightest doubt exists in the mind of Farley Smith, son of the late Senator Ellison D. (Cotton Ed) Smith.

Recommendation of Federal judges rests with each State's senators, Mr. Smith said, adding that at the time of Judge J. Waties Waring's appointment (December 19, 1941), South Carolina's Senators were his father and Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK.

"It most assuredly was not my father who recommended him and there was only one other man who could have done so: Senator MAYBANK."

The issue was raised the last time by United States Representative W. J. BRYAN DORN, a candidate for Senator MAYBANK's Senate seat. In a campaign speech at Greenwood on Wednesday, Mr. DORN referred to a previous statement by Senator MAYBANK that Judge Waring was appointed on the recommendation of Senator Smith.

Then Mr. DORN said he had talked with "Smith's son and daughter and they were shocked and amazed" that their father's name "was brought into the race in such a manner."

Tonight Senator Smith's son, Farley, now a candidate for election to the State house of representatives, said Mr. DORN had quoted his sentiments in the matter with complete accuracy.

"Everybody knows that my father was an outspoken critic of President Roosevelt's New Deal," Mr. Smith declared. "President Roosevelt attempted to 'purge' him in 1938. Roosevelt told my father in the presence of witnesses that he (Senator Smith) would never get to name anybody to another Federal job.

"After that, my father couldn't have had a post-office clerk appointed. His last appointment of a Federal judge was Judge Alva Lumpkin.

"Any statement that my father recommended Judge Waring is absolutely erroneous.

"Furthermore, Waring was not my father's first, second, third, fourth, or fifth choice. If Waring's name had gone down as No. 1 on my father's list he never would have been appointed.

"Anybody who had my father's stamp of approval would have been marked for defeat from the start.

"There were only two people who could have made the recommendation: My father and Senator MAYBANK, and it wasn't my father."

A newspaper account dated November 28, 1941, and published in the News and Courier, said that Senator Smith, cognizant of his unpopularity with the New Deal, refused to recommend any single individual. Instead, he prepared a list of 10 lawyers whom he considered "well qualified" and sent them to Senator MAYBANK.

The newspaper account said that "Senator MAYBANK, waiting to submit a list, is believed to have taken his senior colleague at his word and said, in effect, 'O. K., Waties Waring suits me'."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, at no time have I stated that the appointment of Judge Waring was made solely upon the recommendation of Senator Smith. I stated, "I joined with Senator Smith in recommending the appointment of Judge Waring, who at that time was conceded to be a stanch and loyal Democrat of the Jeffersonian school." I further stated that Senator Smith had recommended Mr. Waring to be judge before I was ever a United States Senator.

Mr. President, I have the official documents showing the basis for my statement, as follows:

Exhibit 1: The original letter signed by the Attorney General.

Exhibit 2: My reply to the Attorney General's letter.

Exhibit 3: The Attorney General's reply to me.

Exhibit 4: The letter the Attorney General wrote to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator Van Nuys, January 9, 1942, copy of which I obtained from Mr. Young, of the committee, yesterday.

I ask that these letters be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., November 7, 1941.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Pursuant to our conversation this morning, there is attached a list of names that were submitted to this Department in November of 1940 by former Senator Byrnes for consideration in connection with the judicial vacancies in South Carolina.

On October 1 of this year Senator Smith called at this office and submitted a list of names for consideration. This list is also attached. There is some duplication in the names.

There is also attached a summary of such information as we have on each of these candidates.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

EXHIBIT 2

NOVEMBER 10, 1941.

Hon. FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Thanks for sending me the list of persons recommended by Senator Smith for judge in South Carolina.

I would agree to the confirmation of any one of the gentlemen named by Senator Smith, or any lawyer in South Carolina, who, after investigation, is nominated by the President.

The first vacancy created was in the eastern district. The second man on the list recommended by Senator Smith is Mr. J. Waties Waring, of Charleston. I join in this recommendation by Senator Smith of Mr. Waring for judge of the eastern district.

As to the appointment of a judge for the eastern and western districts, the headquarters of this judge are in Columbia. I recommend for the appointment Mr. George Bell Timmerman, of Lexington, S. C. Lexington is approximately 15 miles from Columbia.

The name of Mr. Timmerman does not appear on the list submitted by Senator Smith, but I know that Mr. Timmerman has been a friend and political supporter of Senator Smith, and I feel satisfied he will have no objection to him. His qualifications are testified to by many lawyers and judges, whose endorsements have been filed with the Department.

Sincerely yours,

BURNET R. MAYBANK.

EXHIBIT 3

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., November 14, 1941.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: Thank you very much for writing me about your suggestions for filling the vacancies in South Carolina, which I shall discuss with the President at the earliest opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE.

EXHIBIT 4

JANUARY 9, 1942.

Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee of the Senate, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is now pending before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate a nomination in favor of Hon. J. Waties Waring to be United States district judge for the eastern district of South Carolina, and a nomination in favor of Hon. George Bell Timmerman to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina. These nominations were submitted to the President after careful investigation and study, following the recommendations of both Senators of South Carolina.

On October 1, 1941, Senator E. D. Smith, together with his son, Mr. E. D. Smith, Jr., who, I understand, serves as his secretary, called at this Department to discuss the appointments and left a memorandum containing nine names. The Senator stated that the selection of any one of the names mentioned would be highly agreeable to him. In response to a request that he name his first three choices, he designated Mr. Christie Benet, Mr. Waties Waring, and Mr. Angus H. Macaulay. There is attached a photostatic copy of the memorandum which Senator Smith left, with notations made as to these choices. This was done in his presence and at his direction.

Thereafter, Senator Smith from time to time wrote a letter in behalf of other prominent lawyers of South Carolina, indicating that he would interpose no objection should they be selected for one or the other of these judicial posts. On November 27, Mr. Linton M. Collins, Acting Assistant to the Attorney General, saw Senator Smith in his office. At that time the Senator urged that some action be taken early, and mentioned the names of Mr. Waring and Mr. Timmerman, indicating that they were acceptable. At the request of Mr. Collins, Senator Smith wrote a letter on that date, in which he stated that he would have no objection to the confirmation of Mr. Timmerman. A photostatic copy of that letter is attached for your information.

On the morning of December 4, I personally called upon Senator Smith at his office and advised him that after careful study of all the candidates I believed that Mr. Waring and Mr. Timmerman were the best choices and that I would recommend their nominations. He gave me full assurances that he would interpose no objection to their confirmation and indicated that he thought they were splendid selections.

This information is forwarded to you for your consideration in connection with the confirmation of these nominations. I sincerely hope that there may be an early approval by your committee, followed by favorable action in the Senate.

With kind personal regards,

Sincerely,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, after Senator Smith had made the recommendation, Mr. Benet called on me at the Governor's Mansion while I was Governor, just before I became United States Senator, and again called upon me in Washington, and asked me to help in every way I could to have Mr. Waring appointed.

After Mr. Benet requested me to cooperate with Senator Smith in having Mr. Waring appointed, and since Mr. Waring was Senator Smith's second choice, I agreed. While I cooperated with Senator Smith, never once did I speak to President Roosevelt regarding the appointment, nor did I discuss the matter with him at any time.

Let me add that I have the greatest respect for the memory of my former distinguished colleague, Senator Smith, and I know if he had lived he would verify my statement. He and I worked together in the United States Senate for more than 4 years without any dissension.

In justice to myself, I felt I should call attention to the records of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and the Department of Justice.

I have the records showing the executive nomination, the notice of the hearing, and the confirmation.

I might say that the records of the Committee on the Judiciary, which I read in the committee, show that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], was the chairman of the subcommittee, and that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the distinguished chairman of the committee, was present at the meeting, the other member of the subcommittee having been Senator Murdock, of Utah, who is no longer a Member of the Senate.

I am certain that the Senator from Arizona is fully familiar with the facts I have stated. He called on me to come to the meeting, but I did not go, and he called Senator Smith to attend the meeting, and Senator Smith appeared at the meeting in behalf of Judge Waring. That is the record of the Committee on the Judiciary. I have already submitted the correspondence for the RECORD.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, in regard to the nomination of Judge Waring, to which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has just referred, I wish to state that I was appointed by the then chairman of the Judiciary Committee to be chairman of a subcommittee to consider this nomination, and notice was given of the hearing on the nomination, as provided for by the rules of the Judiciary Committee. No one appeared at that hearing. I telephoned the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and asked him if he cared to appear; but he informed me that he was willing to stand by whatever the then senior Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Smith, might recommend in regard to the nomination. The senior Senator from South Carolina appeared before the full committee in behalf of Judge Waring, and endorsed his nomination. It is my opinion that the nomination of Judge Waring would not have been confirmed had Senator Smith not approved it. I say that because of the high esteem in which Senator Smith was held by the members of the Judiciary Committee and by the Senate.

THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to be recognized for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. LODGE. The first matter I desire to read is an editorial from the New York Times under date of Wednesday, August 4, 1948, entitled "The Wheat Agreement." Inasmuch as this is one of the matters now pending in the Congress, I believe Senators will be interested to hear this brief editorial which I think succinctly expresses some of the reasons why this matter should not be taken up now. I am not speaking of its fundamental merits for the future. I read the editorial, as follows:

[From the New York Times of August 4, 1948]

THE WHEAT AGREEMENT

Commenting on the nine "miscellaneous" matters listed by the President last week as requiring legislation at the present special session of Congress, we expressed the opinion here that with respect to five of them there seemed to us to be no good reason for rushing action. Mr. Truman's demand for ratification by the Senate of the proposed International Wheat Agreement is typical.

This proposal for setting up of what can best be described as a Government-sponsored wheat cartel was described by Senator VANDENBERG the other day as "one of the most complicated and controversial agreements ever submitted for our consideration." The plan, he pointed out, was not sent to the Senate for ratification until April 30, last, and approval was called for by July 1. Yet last week Mr. Truman said he had "good

reason to believe that it can still be made effective if ratified promptly."

It is difficult to understand why immediate action should be asked. Since July 1, to complicate matters, Britain, Canada, Australia, Ireland, New Zealand, and Denmark have bowed out on the agreement (though it is conceivable that they might be induced to return if we ratified) and our Department of Agriculture has announced its goal for the 1948–49 wheat crop, calling for a reduction in wheat acreage. There is nothing in the Department's announced program to indicate that its plans were based in any way on approval of the wheat agreement.

Senator VANDENBERG's comment that the proposed agreement is highly controversial is not an overstatement. Under its terms Canada, Australia, and the United States as exporting countries (two of the largest, Russia and Argentina, have elected to remain on the outside) would contract to sell to the importing member countries 500,000,000 bushels of wheat annually at prices fixed by upper and lower limits. The American export quota is 185,000,000 bushels. For 1948–49 the maximum price is $2, the minimum $1.50. What it would come down to at the present time is this: The $2 maximum, which would be the effective price for us, is figured on No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat laid down at Fort William, Canada. Its equivalent in Kansas City is around $1.88. But under our own farm support program the price of wheat at Kansas City is guaranteed today at approximately $2.24 a bushel. Obviously if the Government is going to sell wheat at $1.88 for which it has to pay $2.24 itself, this implies a subsidy of 36 cents on each bushel exported. We would thus be whipsawed, as it were, between two subsidies. With one we would be supporting domestic prices, with the other reducing prices on 185,000,000 bushels of export grain.

As it happens, there is not the slightest pressure, other than vocal, on us to make a decision this month or next, or even next year or the year after. The reason is to be found in the Marshall plan. It was originally estimated by the Economic Cooperation Administration that wheat exports for the coming crop year would be around 300,000,000 bushels. Reports from Washington yesterday indicated that as a result of the unexpected improvement in the grain outlook here and the unexpectedly large amounts of grain being sought by importing countries the goal had been raised tentatively to 450,000,000 bushels and might go higher. These figures should effectively dispel any illusions that only by jumping blindly into such a permanent export policy as that embraced by the wheat agreement can this country avoid a catastrophic wheat carry-over at the end of the coming crop year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts still has the floor.

HOUSING AND SUBSISTENCE NEEDS—LETTER FROM MSGR. DANIEL J. DONOVAN

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, under a separate heading in the RECORD I should like to read a letter which I have received from a constituent of mine on another point. This letter comes from the Very Reverend Monsignor Daniel J. Donovan, and it contains so much wisdom and understanding that I feel I should make it available to all the Members of the Senate, so I shall read it. It is very brief:

BOSTON, MASS., *July 29, 1948.*

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: Today I forwarded to Senator SALTONSTALL a copy of a flier distributed by the Communist Party of Massachusetts at the doors of the textile manufacturing buildings in this district. I am sorry that I have not another copy of it to send you, for I know you would like to see it. It was an appeal to the readers to write to the national legislators regarding proposed measures in the present session of Congress.

Waving aside the pro-Soviet features of the article, I do feel, nevertheless, that the current indifference of our legislators in Washington to the housing and subsistence needs of millions of low-salaried citizens is appalling. I am sure that other millions like myself are convinced it is the most effective way to multiply Communists and communistic sympathizers in our land.

To us who are thoroughly anticommunistic, but whose close experiences with ordinary people give us a sad understanding of their present grave needs of adequate housing and of income enough to buy the basic foods, fuel, and clothing, the present situation is ominous.

I feel it makes no difference at all to the man in the street, including myself, who called the present session of Congress, or what his motives were. The essential fact is that there is a crying need for relief in those two important phases of life for our citizens—housing and reasonably fixed purchasing power to get the material necessities of life.

To make such essentials the football of partisan politics at this time is to invite the scorn of millions of our citizens and to increase resentment among those suffering to the point where they will turn in desperation to communism for the relief that our traditionally sound parties could have attempted to give them.

With kindest feelings of personal esteem for you, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
(Very Rev. Msgr.) DANIEL J. DONOVAN,
St. James Rectory.

Mr. President, I have assured Monsignor Donovan of my complete sympathy with his viewpoint and of my strong conviction that we must take practical and effective action on the vital problems of which he writes.

SOLICITOR GENERAL PHILIP B. PERLMAN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I desire to present for the RECORD the outstanding services and accomplishments of Mr. Philip B. Perlman since he has been the Solicitor General of the United States and to present briefly the record before the Supreme Court and in other respects that he has made since he has occupied that high office.

It will be recalled that the President sent Mr. Perlman's nomination to the Senate on January 31, 1947. He was confirmed July 26, 1947, and sworn in on July 31, 1947, 6 months after his nomination reached the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary dealing with the matter, held up the nomination for 3½ months before beginning hearings, until the last week of the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

On the floor of the Senate, on the last day of the session, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] further delayed the confirmation of the nomination, but fortunately it was finally disposed of before the Senate adjourned.

I now present to the Senate the record Mr. Perlman has made since he was confirmed. During the October 1947 term of court Mr. Perlman personally argued a total of 12 cases before the Supreme Court of the United States. One of the cases was not decided, and was set for reargument in the October 1948 term. Of the 11 cases decided, Mr. Perlman was successful in 8, and in each one of the 3 adverse decisions he lost the case only by a vote of 5 to 4 in the Supreme Court.

During the term the Government had a total of 69 cases for argument in the Supreme Court. The Solicitor General was in general charge of all these cases, and made the assignments of counsel for the arguments. The Government won 51 of the 69 cases tried in that term of court. The Solicitor General and his staff accounted for 37 of the arguments, and the other arguments on these cases were made by attorneys for other divisions of the Department of Justice and from other governmental agencies.

Mr. Perlman, the Solicitor General, argued about one-third, or almost 33 percent, of all the cases handled by his office for the Government. Only two other lawyers argued as many as six cases each, so that Mr. Perlman argued twice as many cases in the Supreme Court as the highest number by any other Government attorney during the term.

Among the cases argued and won by Mr. Perlman were the three cases involving the constitutionality and application of the Renegotiation Acts, a decision that involved sums in excess of $10,000,000,000; the case involving the constitutionality of the Rent Control Act; the cases involving the enforcibility of racial restrictive covenants on real property; and the two cases in which the Supreme Court held that the Government has the right to subpena and use records, the keeping of which is required by law, without automatically granting immunity from prosecution under the Compulsory Testimony Act.

During the term the Solicitor General filed in the Supreme Court 29 petitions for writs of certiorari, of which 19 were granted. On the other hand, 305 petitions for writs of certiorari were filed against the Government, and a brief was filed in each one of these 305 cases. The Supreme Court denied 283 of these petitions, granting but 22.

The Baltimore Sun of Thursday, June 24, 1948, contains an article by Mr. Robert W. Ruth entitled "Record Made

by Perlman—Solicitor General Wins 51 of 69 Cases for United States in Year." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD MADE BY PERLMAN—SOLICITOR GENERAL WINS 51 OF 69 CASES FOR UNITED STATES IN YEAR

(By Robert W. Ruth)

WASHINGTON, June 23.—Philip B. Perlman, United States Solicitor General, has played a leading role in helping establish one of the most impressive records ever marked up by the Justice Department during a single Supreme Court term.

The Baltimorean, who outranks all other Marylanders in the executive branch, has now been in Washington almost a year. He was sworn in on July 31 after a prolonged battle with Senator FERGUSON (Republican, of Michigan) over his confirmation, and even then his name was narrowly squeezed in for Senate approval during the closing rush of Congress last year.

Attachés of the Justice Department and the Supreme Court assert that he is serving with distinction, that the Justices have gotten to know the Marylander well through his frequent appearances before the high tribunal, and that he fits well into the tradition of able men, such as William D. Mitchell and John W. Davis, who have held the Solicitor General's job.

WON 51, LOST 18 CASES

In terms of statistics, Mr. Perlman's record looks well even against the background of an unusually successful year of Department litigation before the Supreme Court.

Of the 69 cases handled through the Department and actually decided by the Court, the Government was successful in 51, unsuccessful in 18. In the memory of one Court official, this is as good as the Department has ever done.

According to Tom C. Clark, Attorney General, the Department won more antitrust cases than during any other term.

Although Mr. Perlman himself appeared in few trust cases, he and his staff argued 37 cases. Of these, 3 were set over for reargument, 24 won and 10 lost—a much above average record.

PERLMAN APPEARED PERSONALLY

In sharp contrast to his immediate predecessor, J. HOWARD MCGRATH, present Democratic Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Perlman has gone personally before the Court in case after case, which has built up for him a reputation as a hard worker.

He himself has argued 12 cases, about a third of the total presented by his staff. His score runs: eight won, three lost, and one set for reargument.

Appearing in cutaway and striped trousers, speaking clearly and with dignity—although he is not a facile talker—Mr. Perlman has fought through the following cases decided in the Government's favor:

Three involving the validity of the Renegotiation Act—the Government's war powers authority to renegotiate contracts was upheld, thus legalizing Federal collection of more than $10,000,000,000.

RACIAL REALTY AGREEMENTS

Unenforceability of racial restrictive covenants—a 6-to-0 decision barred courts from enforcing real-estate agreements which raise racial barriers in all-white neighborhoods.

Validity of the Rent Control Act—a decision setting aside a Cleveland District Court ruling declaring the 1947 Rent Control Act invalid on grounds the country is "in fact" at peace, thus rendering the War Powers Act inapplicable.

Habeas corpus writs sought by enemy aliens—under nineteenth-century statute the Government can deport enemy aliens during war. In this case the German aliens resisted when the Government started to deport them after the war. The Government had contended it was not physically possible to deport them during the conflict. The Supreme Court upheld the Government view that the aliens could be deported after the war.

Cases involving production of documents, which might incriminate—an individual has a right to refuse to produce papers which might incriminate him. An exception, however, is a public document. The Supreme Court sustained the Government view that OPA requirements that businessmen keep sales records kept those records from being private records that need not be produced if they incriminate.

According to Arnold Raum, senior member of Mr. Perlman's staff, the renegotiation, racial covenant, and rent cases were particularly important.

Mr. TYDINGS. In conclusion I should like to say that those who care to examine into the facts will find that no Solicitor General of the United States has ever had a more successful record during the short time he has occupied that office than has Mr. Perlman. I make this statement because I think he is entitled to have it made, considering the long delay between the time the nomination came to the Senate and 6 months later, when the nomination was confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I hope to see the international wheat agreement voted out favorably because to postpone it is, I believe, to kill the agreement. The market has fallen materially since the agreement was negotiated, and we should not forget that the wheat which we are pledged to supply under the Marshall plan we shall have to buy, no matter what the price, and it can be applied on our commitments under the wheat agreement. This combination probably will never happen again. I feel that to fail to ratify this agreement at this session is a desertion of American agriculture. I do not intend to be guilty of doing so.

CLIFFORD K. BERRYMAN

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I learned this morning that today, August 4, marks the sixty-second anniversary of the arrival in Washington from Kentucky of a very great and influential man, Clifford K. Berryman, of the Washington Evening Star, and I should like to pay my compliments to him and to his profession.

In the American political tradition, few commentators have had more influence than the political illustrators and caricaturists. It was one of them, Thomas Nast, who gave us the symbols for our two great parties.

Cliff Berryman, both by the span of his years and the brilliance of his work, has been as responsible as any other for the maintenance of that tradition.

His pen is barbed, but it is guided always by the warmth of deep human feeling. It has always been a constructive influence. His cartoons are editorials of great significance to national affairs.

VETERANS' FLIGHT-TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a statement I presented to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on August 3, 1948, in connection with its executive session on the interpretation of Public Law 862, Eightieth Congress, by the Veterans' Administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR C. WAYLAND BROOKS, OF ILLINOIS, TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS ON AUGUST 3, 1948

Perhaps no other Member of Congress has been closer to the veterans' flight training program than I have. It, therefore, comes as a distinct shock to me to be informed by many of my constituents that the Veterans' Administration has so obviously misinterpreted and misapplied the intent and will of Congress, as expressed in the amendment to the proviso in Public Law 862, Eightieth Congress.

Despite the fact that Congress expressly provided by this statute (Public Law 862, 80th Cong.) that GI flight training courses, in cases where veterans elected them in connection with their present or contemplated business or occupational activities, shall not be considered as avocational or recreational, nevertheless, many field officers are misunderstanding or misapplying rulings from the Veterans' Administration central offices by arbitrarily stating that GI flight training courses are avocational or recreational and a veteran shall therefore not be entitled to elect them.

This unwarranted interpretation is being accomplished in two ways—first, Veterans' Administration regional offices, relying upon General Gray's Instruction No. 1 of June 30, 1948, are demanding that the veteran must show complete justification for electing the courses, going so far in certain instances to demand affidavits from present and prospective employers as the basis for complete justification. Secondly, Veterans' Administration regional offices, because they are unwilling to use the authority delegated to them by the Administrator to interpret and apply complete justification, are refusing to pass judgment for GI flight training courses which are pending stating that they will not rule thereon without more explicit and understandable instructions from the Veterans' Administration central office.

It was never my intention and I am sure it was never the intention of my colleagues in the Senate or of the Members of the House to pass the amendment to the proviso of Public Law 862, Eightieth Congress, to give to the Veterans' Administration and its regional and branch offices unrestricted right and power to pass judgment on the motives of veterans in the use of their entitlements for GI flight training or any other courses. It was our sole intention to empower them to declare certain courses avocational or recreational where they were obviously so with the distinct exception that this power should not extend to GI flight training courses where such courses were designed to give to the veteran instruction or training for his present or contemplated occupation. In other words, both the Senate and House were considering what the veteran expected to do and the word "contemplated" was intended to imply that the veteran was thinking about pursuing such an

occupation. Rarely is a contemplated occupation one which has a promised job waiting completion of a training. The contemplated occupation of a medical student is the practice of medicine, even though no hospital has offered him a post on its staff. The contemplated occupation of a law student is the practice of law and does not assure a position in a law firm. It is an unprecedented twisting of ordinary language, as contained in Instruction No. 1, which states that a veteran while still a trainee cannot have a contemplated occupation unless he has an affidavit in his hand from a prospective employer.

Accordingly, I feel that the central office of the Veterans' Administration should rescind all of its instructions applicable to GI flight training and replace them with new instructions which will more clearly, accurately and fairly give to veterans their rightful entitlements. To these ends, I believe that an affidavit from the veteran to the effect that he wishes to elect GI flight-training courses "in connection with his present or contemplated business or occupation" should be adequate and should entitle him to enroll in the course he elects without delay. Only by taking such action immediately can grave injustice to the veteran be averted.

THE POLL TAX

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, yesterday during the debate certain figures and statistics were given relative to Mississippi, with reference to our primary elections and other matters. At that time there was no oportunity to correct the figures or to submit other figures which make the picture more complete. For that reason I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared relative to this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the debate on H. R. 29, certain figures were cited relative to the State of Mississippi. Without questioning the authenticity of the figures, it is only fair to point out that virtually all of those cited with reference to Mississippi were either out of date or present a distorted picture of the actual condition.

At one point the per capita income of citizens of Mississippi was listed at $123, as compared with a national average of $368. I should like to call attention to the Department of Commerce estimates for the year 1945, which list the per capita income of citizens of Mississippi at $556, as compared with a national average of $1,325. It is evident from this comparison that Mississippi's income is increasing at a greater average than that of the Nation as a whole.

There are those of us in the South who contend that our section has too long been held in a type of economic bondage that corresponds in some respects to the type of political bondage that might result if various types of ill-considered legislation were to be allowed to become law.

Figures were presented showing the percentage of the population participating in general congressional elections in Mississippi in 1946, and much was made of the relatively low percentage of the population of the various districts which participated in these general elections. I should like to point out that there was no opposition to any of the seven nominees cited in this chart. Naturally, only a small fraction of the qualified electorate took the trouble to cast a ballot.

In Mississippi, elections are decided in the primaries. In 1946 there were four congressional seats contested in the primaries, and I submit the percentages of this vote, as a fairer test:

District	Population	Primary vote	Percentage
1. Rankin	263,367	25,208	9.2
5. Winstead	261,466	28,227	10.8
6. Colmer	319,635	44,623	13.9
7. Williams	470,781	39,364	8.4

Even the congressional primaries are not a fair test of the voting strength of Mississippi, however. With the exception of an occasional district judgeship, no other elective offices are at stake in these primaries. In the vast majority of our States, all types of State, district, and local offices are elected in the same primaries and general elections which choose Members of Congress.

In Mississippi our State and local officers are chosen at 4-year intervals. The most recent primary, which chose nominees for all offices from governor down to constable, was held in August of 1947. In this primary 365,228 citizens cast votes for governor, in contrast with 191,806 who participated in the last State-wide congressional primary.

There are no exact figures available as to the number of qualified electors for the Democratic primary, but an official, authoritative estimate places this figure at 560,000. This figure includes those who were declared not eligible to vote for reason of not having paid poll taxes. So it can be seen that actually 65 percent of the qualified electors participated in the general primary. That figure, I submit, compares favorably with most of the States of the Union.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] indulged in rather extended comments on the President's national health insurance program. I believe we all remember that quite recently Mr. Bernard Baruch made some remarks quite different in tone from those delivered by the Senator from Missouri. He said in part, referring to the problem of paying for medical care:

> Nothing has been suggested so far, which promises success, other than some form of insurance covering these people by law and financed by the Government, at least in part—what some would call "compulsory health insurance."

Because Members of the Congress, who are well aware of the excellence of Mr. Baruch's advice on various matters may not be aware of the fact that Mr. Baruch's father, Dr. Simon Baruch, was one of the Nation's pioneers in physical medicine and may not be thoroughly aware of Mr. Baruch's long and expert acquaintance with the field, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Dr. Howard Rusk, entitled "Baruch Committee Spurs Aid to Physically Handicapped," which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times, be set forth in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks. The article succinctly describes what a remarkable job has been done for the physically handicapped in the amazingly short period of 5 years by the Baruch Committee on Physical Medicine. It is just one more evidence of Bernard Baruch's great service to the American people. It is evidence, too, that when Mr. Baruch talks of the economics of medicine he is speaking as one who knows the field.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARUCH COMMITTEE SPURS AID TO PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED—MAJOR OBJECTIVES SET 5 YEARS AGO REACHED—MANY SCHOOLS COOPERATE IN PLAN

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

Of 20,000,000 men examined for selective service during the last war, more than three-quarters of a million were found to have gross physical disabilities, such as amputations, blindness, deafness, a congenitally short leg, club foot, or a withered arm, disabilities requiring intensive physical rehabilitation. Realizing that another large group of disabled persons would be discovered in case of another draft or universal military training, Bernard M. Baruch, in his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee last March, advocated "some compulsory means of rehabilitating youths with physical and mental defects that can be corrected."

Mr. Baruch's recommendation is based on a long-time interest in the problems of handicapped persons. A man noted for his ability to concentrate on a single task until it is accomplished, he was convinced during the early days of World War II that full use was not being made of the specialty of physical medicine in the rehabilitation either of the war disabled or the far greater number of civilian handicapped. Consequently, in October 1943, he invited a committee of 40 scientists, headed by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, chancellor of Stanford University, to draw up a plan for the development of physical medicine for this country, and in 1944, founded the Baruch Committee on Physical Medicine in memory of his father, Dr. Simon Baruch, the first professor of hydrology at Columbia University, and one of the Nation's pioneers in physical medicine.

Major objectives of the committee were: (1) to increase the number of physicians trained to teach and use physical medicine; (2) to provide for more extensive basic and clinical research in physical medicine; and (3) to insure its proper use in relation to wartime rehabilitation and peacetime preparedness.

ALL OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED

In the annual report of the committee, issued last week, Dr. Frank Krusen, director, asserts that those major objectives have been achieved in less than 5 years.

The effect of the committee's efforts on increasing opportunities for training physicians and other personnel in physical medicine, the first objective, is shown by the fact that, when the committee was organized, there were only five approved residencies or fellowships in physical medicine available annually in three medical centers. Today there are 70 such residencies and fellowships available annually at 34 medical centers. Compared with 30 medical schools then offering instruction in physical medicine, there are now 60, just double the original number. Many physicians trained under Baruch fellowships are now teaching in large medical centers or directing programs in Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Since the establishment of the committee the American Board of Physical Medicine has been organized and officially recognized by the American Medical Association as the sixteenth medical specialty.

SIMILAR PROGRESS RECORDED

Similar progress has been made in the achievement of the second objective, provid-

ing for more extensive basic and clinical research. The report, in addition to summarizing the general advancement in physical medicine, outlines current research being carried on in 12 leading medical colleges in the therapeutic utilization of the science of physics through the use of heat, cold, light, water, electricity, massage, muscle reeducation, therapeutic exercise and physical rehabilitation.

Gains in insuring the proper use of physical medicine in relation to wartime rehabilitation and physical preparedness are made evident by the fact that rehabilitation and physical medicine services have been made a regular service in all military and VA hospitals, and are gradually being introduced on a wider scale in civilian medical centers.

ALLOCATIONS ARE LISTED

Although there have been a few pioneer civilian rehabilitation centers, such as the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled, the Milwaukee Curative Workshop and the Cleveland Rehabilitation Clinic, that have done outstanding work, such facilities prior to the war were limited in number, were found only in large cities and were not associated with medical schools or general hospitals. There are, today, however, some 150 communities that have or are planning civilian rehabilitation centers. Most such communities are following the recommendation of the Baruch committee that these centers be medically directed and be associated with civilian hospitals and medical schools if possible.

Of the original allocation of $1,250,000, $400,000 was given to Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons for a model research and treatment center, $250,000 to the Medical College of Virginia for a center specializing in hydrology, and $250,000 to New York University College of Medicine for a center devoting special attention to the structural mechanics of the body. Smaller amounts were given a number of other universities for special research products.

The major centers, which are being developed over a 10-year period, are designed to serve as models for medical schools and hospitals both in this country and abroad. With Mr. Baruch's experience, wisdom and vision, and the great need for increasing services to the physically handicapped, it is easy to see why the major objectives of the committee have been accomplished in such a short time.

BOYS' FORUM ON NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the American Legion for the excellent service it is performing for the youth of this Nation through the Boys' Forum on National Government which the Legion sponsors annually. I am particularly conscious of the value of this Legion activity because yesterday I had the pleasure of lunching with two outstanding young men attending the forum from the State of Montana. They were chosen to represent the several hundred who, in my State, were eager participants in the "Boys' State," sponsored by Montana units of the Legion. These fine young men, who have told me how much this trip has meant to them, are James Woodburn of Bozeman, Mont., and Robert Davis of Dillon, Mont.

I can think of few better ways of building Americanism than by bringing these young men directly in touch with our State and national legislatures and by having them meet the men in charge of the various departments of our Government. The Legion is letting them see our democratic processes in action. Thereby, the American Legion insures a real understanding of how American democracy works. To my mind this is one of the most effective ways of preventing totalitarianism from gaining any sort of foothold in this country of ours. As our young men become acquainted with the working mechanisms of free enterprise, both in business and in Government, there can be no question but that they will value it far above any other way of life.

I know my colleagues in the Senate will want to join with me in complimenting the American Legion for this outstanding work.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, Government officials and Government agencies forever complain that the constant criticism they get from the Congress and the press makes the life of a public servant intolerable. It is hard to recall an occasion when anyone closely associated with the executive branch lamented the fact that a Government agency was suffering from too little critical scrutiny.

This is precisely the complaint made in an article entitled "The Atomic Energy Act: Public Administration Without Public Debate"—which appears today in the University of Chicago Law Review.

Until recently its author, Herbert S. Marks, was General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission. Even before he held that office, Mr. Marks had been intimately identified with the State Department's work on atomic energy, notably the Acheson-Lilienthal Report.

He has been and is a stanch supporter of the McMahon Act, and of Mr. Lilienthal and his associates on the Atomic Energy Commission. But he suggests that the success of our entire atomic energy program is endangered because it does not enjoy the invigorating corrective effects of the kind of broad critical public scrutiny which this country gives to all other governmental affairs.

We have recently observed a striking example of this hands-off attitude of which Mr. Marks writes. In the debate over extension of the terms of the Atomic Energy Commissioners, vague anonymous opinions were cited against confirming Mr. Lilienthal for a 5-year term by the proponents of the 2-year extension bill.

I tried repeatedly and in vain to get a full airing of these anonymous opinions, and to get an open debate on the issue of confirmation so that the entire Congress and the public might have the facts and form a judgment upon them—as they do in other public matters. No one would join issue with me.

Mr. Marks' article discusses this and other examples of unhealthy public indifference to the problems of atomic energy. Open debate and criticism of Government affairs is traditionally our main safeguard against arbitrary or incompetent Government officials and agencies. Mr. Marks believes, as I do, that our atomic-energy program is in good hands. But it is the essence of democracy that no public official and no public agency is above having his activities fully and openly debated and criticized.

The requirements of secrecy, Mr. Marks insists, are not so strict as to prevent adequate public scrutiny and debate of atomic energy affairs. And I can testify from my own intimate experience of atomic energy in the past 3 years that—contrary to popular impression—there is a great deal more about this subject that is completely open to the public than secret. The necessarily secret areas must of course be kept secret. But today enormous areas that are legitimately open are simply unknown to the public.

This article seeks to diagnose the causes of the present conditions and to suggest means by which they may be corrected. I hope the article will be read widely and thoughtfully, especially by members of the Congress and the press. For in the first instance it is up to the Congress and the press to find ways by which our traditional democratic processes can be made to work in this field as in any other.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Atomic Energy Act: Public Administration Without Public Debate," written by Herbert S. Marks and published in the summer 1948 issue of the University of Chicago Law Review, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION WITHOUT PUBLIC DEBATE

(By Herbert S. Marks [1])

I

In the midst of noise it is difficult to perceive areas of silence. Since the appointment of the Atomic Energy Commission in October 1946, millions of words have been published about the administration of the McMahon Act.[2] But the very quantity of material has obscured the fact that critical analysis and insight have been negligible. Even more remarkable, the range of issues which has excited any active public debate has been exceedingly limited despite the many intrinsically controversial questions with which the Atomic Energy Act is concerned.

Actions of the Atomic Energy Commission that are the subject of press release are duly reported in the newspapers—but rarely with more penetrating comment or follow-up than that which accompanies the society news.

[1] Member of the District of Columbia and New York bars. Former assistant general counsel, War Production Board; special assistant to the Under Secretary of State; and most recently general counsel, Atomic Energy Commission. The author is deeply indebted to Mr. John G. Palfrey, a member of the legal staff of the Atomic Energy Commission, for his invaluable assistance and suggestions throughout the preparation of this article. The opinions expressed, however, are the personal views of the author.

[2] 60 Stat. 766, 42 U. S. C. A., sec. 1810 (Supp. 1947). The act became law August 1, 1946. The President appointed the five members of the Commission on October 28, 1946. The properties of the Manhattan Engineer District were formally transferred to the Commission by Executive Order 9816 on December 31, 1946. It was not until April 9, 1947, that the recess appointments of Commissioners were confirmed.

The old argument over military versus civilian control has some continuing vitality; whether or not the secrets of the atomic bomb are being securely kept also gets attention; the patent provisions of the law and their administration are discussed in professional quarters.[3] The list could be extended but not significantly.

Of late a handful of informed appraisals have appeared concerning such matters as the relationship of the Commission's program to business,[4] the Commission's special problems with respect to loyalty investigations, the status of research at Oak Ridge.[5] What is strange, however, is not so much the infrequency of perceptive commentary: the striking fact is that neither in depth nor scope is the public discussion which prevails for other Government affairs even approximated in the field of atomic energy.[6]

Most recently the congressional controversy over the reappointment of the Commissioners might have been expected to stimulate critical review of the broad field of operations of the Atomic Energy Commission. In fact, however, what has been observed in these legislative proceedings is little more than a series of election year maneuvers.[7]

The absence of wide debate and criticism concerning the administration of this far-reaching law is a phenomenon unique in the conduct of important public affairs. There are, of course, strong reasons for this peculiar situation. Some, like the requirements of secrecy, will appear obvious; others may appear more subtle. The significance of the unusual present conditions will be clearer, however, if first viewed in the light of the normal attitude toward public affairs.

II

Throughout its history this country has cherished a principle from which we have rarely tolerated departure. We have believed that the chief protection of society against incompetence, unfairness, and corruption in Government is the unlimited opportunity for public scrutiny and protest. We have believed also that this is the chief means of assuring that officials will pursue the course upon which the public is set. Sixty years ago Lord Bryce observed "a healthy and watchful public opinion" as a commonplace of the American political system. "Mischief is checked in America more frequently than anywhere else by the fear of exposure or by newspaper criticism in the first stage of a bad scheme."[8] And in a current opinion the United States Supreme Court quotes Bentham's century-old observation: "Without publicity all other checks are insufficient; in comparison of publicity all other checks are of small account."[9]

In observance of this principle, the physical and social sciences could find their most important common ground. "Science," says a distinguished physicist, "is not a field in which error awaits death and subsequent generations for verdict—the next issue of the journals will take care of it."[10] Perhaps the test of our faith is our firm belief that it is the fatal weakness of communism and all other forms of totalitarianism that they can find no substitute for the self-correcting process of open discussion and criticism which is the democratic tradition.

We pay a high price to maintain this tradition. Ordinarily, there is no need to encourage criticism of large government enterprise; the danger is rather that it goes too far. The able administrator is harassed and disgusted; the timid administrator is paralyzed; public affairs suffer from endless delays Yet even in the conduct of the war agencies, whether civilian or military, we have insisted upon this principle. On balance we have always been convinced that the price was not too high. Nevertheless, in the case of the administration of the Atomic Energy Act critical debate has been largely absent.

The lack of critical discussion by no means signifies an inactive atomic-energy program. We know that the Atomic Energy Commission operates a capital investment of $3,000,000,000; that it spends well in excess of a half-billion dollars annually; that directly or indirectly it employs 60,000 people; that it has important business relations with hundreds of business concerns and educational institutions; and that its regulatory activities affect business, the press, and other private institutions. We profess to know that there is no activity of government more important than the Atomic Energy Commission, by which, presumably, we mean that there is none which now or potentially affects us so vitally.[11]

Nor is it really possible that the absence of debate and criticism is simply a reflection of the high public respect and confidence which the present Commission and its staff rightly commands. Our theory and practice are such that it is a matter of indifference whether Government officials are able and incorruptible public servants—a David Lilienthal or a General Groves—or suspected machine politicians. We subject both classes to the gantlet.

The public servant, on his part, is rarely aware that the pressures and attacks from which he suffers during all his official life are frequently a source of strength and almost always a source of guidance. It is public pressure which helps weed out incompetent associates when official inertia would retain them. It is an interested, critical public which often supplies the only adequate forum for resolving conflicts between executive agencies, between Congress and the Executive, or between Government agencies and special interests. Above all it is the public reaction to what he does or fails to do which tells the administrator what is expected of him. It is his duty to provide leadership but leadership in the direction of the public's expectations.

But how can the Atomic Energy Commission be responsive to the impulses and expectations of a society which in relation to this subject matter are not expressed, which seemingly are not even felt? The men who compose the Atomic Energy Commission have been conscious of the vacuum in which they operate and have sensed the dangers which it

---

[3] On March 15, 1948, Senator WHERRY, majority whip, introduced and spoke in favor of a bill to return atomic energy to military control (94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 3477 (March 25, 1948)). The most sensational security case during the past year concerned the revelation that prior to the appointment of the Commission, two Army sergeants personally appropriated highly secret documents from the Los Alamos reservation. See statement to the Senate of Senator HICKENLOOPER, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on July 7, 1947 (93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8494 (July 9, 1947)). On patent matters, see Ooms, Atomic Energy and United States Patent Policy, 2 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Nos. 9 and 10, at p. 28, and Nos. 11 and 12, at p. 30 (1946); Miller, the First Official Report on AEC Patent Problems, 4 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, No. 3, at p. 77 (1948); Newman and Miller, Patents and Atomic Energy, 12 Law and Contemporary Problems, 746 (1947); American Bar Association, Section of Patent, Trade-Mark and Copyright Law, committee reports to be presented at annual meeting September 1947, p. 11; First Report of Atomic Energy Commission Patent Advisory Panel, Atomic Energy Commission Press Release No. 56, September 21, 1947.

[4] Atomic Energy—1948, Business Week, April 10, 1948, p. 47.

[5] The New York Herald Tribune recently ran an impressive series of articles on the Atomic Energy Commission's loyalty investigations and on general conditions at Oak Ridge, see New York Herald Tribune May 19, p. 1, May 20, p. 5, May 20, p. 22, May 24, 1948, p. 18. On loyalty investigations cf. O'Brian, Loyalty Tests and Guilt by Association. (61 Harv. L. Rev. p. 592 at p. 598.)

[6] Cf. Report of the Chairman of the American Society of Newspaper Editors Standing Committee on Atomic Energy, Editor and Publisher, April 24, 1948, at p. 22. The New York Herald Tribune, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and Business Week show signs of reaching a level of reporting and comment in the field of atomic energy comparable to that which exists in other areas of public affairs; cf. New York Post, May 28, 1948, p. 41: "The Herald Tribune (is) one of a few United States papers which realizes what atomic energy—and atom bombs—mean to the future of the world." As examples of high quality reporting and comment on atomic energy matters see, Editorial, A Year of Civilian Control of Atomic Energy, 4 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, No. 2 at p. 33 (February 1948) and Atomic Energy—1948, supra, note 4.

[7] Under sec. 2 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 the terms of the Commissioners first appointed expire on August 1, 1948. The President on April 20, 1948, renominated the five members of the Commission for new terms commencing August 1, 1948, giving to the chairman, Mr. Lilienthal, a 5-year appointment, the longest permitted under the system of staggering prescribed in the act. The Republican leadership in the Congress countered President Truman's move by proposing bills, S. 2589 and H. R. 6402, to extend the terms of the five Commissioners automatically for 2 years from August 1, 1948, thereby giving to the President elected in November 1948 power to appoint an entirely new Commission during the next Presidential term. The ground asserted by the Republican leadership for this action was the necessity for a further period of probation for the over-all evaluation of the atomic energy program and its theory of operation. See S. Rept. 1342, 80th Cong., 2d sess., May 17, 1948; H. Rept. 1973, 80th Cong., 2d sess., May 18, 1948. A minority led by Democratic Senator BRIEN MCMAHON filed a report strongly attacking the bills, among other reasons, as a blow to the spirit of political nonpartisanship in which the entire program was conceived and established under the original act.

[8] 2 Bryce, the American Commonwealth (2d ed.), p. 321.

[9] *In re Oliver* (68 S. Ct. 499, 506), quoting from 1 Bentham Rationale of Judicial Evidence 524 (1827).

[10] J. Robert Oppenheimer, Physics in the Contemporary World, 4 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, No. 3, p. 65 at 68 (1948).

[11] For a general summary of the Commission's work see address of David Lilienthal, The Business Side of the Atom, before the Chamber of Commerce of Boston, Mass., March 18, 1948 (Atomic Energy Commission press release). As to regulatory activities of the Commission, the agency has issued regulations governing commerce in the raw materials, uranium and thorium (12 Fed. Reg. 1855, Mar. 20, 1947); regulations governing commerce in facilities for the production of fissionable materials (12 Fed. Reg. 7657, Nov. 18, 1947); and the Commission's security-guidance service is similar in effect to the Government censorship practiced during the war. See Third Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, S. Doc. 118, 80th Cong., 2d sess., at 27 (1948).

portends. For many months in their reports and speeches, they have made eloquent pleas to the public to get educated about and take an active interest in atomic energy.[12] Mr. Lilienthal has warned that without such active participation in these fateful matters the substance of democracy is lost." [13]

To these pleas the most common public response appears to be: "What is it that they want us to know? Why don't they tell us? Then we may know what to do." [14] The pleas have somewhat puzzled the public; the public response has somewhat puzzled the Atomic Energy Commission.

Meanwhile the normal interplay of forces between the Government and the governed does not take place. In the field of atomic energy, the process which has always been our main reliance for a healthy direction of national effort is virtually nonexistent.

III

Nor have any adequate substitutes for the usual processes of public criticism been found, although the two that are sometimes referred to as assuring a measure of public accountability, the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Commission's public advisory committees, are certainly of great value.[15]

We know from its reports to the Congress that the joint committee, established by the McMahon Act and composed of nine Members of the Senate and nine Members of the House, is generally interested in all activities of the Commission [16] as required under that law. We may assume, too, that it takes a critical attitude toward these activities and that the Commission benefits from this attitude.[17] But there has been even less public discussion and comment about the joint committee and its work than there has been about the Commission. Fortunately, the joint committee includes some of the leading Members of both Houses.[18] But just as we rely upon the self-correcting process of public scrutiny in the case of all agencies of the executive branch, good or bad, so, too, we may be apprehensive of an arm of the Congress, however distinguished its Members, whose activities are not the subject of public debate. As long as this condition lasts, it must not be assumed that the joint committee will provide an adequate device to assure public accountability in any usual sense. The unreviewed action of 18 legislators is not likely to be better than the unreviewed action of 5 administrators. In fact, such a situation could easily lead to an unwholesome domination of executive action by a small group of legislators which would not be tolerated if the public were alert and critical.

The advisory committees, too, are important in establishing connections between the atomic-energy program and the country at large. The General Advisory Committee, created by the McMahon Act, and the numerous other committees set up by the Commission as authorized by that law, bring to bear upon the problems of the atomic-energy program the diverse talents of leaders in many phases of American life.[19] But however valuable this form of participation by outsiders may be, it is not a substitute for the kind of public scrutiny to which we have been accustomed. It is, indeed, as different from what we have relied upon in the past as it would be to preserve the principle of jury trial in criminal proceedings but to permit the trials to be conducted in secret without the presence of press or public.

IV

Perhaps the requirements of secrecy are such that there can be no public participation in the problems of atomic energy in any customary sense. As the question is subjected to analysis, however, this answer may appear less clear. At all events while secrecy may seriously inhibit debate, that factor alone hardly accounts for the silence of the interests that are directly affected by the atomic-energy program.

Ordinarily the reaction and response of special groups, favorable or unfavorable, to any particular Government action give rise to and sustain public debate. With limited exceptions, nothing of this sort has happened in the atomic-energy program. In a variety of ways the Commission's program has an important daily effect upon national life. Procurement of raw materials, letting of contracts, construction and operation of plants involving hazardous, new industrial processes and hazardous industrial waste products, administration of regulatory powers—all these activities and many others in this $3,000,000,000 enterprise are in fact affecting the public at many points.

These Commission actions fall in areas of public sensitivity which, judging by the experience of all other Government agencies, should produce a vocal response from those groups which are disappointed by Commission decisions. Indeed, some decisions of the Commission occur in the most sensitive areas of public concern. The effect which Commission action has upon the press itself is the best example.

Under section 10 of the Atomic Energy Act the Commission is given broad powers to control the dissemination of restricted data. Simply stated, practically all information relating to atomic energy is classed as restricted by the Atomic Energy Act. The Commission is authorized to remove information from this category whenever it concludes that it may be published without impairing the national security. We need not concern ourselves here with the question which is sometimes raised as to whether the law is merely an official secrets act or whether it includes broader censorship powers.[20] The press and the publishing industry have apparently accepted the principle that whether or not the act, strictly construed, applies to unofficial as well as official secrets, they will publish nothing in the face of advice by the Commission that publication would be

---

[12] For example, addresses of David E. Lilienthal, Atomic Energy Is Your Business, before a community public meeting in Crawfordsville, Ind., September 22, 1947; Democracy and the Atom, before the American Education Fellowship, Chicago, November 28, 1947; The People, the Atom, and the Press, before the New York State Publishers Association in New York, January 19, 1948; Atomic Energy—Where Do We Stand Today? before the Radio Executives Club in New York, February 5, 1948; also the address of Sumner Pike, Imperatives in Atomic Understanding, before the National Education Association, in Cincinnati, Ohio, February 17, 1948; and addresses of W. W. Waymack, Education in the Atomic Age, before the Institute of Higher Education in Nashville, Tenn., July 31, 1947; and Atomic Energy Implications, before the Illinois Welfare Association, in Chicago, Ill., November 26, 1947. (Atomic Energy Commission press releases.) See also Third Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, op. cit. supra, note 10 at 26–28.

[13] David E. Lilienthal, Democracy and the Atom, supra, note 10 at 8.

[14] See, e. g., letter to the editor, What Do the Scientists Wish Us To Know, from L. McDonald, New York Herald Tribune, February 23, 1948.

[15] See Lilienthal, The People, the Atom, and the Press, op. cit. supra, note 10 at 14–16, and Waymack, Atomic Energy Implications, op. cit. supra, note 11 at 10. See also Third Semiannual Report of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, op. cit. supra, note 10 at 31–32, 34.

[16] First Report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to the Congress of the United States, H. Rept. 1289, 80th Cong., 2d sess., 1948. The committee was created by section 15 (a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. See also reports on S. 2589 and H. R. 6402, supra note 6.

[17] "The very fact of the existence of the Joint Congressional Committee is security against the exercise of arbitrary power by the Commission, while we on the Commission, vested with a kind of quite terrible responsibility find in it a great reassurance." Lilienthal, The People, the Atom, and the Press, op. cit. supra, note 11, at 16.

[18] "The present membership of this 18-man permanent committee is an indication of the importance Congress itself assigns to it in charting the difficult policy course ahead. Its chairman is Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, a former Governor of that State, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, an experienced administrator as well as legislator. Its vice chairman is Representative W. STERLING COLE, of Ithaca, in this State, who, as you know, is among the most respected and influential Members of the House, with long experience in matters of national security. The committee includes the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY, of Michigan, and Texas; it includes Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, who as chairman of the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy in the 79th Cong. sponsored the Atomic Energy Act and who follows with keen interest the international situation on atomic-energy control; it includes Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKEN, of Colorado, chairman of the Finance Committee. On the roster of the committee are other men of both chambers, most of whose names and reputations are familiar to you. In all, the committee is unusually broadly representative of the country, both geographically and in its group interests." Lilienthal, The People, the Atom, and the Press, op. cit. supra, note 11 at 15.

[19] The list, membership, and functions of the numerous advisory committees are set forth in the Third Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, op. cit. supra, note 6 at 31–38. The general advisory committee was established by section 2 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. The other advisory groups were set up by the Commission pursuant to section 12 (a) (1) of the act.

[20] See Newman, Control of Information Relating to Atomic Energy, 56 Yale L. J., 769 (1947), and Newman and Miller, The Control of Atomic Energy, ch. 10 (1948). These writers take the position that the prohibitions on disclosure in section 10 apply equally to official and unofficial information falling within the broadly defined category "restricted data." While this view may be an accurate statement of the effect which the draftsmen intended, neither the statute nor the legislative history seem sufficiently explicit on the point to avoid a question of statutory construction if the issue is ever tested. In that event, it is to be anticipated that questions of constitutionality would also be raised.

prejudicial to the national security.[21] In short, for practical purposes, they seem to have accepted in the field of atomic energy an arrangement somewhat similar to the one which existed more generally during the war under the Office of Censorship.

This voluntary restraint on the part of the press and the publishing industry, and their wholehearted cooperation with the Government in maintaining security, are deserving of highest praise. But what is surprising is that there has not even been any open debate concerning the details of administration. How does it happen that the public bickering between press and Government over the scope and details of censorship so frequently observed in connection with the war agencies does not occur here?[22] Are we then to conclude that the Commission's "security guidance" has been so satisfactory to the press that there has never been occasion for debate concerning it or public notice of the debate? Considering the diversity and character of the American press, there must be other explanations for the unbroken silence that exists in this area of legitimate discussion.

There are many other areas of activities and many incidents in the atomic-energy program where, despite secrecy, lively concern and comment on the part of the public might be expected but where almost none has occurred. The Commission's decisions with respect to its Clinton laboratories is a good illustration.

In May 1947 the Commission publicly announced that the contractor for the Clinton laboratories at Oak Ridge would be changed because the then contractor was unable to manage the laboratory unless it was transferred to a new location remote from Oak Ridge.[23] It was explained in the release that "the Clinton laboratories constitute a vital part of the atomic-energy program and certain projects at Clinton are among the most important in this field." "After comprehensive review," it was said, "the Commission has concluded that in the light of the over-all research and development program in atomic energy, the work of the Clinton laboratory must continue at Oak Ridge." In September 1947 it was publicly announced that a new contractor had been selected for the Clinton laboratories.[24] In addition to naming the new contractor, it was announced that 14 southern universities and a score of industries and industrial representatives would participate in the important research, development, and training programs at the laboratory. Then came a sharp change in direction. On January 1, 1948, the Commission announced a drastic realinement in the September arrangements for the Clinton laboratory.[25] Important work conducted at or contemplated for that location would be transferred to Chicago. In addition, the contractual arrangements originally forecast in the September release were to be fundamentally altered and a third contractor was to enter the picture. All these changes were duly reported in the Commission's release.

The three public releases of May, September, and January described major decisions concerning major industrial interests, major university interests, major geographic interests, major alternatives of national policy. It is not at all clear from the face of the three releases that they are consistent with one another. Were any other important Government agency to issue three such announcements about one of its main operations, the press and affected interests would immediately engage in a storm of public discussion. Such discussion would occur if only because the watchful journalist would discern that on their face the three announcements appear to be contradictory. But such discussion would even more certainly occur in the case of other agencies because important decisions and successive changes in them would inevitably disappoint or, at least, disturb some of the special interests affected by them. It seems highly improbable that the Commission, alone among Government agencies, possesses a Solomon-like faculty for always harmonizing and satisfying all affected interests.

The point of this recital is not to suggest that the Commission's actions as reflected in these announcements were wrong. The point is that almost no one among our individualistic, normally critical public was impelled to debate them openly. No one was impelled to debate them, even though on the face of the releases themselves, without going further for information, there was ample material to excite public discussion.[26]

v

Secrecy is certainly the most important factor in accounting for public inertia in relation to the administration of the Atomic Energy Act. The requirements of security altogether remove from public view certain activities and certain problems of the Atomic Energy Commission. In addition, there is everywhere an air of secrecy which seems impenetrable, even when it is not. The mere mechanics of securing a pass into a commission installation for a routine interview appears formidable, even for the visitor who knows he is entitled to the pass. The areas of information that are shut off for reasons of security inevitably seem to obscure those which are open. No matter how much the questioner may be assured that he can understand what he needs to know without access to what is hidden, he always has a lurking uneasiness that his interpretation of what is in sight will be distorted by what is unknown.

Much of the subject matter—even that which is completely open—is technically complex, and therefore hard to understand. It is not only complex; it is totally unfamiliar. One of the Commissioners has suggested that the subject of atomic energy is less complex than taxation.[27] But when Franklin wrote, "Nothing is more certain than death and taxes," he gave expression to a thought already thousands of years old. The background of ancient familiarity, not to mention suffering, makes it relatively easy to do in the field of taxation what the Commission urges us to do here, that is, distill "out of very complex and superficially bewildering things, relatively simple, quite comprehensible basic issues that the people are capable of understanding."[28]

There is, moreover, a general frame of mind which inhibits the active curiosity without which scrutiny and debate does not take place. A taboo-like quality attaches to atomic energy, which is perhaps no more than another way of saying that the immense proportions of the new physical force, the seeming magic and real mystery connected with it, its tradition-shaking consequences, and the walls of secrecy and epic drama which surrounded it from the first, make of it a subject from which we instinctively shy away.

Also important in suppressing curiosity is the belief that to ask questions in this field is unpatriotic. We have come to feel that because it is wrong to disclose secret information, it is somehow wrong and possibly illegal for the uninitiated to seek information about the subject. Thus, a Washington taxi driver, on being asked by a fare to go to the Public Health Building (the Commission headquarters), inquires "That's where the Atomic Energy Com . . ." and then exclaims, "Oh, I mustn't mention that."

In addition, large and important sectors of the public and the press seem to have been restrained from any generally critical scrutiny of the administration of the Atomic Energy Act, perhaps unconsciously, by a sense of partisanship. These sectors of press and public joined in the fight to secure enactment of the McMahon bill.[29] Hardly had the bill become law before another fight took place over the confirmation of the President's nominees for membership on the Atomic Energy Commission. The same forces, construing the opposition to the President's nominees as a renewal of the original effort to defeat the McMahon bill, again joined to support the President's appointments.[30] That the bill was enacted after a notable unanimity in the vote of the Senate committee which sponsored it, and that confirmation was voted by overwhelming majorities, were regarded not as evidence of the weakness of the opposition, but rather of the strength of the forces that were marshaled in support. Ever since, the feeling has persisted that at the first opportunity these original opponents would reassert themselves to destroy the McMahon Act. In these circumstances, the supporters of the Atomic Energy Act and of the President's nominations to the Commission seem to have assumed that any display of critical attitude toward the administration of the law would play into the hands of these opponents.

---

[21] It was—and is—evident that the public communications media of the Nation desire overwhelmingly to avoid harm to the national defense and security through publication of restricted data. There is a heavy continuing demand for security guidance service * * *. (Third Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, supra, note 10 at 27.)

[22] Compare the immediate reaction to Secretary Forrestal's recent proposal to establish a voluntary system of censorship in connection with security matters in general. See e. g. Security Consciousness, editorial, the Washington Post, page 4B, Mar. 29, 1948.

The first significant criticism on Commission policy in this connection appeared at the end of May. See editorial: "Policy in Secret, New York Herald Tribune, May 28, 1943, at page 22.

[23] Atomic Energy Commission press release "Joint Statement of United States Atomic Energy Commission and Monsanto Chemical Co. at Oak Ridge, Tenn." May 28, 1947.

[24] Atomic Energy Commission press release No. 57 "Clinton National Laboratory established at Oak Ridge," Sept. 25, 1947.

[25] Atomic Energy Commission press release No. 80, "Atomic Energy Commission Consolidates Reactor Research and Development at Argonne, National Laboratory near Chicago; enters new contract for Clinton National Laboratory at Oak Ridge and adds Chemical Engineering Development at that Laboratory," Jan. 1, 1948.

[26] It was not until many months after the release of January 1, 1948, that critical public discussion of the Clinton Laboratories decision began to occur. See, e. g., Why Morale Sags at Oak Ridge, New York Herald Tribune, May 24, 1948, p. 18.

[27] W. W. Waymack, Atomic Energy Implications, op. cit., supra, note 11, at 6.

[28] Ibid.

[29] A summary of these events can be found in Newman and Miller, "The Control of Atomic Energy," chapter 1 (1948).

[30] During the opening remarks of the Senate debate on the confirmation of the Commissioners and the General Manager in March 1947, Senator HICKENLOOPER speaking of Mr. Lilienthal described the very significant and widespread "editorial approval of his appointment of leading newspaper editors of both major parties from coast to coast" (93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2451, March 24, 1947).

There may be other factors at work in preventing the free play of the normal forces of public scrutiny and criticism. Because so many of the barriers are intangible, it is extremely difficult to assess their relative importance. But secrecy, security, complexity, unfamiliarity, self-restraint—whether occasioned by taboos, suppression of curiosity, or partisanship—together compose a formidable array. We may hopefully agree with Mr. Lilienthal that "there is nothing in the nature of atomic energy, nor in the necessary requirements of secrecy in certain areas of knowledge that prevents the people as a whole from exercising their historic role of judging what shall be the course of public policy."[21] But the people are not now exercising that historic role and it is plain that if they are to do so very special exertions will be required of them.

VI

The fact that the traditionally powerful forces of scrutiny and criticism do not now exist in this field in itself suggests the difficulty in devising a program to create for the Atomic Energy Commission the public environment of other governmental agencies. A beginning has been made in the speeches of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission during past months. The awareness of the problem that they reflect, and the emphasis they have given in many forums to the need for public interest and education should contribute materially to the creation of a climate favorable for public action.

It will also help if we become conscious of misconceptions that have interfered with the normal process of scrutiny and criticism. Active curiosity, far from being improper or illegal, is a normal, lawful public responsibility.[22] It has been asserted on behalf of the Commission that "by and large the sources of information on public issues are already open."[23] And it is a fair estimate that the official material so far made available by and about the Commission compares in quantity and content with the official material that is made available about other large Government operations in a comparable period of operations.[24] Here and there one will see the censor's hand in the official material concerning the Commission's activities. But such material is mainly distinguished from the information about other Government agencies in that it has not been illuminated by public reaction.

It takes active curiosity on the part of the press and public to give meaning to official handouts no matter how enlightening the Government tries to make them. The official material of other Government agencies is subjected to searching public analysis and questioning which uncovers and evaluates the reasons behind decisions and the consequences implicit in them. Because of security restrictions an effort to subject the available materials about the Commission to the same treatment would sometimes be frustrating. Surprisingly often, however, the results would be illuminating.

It should be understood that the general public on the one hand and the Commission on the other have different responsibilities in respect to security. It is the duty of the Atomic Energy Commission under the law to see to it that those things are kept secret which in the interest of national security should be kept secret. It is the duty of the public to cooperate with the Commission in this effort, and this the public has been doing with remarkable effectiveness.[25] But, as the Commission itself has repeatedly asserted, it is also a public responsibility to find out and to understand those things which need not be kept secret. This can only be accomplished through incessant questioning.

The Atomic Energy Commission is no more omniscient than any other Government Agency in its capacity to determine precisely what information within its vast area of nonsecret knowledge the public needs to know. It is the duty of a democratic public to direct to its Government every question that its curiosity provokes. It is the Atomic Energy Commission which must bear the responsibility of deciding whether an answer to any particular question may prejudice the national security.

Once this relationship is clearly defined, it will be possible for the public to begin to develop insights about the atomic energy program. Such insights can come about only through a constant interchange between the Government and the people. The questions raised in congressional hearings, in congressional debates, in news stories and editorials, the questions raised by all manner of special interests—these and the Government's answers to them, and the further questions thereby suggested, can produce a broad and endless process, through which understanding will evolve and influence will ultimately exert itself.

This process is especially necessary if the public is to overcome the difficulties growing out of the complexity and unfamiliarity of the subject matter. The Acheson-Lilienthal report and the Baruch proposals on international control of atomic energy were understood clearly enough in the course of the extensive discussion that they provoked. In comparison, the official material which has been published about the Atomic Energy Commission seems less complex. Once the same process of scrutiny, questioning, and discussion which illuminated the proposals on international control is brought to bear upon the available information in the domestic field a comparable measure of understanding can result.

Not only is it essential that there be an active curiosity about the atomic energy program—a curiosity which expresses itself in incessant questioning—there must also be a willingness to criticize. Partisanship that exercises a restraint upon legitimate criticism out of a fear that such criticism will aid the enemies of the McMahon Act defeats its own purposes. The sectors of the press and public which thus refrain from critical comment are the very groups which by virtue of their participation in the fight on the McMahon bill and on confirmation acquired an informed background on atomic energy. In refraining from criticism, these groups have no doubt spared the Commission a considerable amount of annoyance. But they have deprived the administration of the Atomic Energy Act of a much more important source of strength—the strength that comes from constructive exposure of weakness and error and the opportunity thereby created for correction.

In any effort to quicken the forces of public scrutiny and criticism, account must be taken of the attitude of public officials toward these forces, and particularly toward the quest for information which these forces stimulate. The usual but never tolerable condition of a Government official is one of continual harassment by a seemingly specious, unfair, and unsympathetic press and public. That this condition makes officials wary and that it often makes the process of getting information from a public agency difficult is not surprising. The fear of embarrassment which the official or his agency may suffer as a result of disclosing information can be a more important factor in deciding whether or not to answer a question than the public need for an answer.

These considerations are as relevant to atomic energy as to any other subject. The staff of the Commission will be conscious that what they say may be used to discredit them, in ways that are frequently unfair and always painful. The members of the Atomic Energy Commission have urged earnestly and often that the public take a critical interest in their work. It should not be thought, however, that the express recognition by the Commissioners and their staff of the need for scrutiny will make the path of the questioner and potential critic easier than it would be with any other public agency. A party in power may assert that a strong opposition is essential to democracy; but it cannot be expected willingly to supply what might be used as ammunition by its opponents.

In the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, there is, moreover, a special hazard to

---

[21] Lilienthal, Democracy and the Atom, supra, note 11 at 8.

[22] Actually, the criminal sanctions of sec. 10 (b) (3) of the Atomic Energy Act apply to attempts to acquire information involving or incorporating "restricted data" only when the act is done "with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to any foreign nation." It can hardly be imagined that such intent could be read into any normal efforts of press and public to secure information about atomic energy. On the other hand, the provisions relating to disclosure of "restricted data" (sec. 10 (b) (2)) include sanctions when the person has "reason to believe" that the above consequences will ensue.

[23] Lilienthal, Atomic Energy Is Your Business, op. cit. supra note 8 at 11.

[24] The list includes the following: (a) Commission Reports to Congress: The First Semi-Annual Report of the Commission, 80th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. No. 8, Jan. 31, 1947; the Second Semiannual Report of the Commission, 80th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. No. 96, July 24, 1947; the Third Semiannual Report of the Commission, supra note 10. (b) Congressional hearings: Independent offices appropriation bill for 1948. Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, U. S. Senate, 80th Cong., 1st sess. on H. R. 3839 (1947); hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 80th Cong., 2d sess., on the supplemental independent offices appropriation bill for 1949, p. 747, et seq. See also H. Rept. No. 589, p. 8, independent offices appropriation bill for 1948, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947); H. Rept. No. 1618, p. 2, first deficiency appropriation bill 1948 (1948); H. Rept. No. 2245, p. 2, supplemental independent offices appropriation bill for 1949 (1948); hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on labor relations at Oak Ridge, Tenn., 80th Cong., 2d sess, March 1948. (c) A large number of reports and documents released by the Commission, including 1,700 individual declassified documents made available to the public through the Office of Technical Services of the Department of Commerce; over 75 statements for press and public giving facts of new developments; reprints of public speeches made by members of the Commission; and reports of advisory boards of the Commission; namely, Report of the Medical Board of Review, June 20, 1947, and the Report of the Patent Advisory Panel, Sept. 17, 1947. See Third Semiannual Report of the Commission, supra note 10 at pages 24–28 for a description of such material.

[25] Public compliance with the law has been so effective that thus far there has been no real court test of the extremely difficult evidentiary questions that would arise in any public criminal trial for alleged unlawful disclosure of secret information. cf. Haydock, Some Evidentiary Problems Posed by Atomic Energy Security Requirements, 61 Harv. L. Rev. 468 (1948); see also Note, Secret Documents in Criminal Prosecutions, 47 Col. L. Rev. 1356 (1947).

the process of debate and criticism. The line between what must be secret and what can be open is not a sharp one. When areas of information involving possible embarrassment are probed, the temptation must always be present to draw the line so that embarrassment will be avoided rather than to draw the line only where the reasonable requirements of security dictate. The danger is not that the Atomic Energy Commission or its staff would thus act deliberately. The danger is rather of unconsciously confusing the needs of security with the desire for self-protection from critical comment.[56] During the war, journalists developed a sixth sense which enabled the press to tell whether the Government's releases and its response to questions were really as full and frank as security would permit. This experience may ultimately be repeated in the field of atomic energy. But it will not be repeated as long as it continues to be possible to say that "only about a dozen newspaper reporters in the United States are equipped to write about atomic information accurately and with understanding."[57]

VII

The absence of public scrutiny and criticism which the Atomic Energy Commission has so far experienced will not last indefinitely. The deep and powerful forces which have made our public alert and vocal in other public affairs will sooner or later assert themselves in this field. The question is not whether this will happen but when and in what form. If too long delayed, our atomic-energy program will almost certainly grow so far out of touch with the American environment that when the forces of criticism finally begin to operate with their customary vigor they will produce drastic upheavals. Deprived of the continuous, corrective effects of public review, the atomic-energy program will have developed so much that is weak and unsound that the public dissatisfaction which then seeks drastic change will be justified. By then the administration that is thus destroyed may not be worth saving. If this should happen, not only will the continuity essential to the success of the undertaking be destroyed, but the public, without the knowledge gained by prior participation in the problems of atomic energy, will not be in a position to insure the establishment of a sound administration in its place.

Any practical measures that may be proposed now for releasing the normal forces of critical scrutiny and debate will seem modest as compared with the proportions of the problem. What is important is that the process commence. The best hope for constructive change lies in recognition of the fact that once started this process which is so close to our most basic traditions will find its own strength, and its own new channels for growth.

[56] The Washington Post recently referred to "past military efforts to cover up mistakes under the guise of security and the tendency of some officers to classify virtually everything controversial as 'top secret'." Op. cit. supra, note 21. It is at least open to question whether it is fair to suggest that the military is any more subject to this temptation than the civilian administrator.

[57] See report of the chairman of the American Society of Newspaper Editors Standing Committee on Atomic Energy, Editor and Publisher, Apr. 24, 1948 at p. 22.

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, an editorial entitled "Wrong Timing," appearing in the Washington Post for August 1. Frequently I do not agree with the editorial conclusions of this newspaper; but in this instance I think the conclusions expressed are substantially correct and truly reveal the present situation existing in Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WRONG TIMING

The chief defect of the President's comprehensive program for control of inflation is that it has come too late to meet the needs of the immediate future. The Washington Post believes that rationing and price controls should have been retained for a much longer period after the war as a means of limiting consumption expenditures and checking price increases. However, there were two very good reasons for the premature scrapping of the OPA control system: (1) Public disaffection and (2) defective administration for which public hostility was in part responsible.

If an effective system of selective price and rationing controls could have been retained until wartime shortage of civilian goods had been made good, and if, concurrently, strenuous efforts had been made to absorb surplus cash created by war financing through retirement of bank-held Federal debt and sale of Government securities to nonbank investors—if these things had been done, then the transition from a controlled to a free price system could have been effected with much less danger of a sudden sharp upward spurt of prices. But the choice has been made: the potential inflation represented by dammed-up purchasing power—a legacy of deficit financing—has been activated, and is raising already inflated prices to even higher levels.

Furthermore, the rise in prices since the last prewar year has been very uneven. Increases have been greatest in foods and certain so-called soft consumer goods, thereby swelling the incomes of farmers and producers of such goods. Wage increases, too, have been uneven; some workers have secured additions to income that have more than offset rising living costs, while many white-collar workers and recipients of annuities and fixed incomes have been left far behind in the race to keep abreast of rising living costs.

The stresses and strains resulting from such fundamental dislocations call for readjustments of price relationships, not for plans to freeze prices at present levels or to roll back prices to some arbitrarily set date recommended by the President. In fact, it is impossible to undo by legislative decree what has already been done, even if the objective appeared to be desirable. For price roll-backs would either force high-cost producers out of business and inaugurate a new era of scarcity or necessitate heavy subsidies at the expense of taxpayers to enable production to go forward.

The sensible alternative is to concentrate on plans to prevent further additions to consumer purchasing power while permitting market forces of demand and supply to correct the distortions of the price structure that have resulted from our inflation splurge. As Marriner Eccles warned when testifying before the Senate Banking Committee, such adjustments are bound to be unpleasant, but it's too late to find a pleasant solution of the inflation problem. The method of dealing with inflation that best meets present needs is an indirect over-all method of control designed to curb inflationary expansion of bank credit by giving Federal Reserve authorities permissive powers to control consumer credit and increase the reserve requirements of member banks.

Such checks are, of course, of limited efficacy, and insofar as the reserve proposals are concerned, a rather crude and inequitable device for checking expansion of bank lending. Nevertheless, the mere possession of such powers, even if they were not exercised, would have a restraining effect on bank-loan expansion. These controls have the further advantage of being orthodox methods of restraint that look toward the future instead of back to the past. Moreover, they strike at the root causes of inflation by attempting to prevent further increases in the amount of money available for the purchase of goods.

If the budget can be kept in balance, and if we succeed in avoiding credit inflation through a combination of limited credit controls and voluntary banker efforts to restrain loan expansion, inflation can be fought to a standstill. But it cannot be done overnight, nor can it be done without a good many painful shifts in price relationships that reimposition of direct price controls would only defer and make more painful in the long run.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM FOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, it has been my privilege during the Eightieth Congress to serve as chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. In this connection I handled in the Senate, in both the first and second sessions of the Eightieth Congress, legislation relating to the welfare of the American farmer.

With the endorsement of the Illinois Agriculture Association and other leaders of farm groups, and at my request, Dr. H. C. M. Case, head of the department of agricultural economics, University of Illinois, College of Agriculture, took leave temporarily from the university to come to Washington to act as my chief adviser while handling these important agricultural appropriations.

Subsequently he served as chief adviser to the agricultural legislative committee of the Senate during the hearings on and writing of the long-range program relating to American agriculture.

Dr. Case brought to us his mature judgment which enabled him to make a most valuable contribution to the farmers of Illinois and of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an explanation written by Dr. Case of the farm program enacted by the Eightieth Congress.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASE EXPLAINS EIGHTIETH CONGRESS FARM PROGRAM

(By Dr. H. C. M. Case, head of the Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois College of Agriculture)

The new farm legislation passed in the last hours of the Eightieth Congress is essentially a long-range price-support program. The new act provides for a flexible farm price support program to become effective in 1950. It passed the Senate by a vote of 79 to 3. The House bill had provided for a stopgap measure that would continue until July 1950 most of the price-support measures now in existence

The bill that was finally passed by both Houses of Congress is a combination of the two bills. It provides that the price support of basic farm commodities—i. e., corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts—will be continued at 90 percent of parity until the

1949 crop is marketed or June 30, 1950. At that time the long-time flexible farm price support program will come into effect for these commodities.

The provision to support the prices of the so-called Steagall commodities at 90 percent of parity was a wartime measure designed to encourage increased production of the commodities deemed to be in greatest demand. When this act was passed, it was not anticipated that it would continue under normal peacetime conditions.

NEED LONG-TERM PROGRAM

The Senate bill assumed that, since the war was over, provision should be made for a desirable long-time price-support program. However, the compromise with the House bill supports milk and its products, hogs, chickens and eggs at 90 percent of parity until December 31, 1949. At the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, other Steagall commodities will be supported at 60–90 percent of parity until December 31, 1949.

Under the new act, tobacco will be supported permanently at 90 percent of parity with marketing quotas. The 1949 crop of wool will be supported at 90 percent of parity, but the future support for wool will be 60–90 percent of parity, the objective being to encourage an annual production of 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool.

In the new legislation, wool is given special consideration in order to stabilize the sheep industry at a level to meet a substantial part of our needs without relying upon the uncertainty of wool imports. At the present time the world demand for wool has forced the price to a high level.

The support for wool will probably not be effective until the world consumption of wool falls much below the present level. At present the domestic production of wool has fallen below 300,000,000 pounds, or to the lowest point in 47 years.

EFFECTIVE IN 1950

The long-time features of the bill, which becomes effective in 1950, provide that when there is a normal supply of any of the 6 basic commodities, corn, wheat, cotton, rice, peanuts, and tobacco, the price will be supported at 75 percent of parity. In addition, as the supply of a product increases by 2 percent, the price support drops 1 percent until it reaches 60 percent of parity when the supply of the product reaches 130 percent of normal production. Also as the supply falls to 70 percent of a normal supply the price support rises to 90 percent of parity.

A thought back of this long-time flexible price-support policy is that, under the schedule provided, farmers will receive a larger total income for a large production than for a small production. This situation is desirable for consumers, who want abundant production, since it encourages farmers to produce a large output of food. Further, a definite floor below which the prices of these commodities will not be permitted to fall will have a stabilizing influence on the market price.

When the price of a farm commodity breaks seriously it is probably due in a measure to farmers' hastening to sell their products before prices sink lower during a downswing in prices. The actual floor under prices at a given level may have the effect of increasing the price at harvesttime in the case of grain by perhaps 10 percent or more when supplies are unusually high.

FARM INCOME VERSUS NATIONAL ECONOMY

Furthermore, the reasoning may be that when prices of farm products sink below 60 percent of parity, as they did in the early thirties, it will disrupt the entire national economy because farmers, as well as others, cease to be normal purchasers of other goods and services. This action leads to heavy unemployment and reduces the consumers' purchasing power for farm products.

It is to the interest of the Nation not to allow prices of farm products to fall to extremely low levels; in fact, it is essential, in order to maintain our national economy, to prevent net farm income from sinking to low levels.

When the long-range price support goes into effect a new parity price formula also becomes effective. As is true of present parity prices, the new parity price formula is based on the relationship of the prices of all products farmers sell to the prices of the commodities farmers buy. Also, the relationship between the prices of these two groups of commodities in the period of 1909–14 is still used as a base period.

The difference between the old and new parity formulas is simply this: The old formula makes use of the relationship between prices of individual farm commodities in the period of 1909–14. Because of changes in methods of production, improvement in crop yields, and many other factors, that period does not reflect present-day price relationships.

AUTOMATIC FORMULA

The new formula takes into account the relationship of the price of the individual farm product to the average price of all farm products for the 10 immediately preceding years. This procedure keeps the parity prices of individual farm products adjusted to changing price relationships. It is an automatic formula that each year adds the new year and drops the oldest of the 10 preceding years as a basis for determining the parity price of individual farm products.

The change from the old to the new parity formula changes the parity prices for individual farm products. In general, the parity prices of livestock and livestock products are increased, while the parity prices of grain and cotton are reduced slightly. However, the average parity prices for all farm products as a group are the same under the old and new parity formulas.

The act further provides that, when the parity price of a farm product under the old and new formula is more than 5 percent of the old parity price, the adjustment to the new parity price will not exceed 5 percent of the old parity price in any one year.

The price support bill also provides for the support, at prices up to 90 percent of parity, of commodities other than the six basic ones. For this purpose such funds will be used as may be provided to the Secretary of Agriculture. The so-called section 32 funds, which represent 30 percent of our import duties, are made available for farm price-support operations. In 1947–48 these funds amounted to $135,000,000. At the present time $75,000,000 of this total are assigned to the school-lunch program, leaving about $60,000,000 to be used to support various commodities.

SUPPORTS FOR PERISHABLES ALSO

The Commodity Credit Corporation, of course, is permitted to support prices of products within reasonable limits if the products are storable and can be handled without too great a carrying charge. Section 32 funds, however, may be used to help support the price of perishable products. As a matter of fact, they represent a larger amount than has been used in any year except for subsidy payments made during the war years to hold down prices of food products.

Some features of the Senate bill dealing with the reorganization of agencies to handle various services that the Government renders to farmers were eliminated from the bill in the conference between the Senate and the House. It was the intent of the Senate bill to place more responsibility on local farm people for directing the operations of the various agencies through which the Federal Government deals directly with individual farmers.

However, the price-support legislation which was retained in the bill accepted by both Houses is constructive in affording a transition from the present wartime price program to a sound long-time price-support program. The essential feature of the long-time program is that the support varies inversely with the supply of the product. This provision should give farmers adequate opportunity to adjust their production in line with changes in demand, because the price supports, which will be higher for products in short supply, will stimulate production of those commodities.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM FOR HOUSING AND ANTI-INFLATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD copies of telegrams sent by the American Federation of Labor, the CIO, the Railway Labor Executives Association, and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen to various Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, particularly the chairmen of the two Committees on Banking and Currency, and also to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Kentucky, the present speaker, and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], in regard to pending proposed legislation dealing with housing and the high cost of living.

All these telegrams were sent on Wednesday, August 4, 1948.

On Wednesday, August 4, newspapers for the first time made it authoritative that the Republicans in Congress intended to substitute very narrow, ineffective, inefficient bills for the bills proposed by the President on, first, housing; and, second, anti-inflation.

All American labor organizations therefore promptly wired that they desired to testify on the subject. This was an effort to prevent the substitution of plausible and specious legislation in place of true and effective legislation.

Although the telegrams went to the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Senate and House, and to the Republican leaders in both Senate and House, bills are being reported out of committees without giving American labor or any other organizations a chance to be heard.

This is an unprecedented action in congressional history—the rushing of legislation through committees without giving those who request an opportunity to be heard any such opportunity.

The telegrams came from the leaders of organizations whose members and their immediate families constitute at least one-third of the entire population of the United States.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEGRAMS FROM AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

AUGUST 4, 1948.

To Senator TOBEY:

Press reports indicate that housing legislation is now being considered which would not include such essential features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as public housing,

slum clearance, and rural housing. We strongly urge that your committee hold fast to all of the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. If any housing legislation other than S. 866 should be considered by your committee, we respectfully request that we be given an opportunity to state our views on this all-important question.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

AUGUST 4, 1948.

To Congressman JESSE WOLCOTT:

Press reports indicate that housing legislation is now being considered which would not include such essential features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as public housing, slum clearance, and rural housing. This organization is strongly on record as favoring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as it passed the Senate. If your committee should consider any housing legislation which does not include all of the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, we respectfully request that we be given an opportunity to state our views on this all-important question.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

TELEGRAMS FROM LABOR ORGANIZATIONS TO CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS REQUESTING OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY BEFORE BILLS ARE REPORTED OUT OF COMMITTEE

1. Telegram from H. W. Fraser, President of Railway Labor Executives Association, to Senators CHARLES W. TOBEY, J. J. SPARKMAN, Congressmen JESSE P. WOLCOTT, BRENT SPENCE:

"AUGUST 4, 1948.

"Railway labor regards as imperative the passage of adequate housing and anti-inflation measures before the special session adjourns, I urge you and your associates on behalf of a million and a quarter of railroad workers to press for action on these two basic problems. We must have good laws on both if our economy is to avoid increasing difficulties in the months immediately ahead. Our people desire to be heard on any new housing measure or any anti-inflation measure which the special session may consider. Please address reply to 1412 E. Pikes Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo., H. W. Fraser, chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association."

2. Telegram from Alexander F. Whitney, president of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to Senators TAFT, WHERRY, BARKLEY, MCGRATH; Congressmen MARTIN, HALLECK, RAYBURN, and MCCORMACK:

"AUGUST 4, 1948.

"Due to pyramiding in prices which are forcing a reduction in standards of millions of the common people and a serious housing shortage, it is imperative that adequate laws be enacted to immediately relieve these serious situations and I urge that immediate public hearings be held to permit testimony from well-informed and interested people. I desire to personally testify before the appropriate committees and will greatly appreciate an early reply advising day and hour I may be heard.

"A. F. WHITNEY,
"Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen."

AUGUST 4, 1948.

Send the following telegram to Senator ROBERT TAFT, Senator of the United States, Washington, D. C., and JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C. Charge to the CIO, 718 Jackson Place, Northwest:

"When the Congress adjourned in June it left behind an unprecedented record of unfinished business. Bills to meet the needs of the American people were ignored, pigeonholed, or amended beyond recognition. The special session of Congress called by President Truman gave Congress an opportunity to rewrite its record. Food that cost $1 in June 1946 now costs $1.47. Other necessities, like clothing, which cost $1 in June 1946, now costs $1.25. The doubling up of many American families, due to the housing shortage, is a crime. With both political parties committed to the passage of civil rights legislation, the effect of Senator VANDENBERG'S ruling prevents this issue from coming to a vote.

"The Congress of Industrial Organizations was informed this morning that, due to a decision of the Republican policy committee, the Congress will adjourn Saturday, having heard, outside of Government witnesses, only the representatives of the banking fraternity on the all-important question of inflation.

"The phony filibuster successfully conducted by the southern Democrats is a decided contrast to the prompt squelching by the Republican leadership of the recent filibuster led by Senator LANGER to include a civil-rights program in the recently enacted Selective Service Act. Senator VANDENBERG'S ruling, which allowed the filibuster to continue, makes a mockery of the deliberative process and, in view of the arbitrary adjournment date, made it easy for the Republican Party to do nothing effective to control inflation, to do nothing to provide decent homes for the returned veterans, to do nothing to protect and extend the civil rights of all the people.

"Although it would appear that there is no need for long hearings to establish the need for anti-inflation legislation, the meaningless bill now being considered makes it mandatory for organizations representing the public interest to be heard. Senator CAPEHART has publicly stated that the people were not interested in the cost of living. He claimed that there were no requests to testify on the need for legislation to halt the upward inflationary spiral, despite the fact that the CIO and many other groups representing the average American have requested time to be heard on this subject.

"In the interest of the general public, we urge that you as leaders of the Republican Party exercise your influence to hold Congress in session in order to hear the views of President Philip Murray on inflation, Secretary-Treasurer Carey on the civil-rights program, Vice President Rieve on the excess-profits tax bill introduced by Congressman DINGELL, and the need for enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill by Vice President Reuther. This special session of Congress cannot afford to adjourn without establishing this record on which the American people will vote November 2.

"I would appreciate an early reply so that if Congress is to stay at work and do its job we can inform our membership and arrange for the appearance of our witnesses.

"JAMES B. CAREY,
"Secretary-Treasurer of the CIO."

AUGUST 4, 1948.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

We were shocked to be informed today that the CIO has been denied an opportunity to testify during the hearings being conducted by your committee on proposed anti-inflation legislation.

The 6,000,000 members of the CIO and their families are suffering daily what may properly be described in the language of the Republican Party presidential candidate as "frightful impositions" caused by the high and rising cost of living resulting from uncontrolled inflation that, if continued, is bound to result in bust and depression. We believe our testimony would be of interest and value to your committee. In any event, we feel that we should have an opportunity to present it on its merits and under circumstances that will make it possible for the members of your committee to test its validity by questioning.

More shocking than the abrupt cloture invoked before opportunity had been given to us or to other organizations to present facts, opinions, problems, and criticisms of pending legislation is the reason stated for breaking off hearings, namely, a decision by the Republican policy committee that, rain or shine, inflation or no inflation, the Congress must adjourn next Saturday night.

Most shocking is the statement that only "Government witnesses" would be heard and the unprecedented classification of private bankers whose banks happen to be members of the Federal Reserve System as "Government witnesses." As we understand it, they are members of the Federal Reserve System purely for regulatory purposes.

The discrimination in favor of the bankers on the one hand, and against other citizens and their organizations on the other hand, is an unfortunate precedent which, we prefer to believe, you personally would not seriously defend.

We urge you to reconsider and to support our request to Senator TAFT and Speaker MARTIN that Congress be kept in session until effective action has been taken on the emergency items of inflation, housing, and civil rights.

We will appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience.

JAMES B. CAREY,
Secretary-Treasurer, CIO.

THE PRESIDENT'S ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM—STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement issued today by the President at his press conference.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, I am reporting to the Congress concerning a labor dispute which recently existed in the bituminous coal industry.

The significant facts concerning this dispute may be summarized as follows:

The dispute involved the administration of a collective-bargaining agreement known as the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement of 1947, which was signed by the United Mine Workers of America and certain coal operators and associations. The dispute grew out of the dissatisfaction of the union with the failure of the trustees of the United Mine Workers of America Welfare and Retirement Fund, established by the agreement, to begin the payment of benefits. In accordance with the terms of the agreement the union had appointed Mr. John L. Lewis as trustee of the fund, the operators had appointed Mr. Ezra Van Horn, and these two had selected Mr. Thomas E. Murray as the third trustee. The trustees were unable to agree upon any plan for the amount of benefits to be paid out of the fund or the eligibility of miners for such benefits. Mr. Murray therefore resigned from his office as trustee. The continued failure to begin payment from the fund resulted in a work stoppage.

On March 23, 1948, I signed Executive Order 9939, creating a board of inquiry pur-

suant to section 206 of the Labor Management Relations Act. I requested the board to report to me on or before April 5, 1948. The board held public hearings on March 26, 29, and 30, and filed its first report with me on March 31, 1948. That report advised me fully of the facts of the dispute and indicated that the stoppage had "precipitated a crisis in the industry and in the Nation as a whole." A copy of that report is attached.

I therefore requested the Attorney General, in accordance with the provisions of section 208 of the Labor Management Relations Act, to petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for an injunction. An injunction was granted by Justice T. Alan Goldsborough of that court on April 3, 1948. It restrained the union from continuing the strike which the court then found was in existence, ordered the union to instruct all members to return to their employment, and further ordered the union and the operators to bargain collectively.

Following the issuance of the injunction on April 3, 1948, there was a gradual return of miners to work. Compliance with the provisions of that injunction and substantially normal production in the bituminous coal mines was obtained on or about April 26, 1948.

Soon after the issuance of the injunction of April 3, 1948, the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES was selected by the two remaining trustees as the new third trustee under the agreement. Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. Lewis, as trustees, approved a plan for beginning payment of benefits under the fund. Mr. Van Horn withheld his approval and challenged the legality of the action of the majority of the trustees in a proceeding instituted in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. On June 23, 1948, Justice Goldsborough dismissed the complaint filed by Mr. Van Horn and held that the plan of Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. Lewis for beginning payment of benefits under the fund was legal.

As a result of the settlement of the dispute over the fund, the Attorney General, pursuant to section 210 of the Labor Management Relations Act, requested the court to discharge the injunction. The injunction was discharged on June 23, 1948.

The Board of Inquiry was reconvened subsequent to the issuance of the injunction, pursuant to section 209 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, and submitted its final report to me on June 26, 1948. A copy of the report is attached.

It should be noted that this dispute is distinct from that with respect to which I created a board of inquiry on June 19, 1948, by Executive Order 9970, and which made its report to me on June 24, 1948. That board was created because of the imminent expiration of the 1947 contract between the United Mine Workers of America and the bituminous coal operators, and the consequent threat of a stoppage of work. A new contract covering most of the industry was agreed upon by the parties prior to the expiration of the old contract and no injunction was sought. A new contract for the remainder of the industry was subsequently negotiated. Since the report of the second board contains a comprehensive summary of the entire chain of events concerning both disputes, a copy of its report is attached to this message for the convenience of the Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 5, 1948.*

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Negro Looks at Civil Rights," which appeared in the Danville (Va.) Register.

I desire to call particular attention to the excerpt this editorial contains from an article written by Mr. Davis Lee, Negro publisher of the Newark (N. J.) Telegram.

I regard this statement as one of the most accurate and clearest presentations I have even seen of the racial controversy. I think it is especially timely and fitting and should be read by every patriotic American who is so deeply interested in the problems confronting our Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEGRO LOOKS AT CIVIL RIGHTS

It is unfortunate that most of the news discussing race relations comes from professional agitators who have, or think they have, something to gain from creating animosity while talking rabidly about discrimination and, in the same voice, good will.

As publisher of a newspaper with a large circulation and a corresponding influence, Davis Lee, Negro publisher of the Telegram, of Newark, N. J., which has some 500,000 Negro readers in the Southern States, grew less willing to accept the preachments of agitators concerning racial relations in the South. He decided to do a bit of investigating personally. Last Sunday he reported to his readers in a comprehensive article on the editorial page. Some excerpts which reflect his objective approach to the problem and provide sound counsel were called to our attention by the Bedford Democrat, which also was impressed by Publisher Lee. Keeping in mind that the comment is that of a distinguished champion of Negro advancement, and that it was printed in New Jersey, the Telegram editorial takes on added significance.

"I have just returned from an extensive tour of the South. In addition to meeting and talking with our agents and distributors who get our newspapers out to the more than 500,000 readers in the South, I met both Negroes and whites in the urban and rural centers.

"Because of these personal observations, studies and contacts, I feel that I can speak with some degree of authority. I am certainly in a better position to voice an opinion than the Negro leader who occupies a suite in downtown New York and bases his opinions on the South from the distorted stories he reads in the Negro press and in the Daily Worker.

"The racial lines in the South are so clearly drawn and defined there can be no confusion. When I am in Virginia or South Carolina I don't wonder if I will be served if I walk into a white restaurant. I know the score. However, I have walked into several right here in New Jersey where we have a civil-rights law, and have been refused service.

"The whites in the South stay with their own and the Negroes do likewise. This one fact has been the economic salvation of the Negro in the South. Atlanta, Ga., compares favorably with Newark in size and population. Negroes there own and control millions of dollars' worth of business. All of the Negro business in New Jersey will not amount to as much as our race has in one city in Georgia. This is also true in South Carolina and Virginia.

"New Jersey today boasts of more civil-rights legislation than any other State in the Union, and State government itself practices more discrimination than Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Georgia. New Jersey employs one Negro in the motor vehicle department. All of the States above-mentioned employ plenty.

"No matter what a Negro wants to do, he can do it in the South. In Spartanburg, S. C., Ernest Collins, a young Negro, operates a large funeral home, a taxicab business, a filling station, grocery store, has several busses, runs a large farm and a night club.

"Mr. Collins couldn't do all that in New Jersey or New York. The only bus line operated by Negroes is in the South. The Safe Bus Co. in Winston-Salem, N. C., owns and operates over a hundred. If a Negro in New Jersey or New York had the money and attempted to obtain a franchise to operate a line he would not only be turned down, but he would be lucky if he didn't get a bullet in the back.

"The attitude of the southerners toward our race is a natural psychological reaction and aftermath of the Civil War. Negroes were the properties of these people.

"Certainly you could not expect the South to forget this in 75 or even a hundred and fifty years. That feeling has passed from one generation to another, but it is not one of hatred for the Negro. The South just doesn't believe that the Negro has grown up. No section of the country has made more progress in finding a workable solution to the Negro problem than the South. Naturally southerners are resentful when the North attempts to ram a civil-rights program down their throats.

"The entire race program in America is wrong. Our approach is wrong. We expend all our energies, and spend millions of dollars trying to convince white people that we are as good as they are, that we are an equal. Joe Louis is not looked upon as a Negro but the greatest fighter of all time, loved and admired by whites in South Carolina as much as by those in Michigan. He convinced the world, not by propaganda and agitation, but by demonstration.

"Our fight for recognition, justice, civil rights and equality, should be carried on within the race. Let us demonstrate to the world by our living standards, our conduct, our ability and intelligence that we are the equal of any man, and when we shall have done this the entire world, including the South, will accept us on our terms. Our present program of threats and agitation makes enemies out of our friends."

The findings of Publisher Lee are just what any well-informed southerner, white or colored, has known all along. The only difference is that Publisher Lee has chosen to state plainly facts which agitation distorts, and which any Negro leader of lesser standing could not declare without subjecting himself to vituperation and charges of being "a white man's Negro."

Both white and colored people of the Nation must come to understand, and quickly, that much of the agitation attempting to break up their friendship and cordial relations is inspired by persons at home and abroad who have no interest whatever in seeing southern whites and Negroes march toward a firmer economic base and to higher economic base and to higher standards of living for both races.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter just received from a Montana constituent who is typical, I am sure, of thousands of mothers in America. I strongly urge my fellow Members of the Congress to give her letter their careful attention. They will find it, as I have, a most graphic presentation of the overwhelming problems now besetting America's

families. Upon reading it, they will be convinced that so far as our people are concerned, we are truly confronted with a national emergency. They will, I hope, join with me in recognizing that it is our duty to stay on the job until we have passed legislation which will solve the overwhelming problems confronting the mothers of Montana and of the Nation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUTTE, MONT., *July 28, 1948.*

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY.

DEAR SIR: I just heard Senator TAFT and Representative HALLECK speaking on their attitude toward the problems posed for the special session by President Truman.

Among other statements made by Representative HALLECK was one to the effect that many prices including that of haircuts were going down, and I am wondering how long since he has had one, and at which shop in which State he got it, certainly not in Butte, Mont. They also spoke of all the protection they have given the veterans and their dependents; I would surely like to see some of it. I very well know that my husband, a veteran of World War I, has received none of these despite the fact that due to a service-connected heart condition he has been unable to work at a gainful occupation for over 2 years, for this disability he is rated at 30 percent and allowed compensation at the rate of $41.40 per month; this completely disregards his dependents which include a wife and eight minor children. He is a man who worked steadily as long as he was able, and would gladly work now were he able, instead he has to stand helplessly by and watch his children be deprived of the necessities of life because the aid to dependent children in the amount of $130 a month which I receive simply won't provide more than a mere existence at today's high prices. Have you ever tried feeding, clothing, housing, and supplying medical, dental, and optical care on an income per person of $17 a month? Try it. Then you won't wonder why so many of our youth can't meet the physical requirements of our armed forces.

In the face of conditions such as these, can you with a clear conscience, vote to adjourn this special session without taking action to rectify these conditions?

If you can, my suggestion is that you at least act to supply gas chambers such as the Nazis had to eliminate people such as us, as being far more merciful than a slow death from malnutrition, which is sure to be our fate if inflation is allowed to continue unchecked.

My people have been giving their lives and services in defense of this democracy for over 130 years. I wonder if they could see the state of the common man now, if they wouldn't consider their sacrifices as being just wasted energy.

Hoping that I will have your answer soon, I remain,

Yours truly,

PATRICIA BURNS
(Mrs. Patrick J. Burns).

CLAIMS OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR AGAINST ENEMY NATIONS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, a statement in the National AMVET, the official publication of the AMVETS of World War II, for August 1948, pertaining to the question of claims of American prisoners of war against enemy nations, is of particular interest now to a great number of former prisoners of war in Maryland and other States.

It calls attention to the fact which some of us noted with deep regret, that Public Law 896, enacted during the closing days of the second session of the Eightieth Congress, failed to provide administrative or other necessary costs to effectuate the legislation.

Because it points so definitely to the need for action in this respect, I ask that the AMVET statement be placed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUICK SETTLEMENT OF POW'S CLAIMS URGED

WASHINGTON.—Failure of the Federal Government to move promptly in setting up legal machinery to handle the claims of American prisoners of war against enemy nations brought an urgent demand for action from AMVETS this month.

Commander Edward C. Corry appealed personally to Director James E. Webb of the Federal Budget Bureau urging that the liquidated assets of enemy aliens be used to provide the necessary money for meeting these claims.

Corry pointed out that the Government already has upward of $70,000,000 in such assets available for transfer to the newly authorized War Claims Commission created by Congress for the express purpose of adjudicating the claims of American POW's.

Although the War Claims Commission was established under Public Law 896, as passed by the Eightieth Congress, Commander Corry called Mr. Webb's attention to the fact that no appropriation is included in the law.

Said Corry:

"Inasmuch as we feel this is an urgent problem for those veterans who paid such a high price in suffering for our victory and because they have waited patiently since 1945 for this Commission, it is felt by AMVETS that the Bureau of the Budget should now take whatever steps may be necessary in fulfilling the intent of Congress that an appropriation be made."

The new law applies particularly to the claims of prisoners who suffered cruel and inhuman treatment in violation of the Geneva covenants.

The bulk of such claims, of course, are against the Japanese Government.

DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL-TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2644) to provide for the development of civil-transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I appeared before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and presented to that committee certain facts regarding the destruction of food in America, which is now taking place under the authority of the Department of Agriculture. It has been recognized that one of the major problems facing this country today is the high cost of living. The President of the United States apparently felt that this problem was serious enough to use it as one of the excuses for calling Congress back into session.

I was not at all surprised to hear the President last Tuesday in his message to the joint session of Congress ask for a restoration of price controls and rationing. Soon after assuming my duties in the Senate, it became evident to me that the present New Deal administration had no other method to offer to meet the high cost of living than through the rigid controls of our economy, and it was determined to reinstate them even though our experience under OPA demonstrated that controls in peacetime would retard rather than increase production.

I am not disputing the statement of the President that the cost of living today has reached fantastic heights. Nor am I questioning the wisdom that some action should be taken to remedy the situation. I do differ with the administration, however, on what method should be taken.

Rather than restore price controls, which President Truman once described as "police-state methods," and revive the black markets in this country, I think it would be much more sensible to examine the policies of the New Deal administration over the past 16 years which have contributed to high prices and then make necessary adjustments.

One of the first acts of the New Deal administration 15 years ago was the deliberate devaluation of the American dollar through the abandonment of the gold standard, followed in rapid order by the creation of numerous alphabetical agencies, whose principal functions were the redistribution of wealth along socialistic patterns through the medium of 14 years of deficit financing.

This philosophy became so brazen that the New Deal apostle, Harry Hopkins, coined his memorable phrase, "We will tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect."

One overlooked factor contributing to the high cost of living is the high cost of government, which today requires for its support an average of 31 cents out of every earned dollar.

The New Deal administration has completely ignored the historical fact that continued excessive Government expenditures lead to ruinous inflation. In fact, the President in his message to the Congress still ignored this economic principle when, in one sentence, he urged the Congress to take action on the high cost of living, and at the next moment called for additional Federal spending on a gigantic scale and an enlargement of Government subsidy programs.

The policy of the administration has been not only to continue but in many instances to further enlarge the payment of Government subsidies to farmers as well as to numerous industrial corporations. Actually we are today spending annually hundreds of millions of dollars subsidizing industry during the period of the greatest prosperity our country has ever experienced. Many of these subsidies could have been eliminated or at least drastically reduced during recent years, yet no suggestion is made along these lines. Even today we have on our Senate calendar bills calling for subsidy

payments to the mining industry, the aviation industry, and to many other groups. All these bills have the enthusiastic support of Senators on both sides of the aisle, many of whom are here today criticizing the high cost of Government.

In his message the President endorsed the principle of raising wages in industry, and again claimed this could be done without necessitating increased prices. At the same time, he recommended and urged increased wage levels for Government employees; however, in this instance, as Chief Executive of the greatest corporation in the United States, the Government itself, he admits his inability to perform the miracle and requests Congress to appropriate additional sums, making no effort to absorb the wage increase in the normal income of the Government.

The President points out that production in industry has not reached the expected goals in meeting supply and demand; however, he makes no reference to the fact that it was the New Deal administration which recommended reducing the 44-hour week immediately following the war to prevent at that time the depression predicted by the brain trust.

To further demonstrate the lack of sincerity on the part of the present New Deal administration in taking adequate steps to reduce the cost of living, notably the housewife's food basket, I wish at this time to present some examples of a policy now being used by the New Deal administration deliberately to hold prices up. I refer now to the farm price-support program which the President, if he were sincere, would have requested Congress to revise on a realistic basis.

This program is a byproduct of Henry Wallace's brainstorm under which he advocated plowing under every third row and killing every fourth pig to remove the agricultural surpluses of the country. To show how this program works to keep prices up, I shall cite a few examples.

The first example I cite is that of potatoes.

At the very moment I speak here, agents of the Department of Agriculture are swarming over the potato-producing areas of the Nation, buying from the farmers potatoes at a price averaging $2.75 per hundredweight. Since the Congress adjourned in June, I have spent considerable time watching this wasteful program function. I would recommend that each Member of the Senate who is interested in the high cost of living visit some of these agricultural areas and see for himself these programs in operation.

I had previously felt that my knowledge of this program was reasonably complete, but I was both amazed and disgusted, as were the farmers themselves, with the policy of our Government in its methods of administering this program.

I saw farmers delivering strictly U. S. No. 1 potatoes to the Government at the delivery centers and receiving in return a price of $2.75 per hundredweight. The purchases were being conducted by a group of Government buyers on the spot.

At the same location other Government agents were offering for resale these same potatoes to other farmers and in many instances to the same farmers who produced them, for the ridiculously low price of 1 cent per hundredweight. The principal condition to the contract which the farmer signs when purchasing these potatoes for 1 cent per bag is that he will not allow any of them so purchased to be used for human consumption. He is allowed only to feed these strictly No. 1 potatoes to domestic animals.

In plain language, it was perfectly legal under this contract to feed these potatoes to any livestock, whether they be cattle, hogs, or dogs, but under no circumstances could he allow his children to eat them, regardless of the need. I have witnessed the dumping of hundreds of bags of good edible potatoes into the hog lots. This procedure is comparable to that which is being carried out all over the Nation right now while we debate the high cost of living.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator name the farmer to whom he has been referring?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, because I am not criticizing the farmers. I am criticizing the administration. If the Senator from Illinois wants to verify my statement, he can obtain records from the Department of Agriculture, or if he will come to the State of Delaware I shall be glad to take him for a ride in my automobile and show him where it occurred.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not care to take an automobile ride with the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the Senator's own State of Illinois the same thing is going on.

Mr. LUCAS. I asked the Senator a simple question. He made the statement that he could prove that the Government was buying potatoes from certain farmers and selling them right back to the same farmers, and I asked him to name one farmer, which he refuses to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because I am not criticizing the farmers.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not, either.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall read a letter from the Department of Agriculture in connection with the question, because the Senator from Illinois seemed to be in a little doubt——

Mr. LUCAS. I am not in doubt about anything. All I am asking is that the Senator name one farmer. I do not care anything about hearing a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture. The Senator has made a statement, and I think he ought to give me the information requested.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not criticizing any farmer. Of the 1948 crop, all of which has been dug since Congress adjourned on June 20, the Government has disposed of 3,410,000 bushels of strictly No. 1 potatoes in the manner in which I have indicated, for which the Government has paid from $2.75 to $2.90, for the farmers to dump into the hog lots at one penny a bag.

The Secretary of Agriculture who appeared before the committee yesterday admitted all these things. I am not bringing in the names of the farmers involved, because it is not the farmers' fault.

Mr. LUCAS. Whose fault is it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is the fault of the Congress and the President of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very happy that the Senator has included the Congress of the United States, because the Congress, as the Senator well knows, continued the support program over the protest of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and other Senators who sought a program at the last session which would take care of the very situation about which the Senator from Delaware is complaining. We discussed the potato question for days, and after the Senate passed a long-range farm program which would have effectively dealt with the question, the Republicans in the House refused to go along with the bill and brought back the same old 90-percent parity guaranty on basic and nonbasic commodities. So the Secretary of Agriculture has a mandate from the Republican Congress to do exactly what he is doing with reference to potatoes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad the Senator from Illinois has brought that up, and I want at this time to call his attention to the fact that I voted against this unsound program while the Senator from Illinois voted for it, as did every Democrat except one on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not know what he is talking about with respect to the farm program I am discussing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The President of the United States criticized the bill by saying it was not liberal enough to the farmers.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not speaking of what the President of the United States did; I am talking about what Congress did.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And I am talking about what the Senator from Illinois did.

Mr. LUCAS. I am talking about what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] who was the leader of a long-range farm program containing flexible parity provisions, proposed, which would have taken care of the very situation to which the Senator is now referring. He could not get it through because the House of Representatives, led by the distinguished Representative from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, would not let the bill pass. The House sent this bill back with the same old support program. Now the Senator from Delaware criticizes the Agriculture Department for the potato situation, when all that it is doing is acting under a mandate of this Congress, and nothing else.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Illinois think that if the Secretary of Agriculture had not been acting under a mandate of the Congress his actions would have been different?

Mr. LUCAS. Of course. If the Congress had given him flexible authority to deal with the potato situation and with the citrus-fruit situation, with raisins, chickens, eggs, and every other basic and nonbasic commodity, of course, the situation would have been different from what it is at the present time. If there is any responsibility in connection with the potato question or with respect to any other nonbasic commodities, and the Government has to go into the taxpayers' pockets to pay a subsidy, the responsibility rests with the Republican-controlled Congress, because it had an opportunity to correct the situation. The Committee on Agriculture, headed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont after investigations throughout the country, brought back a program which was adopted in the last days of the session, because of the courage of the Senator from Vermont. He had difficulty in getting the policy committee to accept the bill, but it was finally overwhelmingly passed by the Senate. The House refused to go along with it, and so the identical support program was brought back. We agreed to continue the bill providing 90 percent of parity on basic and nonbasic commodities for 1 year, and that is why the potato situation is as it is today. That is the only reason.

I challenge the Senator to show where the Secretary of Agriculture is exceeding his authority under the mandates laid down by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Illinois to remain in the Chamber for a few minutes, because I am going to discuss a part of this program over which the Congress did not give the Secretary of Agriculture a mandate and under which food is being removed from the American markets.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to remain.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I emphasize that I stood on the floor of the Senate at the time the agricultural program was up for discussion and denounced it as economically unsound. I voted against it. I live in an agricultural county which ranks third in agricultural production east of the Rocky Mountains, and rates ahead of any county in Illinois. The Senator from Illinois and every Democrat on the other side of the aisle voted for the program, with the exception of one, so there is no use criticising the Eightieth Congress or the Republican Party. There is nothing in the law instructing the Secretary of Agriculture to destroy food. I said at the time that the program was unsound, and I repeat, it is still unsound, but it is absurd for the President to ask for price controls when at the same time the Government is supporting those prices at artificially high levels. It cannot be done.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. Rather an observation. I am not going to debate the issue the Senator is discussing. The only thing I am trying to get straight in the minds of the people is the potato question. As I understood the Senator, he was attempting to lay the responsibility and assess the blame upon the Department of Agriculture for what was going on in the disposition of surplus potatoes. My only point is that whatever goes on with respect to potatoes, the Secretary of Agriculture is following the mandate laid down by the Eightieth Congress in the last session. That is the point I wish to make, and that is the point the American people ought to have made clear. Instead of blaming the Department of Agriculture, the Senator should lay all the responsibility on the Congress of the United States where it legitimately belongs, and not upon the executive branch of the Government which is compelled under the Constitution to execute faithfully the laws the legislative branch enacts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I still say, Mr. President, and without excusing the actions of the Congress at all, either my party or the other, that the major part of the responsibility for this program does lie with the Secretary of Agriculture. There is nothing in the law anywhere which says that the Secretary of Agriculture shall destroy these potatoes, or sell them for the prices being received. We are now operating the European recovery program, under which we are feeding Europe, and why are not any of these potatoes shipped to Europe?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows that many of the potatoes are not the kind that can be shipped. There is a potato raised in Alabama, many of which were destroyed last year, about which a great fuss was made all over the country, a peculiar potato that had to be shipped in a refrigerator car and be in New York within 3 days after it was dumped on the ground. But the growers could not get refrigerator cars, and the potatoes had to be destroyed. It is necessary in most cases to dehydrate them in order to send them to Europe, and that is not being done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think the Senator from Illinois can tell me much about potatoes. I handled potatoes for 25 years before I came to the Senate. The potatoes in Virginia, North Carolina, Maryland, and Delaware cannot be exported satisfactorily, it is true. But those potatoes can be stored in warehouses in the United States, and they will keep until the middle of winter, and will still be good enough to eat. I have eaten such potatoes.

The potatoes the Government buys, which are produced in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, or anywhere in the northern section, are good for export, but they were not exported. For instance, during the period when the Luckman committee was in control, which was advocating the conservation of food in America, over 1,000 cars of good northern potatoes which could have been exported, were given to the alcohol companies free of charge, and as if that were not attractive enough, the Government paid out additional money to get them to take them off their hands.

Potatoes were exported last year to the Argentine, to Buenos Aires, which is twice the distance potatoes would go if they were shipped to Europe. I know potatoes can be exported, and the Senator from Illinois need not tell me they cannot. They have been exported by the Department of Agriculture, to South American countries, during the winter months, good potatoes, that could have gone to Europe, and the interesting point is that they were sold for shipment to people in South America at prices lower than those the Department of Agriculture was allowing the American housewife to pay for them.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a very interesting observation, but what I am saying, in substance, is that in spite of the criticisms the Senator is making against the Department of Agriculture if potatoes were sent abroad and were rotting, for example, on the docks at Southampton, the information would be sent all over this country, and the Senator from Delaware would be the first to rise and criticize the Department of Agriculture in case they lost some carload lots.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, why should they rot on the docks? Let the people eat them. Potatoes are now being rationed in Europe. The potatoes I am referring to could have been shipped to Europe. There is no one in the Department of Agriculture who can convince me otherwise. If they can go to South America, they can go to Europe, and I know they can be exported. Any man who has ever handled potatoes will agree with that. I do not refer to the southern potatoes, but the southern potatoes now being destroyed could be held in warehouses and the American people could use them while the northern potatoes could be exported. This would have eliminated the necessity of scraping the bottom of the American grain bins.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, the Senator is absolutely opposed to any kind of a support program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I believe in a support program, but not one which supports any agricultural commodity or any industry—at artificially high levels, especially during a period of our greatest prosperity.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator vote against the Aiken bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, and the Senator from Illinois voted for it.

Mr. LUCAS. That is typical of the political philosophy of most of the eastern Republicans.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is all right; I am still condemning it, and the Senator from Illinois is upholding it. The same program can be carried out under the Aiken bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In order to keep the subject out of politics, I should like to say that Governor Dewey has publicly announced that a long-range farm bill

should be the cornerstone of a good farm program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I said at the time the bill was under discussion, as will be found if Senators will read the RECORD, and I repeat now, that I believe we should have a sound agricultural program. I have been as close to agriculture as has any other Senator, but I do not think any agricultural program which guarantees a margin of profit is economically sound. An agricultural program is supposed to keep the farmers from going bankrupt in hard times, or tide them over an emergency. It is not supposed to guarantee them a profit, and $2.75 or $2.90 a bag is a big price for potatoes. Farmers can make a great deal of money growing them at that price if they have a reasonable yield. Any potato grower will verify that. Do not forget that the American housewife is caught in the middle of this program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Was the Senator from Delaware present yesterday when Mr. Brannan, the Secretary of Agriculture, testified?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was present, yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Did the Senator hear him say he was unalterably opposed to the subsidy program upon potatoes, but was carrying out the mandate of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I heard him say that it should be revised, but he failed to tell what his program was. I asked him if he would join with me in saying that the program should be repealed or revised, and I am still waiting for his answer.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course he does. He could not be against subsidies on potatoes without desiring a change in the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The point I am making is that the Senator cannot put the blame on the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Secretary of Agriculture does not have to destroy these potatoes under any law. I have said before, and I repeat again, there is no justifiable reason for the destruction of good food in America.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was interested in the remark made by the Senator from Vermont about the endorsement given by Governor Dewey to the farm program. As I understood him, he said Governor Dewey favored a long-range agricultural program. Does that mean that the Governor has specifically endorsed the Aiken bill?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it means that.

Mr. HATCH. He did not refer to it by name, but merely said he favored a long-range program.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, he referred to the specific price support and the bill which was approved by this Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To continue what I said before; when these potatoes are sold to the farmers it is perfectly legal under the contract of sale to the farmers to feed the potatoes to any livestock, whether they be cattle, hogs, or dogs, but under no circumstances could he allow his children to eat them, regardless of the need. In recent weeks I have witnessed the dumping of hundreds of bags of edible potatoes in the hog lots. The procedure is comparable to that which is being carried out all over the Nation right now while we debate the high cost of living.

Out of this year's potato crop alone the Government has disposed of 3,410,000 bushels of strictly No. 1 potatoes in the manner I have just described. This is not the whole story. In addition, the Government has purchased over 5,000,000 bushels of potatoes which have been diverted to the distillers of this country, for which the Government has actually paid out money to get the distillers to take them off its hands.

The loss to the Government to date on the 1948 white-potato crop alone is approximately $16,000,000, the bulk of which has been sustained since Congress adjourned June 19, 1948. It is ironical to read in the Government reports that large quantities of potatoes were being dumped into alcohol plants in Philadelphia at the very moment when, on the other side of the city of Philadelphia, the Democratic Party was adopting a platform endorsing this unsound program, and at the same time loudly proclaiming its sympathy to the American housewife, who is obliged as a result to pay continued high prices for potatoes. While the Democratic Convention was in progress in the city of Philadelphia, on the other side of the city the distilleries were actually dumping over 100 cars of good potatoes, and the Government paid out approximately $10,000 to get the distillers to take those potatoes off their hands.

ANOTHER FOOD ITEM

Our Government has spent in recent months $32,000,000 to make certain that the eggs purchased by the housewife will not drop in price. The eggs purchased under this program have been disposed of principally in foreign-occupied areas and at a loss of over $24,000,000. This loss in itself is not so much as the effect such operations have on the cost of a purchase at the grocery store by the housewife.

I hope the Senator from Illinois will not leave the Chamber just now. We are reaching a particularly interesting point.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Delaware has any question he wishes to direct to the Senator from Illinois, I shall be glad to answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It so happens that the part of the program I am discussing now is not mandatory on the Department of Agriculture. It is not written into law. For instance, I shall now call attention to the fact that early this year when the market price for prunes began to decline the Government began purchases. There is nothing in the law which says the Secretary of Agriculture must support the price of prunes.

Mr. LUCAS. Well, the Senator from Delaware just does not know the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Secretary of Agriculture himself confirmed this fact that while he has the power to do it if he wishes, it is not mandatory.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Delaware will recall what we wrote into the ERP legislation with respect to prunes, raisins, and other California fruits.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, but that does not make the support of such fruits mandatory.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Delaware knows that Congress wrote into the ERP legislation provisions with respect to California fruits and commodities, as applied to that program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Where is the language with respect to prunes mandatory?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from California is on the floor. He offered an amendment, which I understand the Senator from Delaware supported, giving the citrus growers and prune and raisin growers of California the right to dispose of their surplus crops under the ERP program in order that the needy European people might get them. I believe the Senator from Delaware supported that amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois is just a little off base. I appeared before the committee, as I believe the present occupant of the chair, the President pro tempore, will confirm, and protested against that amendment, as I thought it was unsound. I voted against the amendment on the floor of the Senate. As I remember the Senator from Illinois voted for it.

Mr. LUCAS I certainly did. I thought it was a very good thing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know the Senator from Illinois thought it was a very good thing. But to show how it is working out, I will say that immediately the Government entered the market and purchased over 140,000,000 pounds of prunes under that provision of the law, at a cost of $15,000,000. These in turn were diverted for foreign consumption in foreign occupied areas at a loss of over $9,000,000 to the American taxpayer. They were sold with the proviso that under no circumstances should they be offered for resale in the continental United States, while at the same time, and as a consequence, the retail price of prunes to the American housewife immediately started to rise.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Delaware should not be talking to me. He should be talking to the Senator from California, who knows all about this matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought the Senator from Illinois was interested, because he defends this program and supported the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Delaware is mistaken. I did not offer an amendment respecting prunes. I am trying to take care of the corn, wheat, soybean, and hog producers in Illinois.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will come to them in a moment, and show what is being done with respect to them.

Mr. LUCAS. Well, the farmers in my part of the country are doing pretty well. I do not know how they are doing in Delaware under the able leadership of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I agree with you the farmers in Illinois are doing all right under this program, but how about the housewives in Chicago? The farmers in both States do better when managing their own affairs.

Mr. LUCAS. If so, they are doing very, very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I repeat, it will be better for everyone in the country when the Government takes itself out of this situation, and the producers are permitted to manage their own affairs.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; let them go back to a condition such as we had in 1932, when they turned the black acres loose and managed their own affairs.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say that if a great many of the Government regulations are dispensed with the farmers will produce the food the country needs. I call your attention to another food product.

In the early part of this year the market on dried raisins indicated weakness, and again the Government entered this market—which is something the Senator from Illinois said he agreed with and approves—and purchased 170,000,000 pounds of dried raisins—again disposed of them with the understanding that they could not be resold in the continental United States. No, Mr. President, the American housewife cannot be permitted to buy them. The raisins are here and could be made available to her at a reasonable price; but, no, she cannot buy them. The Government purchased 170,000,000 pounds of dried raisins at an approximate cost of $16,000,000 and diverted them from the normal trade channels, sustaining a loss in this instance of over $7,000,000. Immediately the retail price for dried raisins started to rise. We deduct a little additional from the American housewife's husband's pay envelope to pay for this loss so as to hold up the price.

Mr. LUCAS. What would the Senator from Delaware have done with the surplus prunes and raisins in California?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would have let the American people buy them.

Mr. LUCAS. Suppose no one had bought them, then what would the Senator have done?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If we have reached the state where no one would buy these food products at a reasonable price, then I would say that the Senator from Illinois, and the President of the United States, have wasted a lot of time talking about the high cost of living.

Mr. LUCAS. How about the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who offered the amendment? He was interested in the matter of whether the producers in California were going to lose money on these crops.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois can ask the Senator from California and secure a reply from him. I will say that the proposal was a rather interesting one to me. Everyone seems to be concerned about the farmer around election time.

Mr. LUCAS. Everyone but the Senator from Delaware. He apparently is not concerned about the farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, the Senator from Delaware is concerned about the farmer, because if this kind of practice is continued we will have no agricultural program. Do not overlook the fact that the citrus products were bought from the dealers. The farmers had previously sold these products to the dealers. The harvest season was past. It was merely a matter of bailing out a bunch of dealers, using the farmers as an excuse. I have a list showing every single dealer from which the products were bought, and the prices paid to them.

Mr. LUCAS. The farmers have done pretty well under the so-called New Deal program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If they can be made to forget how much of the huge national debt has been charged up against each one of them, yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The farmer has been pretty well satisfied.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This November will tell us how well satisfied they are. The farmers were not satisfied 2 years ago.

Mr. LUCAS. He was not satisfied 2 years ago with the OPA because of what Republicans promised if it were abolished.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps you will find out how well satisfied the farmer is after November 2.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Delaware knows, and I know, that the farmer has more money in the bank now, is more prosperous, and his living conditions are much better than ever before. There is more rural electricity available to him, he has more refrigerators, washing machines, telephones, and more of the good things of life than he ever had in the history of America, and that improvement has come about under a Democratic administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with what the Senator has said respecting the improvement in the farmers' situation, but do not forget that these improvements are charged up against him in our national debt. That is another reason I say there is no justification for a subsidy at this time either to the farmer, industry, or any other group.

Mr. LUCAS. Ah, but what would the farmers' condition be had it not been for the program laid down by the Democratic administration back in 1933, when farmers all over the country, even in Delaware, were bankrupt; when a judge in Iowa was taken off the bench and threatened with hanging because he signed decrees of foreclosure? Had it not been for the imagination and courage shown by the Democratic administration, which entered upon a legislative program in 1933, for the improvement of the condition of the people of the country, the farmer never would have pulled out. Under the Republican theory just now being advocated by the Senator from Delaware he would have been unable to get out from under. Apparently the Senator from Delaware wants the farmers to go back to the condition in which they were in 1931, 1932, and 1933 when we had the worst depression in the history of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. When the Senator refers to 1932, all he can think of is "depression." It is no more correct to charge that depression, which was world-wide, against the Republican Party than it would be now to charge World War II against the Democratic Party just because they happened to be in power.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure that is what the Senator would like; to go on back to the 1932 depression, because every political view he represents on the floor of the Senate demonstrates his reactionary viewpoint upon government. He would like to go back. But I want to remind the Senator that nothing is static in this world, and that things move on regardless of the Senator from Delaware and myself. The country cannot stand still. It cannot go back. We must move forward.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with you, things do change. That is the reason the Republicans are coming back into power.

Mr. LUCAS. We will wait and see about that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will describe their operations in another commodity—the market price for grapefruit juice began to decline from the wartime price level. Again the Government rushed into the market and purchased 1,500,000 gallons at a cost of $2.25 per gallon and immediately offered it for resale to be distributed outside this country at slightly less than 40 cents per gallon, sustaining a loss of $3,000,000, and pushing the retail price of this product to higher levels.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to finish this statement.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator called me back. I was ready to leave, and he called me over here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad the Senator is over here. I should like to finish this statement.

On the transaction to which I have referred the Government lost $3,000,000, and the price of grapefruit juice began to rise.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois and ask, Does he believe that the program I am describing should continue? It is not mandatory upon the Secretary of Agriculture to continue it. Does the Senator believe that he should do so?

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator, if he had been a citrus grower, if he would have taken any money for grapefruit juice under those circumstances?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I had been a citrus grower, I would have sold it, just as the citrus growers did. I am not criticizing the producers, as I stated in the beginning. I criticize the policy of the administration; and I point out to the Senator from Illinois—which he can check if he wishes—that the farmers have very little chance under the potato program, and many other programs, other than to sell to the Government, because all the private buyers who used to handle those products have been forced out of busi-

ness. On the eastern shore of Virginia today, where 10,000 to 12,000 cars of potatoes are moved, we find very few private buyers left, because they cannot stay in business. No private buyer can operate in competition with the Government, which is handling the taxpayers' money, and does not care how it handles it. The farmers are forced to go into this program.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Government decided that the retail price for honey was not high enough, so it purchased 11,800,000 pounds at an approximate cost of $1,500,000 and shipped it outside this country. A loss of approximately $1,000,000 resulted, and the American housewife was forced to pay a higher price.

On June 30, 1946, the ceiling price on wheat was $1.74 a bushel. At the present time the Department of Agriculture has buyers in the Midwest supporting the market for wheat at an average of $2 a bushel. The Secretary of Agriculture has advised the farmers to store their wheat in the warehouses and to withhold it from the markets until such time as arrangements can be made with the Government buyers at the support prices.

The American housewife cannot expect the price of bread to decline so long as the Government insists upon maintaining the price of wheat at the present level.

The same statement made in reference to wheat applies with equal force in the corn market. In this instance the Government has announced a parity price at $1.59 per bushel, which is 17 cents per bushel higher than the maximum ceiling price prevailing during the war.

With the Government pledged to support the price of corn at these high levels, the American housewife cannot expect to buy cheaper pork and beef.

The Government has announced that it will support the wool market around 43 cents a pound. The 43-cent price is about 30 percent higher than the average price for which this commodity sold in the preceding 10 years. So long as this program remains in effect, you cannot expect cheaper woolen products.

Cotton is an essential product for every American home. In the preceding 10 years, including the war years, the average price which the American farmer received for cotton was 18 cents per pound. Today the Government is supporting the cotton market at approximately 28 cents per pound, or an increase over the preceding 10-year price of 50 percent.

How can the American housewife entertain any hope that under the administration's program she will be able to buy cheaper clothing? I wish someone in the administration or someone on the other side of the aisle would explain to me how it is mathematically possible to roll back prices to a level as recommended by the President, not to exceed 20 percent over the June 30, 1946, price, and at the same time continue a program under the Department of Agriculture whereby the administration itself supports the markets at levels greatly exceeding those figures. The administration has resisted every effort on the part of Congress or anyone else to modify this program.

After the ceiling price was removed on sugar, under a free market the price began to adjust itself at a reasonable level, and the market conditions indicated that the retail price would gradually become stabilized at a normal level.

The import quota was fixed on January 2, 1948, at 7,800,000 short tons, but as soon as the markets began to indicate weakness this import quota was reduced by the Department of Agriculture on February 26, 1948, in the amount of 300,000 tons. In the bulletin announcing that reduction in the import quota the Department pointed out that sugar prices in the United States had declined to a level below those prevailing while ceiling prices were in effect; therefore the import quota was being reduced to strengthen the market. They wanted to be sure that the market would not go down.

On May 26, 1948, a further reduction of 500,000 tons in the import quota was made by the Secretary of Agriculture and again the same reasons were given; namely, to check a declining market. Obviously the administration was determined that the sugar prices should remain high.

In every instance the Department's action of reducing the quota was followed by increased sugar prices, which completely contradicts the statement of the administration that it is concerned with the high price which the housewife pays for her sugar.

I have been advised that the Department of Agriculture has belatedly recognized that perhaps it has overdone this cutting back and either has recently or expects to in the very near future revise this quota upward.

I was advised yesterday that a third change has been made, as of July 26, and that the quota has now been revised upward.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Has the Senator discussed eggs and poultry?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am coming to eggs and poultry.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Delaware, I understand, is very much interested in those commodities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall reach it shortly.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to hear what the Senator has to say on that subject, because eggs and poultry have been treated in similar fashion with potatoes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I invite the attention of the Senator from Illinois to something which he perhaps does not know. So far as I know, not a single farmer in the State of Delaware has ever been subsidized in connection with poultry.

Mr. LUCAS. Let the Senator go ahead and talk about eggs and poultry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. First I ask, Can the Senator from Illinois say the same thing about his constituents?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is in that business, and he knows all about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, I am proud to say that our farmers have been doing all right without the support of the Government.

MEAT

The Government is supporting the price of pigs, beef, cattle, veal, sheep, chickens, and turkeys all at prices higher than the ceiling prices which prevailed during the war. To further aggravate the situation, the administration has recently announced a program for stock piling meats for future Government use and is launching its purchases for this stock piling during the current summer months, at a time when prices are extremely high, and during the months of lowest normal production.

Evidently the administration is determined to prove its statement that the American housewife will not be able to get meats.

I now yield to the Senator if he wishes to make comment. I should like to know how his farmers in Illinois are doing.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not need to ask me about my farmers in Illinois. He is making the address. All I am trying to do is to elicit some information about poultry and eggs. The Senator is an expert on that question. I know that the Government has subsidized the poultry dealers of the country under the 90-percent guaranty of parity in connection with nonbasic commodities. I was wondering whether or not the Senator had benefited as a result of that provision of the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Delaware has not benefited a single penny.

Mr. LUCAS. Many poultry raisers throughout the Nation have.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not benefited a single penny. Furthermore, to my knowledge not a single farmer in the State of Delaware has called on the Government for a subsidy on poultry.

Mr. LUCAS. That is very fine. I congratulate the Senator from Delaware. The Senator from Delaware will not deny that the law applies equally to the poultry farmers of Delaware as it does to the farmers in every other section of the country. If there was any subsidy coming to the farmers of Delaware, I presume they might take just a little of it if they had the opportunity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois says that they had the opportunity. I have pointed out that they have not taken advantage of the opportunity. If he wishes to prove otherwise, let him produce the record.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. At the present time the Government is supporting the price of eggs in the Midwest, but it is supporting them at 35 cents a dozen, which is a long way from the 75 or 80 cents which the consumer is paying for them. Somewhere between the price of 35 cents and the price of 80 cents there is about 45 cents which is lost in handling, transportation, profits, and other charges. I am glad that the Senator gave me an opportunity to point out that when the eastern consumer complains about the

high cost of eggs, we should not blame the farmer for it, nor Government price support, because the support is 35 cents a dozen.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not blaming the farmer, because laws are enacted in Congress. The President of the United States and the Congress together should assume responsibility. I am not criticizing the farmers for participating in this program. I have made that plain from the beginning. I am not criticizing them any more than I would criticize consumers in the cities during the war who bought food products when they were being subsidized by the Government. They had no choice. But I do criticize the economic soundness of the program. I think we have a right to criticize it. Otherwise the facts will not be brought out. I do not believe that it is sound to continue a program which supports at such high levels any agricultural commodities. I objected to the same thing in connection with industrial subsidies on numerous occasions. Many times the Senator from Illinois has complained at the large amount of money which industrial corporations are making. He will find that I was voting against him on industrial subsidies. I was one of the group of Senators—and we did not have the assistance of the Senator from Illinois, unfortunately—who in the closing days of the last session opposed the subsidy bill for the aviation industry; and I joined with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] in opposing a subsidy bill for the mining industry. I wish on that occasion we had had the enthusiastic support of the Senator from Illinois. I am opposed to subsidies, either to industry or to agriculture, at all times of prosperity. I do not think they are economically sound.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has a right to his position, of course.

If he will further yield, for one last remark by me, and then I shall cease and desist, let me say that when the Senator began his able address on the subject he evidently wished to leave the implication, and it seems to me that he has continued to try to do so, that the Department of Agriculture is to blame for all the bungling about potatoes and what not. What I maintain is that the Secretary of Agriculture is acting under the authority granted him by the Congress of the United States; and what he has done is what he has been required to do by the law which was passed at the last session of Congress.

I repeat that if the courageous Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] had had his way in the Congress, and if the Congress had passed the Aiken bill, with the flexible provisions so far as concerns parity on basic and nonbasic commodities, we would not have the trouble which now exists with respect to potatoes, chickens, eggs, and other nonbasic commodities which the Senator from Delaware has been discussing.

If there is any responsibility or blame to be placed, I repeat that it is to be placed upon the Eightieth Congress for its failure to adopt the program recommended by the committee headed by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Some of that responsibility may rest on the Eightieth Congress, but I call attention to the fact that the Senator from Illinois was one of the Senators who voted for the action which was taken and the President himself endorsed the program.

Mr. LUCAS. I was strongly in favor of the program advocated by the Senator from Vermont, and even some of the chicken and egg farmers thought that program was all right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, the Senator from Illinois supported that version of the program.

Mr. LUCAS. At the time when the final version was brought in, I could do nothing else; it was brought in at midnight, during the last hours of the session, and we had no choice; it was a question of either taking it or having nothing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All Senators were at liberty to vote against it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Aiken program itself was not before us for a vote at that time; we had to choose between either adopting the conference report or having nothing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Illinois could have voted against it if he wished to do so. Regardless of the sympathy that is expressed in speech the vote is what counts. I know the Senator will agree with me as to that.

Mr. LUCAS. From a parliamentary standpoint, the Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And the Senator from Illinois and other Senators voted, on the floor of the Senate for the program I am criticizing today.

It is true that, under the law, the Secretary of Agriculture has to buy the potatoes. I am not criticizing him for that, and I never have. But I do criticize him for destroying them needlessly.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Delaware for that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Secretary of Agriculture does not have to destroy those potatoes. With a little more research, he could find ways in which they could be utilized.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish the Senator from Delaware would advise the Secretary of Agriculture about that matter. I know he would welcome the Senator's advice and counsel in regard to what to do with perishable potatoes, when it is impossible to get sufficient iced cars in which to ship them at certain times of the year, and so forth.

FUEL OIL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, another commodity to be mentioned in this connection is fuel oil. Both fuel oil and gasoline are high in price and scarce. Last winter this country was faced with a serious shortage of fuel oil, which was attributed primarily to the lack of transportation facilities. This was difficult to understand in view of the fact that our transportation facilities were adequate during the war to take care of both our wartime needs and our domestic requirements. This situation was even more difficult to understand since we have unlimited reserves of fuel oil in Arabia awaiting transportation.

An explanation can best be found in a report of the Maritime Commission which discloses the following facts:

At the beginning of World War II there were under the United States flag 447 tankers of all types. At the end of World War II there were under the American flag 764 tankers. During the period between the end of the war and May 1, 1948, the Maritime Commission sold and delivered to foreign nations 148 tankers, including some of our latest designs, at a loss to our taxpayers of approximately $200,000,000. This reduced our tanker fleet to approximately the prewar level, which was not adequate to take care of the additional volume of fuel oil now being currently required.

Recognizing its error somewhat late, the Maritime Commission, as of April 1, 1948, was frantically rushing construction of 27 new tankers, the expense of which will again largely be borne by the taxpayers.

I could go on indefinitely naming various commodities, the prices of which are kept high by Federal intervention; but from these examples it should be evident to everyone that it is impossible for the cost of living to be reduced so long as these unsound practices are continued. Price ceilings would be ineffective and mathematically impossible as I have pointed out, unless supplemented by consumer subsidy payments, as they were during the war period. As all of us know, subsidy payments by the Government, either at the consumer or producer levels, result in merely transferring a portion of our present-day grocery bill to the charge account of our children and grandchildren. When we compare the present-day prices with the prices existing prior to the removal of price ceilings, we should not overlook the fact that in the maintenance of the lower retail prices prevailing during the war period, the Government spent about $5,000,000,000 in consumer-subsidy payments to maintain those prices. That cost is now a part of our huge national debt.

I denounce this Government program as economically unsound and contrary to our American principles. There never has been, nor will there ever be, any excuse for the waste and destruction of food in America so long as some of our citizens are in need. I ask any member of this Senate to tell me how the high cost of these essential food and clothing products can be reduced by mere price controls without making some downward revision in this agricultural program or else resorting to direct subsidy payments.

As I have already said, my criticism of this program is not directed against any of the farmers who are participating in these sales or purchases. I know that most of the farmers would prefer a free economy and their own liberty of action. I personally have always been an advocate of a sound agricultural program; but it is my contention, and I have so expressed myself on many occasions, that any agricultural support program which equals or exceeds the cost of production is economically unsound and encourages waste and inefficiency.

The purpose of a support program should never be to guarantee a margin

of profit, but it should be used only as an instrument to which the farmers could resort in times of a national emergency. There is no justifiable reason for paying a subsidy to any group, whether they be farmers, laborers, consumers, or manufacturers, during times of national prosperity.

This inflationary program of supporting agricultural products at fantastically high levels, with the resultant high cost of living, is in reality benefiting no one. Every time the Government, through its purchases, increases the cost of agricultural products, as described, the result is a corresponding increase in the cost of living to the housewife. This in turn requires her husband to demand an increase in wages from his employer; the manufacturer for whom he is working must then increase his prices; and, to complete this inflationary cycle, the farmer, who must purchase these manufactured products, is required to pay the corresponding increase.

It is the height of political and economic nonsense for us to stand here today and promise the American farmer continued high support levels for his products, and at the same time promise the American housewife a reduction in the high cost of living. It just cannot be done under the American system of free enterprise, and the sooner we recognize it, the better it will be for the American people.

Also, Mr. President, let us not lose sight of a recent Supreme Court decision which asserted that the Government will always retain the right to control that which it subsidizes.

REVIEW OF ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS RELATIVE TO NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have a report to make, and I believe it should be made at this time, so as to acquaint the Congress and the people with the steps taken by the Eightieth Congress on measures necessary for the national security.

From time to time we hear statements and read articles criticizing the Eightieth Congress for failing to conceive and execute constructive legislation to meet the many vital domestic and foreign problems which face our country. I am mindful, of course, that this is not exactly a new tactic. So far as I can recall, each of the 79 preceding Congresses has been similarly criticized—especially in presidential election years. In fact, I do not believe our national history contains a single instance in which an outgoing Congress has been blessed with Nation-wide acclaim or an E either for effort or for excellence. Notwithstanding the woeful forebodings of this long line of congressional critics, our Nation has continued its unparalleled progress, and has remained the best country in the world in which to live, and in which to make a living. And so, while I am deeply conscious of the wholesome and stimulating effect of sound and impartial criticism, I do not feel greatly alarmed as I listen to or read the unflattering barrage which is directed toward the record of this Eightieth Congress by either the heavy howitzers or the light guns of the hostile artillery.

Yet, as the chairman of a committee which has been charged with responsibilities of the utmost significance to the safety and well-being of this Nation and its people, I feel that it is both appropriate and necessary that I should strive to reassure the men and women of this country as to the manner in which these responsibilities have been met. I also feel that it is incumbent upon me, as the nominal spokesman for the 12 other members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, to make the record perfectly clear insofar as it concerns the months of diligent, thorough, painstaking and thoroughly unselfish effort which they have devoted to the cause of national security, and the energetic and prompt cooperation which their efforts have met on the floor of the Senate.

On that basis, therefore, I shall address myself to a brief review of the specific achievements of the Eightieth Congress in the field of legislation promoting the national security. Not only do I believe the Members of this Congress are entitled to have these facts made known, but I also believe the people of the United States are entitled to some definite reassurance on this vital subject. I think this latter aspect of the matter is particularly important in view of the hazardous and uncertain international situation existing today.

If we go back to the opening days of the Eightieth Congress, we recall that we were in the process of demobilizing and disbanding the most powerful military force ever assembled by any nation. As an after effect of a long and bitter war, there was an overpowering national urge for speed in the demobilization and reconversion process. As a result, as this Congress assembled it found our armed services badly depleted and disorganized. Further, the character of war had changed so radically that the entire problem of national defense required a complete restudy and a radical change in approach. At the same time, the Congress was convening for the first time under the far-reaching procedural changes specified in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. In view of these factors, I believe it is entirely fair and accurate to say that no Congress was ever faced with more difficult and vital problems in the field of national security than was this Congress when it first assembled in January 1947.

The first step was to organize the Committees on Armed Services in the Senate and House, and assume the functions and records previously held by the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs. The promptness and effectiveness with which that committee was organized and proceeded to transact its business is a major tribute to the sincerity, the ability, and the spirit of public service of its membership. The problems with which they had to prepare to deal were not only of overriding national importance, but they were vastly complex and difficult. They covered not only the complicated technique of modern war on land, at sea, and in the air, but they involved also the vital fields of personnel, equipment, organization, and national resources. To summarize, the Committee was called upon to integrate and deal with an intricate yet vital series of questions which had theretofore been dealt with on a piecemeal and fragmentary basis.

At the outset it became apparent that the Nation's basic organization for national security was outmoded, and was no longer sound in the light of our wartime experiences. The two-department system, built around the Navy Department and the War Department, was utterly inadequate to meet the demands of modern weapons and equipment. The importance of air power had become too decisive to warrant its further retention as a part of the War Department. It is quite true that this problem was not a new one, but previous efforts to effect a change in our basic organization through some form of unification or integration had been unsuccessful. Plainly, therefore, the first task of the Committee was to find some unification pattern that would start us on the road to a better coordinated and integrated Military Establishment. The long and exhaustive hearings which led to the presenting of the National Security Act of 1947 to the Eightieth Congress, and the searching scrutiny given to that legislation by both the Senate and House membership, are now matters of history. Suffice it to say that definite and prompt action was taken on this very fundamental issue, and the newly created National Military Establishment was brought into being and set in operation.

I am aware, of course, that the so-called Unification Act has been criticized. It has been contended that we have no unification; that the services not only are not coordinated, but that there is constant bickering and jealousy among them. I should be the last one to completely gainsay this adverse comment. But at the same time I insist that the National Military Establishment has made great strides toward its goal. And I further insist that as one studies the almost staggering magnitude of the problem, he must recognize that a remarkably competent job is being done. It is only when the observer considers how utterly and completely our old organization lacked cohesion and coordination that he appreciates the progress that has been made. In the popular mind, the passage of any sort of unification law should bring about an immediate and evident result. But I submit that such a concept fails completely to appreciate the vast amount of preliminary organization, planning, cataloging, and other administrative preparation which must precede any operation of this magnitude, if it is to be conducted in a sound and orderly manner.

Permit me to give a few examples of the problems peculiar to the unification of our armed services, and to outline what is being done to meet them. As a case in point, it would seem, at first glance, that a unified procurement plan could be put into effect at once. Yet, on closer examination, it becomes immediately obvious that a standard cataloging system must first be developed

before there can be any unified procurement, except in the case of a relatively few basic items. The preparation of such a system was inaugurated at once, it is well along toward completion, and in the end will be of major significance. Notwithstanding the large amount of preliminary work which is essential before coordinated procurement can become a reality, it should be noted that under purchase assignments in effect on May 1, 1948, more than 64 percent of the total dollar value of purchases by the National Military Establishment will be carried out under single-service assignments, as compared with only 16 percent a year previously. Similarly, a study of the activities of the Research and Development Board in coordinating our research and development programs, the creation of the Military Air Transport Service to assume the functions previously carried out by duplicate facilities operated by the Air Force and the Navy, the studies of the Gray committee on civilian components, the studies of the Hook Service Pay Commission in the field of uniform pay to the armed services, the effective action taken by the Interdepartmental Space Board in consolidating space utilized by the three services, the detailed plans and the preliminary steps already taken by the Medical and Hospital Services Committee, the Civil Defense Planning Unit, the manifold activities of the Munitions Board, and the steps toward standardization of forms, administrative controls, physical standards, and medical procedures lead one to the conclusion that much sound and businesslike progress is being made, and that spectacular and poorly planned measures are being avoided.

Aside from the need for unification in the top organization of the armed services, a number of other legislative steps were necessary if the lessons learned from the war were to be used to their full advantage. In the field of procurement, existing procedures and laws governing Federal purchasing were not uniformly suitable to the needs of the vast purchasing programs of the military services. During the war some of the outstanding purchasing experts of the country were available to the armed forces in carrying out procurement activities. These individuals, in collaboration with procurement experts of the Government, suggested certain changes in basic procurement responsibilities for the armed services which would improve the methods and techniques previously in use. This led to the preparation and passage of House bill 1366, which has assisted materially in bringing about many of the improvements in purchasing methods now in effect, or planned, in the Military Establishment.

To turn to another field, the war demonstrated a need within the medical departments of the services for a new corps of personnel which would perform the many nonmedical functions which are a part of any large health or hospitalization program. The lack of such a corps of specialists led to the draining away from strictly professional duties of many doctors and dentists whose services were needed in their own particular fields. To correct this situation the committee recommended and the Senate approved the Medical Service Corps bill, which was enacted as Public Law 337. There is no doubt but what this action by the Congress represents an important step forward in meeting the critical problem of furnishing adequate medical support for the armed forces without at the same time placing an impossible burden on the number of doctors available to meet civilian needs.

Other bills to improve the medical service available to our troops were also passed. House bill 1943 placed the Nurse Corps on a permanent basis and established our military nurses as commissioned personnel. Also, a bill to equalize the retirement benefits between members of the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps was passed, and enacted as Public Law 517. In July 1947 the Army and the Navy were faced with a serious situation in which many of their qualified doctors and dentists were leaving the military service to take advantage of the greater opportunities offered by private practice. Senate bill 1661, to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the military services, was recommended by the committee and promptly passed by the Congress.

Another important piece of legislation in the field of personnel was the so-called WAC-WAVE bill, which gives regular commissioned and enlisted status to women in the armed services. The history of the last war shows not only that our manpower resources were strained to the limit, but also that there are many skills and positions with the armed services which women can fill more effectively than men. It is therefore not only essential, but fair and just, that women in the armed services should be given a permanent, rather than a purely temporary status.

As our studies of the procedures in effect within the three services continued, it became increasingly apparent that one of the outstanding examples of lack of uniformity in the treatment of common problems by the Army, Navy, and Air Force was the variety of systems followed in the procurement, assignment, and promotion of officers. The fundamental difference lay in the fact that the Navy operated on a system of promotion by selection, whereas the Army and Air Force operated on a system of promotion by seniority. Many other policies governing the treatment of commissioned personnel were equally divergent as between the three services. After a detailed study of this very complex situation, the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 was recommended to the Senate, and was promptly enacted, to become Public Law 381. This legislation may be looked upon as a major step in the revision of the laws governing the Military Establishment—a step which had repeatedly been tried in past years, but without success.

Not all the legislative action taken by this Congress in the field of national security dealt with all three of the services. Frequently either the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force had problems which were peculiar to but one of them. As an example, the top organization of the Navy Department required extensive change if the operating procedures so successfully used during the war were to be retained. To bring this about, the committee recommended Senate bill 1252, a bill to reorganize the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations and to create the Office of the Chief of the Matériel Division. This bill was promptly considered by the Senate, and was enacted as public law on March 5, 1948. Similarly, the newly created Air Force required legislation which would establish for it a system of military justice. This was accomplished by the prompt enactment of Senate bill 2401.

Turning for a moment to a completely different field, a consideration of the legislation enacted by this Congress to provide for more adequate planning for industrial mobilization is of major interest, and serves to emphasize the variety of the problems related to national security. During the war the services had developed, either directly or indirectly, many large industrial facilities which could not be operated during peacetime, but which would again be vital in any future war effort. Other committees of the Congress had examined various phases of this problem. Coordinating its work with these other groups, the Committee on Armed Services began to implement the different recommendations, as a result of which two bills have been enacted. Senate bill 1198 established an industrial stand-by facility plan, built around some of the plants which were operated during the war. These plants will be continued in operation, if possible, either through contracts or by the departments. If this cannot be done, these plants will be maintained in such condition as will make them readily available in the event of a future national emergency. In addition to the maintenance of the plants themselves, a far-reaching plan for the maintenance of the machine tools needed to operate these and similar plants has been inaugurated.

Subsequent to the enactment of this industrial stand-by facility plan by the Eightieth Congress, another and far more basic piece of legislation dealing with the subject of industrial preparedness was recommended by the committee and passed by both Houses. Senate bill 2554, which was enacted as Public Law 883, extended the scope of industrial-reserve planning to include a great many surplus industrial facilities which were in danger of being sold for scrap, or completely destroyed insofar as their original purposes were concerned. These plants had been built during the war at great cost to the Government. Their loss or their deterioration would have been a major blow to our future military-industrial potential, and has wisely been precluded by the passage of this bill to insure their proper maintenance in cases where these installations cannot be sold or leased with a suitable security clause. I believe that even the least charitable of the various critics of this Congress would concede that in the event of an-

other national emergency the rapid conversion to a wartime basis made possible by these two laws will be of immeasurable value to the Nation, and represents a marked advance in our plans for industrial readiness.

In the field of surplus property, the committee recommended, and the Congress passed, two important measures. The first had to do with the disposal of the hugh network of surplus military airports which had been established throughout the Nation during the war. These airfields constituted an almost priceless national resource, yet they were deteriorating rapidly because no civilian air lines could afford to purchase and maintain them. To the same extent, they were too expensive to permit of their purchase by local governmental agencies. Yet the national interest demanded that every effort should be made toward keeping the maximum number of these installations in operation. After a long study of this very intricate problem, the Committee on Armed Services recommended, and the Congress promptly enacted, the Surplus Airports Act, which will insure that this vital network of airfields shall be retained in operation for the benefit of the public.

A similar problem was presented by the large numbers of military posts, camps, and stations which were being declared surplus by the armed forces. Many of these properties had been acquired during the war, and their disposal presented no particular difficulty under the terms of the Surplus Property Act. However, a considerable number of these installations had been owned by the Federal Government for many years. Some of them dated back to the very early days of the Nation's history. In numerous cases, they had been closely identified with the nearby civilian community for generations and had unquestioned historic value, or public value for park or recreational purposes. Most important of all, these properties were not becoming surplus as the result of the ending of World War II; they were becoming surplus because the redeployment of our armed forces in this modern age was far different from what it had been in the days of the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, and the Indian wars. The Surplus Property Act proved inadequate to provide for the disposal of these old forts in a manner consistent with the best public interest. Numerous local communities were greatly disturbed at the possibility of these historic old properties losing their identity, or being put to uses not consistent with the interests of the local community. Yet the fact remained that these properties were owned by the Federal Government, and as such belonged to all of the Nation's taxpayers, rather than to only those of the local community.

A fair solution to this very vexing question presented one of the most difficult, though perhaps not important, of the problems faced by the committee. After an extensive and complete investigation, S. 2277 was recommended to the Senate, and was promptly enacted, to become Public Law 616. This law has but recently gone into operation, and no disposals have been made under it as yet. However, the executive agencies report that rapid progress is being made, and that the legislative action taken by the Congress will adequately meet this situation. The Surplus Airports Act and the Old Forts Act thus represent two laws which differ most remarkably in content from other legislation in the field of national security, yet their importance cannot be minimized.

The Airports Act provided a means of transferring to States and their political subdivisions many airfields which otherwise would have deteriorated. This law has strengthened the aviation facilities of the country to a major degree, and has provided a reservoir of bases and fields which will be invaluable in the event of another national emergency. The Old Forts Act has provided an instrument which will permit sites which are of undying historic value to be retained for public use, and will permit other properties to be used to meet the growing need for additional parks and recreational areas near many of our metropolitan areas, while at the same time safeguarding the financial interest of the Federal Government in each instance.

With respect to the civilian components of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, I believe it is perfectly accurate to state that this Congress has provided them more legislative support than has been the case at any time in the past. The committee has taken the position that a sound defense structure must rest upon a well-trained and well-equipped reserve. The Congress has supported the committee vigorously in this view, and has accepted each implementing recommendation made by the committee. The number of approved bills which benefit the civilian components is too large to permit of detailed discussion of each, but I shall mention several which warrant special attention.

One of the more serious handicaps with which the members of the civilian components were required to cope was the fact that they received no medical care or hospital benefits if injured during 30-day training periods, as contrasted with extended active duty. S. 1470, which was enacted as Public Law 678, corrected this situation and placed the members of the civilian components on a basis comparable to that of the regular personnel in this regard.

As regards pay for inactive-duty training for the civilian components, the Army for many years has had authority to pay members of the National Guard for armory drills, but had no corresponding authority as regards its other Reserve components. On the other hand, the Navy has had this authority with respect to members of the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve. So to remove what was a serious handicap to the training of the Organized Reserve of the Army and the Air Force, S. 1174 was introduced by the committee and passed by the Congress, giving those components the same status as the Organized Reserve of the Navy and the Marine Corps, and the National Guard. At the same time, the size of the Guard and the Organized Reserve has been materially increased. Also, legislation setting up a retirement system for members of the civilian components who maintain a prescribed standard of training and activity over a period of 20 years was enacted. The Selective Service Act of 1948 places great emphasis upon the importance of membership in organized units of the Reserve components, and provides specific means for building up and maintaining a better standard of training and readiness for active duty. In fact, the whole concept of the position to be occupied by the civilian components in our scheme of national security has been greatly changed for the better through the legislative action taken during the past 2 years, with the result that our country's ability to defend itself has been greatly improved.

The Selective Service Act of 1948 was introduced late in May of 1948, and received full and complete consideration on the floor of both Houses of this Congress. This legislation is of fundamental importance to this Nation and its people. It marks the second instance in the history of our Nation when a law of this type has been enacted in time of peace. The fact that this legislation was enacted only a little more than a month ago makes it unnecessary for me to review its provisions at this time. But I should like to emphasize again the painstaking and exhaustive work which was done on both sides of the Capitol in the formulating of this vital measure, and to point out that few legislative measures have had more careful and conscientious effort devoted to them by any Congress. Regardless of our personal opinions on the matter, I feel that the high standard of thought and attention devoted to the formulation and consideration of this vitally important measure is a tribute to the membership of this Congress which cannot be taken lightly.

In accordance with section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Armed Services—as is the case with other committees—has taken positive action looking toward maintaining appropriate surveillance over matters which come within its jurisdiction.

The committee established a subcommittee charged with making a continuous study of all policies, programs, activities, facilities, requirements, and practices of the armed services and agencies exercising functions related to them, and the administration thereof in all respects. The appointment of such subcommittees is a wise and necessary procedure, and adds great strength to our governmental structure. Yet critics who measure the contribution of a Congress solely in terms of the number of bills which it enacts too often lose sight of the great burden which the Congress imposes upon itself in maintaining watchfulness over the manifold activities which so closely and vitally affect our people.

I have reviewed but a few of the steps taken during the past 2 years in the field of legislation affecting our national security. There are many more which I have not mentioned. I should, therefore, like to have unanimous consent at this time to insert in the RECORD, following my remarks, a complete tabulation

showing all the measures promoting our national security which the Eightieth Congress has enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD following my remarks a complete tabulation of the moneys appropriated by the Eightieth Congress for national-security purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. GURNEY. I should also like to point out that, in the final analysis, the present Congress, like any other Congress, should be judged not by the quantity of the legislation which it enacts, but by its quality and its contribution to the public well-being. With this thought in mind I can assure the Senate that the tabulation which I have just inserted in the RECORD reflects none of the hours of detailed hearings and consideration devoted by the Committee on Armed Services to numerous legislative proposals which were, in the end, rejected by the committee, or held for further study.

I think that the Nation should know that one of the greatest strides taken by the Eightieth Congress was to make national defense a truly national and truly bipartisan problem. Never, in all of the hearings which I attended, and never, even behind the closed doors of the committee in executive session, did I witness the spectacle of party against party on any of the issues of national security. True, there were divisions of opinion, but always they were honest ones, and always they were on both sides of the table, reflecting the true feelings of the individuals. At no time did I see the partisan divisions which were evident elsewhere.

If this be an accomplishment, if the Congress can be commended in having achieved this sort of national unity, I hope that the Senate will forgive me my pride when I humbly suggest that this high plane of cooperation was achieved during a Republican Congress.

In conclusion, may I reiterate my reasons for speaking in this vein, and at this time? I hold to the American tradition that fair and impartial criticism is a stimulating and wholesome thing. Yet I also hold to the belief that it is disturbing and unfair to our people to permit unfair and biased criticism to go unanswered. I also feel a Congress that has devoted so much time and unselfish effort to matters dealing with our national security, should have its accomplishments made perfectly clear. To that end, and confining myself to matters of national security, I have outlined in small part the conditions which have faced the country during the past 2 years, and what the Eightieth Congress has done in the interest of our national welfare in dealing with these conditions. I have confined myself to facts, because even the most biased individual cannot argue against the plain truth. The record speaks for itself, and I for one am proud of that record.

EXHIBIT A

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.

[Committee on Armed Services, U. S. Senate]

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
S. 153	Pepper	Dade Monument replica: To permit the making of a replica of the General Dade Monument which is presently located on the grounds of the United States military reservation at West Point and to present such replica to the State of Florida for erection in the Dade State Memorial Park.	June 17, 1948	Public Law 663.
S. 220	Gurney	Easement in certain lands in Virginia and Maryland: To enable the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to install and operate communication lines across certain small strips of land in the naval proving grounds at Dahlgren, Va., cross the railroad right-of-way between Fredericksburg and Dahlgren, Va., and across the railroad right-of-way between Indian Head and White Plains, Md.	Mar. 21, 1947	Public Law 18.
S. 221	do	Easement in lands in the Norfolk Navy Yard: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey a perpetual easement in certain lands, and to provide authority for the Secretary of the Navy to transfer title with perpetual easement to certain personal property, to the Virginia Electric & Power Co.	do	Public Law 19.
S. 231	do	Camp Gillespie, Calif., right-of-way: To grant a right-of-way to the city of San Diego for the construction and operation of a water pipe line through land within the boundaries of Camp Gillespie, a Marine Corps auxiliary airfield located in San Diego County, Calif., to enable San Diego to assure its inhabitants of an adequate water supply.	Apr. 15, 1947	Public Law 32.
S. 234	do	Easement in lands, Bibb County, Ga: To convey an easement to the Central of Georgia Ry. Co. for the installation and operation of a railroad spur track across approximately 0.33 acre of land at the naval ordnance plant at Macon, Ga.	Mar. 7, 1947	Public Law 13.
S. 235	do	Easement in lands in Los Angeles, Calif.: To drain Birby slough, an inland lake that has no outlet to the ocean. Under present conditions, several of the streets in the vicinity of the lake are flooded during the rainy season and traffic is disrupted.	do	Public Law 11.
S. 239	do	Naval and Military Academy Board of Visitors: To provide a uniform procedure for the appointment of members and functioning of the Boards of Visitors to the U. S. Naval Academy and to the U. S. Military Academy.	June 29, 1948	Public Law 816.
S. 276	do	Mileage and other travel allowances: To provide statutory authority for the use of the official mileage tables prepared by the Chief of Finance, War Department, in the payment and settlement of mileage or other travel allowance accounts of all military personnel—of enlisted personnel as well as of officers.	Mar. 26, 1947	Public Law 21.
S. 295	do	Army personnel detailed as students: To extend permanent authority presently contained in the National Defense Act to permit the Secretary of the Army to detail personnel of the armed forces as students in educational institutions, industrial plants, or hospitals, without limitations as to the number that can be so detailed. It is further expanded to cover the Reserve components of the Army and requires service on active duty for such Reserves immediately following the completion of the course of training.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 670.
S. 321	do	Pay increase for cadets and midshipmen: To authorize an increase of 20 percent in the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the U. S. Military, Coast Guard, and Naval Academies.	June 20, 1947	Public Law 96.
S. 364	McMahon and Baldwin	Surplus airports: To encourage and permit the transfer of federally owned surplus airports and airport facilities and equipment to public agencies by the War Assets Administration. Such transfers would be without reimbursement and would include both the aviation and nonaviation facilities connected with the airports. It also provides for the transfer of certain surplus personal property in the custody of the War Assets Administration which may be needed in the administration and operation of airports transferred by this legislation.	July 30, 1947	Public Law 289.
S. 703	Tydings	Civil War battle streamers: To authorize the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations authorizing regiments, and other units, in the Army of the United States to carry Civil War battle streamers, including those granted for service with the Confederate States, with their colors or standards.	Mar. 9, 1948	Public Law 437.
S. 758	Gurney	National Military Establishment: To create an over-all structure to insure a more coordinated and efficient approach to the problems of national defense. In addition to the strictly military aspects of this legislation, a National Security Resources Board was established to plan for future mobilization, and a Security Council was established to advise the President on all matters, civilian or military, pertinent to the national security.	July 26, 1947	Public Law 253.
S. 918	Saltonstall	Selective Service Records Office: The bill provided for the establishment of an Office of Selective Service Records; the transfer to this Office of all property, records, personnel, and unexpended balances of the appropriations of the Selective Service System; and the continuance of the confidential nature of selective-service records with a provision for penalties for violations of these confidences.	Mar. 31, 1947	Public Law 26.

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
S. 929	Gurney	Soldiers' Home regulations: To relieve the Inspector General of the Army from personally performing certain annual inspection duties at the United States Soldiers' Home, Washington, D. C.	Jan. 27, 1948	Public Law 401.
S. 1107	do	Armine of American vessels: To provide permanent authority for the arming of American vessels in time of national emergency.	June 29, 1948	Public Law 817.
S. 1174	do	Pay for Organized Reserve Corps: To provide uniform standards for inactive-duty training for all Reserve components of the armed forces; to authorize inactive-duty training pay for members of the Reserve Corps of the Army in order to facilitate the procurement, training, and readiness for mobilization of members thereof; and to make several incidental changes in the provisions of the National Defense Act pertaining to the Reserve components of the Army.	Mar. 25, 1948	Public Law 460.
S. 1195	do	Foreign duty tours: To repeal present provisions of law which limit the tour of duty of officer and enlisted personnel of the Army and the Air Force in certain foreign-duty stations to a maximum of 2 years.	Mar. 8, 1948	Public Law 436.
S. 1198	do	Leases on stand-by plants: To broaden and make uniform the authority of the War and Navy Departments to lease Government property and to permit the transfer of certain plants, machinery, and equipment to their custody, without reimbursement to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the War Assets Administration.	Aug. 5, 1947	Public Law 304.
S. 1214	do	Naval Officers Training Act amendments: The so-called Holloway plan for a naval and Marine Corps officer candidate-training program was embodied in Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess. A number of technical errors in the act were later corrected by a series of amendments contained in Public Law 71, 80th Cong., 1st sess. It is the purpose of the bill S. 1214 to further amend Public Law 729 so as to facilitate some of the administrative procedures and to clarify the status of certain of the officers commissioned pursuant to the original act.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 675.
S. 1215	do	Conversion of vessels: To remove the limitation on the amount that can be expended for the conversion of any one naval vessel during any 18-month period, and to authorize the conversion of certain vessels.	Aug. 1, 1947	Public Law 319.
S. 1252	do	Organization of the Navy Department: The status of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations and of his principal assistants and of the Office of the Chief of Naval Material are now governed by Executive Order 9635, dated Sept. 29, 1945. The purpose of the legislation is to establish by statute the authority now being exercised under the Executive order and to repeal any existing statutes in conflict with this legislation. Permanent legislation is necessary because the Executive order under which these offices and positions now exist and function will become inoperative when title I of the First War Powers Act expires 6 months after the termination of the present war.	Mar. 5, 1948	Public Law 432.
S. 1298	do	Household effects of civilian employees: To validate payments previously made by disbursing officers covering the shipment of household effects of civilian employees where the shipment was made to other than the new duty station of the employee. It also provides for reimbursement to civilian employees where disbursing officers have recovered payment for such expense in the past as is contemplated by this legislation, and further provides relief for disbursing officers for payments made by them and which this legislation validates.	May 12, 1948	Public Law 523.
S. 1302	Johnson of Colorado	Surplus athletic equipment: To authorize the War Assets Administrator to transfer, without charge, any surplus property which is suitable for athletics, sports, or games by the youth of the country to "States, their political subdivisions and instrumentalities; to public and governmental institutions; to nonprofit or tax-supported educational institutions and organizations; to charitable and eleemosynary institutions and organizations; to nonprofit associations, groups, institutions, and organizations designated to promote, support, sponsor, or encourage the participation of the youth of the country in athletics, sports, and games."	June 16, 1948	Public Law 652.
S. 1470	Gurney	Medical care for reservists: This legislation is of a temporary nature and is intended to cover reserves of the Army and of the Air Force, who might be injured or contract disease during training periods prior to the official termination of the war.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 678.
S. 1520	do	Postal account shortages: To permit the Navy Department to reimburse the Post Office Department for any loss of funds due to embezzlement, errors, or for other losses due to acts of commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps who might be designated custodians of postal effects by competent authority.	June 17, 1948	Public Law 664.
S. 1525	do	Transportation for Government and other personnel: Permanent legislation to replace temporary wartime legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to provide transportation by motor vehicle or water carrier to and from their places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by those Departments. The bill contains a clause proposing that during any period of war this authority may be extended to personnel attached to or employed by private plants engaged in the production of material for the Departments.	May 28, 1948	Public Law 760.
S. 1528	do	Gifts to schools and other institutions: To authorize the Secretaries of the various military services to accept gifts for museums, libraries, schools, cemeteries, etc., under their respective jurisdiction, which can be of use to such institutions; it further provides for the expenditure of any moneys donated to the United States for a specific purpose without securing the express authority of Congress. Such expenditures will be limited to use by the designated institutions, and shall be subject to the terms and conditions of the gift.	Mar. 11, 1948	Public Law 439.
S. 1551	Green	Anchorage housing project: To expedite the sale of this property in order that the Miller Co. may construct on the property a housing project which can be used by officers and families of the Atlantic Fleet which is based at Newport. Approximately 27,000 naval officers and personnel accompany that portion of the Atlantic Fleet which has Newport for its base.	June 16, 1948	Private Law 353.
S. 1571	Gurney	National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: Amends present laws relating to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The more pertinent changes which the bill makes are: (1) The number of members is increased from 15 to 17; (2) the Chairman of the Research and Development Board of the National Military Establishment will automatically become a member of the Committee. There are several other minor changes of a technical nature in order to be in accord with present law.	May 25, 1948	Public Law 549.
S. 1581	Hawkes	Port Newark Army Base, N. J.: To give the Secretary of the Army authority to enter into an agreement with the city of Newark, N. J., extending the time for payment of certain installments on the purchase price of the Port Newark Army Base.	Apr. 15, 1948	Public Law 483.
S. 1633	Ives	Marine Band at New York: To authorize the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and perform in the parade of the American Legion to be held in New York City on Aug. 30, 1947.	July 30, 1947	Public Law 275.
S. 1641	Baldwin	Women's Armed Services Integration Act: To include women officers, warrant officers, and enlisted personnel in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force on a basis similar to that which proved successful during World War II for the wartime Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. A maximum authorized strength of 1,000 officers and 17,500 enlisted women is provided for the Army and 1,000 officers and 10,000 enlisted women for the Navy-Marine Corps, based on a Regular Army strength of 51,000 officers and 875,000 enlisted and a Regular Navy of 500,000 enlisted personnel.	June 12, 1948	Public Law 625.
S. 1661	Morse	Pay increase for doctors in armed services: The armed services and the Public Health Service are currently experiencing great difficulty in securing and retaining an adequate number of physicians, surgeons, and dentists. The purpose of the bill is to alleviate the shortage by offering as an inducement a salary increase of $100 per month to all active Regular medical and dental officers and to all non-Regular medical and dental officers who are now on duty on a volunteer status, or who hereafter voluntarily come on active duty during the 5-year period following the effective date of this section. It also provides authority to appoint qualified dentists and doctors of medicine in the Army and Navy in grades up to that of colonel in the Army and captain in the Navy.	Aug. 5, 1947	Public Law 365.

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
S. 1673	Gurney	Relief of James Y. Parker: To correct an administrative error within the War Department which resulted in the failure of James Y. Parker to be promoted to the rank of major while a prisoner of war of the Japanese and to validate certain payments made to him.	Feb. 27, 1948	Private Law 184.
S. 1675	do	Navy public works bill: To authorize the appropriation for construction required by the Department of the Navy.	June 16, 1948	Public Law 653.
S. 1676	Tydings	Army public works: To authorize the appropriation for construction required by the Departments of the Army and the Air Force.	June 12, 1948	Public Law 626.
S. 1723	Gurney	Midshipmen from Canada: Public Law 168, 77th Cong. (55 Stat. 589), provides that the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to permit, upon designation of the President of the United States, not to exceed 20 persons at a time from American Republics and not to exceed 3 at a time from any country to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy. This law further prescribes that persons receiving instruction under this authority shall receive the same pay and allowances and, subject to such exceptions to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, shall be subject to the same rules and regulations as other midshipmen at the Academy. Such persons shall not be entitled to appointment to any office or grade in the U. S. Navy by reason of their graduation. Public Law 564 amends present law to authorize the inclusion of persons from the Dominion of Canada along with persons from other American Republics without any increase in numbers and under the same provisions.	June 1, 1948	Public Law 564.
S. 1783	do	Retention of disabled Army personnel: To permit the retention of certain disabled personnel of the Army of the United States beyond the statutory termination date of their appointments in order to complete their hospitalization or treatment.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 680.
S. 1790	do	Longevity credit for service prior to 18: To amend present law so as to make permanent the temporary provision which authorizes that service in the Army, including the Air Force, Navy, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, or in any Reserve component thereof prior to the attainment of 18 years of age, shall be credited for longevity pay, where it has been excluded solely for this reason.	do	Public Law 681.
S. 1791	do	Camp Phillips, Kans., transfer of lands: To retransfer to the Department of the Army certain lands and improvements thereon which had previously been transferred by the Department of the Army to the Veterans' Administration.	do	Public Law 682.
S. 1794	do	Reflecting pool in Houston, Tex.: To authorize the construction of a reflection pool on the grounds of the naval hospital, Houston, Tex., and to authorize the Navy to accept the pool as an unconditional gift to the United States from the donors, the Houston Council, Navy League of the United States.	Apr. 9, 1948	Public Law 479.
S. 1795	do	Relief of Army officers from inspection duties: To relieve officers of the Inspector General's Department of the Army of certain inspection requirements prescribed in sec. 1 of the act of Apr. 20, 1874.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 683.
S. 1796	do	Preservation of frigate *Constellation:* To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to restore the U. S. S. *Constellation*, as far as may be practical, to her original condition, and to accept contributions and donations for that purpose. It further authorizes the Secretary to give or sell parts of the U. S. S. *Constellation* not suitable for retention as souvenirs to clubs, associations, and individuals making contributions for restoring the ship. Only contributed funds to be utilized for the restoration of this vessel.	Mar. 13, 1948	Public Law 442.
S. 1799	do	Protection of service uniforms: To extend the application of the law prohibiting the wearing of the uniform by unauthorized persons to include the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.	Apr. 15, 1948	Public Law 484.
S. 1802	do	Medal of Honor to unknown American: To authorize the President to award, in the name of the Congress, a Medal of Honor to the unknown American soldier of World War II who is to be buried in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery, at Arlington, Va.	Mar. 9, 1948	Public Law 438.
S. 1961	do	Exemption of vessels from certain requirements: To extend temporarily the exemption of certain vessels with unusual characteristics of the Navy and Coast Guard from statutory requirements concerning navigation lights, where the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of Coast Guard vessels, shall determine that by reason of such unusual construction it is not possible for such vessels to comply with existing statutes.	Mar. 5, 1948	Public Law 433.
S. 2077	do	Kearney, Nebr., land exchange: To effect the transfer to the United States of approximately 440 acres of land located within the boundaries of the Kearney Army Airfield, Kearney, Nebr., owned by the city of Kearney, in exchange for approximately 17 acres of federally owned land contiguous to that airfield, together with certain surplus buildings and other improvements located on that land and upon city-owned land adjacent thereto.	June 1, 1948	Public Law 565.
S. 2223	Hickenlooper	Promotion of General Groves: To promote Lt. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves to the permanent grade of major general, and upon his retirement to advance him without any increase in retired pay to the honorary rank of lieutenant general.	June 24, 1948	Private Law 394A.
S. 2233	Gurney	Easement in lands in naval air station, Alameda, Calif.: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant an easement on certain Government-owned property for the construction and operation of a water main which in part will service the United States naval air station at Alameda, Calif.	May 25, 1948	Public Law 551.
S. 2251	do	Recreation center, Great Lakes: To permit the Secretary of the Navy to accept a park to be constructed by the Army and Navy Union without cost to the Federal Government. This park will be for the use of patients at the United States naval hospital located at Great Lakes, Ill. It will provide an outdoor recreational area for their use.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 688.
S. 2277	Robertson	Surplus Property Act of 1944, amendment: To amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, first, to permit the War Assets Administrator to transfer to State and local governmental agencies surplus real estate suitable for use as public parks or recreational areas, or as historical monuments, and, second, by giving State and local governments a higher priority than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with regard to certain real properties. Conveyances made for use as public parks or recreational areas shall be at 50 percent of fair value, and those made for historic monuments shall be made without monetary consideration.	June 10, 1948	Public Law 616.
S. 2400	Gurney	Stoppage of work on certain vessels: Under a provision of the Second Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946 those combatant vessels which were more than 20 percent complete as of Mar. 1, 1946, are required to be completed. Public Law 690 provides the President with authority to remove from the mandatory operation of that act, which necessitates their completion, 13 named vessels consisting of 1 battleship, 1 cruiser, 2 destroyer escorts, 7 destroyers, and 2 submarines. The cessation of construction will suspend present obligations against the Treasury to an extent of over $300,000,000. It is intended that a portion of this sum will be used if appropriated to institute a new shipbuilding and conversion program of advance-design ships.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 690.
S. 2401	do	Military justice, Air Force: To grant authority to the U. S. Air Force similar to that of the U. S. Army and U. S. Navy for the administration of military justice.	June 25, 1948	Public Law 775.
S. 2505	Baldwin	Scientific positions in the Military Establishment: To permit the Secretary of Defense to establish 6 additional positions of a professional and scientific character for duty within the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The top salary placed on these positions is $15,000 per year and they will be utilized primarily by the Research and Development Board.	June 24, 1948	Public Law 758.
S. 2553	Gurney	Mystic River bridge: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Mystic River Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, an easement for the construction and operation of bridge approaches over and across lands comprising a part of the United States naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass.	June 16, 1948	Public Law 658.
S. 2654	do	National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948: To establish statutory authority for the maintenance or control of a pool of Government-built essential and strategic plants, machine tools, and industrial manufacturing equipment to be available for national defense purposes and war production in event of a possible future emergency.	July 2, 1948	Public Law 883.

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
S. 2592	Gurney	Lands in Puerto Rico: To authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force to return certain lands in Puerto Rico to the owners. This land was deeded to the United States, without cost, during the early part of the war on condition that it be reconveyed when no longer needed for purposes of national defense.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 693.
S. 2593	do	Right-of-way at Pungo, Va.: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant the Commonwealth of Virginia, without cost, a right-of-way across lands of the former naval auxiliary air station, at Pungo, Va., in order to widen State Secondary Route No. 615 at a point contiguous to the station.	June 16, 1948	Public Law 659.
S. 2621	do	Federal Prison Industries: To authorize the extension of the functions and duties of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., to military disciplinary barracks.	June 29, 1948	Public Law 821.
S. 2655	do	Selective Service Act of 1948: To increase the authorized strength of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to bring the strength of the services up to these authorized ceilings by means of a selective-service program calling for the drafting of 19- to 26-year-olds for a period of 21 months' active service with the armed services; and to strengthen the Reserve components by means of a program of enlisting 18-year-olds for a period of 1 year of active service with the armed forces, followed by transfer to the Reserve components.	June 24, 1948	Public Law 759.
S. 2698	Hatch	Transfer of Army horses: To authorize the transfer without compensation from the U. S. Army to 4 different military institutes in the United States of Army horses which are now on loan to those institutions for use in the ROTC program.	June 29, 1948	Public Law 823.
S. 2747	Morse	Panama Railroad Company: To authorize the incorporation of the Panama Railroad Company and to provide an appropriate charter.	do	Public Law 808.
S. 2770	Gurney	Assistant to Chief of Engineers: To fix the rank of the officer who is serving as assistant to the Chief of Engineers in charge of river, harbor, and flood-control work in the grade of brigadier general, to require that the position shall not be charged against the authorized strength of general officers of the Army, and to provide that his pay, allowances, and mileage and travel expenses should be paid from the appropriations for the works on which he is engaged.	June 25, 1948	Public Law 777.
S. 2830	Morse	Tin smelting: To amend the act of June 28, 1947 (Public Law 125, 80th Cong.), to extend from June 30, 1949, until June 30, 1954, or until such earlier time as the Congress shall otherwise provide, the powers, functions, duties, and authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (1) to buy, sell, and transport tin, tin ore and tin concentrates; (2) to improve, develop, maintain and operate by lease or otherwise the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.; (3) to finance research in tin smelting and processing, and (4) to do all other things necessary to accomplish the foregoing.	June 29, 1948	Public Law 824.
S. J. Res. 207	Saltonstall and Gurney	Navy sesquicentennial: To provide for the commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to carry out appropriate ceremonies.	Apr. 26, 1948	Public Law 498.
H. R. 450	Bates of Massachusetts	Marblehead Military Reservation: Providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, upon payment to the United States of the sum of $5,000, of property generally referred to as the Marblehead Reservation.	May 16, 1947	Public Law 70.
H. R. 774	Bland	Condemned ordnance: To extend to the Secretary of the Tresaury the authority heretofore exercised by the Secretaries of War and of the Navy under legislation enacted in 1896. The earlier act referred to, permits the service Secretaries, in their discretion, to loan or give obsolete or condemned combat material to certain designated veterans' organizations and other nonprofit institutions.	Feb. 27, 1948	Public Law 421.
H. R. 1260	Peterson	Canal Zone Retirement Act amendment: To extend to certain annuitants retired under the Canal Zone Retirement Act prior to July 29, 1942, the privilege of having their annuities recomputed under the new method of computation contained in the act of that date if such computation would result in increased benefits.	Aug. 4, 1947	Public Law 345.
H. R. 1275	Cole of New York	Medical care of naval personnel: Authorizes the payment for medical treatment of officers in the naval service while in an authorized leave status.	May 4, 1948	Public Law 511.
H. R. 1341	Anderson of California	Naval postgraduate school authorization, Monterey, Calif. (H. R. 1341 substituted on Senate floor for S. 229): To provide additional facilities which are urgently needed for the postgraduate training of naval officers.	July 31, 1947	Public Law 302.
H. R. 1358	Andrews of New York	Naval Plantations Act amendment: To make permanent Public Law 377, 78th Cong., with further restrictions. Public Law 377 is a temporary wartime statute, which authorizes the use of funds appropriated for the subsistence of naval personnel, in the management and operation of farms and plantations on land subject to naval jurisdiction outside of the continental limits of the United States. Public Law 149 extends the same authority to the War Department and limits production to fresh fruits and vegetables.	July 1, 1947	Public Law 149.
H. R. 1359	do	Civil Engineer Corps of Navy: To increase the authorized strength of the Corps of Civil Engineers from 2 to 3 percent of the total active list of the commissioned line officers of the Navy.	May 16, 1947	Public Law 62.
H. R. 1362	do	Temporary appointment counted for promotion: To correct an inequity now existent by authorizing members of the U. S. Navy and Marine Corps to count all active service rendered as warrant or commissioned officers in the Navy or Marine Corps for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer.	June 30, 1947	Public Law 134.
H. R. 1363	do	Pay Readjustment Act amendment regarding annulled marriage: To eliminate the required repayment to the Government of increased allowances paid to service personnel by reason of a dependent spouse in cases where a marriage in good faith is subsequently annulled or set aside from its inception.	May 15, 1947	Public Law 55.
H. R. 1365	do	Chief of Chaplains in the Navy: To establish a permanent Chief of Navy Chaplains and to authorize the Chief of Naval Personnel to designate from the Navy Chaplain Corps an officer not below the rank of commander to be chief of the corps.	do	Public Law 56.
H. R. 1366	do	Procurement of supplies and services: Provides for a return to normal purchasing procedures through the advertising-bid method on the part of the armed services, namely, the War Department, the Navy Department, and the U. S. Coast Guard. It capitalizes on the lessons learned during wartime purchasing and provides authority, in certain specific and limited categories, for the negotiation of contracts without advertising. It restates the rules governing advertising and making awards as well as fixing the types of contract that can be made.	Feb. 19, 1948	Public Law 413.
H. R. 1367	do	Construction of experimental submarines: To authorize construction of experimental submarines by lifting a statutory provision limiting the availability of balances of funds appropriated for "Increase and replacement of naval vessels."	May 16, 1947	Public Law 63.
H. R. 1368	do	Civilian officers and employees on Guam: To include civilian officers and employees of the U. S. Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 (Missing Persons Act).	do	Public Law 64.
H. R. 1369	do	Under Secretary of Navy permanent: To amend existing law so as to establish permanently the offices of Under Secretary of War and Under Secretary of Navy.	May 15, 1947	Public Law 57.
H. R. 1371	do	Marine Corps officers for supply duty: Permits the Secretary of the Navy to assign captains, majors, lieutenant colonels, and colonels of the Marine Corps to supply duty only and provides for their lineal position and precedence, and authorizes their being carried as additional numbers in their respective grades. It would establish the number of officers to be so assigned and would preserve the precedence of those assigned to supply duty.	July 1, 1947	Public Law 150.
H. R. 1375	do	Clothing allowance in cash for clothing in kind to enlisted men: To authorize the President to substitute a cash allowance for clothing in kind for the Army, Marine Corps, and Marine Corps Reserve and to place the Marine Corps under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy with regard to clothing allowance.	do	Public Law 158.
H. R. 1376	do	Transportation of dependents and household effects: To authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases.	do	Public Law 151.
H. R. 1379	do	Naval postgraduate school authorization: To provide legislative authority for postgraduate instruction and training of commissioned officers of the naval service.	July 31, 1947	Public Law 303.

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
H. R. 1381	Andrews of New York	Decorations from neutral nations to officers and enlisted men of the armed forces: To authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems from the governments of neutral nations, and to allow such personnel to wear permanently any foreign decorations which have been, or may be, bestowed pursuant to the provisions of that act.	May 15, 1947	Public Law 58.
H. R. 1544	Keating	Gold star lapel buttons: To provide for a distinctive gold star lapel button for issue to widows, parents, or next of kin of members of the armed forces who lost their lives while serving in one of the armed services of the United States in World War II.	Aug. 1, 1947	Public Law 306.
H. R. 1562	Johnson of California	Federal aid for soldiers' and sailors' homes: To increase, from $300 to $500 per capita per annum, until June 30, 1951, the Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of veterans hospitalized in such homes, who are eligible for such care in U. S. Veterans' Administration hospitals and homes.	May 18, 1948	Public Law 531.
H. R. 1605	Andrews of New York	Date of appointment as commissioned officer: To clarify present law governing the appointment of additional officers in the Regular Army. The law does not, in any way, increase Army promotions or result in additional Army officers.	May 15, 1947	Public Law 61.
H. R. 1621	Johnson of California	Boy Scouts' World Jamboree: To authorize the War Department and the State Department to assist the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France during July and August 1947.	Apr. 14, 1947	Public Law 31.
H. R. 1807	Andrews of New York	Easement in land in U. S. Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.: To provide a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a Federal-aid farm-to-market highway along the west boundary of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.	June 30, 1947	Public Law 135.
H. R. 1845	Mrs. Smith of Maine	Military leave for Federal employees: To unify the existing laws pertaining to the granting of military leave to permanent and temporary indefinite employees of the United States or the District of Columbia, who are members of the Reserve components of the various services, including the National Guard.	July 1, 1947	Public Law 153.
H. R. 1943	do	Army and Navy Nurse Corps: To establish an Army Nurse Corps and a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Medical Department of the Regular Army and to establish a Navy Nurse Corps as a component part of the Medical Department of the Navy.	Apr. 16, 1947	Public Law 36.
H. R. 2225	West	Fort McIntosh, Tex. (H. R. 2225 substituted on Senate floor for S. 739): To authorize the War Assets Administration to transfer a portion of Fort McIntosh, Laredo, Tex., along with certain personal property, to the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, without reimbursement or exchange of funds.	July 25, 1947	Public Law 235
H. R. 2248	Andrews of New York	Easement in land in Camp Livingston, La.: To provide a perpetual easement on the Camp Livingston Military Reservation to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. to cover a relocation of its transmission line and to convey by quitclaim deed a tract of land for a reconstructed substation.	July 1, 1947	Private Law 44.
H. R. 2276	do	Olympic Games: To permit the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to augment the national Olympic effort in all sports by authorizing the participation of their personnel in the games. Also to make such authorization permanent in character but placing a monetary limitation on both the Army and Navy for expenses incident thereto.	do	Public Law 159
H. R. 2314	do	Lump-sum payments to survivors of deceased officers. To establish additional beneficiaries to whom lump-sum aviation bonuses may be paid in the event of the death of aviation officers who have not designated beneficiaries.	July 25, 1947	Public Law 236.
H. R. 2339	do	Army mail clerks: To eliminate certain unnecessary authority within the War Department to pay additional compensation to enlisted personnel designated as mail clerks.	June 30, 1947	Public Law 136.
H. R. 2359	Mrs. St. George	Highland Falls filtration plant: Authorizes a lump-sum payment of $85,000 by the United States to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., as a contribution toward the cost of construction of a water-filtration plant.	June 12, 1948	Public Law 627.
H. R. 2744	Brooks	Retirement: Establishes a permanent and more expeditious method of eliminating substandard officers of the Regular Army and the Regular Air Force. Places the personnel of the Army and the Air Force on a par with personnel of the Navy, insofar as (*a*) years of service required for voluntary longevity retirement is concerned, and (*b*) retirement in the highest temporary rank. Establishes longevity retirement benefits for members of the Reserve components predicated both on time spent on active duty and satisfactory service performed during periods of inactive duty.	June 29, 1948	Public Law 810.
H. R. 3053	Andrews of New York	Easement in lands in Hawaii: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant a perpetual easement for 28 small parcels of land in the vicinity of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard to the Territory of Hawaii for highway and utility purposes.	July 22, 1947	Public Law 212.
H. R. 3055	do	Utilities and related services: To authorize the War and Navy Departments to sell utilities and certain related services to welfare activities and private persons residing in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities, provided such utilities are not otherwise available.	July 30, 1947	Public Law 284.
H. R. 3056	do	Easement for road in Bibb County, Ga.: To provide authority for the Secretary of the Navy to convey an easement to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., for the construction and operation of a public road and the installation of equipment of public-utility services across the naval ordnance plant at Macon, Ga.	July 21, 1947	Public Law 207.
H. R. 3124	Mrs. Bolton	Marine Band in Cleveland, Ohio: To authorize the Marine Band to attend the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic at Cleveland, Ohio, Aug. 10 to 14, 1947.	June 30, 1947	Public Law 141.
H. R. 3127	Mathews	Obsolete ordnance to State homes: To make State homes for former members of the armed forces eligible for loan or gift of condemned ordnance, guns, and cannon balls, under the act of May 22, 1896, as amended.	July 31, 1947	Public Law 304.
H. R. 3191	Andrews of New York	Filipinos under Missing Persons Act: To amend Public Law 301, 79th Cong., in order to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act (56 Stat. 143) to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines while these forces were in the service of the armed forces of the United States.	July 25, 1947	Public Law 241.
H. R. 3215	do	Army and Navy Medical Departments, revised: To establish in the Medical Departments of the Regular Army and Navy a Medical Service Corps with a Reserve component; be composed of pharmacists, sanitary engineers, optometrists, psychologists, bacteriologists, business administrators, and similar skills.	Aug. 4, 1947	Public Law 337.
H. R. 3251	do	Retirement of certain Navy officers: To authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers.	July 11, 1947	Public Law 178.
H. R. 3252	do	Easement in lands in Long Beach, Calif.: To grant a perpetual easement to the city of Long Beach, Calif., in two strips of land each 20 feet wide and 600 and 330 feet long, respectively. Both of these parcels lie within the site of the Navy housing project at Long Beach and adjacent to the west side of Santa Fe Ave.; the proposed easement is to be granted for street and utility purposes.	July 21, 1947	Public Law 208.
H. R. 3303	do	Volunteer enlistments (H. R. 3303 substituted on Senate floor for S. 1218): To establish a permanent system of volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment designed to fit the future variable requirements of the Army. It further authorizes certain benefits to enlisted men for the purpose of encouraging enlistment and reenlistment in the Regular Army on a career basis, and terminates the payment of mustering-out pay and reduces the minimum age for enlistment in the National Guard from 18 to 17.	June 28, 1947	Public Law 128.
H. R. 3394	do	Remains buried outside the United States: Authorizes the return of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the next of kin as well as the homeland of the deceased. Also authorizes the Secretary of War to exercise discretionary authority in directing the disposition of group and mass burials and directs the permanent overseas burial of unknown American World War II dead. Further permits the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas for United States military cemeteries.	Aug. 5, 1947	Public Law 368.
H. R. 3416	Sikes	Pensacola National Monument, Fla.: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to receive certain surplus lands presently owned by the Departments of the Army and the Navy and to develop them as a national monument, or in the discretion of the Secretary, to designate them for use as a State historical park. The areas included in this bill are Old Forts San Carlos, Barrancas, Redoubt, and Pickens, comprising approximately 13 acres of land.	July 2, 1948	Public Law 878.

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
H. R. 3484	Case of South Dakota	Transfer of Remount Service: To insure the maintenance of a Nation-wide horse-breeding program by transferring certain records, property, and civilian personnel of the Remount Service of the Quartermaster Corps, War Department, to the Department of Agriculture.	Apr. 21, 1948	Public Law 494.
H. R. 3501	Andrews of New York	Abolishing terminal leave: To amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to grant to all military and naval personnel equal treatment in the matter of leave, and to correct certain inequities and defects which have arisen in the administration of the present act. It also provides for the lump-sum payment for accrued leave in certain cases. It will incorporate all existing law concerning leave with changes into one act.	Aug. 4, 1947	Public Law 350.
H. R. 3629	do	Surplus property to Panama Canal: To authorize the War Department and the Navy Department to transfer to the Panama Canal materials, supplies, tools, and equipment of every character, including structures, vessels, and floating equipment, which are surplus to the needs of the Department having title thereto and which may be certified by the Governor of the Panama Canal as necessary for the care, maintenance, operation, improvement, sanitation, and government of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone.	July 2, 1947	Public Law 160.
H. R. 3645	Gross	Gettysburg National Military Park: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept on behalf of the United States approximately 4 acres of non-Federal land within the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park.	Jan. 31, 1948	Public Law 404.
H. R. 3735	Sikes	Santa Rosa Island: To authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey to Okaloosa County, Fla., a tract of land on Santa Rosa Island in that county.	July 2, 1948	Public Law 885.
H. R. 3830	Short	Promotion and elimination of officers: To reestablish a permanent promotion system for the armed forces; to make necessary improvements to the present Navy system of promotion by selection; to change the present Army system of promotion by seniority to a selection system and, insofar as is practicable at this time, to make uniform the promotion systems of the two services.	Aug. 7, 1947	Public Law 381.
H. R. 3883	Bartlett	Transfer of vessel *Hygiene:* To authorize the transfer, without exchange of funds, of the vessel *Hygiene* from the Department of the Army to the Territory of Alaska for use as a floating health clinic within Alaskan waters.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 700.
H. R. 4017	Blackney	Armed Forces Leave Act bonds redeemable: To amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong.) to provide that bonds issued under that act may be redeemed in cash at any time after Sept. 1, 1947, to permit future claimants to request settlement and compensation entirely in cash, and to extend the time within which applications for settlement and compensation under the act may be made to Sept. 1, 1948.	July 26, 1947	Public Law 254.
H. R. 4032	Andrews of New York	Delegation of powers to Secretary of the Navy: To authorize the President of the United States to delegate certain descretionary powers which he now has to the Secretary of the Navy. These powers are: (1) Retirement of officers upon the completion of 30 years of service; (2) retirement of officers upon the completion of 40 years of service; (3) retirement of officers for disability resulting from an incident of the service; (4) retirement of officers for disability not the result of an incident of the service; (5) removal of the charge of desertion from the records of the personnel of the Navy.	June 17, 1948	Public Law 668.
H. R. 4090	do	Nurses retirement benefits: To correct a situation whereby a group of retired Army and Navy nurses is paid according to a lower schedule than is currently in use for the majority of retired Army and Navy nurses.	May 7, 1948	Public Law 517.
H. R. 4272	Welch	Headstones for unmarked graves: To give statutory authority to the Secretary of the Army to furnish headstones or markers for the graves of all persons who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States, including the Union and Confederate Armies.	July 1, 1948	Public Law 871.
H. R. 4308	Andrews of New York	Decorations from foreign governments: To insure that former officers and enlisted men of the armed forces, as well as those now in the services, may receive decorations, orders, and medals tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or other American republics.	Aug. 1, 1947	Public Law 314.
H. R. 4490	do	Salvage facilities: To authorize the Navy Department, either by contract or through its own facilities, to provide adequate offshore salvage facilities in American waters and in areas where our vessels may operate.	May 4, 1948	Public Law 513.
H. R. 4721	do	Repairs to naval vessels: To repeal the act of July 18, 1935 (49 Stat. 482), which provides that not more than $450,000 can be spent in any 18 consecutive months on repairs and alterations to any one ship, and earlier laws which set comparable limitations. These laws are not now in effect since they were suspended during the war until the end of the first fiscal year following the expiration of the war.	June 12, 1948	Public Law 628.
H. R. 5035	Jonkman	Marine Band at Grand Rapids, Mich.: To authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic.	May 18, 1948	Public Law 532.
H. R. 5036	Kersten	Marine Band at Milwaukee (H. R. 5036 substituted on Senate floor for S. 2064): To authorize the President to permit the Marine Corps Band to attend and give concerts at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League to be held in Milwaukee, Wis., from Sept. 22 to 25, inclusive, 1948.	June 24, 1948	Public Law 763.
H. R. 5283	Hardy	Surplus sand at Fort Story: To authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of surplus sand on Government-owned land at Fort Story, Va., by sale, upon such terms and conditions as are deemed advisable by him.	June 10, 1948	Public Law 619.
H. R. 5298	Johnson of California	Civil Air Patrol: To establish as permanent law the Civil Air Patrol as a volunteer civilian auxiliary to the U. S. Air Force; to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to accept and utilize the service of the Civil Air Patrol; to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make available to Civil Air Patrol, by gift or by loan, sale or otherwise, obsolete or surplus aircraft, aircraft parts, matériel, supplies, equipment, and facilities of the Department of the Air Force.	May 26, 1948	Public Law 557.
H. R. 5344	Andrews of New York	Retired pay of certain enlisted men and warrant officers: To prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, which will alleviate an unjust situation which has affected approximately 3,000 retired enlisted men and warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 709.
H. R. 5758	Potter	Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, amendment: To permit certain payments to be made to surviving brothers, sisters, nieces, or nephews of deceased members and former members of the armed forces.	do	Public Law 710.
H. R. 5805	Blackney	Mustering-out payment: To extend the time for filing claims for payment under the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 to Feb. 3, 1950.	May 19, 1948	Public Law 539.
H. R. 5836	Andrews of New York	Easement at Fort Myers, Fla. (H. R. 5836 substituted on Senate floor for S. 2291): To authorize a perpetual easement over certain lands adjacent to the Fort Myers Army Airfield in Florida.	June 3, 1948	Private Law 339.
H. R. 5870	do	Allowances for war dead escorts: To provide increased allowances for the escorts of repatriated war dead.	do	Public Law 599.
H. R. 5882	Anderson of California	Surplus property for educational purposes: To authorize donations by the armed services, for educational purposes, of such equipment, materials, books, and other supplies as may be obsolete or no longer needed within the National Military Establishment.	July 2, 1948	Public Law 889.
H. R. 5983	Andrews of New York	Medical Services Corps Act (H. R. 5983 substituted on Senate floor for S. 2366): To remove certain restrictions on the source of appointments of pharmacists, optometrists, and other related specialists to the Navy Medical Service Corps.	June 19, 1948	Public Law 716.
H. R. 6039	do	Appointment of Army and Air Force generals: To provide statutory authority for the appointment in the permanent grade of general in the Regular Army of Omar Nelson Bradley, general of the U. S. Air Force of Carl Spaatz, and admiral in the U. S. Navy of Raymond A. Spruance.	June 26, 1948	Public Law 791.
H. R. 6633	Fletcher	San Diego land exchange: To authorize exchange of lands and interest therein between the United States and the city of San Diego, Calif.	July 2, 1948	Public Law 891.

Measures enacted into law, 80th Cong.—Continued

Bill No.	Author	Subject and purpose of bill	Date approved by President	Law No.
H. R. 6698	Andrews of New York	Filipinos at the Naval Academy: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit Filipinos, not exceeding 4 in number at any one time, to receive instruction at the Naval Academy.	June 24, 1948	Public Law 752.
H. R. 6707	do	Officer Personnel Act amendment: To extend the time before which certain officers now serving in the grade of admiral in the Navy and general in the Air Force and Army must be reduced in rank.	June 28, 1948	Public Law 804
H. J. Res. 90	do	Former naval reservists in Philippines: To eliminate present discrimination against certain former naval reservists in the Philippine Islands.	May 15, 1947	Public Law 50.
H. J. Res. 92	do	Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl: To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to present the Distinguished Flying Cross, with accompanying ribbon, to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, U. S. Navy, in recognition of his heroic action as commanding officer of the Navy dirigible, U. S. S. *Shenandoah* at the time of its destruction during a violent storm on Sept. 3, 1925.	June 30, 1947	Private Law 35.
H. J. Res. 95	Cole of New York	Lt. Gen. Roy Stanley Geiger: To promote posthumously the late Lieutenant General Geiger, U. S. Marine Corps, to the rank of general in the U. S. Marine Corps.	do	Private Law 36.
H. J. Res. 116	Andrews of New York	Naval Academy appointments: To correct technical errors in Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess., and to provide for the appointment to the Naval Academy, by the Secretary of the Navy, of 160 men annually from enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, and 160 men annually from the enlisted men of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve.	May 16, 1947	Public Law 71.
H. J. Res. 107	Gavin	Service rendered under Selective Service: To recognize and publicly acknowledge the gratitude of the people and the Government of the United States for patriotic service rendered by many uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System during the war.	June 30, 1947	Public Law 133.

EXHIBIT B

Military and naval appropriations, 80th Cong., 1st and 2d sess.

Act	Military Establishment	Air Corps	Naval Establishment
Military Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 267, approved July 30, 1947	[1] $5,482,529,633	(2)	
Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 271, approved July 30, 1947	[3] 600,045,349		$16,736,701
Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 299, approved July 31, 1947	350,000		
First Deficiency Appropriation Act, Public Law 46, approved May 1, 1947	766,201,375		17,710,726
Navy Department Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 202, approved July 18, 1947			[4] 3,268,766,100
Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 393, approved Dec. 23, 1947	[5] 340,000,000		
Total, 80th Cong., 1st sess.	7,189,126,357		3,303,243,527
Military Functions Appropriation Act, 1949, Public Law 766, approved June 24, 1948	[6] 5,808,607,162	$396,811,000	
Department of the Navy Appropriation Act, 1949, Public Law 753, approved June 24, 1948			[3] 3,749,059,250
First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 519, approved May 10, 1948	[7] 149,087,488		[8] 2,957,000
Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 547, approved May 21, 1948	25,900,000	[9] 608,100,000	[10] 315,000,000
Foreign Aid Appropriation Act, 1949, Public Law 793, approved June 28, 1948	[11] 1,300,000,000		
Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 785, approved June 25, 1948	32,700,000		[12] 51,337,200
Total, 80th Cong., 2d sess.	7,316,290,650	1,504,911,000	4,118,353,450

[1] In addition, contract authorizations totaling $454,000,000.
[2] Air Corps funds in this act included in Military Establishment total.
[3] Includes $600,000,000 "Government and relief in occupied areas."
[4] In addition, contract authorizations totaling $248,000,000.
[5] For "Government and relief in occupied areas."
[6] In addition to Department of the Army, this act includes funds for the Department of the Air Corps, which are shown in column 2, and also funds for Office of Secretary of Defense, National Security Council, and National Security Resources Board, which are included in the total under Military Establishment, column 1. In addition, includes for Department of the Army, contract authorizations totaling $220,000,000.
[7] Includes $143,000,000 for "Government and relief in occupied areas."
[8] In addition, contract authorizations totaling $4,100,000 with authority to liquidate such contracts out of balances on hand.
[9] In addition, contract authorizations totaling $1,687,000,000.
[10] In addition, contract authorization totaling $588,000,000.
[11] For "Government and relief in occupied areas."
[12] In addition, contract authorizations totaling $50,000,000.

Recapitulation

	80th Cong., 1st sess.	80th Cong., 2d sess.	Total
Military Establishment	[1] $7,189,126,357	[2] $7,316,290,650	[1 2] $14,505,417,007
Air Corps	(3)	[4] 1,504,911,000	[4] 1,504,911,000
Naval Establishment	[5] 3,303,243,527	[6] 4,118,353,450	[5 6] 7,421,596,977
Grand total	10,492,369,884	12,939,555,100	23,431,924,984

[1] In addition, $454,000,000 contract authorizations.
[2] In addition, $220,000,000 contract authorizations.
[3] Air Corps funds included in the Military Establishment figures of $7,189,126,357.
[4] In addition, contract authorizations of $1,687,000,000.
[5] In addition, $248,000,000 contract authorizations.
[6] In addition, $642,100,000 contract authorizations.

CURRENT STATUS AND HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE POWER CONTRACTS—COST OF POWER—PRIMARY CONTRACTORS—WITHDRAWAL RIGHTS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA FROM HOOVER (BOULDER) DAM—AND OF THE BASIC MAGNESIUM PLANT LOCATED AT HENDERSON, NEV.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the great interest in the seven Colorado River Basin States regarding the current status of the water and power rights and development prompts me to request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the recommendations, conclusions, and a summary of the facts pertaining to the status of the electric power leases, withdrawals, and costs at Hoover—Boulder—Dam; also the current status of the Basic Magnesium plant located at Henderson as determined by the Subcommittee on Basic Magnesium of the Special Senate Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BASIC MAGNESIUM PLANT DISPOSAL

(Joint report of the Subcommittee on Basic Magnesium Plant of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and the Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments pursuant to S. Res. 75, March 1947)

Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program: Owen Brewster, Maine, chairman; Homer Ferguson, Michigan; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; John J. Williams, Delaware; George W. Malone, Nevada; Harry P. Cain, Washington; Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Claude Pepper, Florida; J. Howard McGrath, Rhode Island; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: George D. Aiken, Vermont, chairman; Homer Ferguson, Michigan; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Iowa; John W. Bricker, Ohio; Edward J. Thye, Minnesota; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; Irving M. Ives, New York; John L. McClellan, Arkansas; James O. Eastland, Mississippi; Clyde R. Hoey, North Carolina; Glen H. Taylor, Idaho; A. Willis Robertson, Virginia; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland

Subcommittee on Basic Magnesium of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program: Homer Ferguson, Michigan, chairman; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; George W. Malone, Nevada; Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland; George Meader, counsel

Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Homer Ferguson, Michigan, chairman; Bourke B Hickenlooper, Iowa; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; John L. McClellan, Arkansas; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland; Miles N. Culehan, counsel

(Letter of transmittal)

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman, Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: There is transmitted herewith to the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments a report of the Joint Committee of the Subcommittee on Basic Magnesium of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and the Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments concerning the management and operation and prospects of disposal of the Basic Magnesium plant at Henderson, Nev. This report incorporates the findings and recommendations by the joint committee as the result of the hearing.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER FERGUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and Subcommittee on Basic Magnesium of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

INTERIM REPORT ON THE BASIC MAGNESIUM PLANT AT HENDERSON, NEV.—INTRODUCTION

Early in 1947, Senator GEORGE W. MALONE (Republican, Nevada) recommended that the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program conduct an investigation of the Basic Magnesium plant at Henderson, Nev. Senator MALONE urged that both the efficiency of operation of the plant and the deficit in the operation of the plant at the expense of the United States taxpayers, together with the apparent delay in securing firm contracts for Hoover Dam low cost power for use at the plant, be explored, as well as the possibilities of the disposal of this $140,000,000 war investment to the best interests of the State of Nevada, the Southwest, and the United States at a whole.

Five-man subcommittee

Accordingly, in February,, a five-man subcommittee of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program was appointed to exercise the jurisdiction of the committee in the investigation of certain aspects of the management and operation of the Basic Magnesium plant. It was understood that this subcommittee would work in conjunction with the standing Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It will be noted that the membership of the two subcommittees is identical with respect to three of the members of each subcommittee.

This investigation was preceded by two other investigations by Senate committees; early in the war, the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program—and under the chairmanship of Senator, now President Truman—through a Subcommittee on Light Metals and Aircraft—under the chairmanship of the then Senator Mon C. Wallgren, now Governor of the State of Washington—conducted an investigation into the construction of the Basic magnesium plant at Henderson, Nev., and its operation by Basic Magnesium, Inc. That investigation culminated in a report, filed later as a part of the Committee's Report on Magnesium, filed with the Senate on March 13, 1944, as Report No. 10, part 17, of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

In November 1944, shortly after all production of magnesium had ceased, but while the plant was still producing large quantities of chlorine, badly needed for the war effort, a Subcommittee of a Special Committee to Investigate Industrial Centralization, established pursuant to Senate Resolution 190 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, held hearings in Las Vegas, Nev. This subcommittee was under the chairmanship of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, and its hearings are reported as part 5 (Nov. 27 and 28, 1944), of the hearings of that special committee. No report of this subcommittee was filed, but it is apparent from the hearings that the committee was concerned about the possible postwar commercial use of the plant.

Basic Magnesium subject of committee interest

It is thus apparent that almost from its inception the Basic Magnesium plant has been the object of special interest on the part of the United States Senate. The joint subcommittees (hereinafter referred to as the Committee) of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program and the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of course, expected that administrative agents would use due diligence in protecting the interests of the Government in all of their activities. However, there can be no excuse for failure to act diligently and effectively with respect to the Basic Magnesium plant on the ground that it was not called to the attention of the administrative agents having functions to perform with respect thereto. This plant has been in the spotlight of congressional attention from its beginning. This fact should have constituted notice to all administrative personnel that an accounting would be expected of the discharge of their functions.

Hearing dates

In addition to the investigative work and the assembling of facts on the part of the staffs of both subcommittees, joint public hearings were held as follows: May 29, 1947, Washington, D. C.; June 24, 1947, Washington, D. C.; June 25, 1947, Washington, D. C.; August 21, 1947, Las Vegas, Nev.; August 22, 1947, Las Vegas, Nev.; January 5, 1948, Las Vegas, Nev.

The purpose of this report is to make available to all concerned a summary of the facts developed in the committee's investigation, together with a statement of conclusions and recommendations, which, in the judgment of the committee, based upon the facts it has developed, will serve the best interests of the country in any future final disposition to be taken with respect to the Basic Magnesium plant.

The purpose of the hearings was to develop the facts with respect to the management and operation of the Basic Magnesium plant and the housing development adjacent thereto, as well as the present status of plans for the disposal of the Government's interest in these facilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The amount of low-cost power available for industrial use within the Hoover (Boulder) Dam area—and the conditions surrounding its use, will determine not only the ultimate value of the Basic Magnesium plant facilities—but also the industrial value of the entire area to the State of Nevada, the Southwest and to the Nation.

The necessary transportation, industrial, and domestic water supply and many of the raw materials are available.

In the interest of efficiency of operation, and to secure the maximum benefit to the Nation as a whole, the State of Nevada, and the southwestern area, the joint committee recommends:

1. That the Basic Magnesium plant be disposed of to private industrial operators at the earliest possible time for the reasons: First, that the property may remain upon the tax rolls of the county and State of Nevada (now approximately $102,000 annually); and, second, in the interest of efficient operation. Experience has demonstrated that neither the Federal Government nor a State can operate such industrial enterprises efficiently; that they become political footballs; and that the net result is an unhappy condition for all concerned when such operation is attempted. The committee is convinced from the information developed during the hearings, that such disposal can be made almost immediately when the Colorado River Commission of Nevada has made the necessary arrangements for the availability of industrial power under the proper conditions.

2. That the Colorado River Commission apply for and secure a minimum of one-third of the electrical energy to be generated at the Davis Dam, now under construction on the Colorado River approximately 50 miles below Hoover (Boulder) Dam, to be utilized in conjunction with Hoover Dam power. This power can then be utilized in conjunction with the Hoover Dam power in the proportion of about 2 to 1—that is, 1 kilowatt-hour from Davis Dam to 2 kilowatt-hours from Hoover Dam—thereby providing reciprocal stand-by power and automatically eliminating the necessity for the purchase of such stand-by energy. The Congress has already appropriated the necessary funds for the construction of the transmission line from Davis Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant area.

3. That the two power transmission-line systems connecting Hoover Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant (now the property of the War Assets Administration) be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation which is constructing and will operate the Davis Dam transmission lines.

With the Bureau operating both transmission systems in conjunction in a manner to provide reciprocal stand-by power, the cost of purchasing such additional stand-by power will be almost entirely eliminated.

Under no foreseeable conditions should the Hoover Dam-Basic Magnesium transmission lines be delivered to a separate agency or company—since the result could easily be an additional service charge.

4. That the Colorado River Commission take over the generator at Hoover Dam known as N-7 generator—which was installed during World War II for the purpose of furnishing power belonging to the State of Nevada and other contractees to the Basic Magnesium plant for the manufacture of magnesium for war purposes.

5. That since the Colorado Commission of Nevada is the sole agent of the State of Nevada in the withdrawal of the electrical energy allotted to the State, the commission determine at the earliest possible date the rate per kilowatt-hour that such electrical energy will be available to prospective users in order that sale of and the full use of the plant may be expedited.

6. That legislation be introduced in the Congress of the United States for the purpose of allocating to the United States-Mexico-Colorado water treaty that part of the cost of Davis Dam regulatory storage properly chargeable to and guaranteed to be furnished by the international treaty.

At the present time the entire cost of the Davis Dam water storage necessary to make the treaty effective is charged to power and will be paid for by the power users of that particular area. The cost of the combination Hoover-Davis Dams firm electrical energy delivered to the Basic Magnesium plant should be approximately 3 mills per kilowatt-hour—this rate would then be reduced by whatever amount of the cost of Davis Dam regulatory storage is found to be properly chargeable to the United States-Mexico international treaty, and should have a considerable effect upon the industrial feasibility within the area.

7. That the War Assets Administration continue watching closely the cost of administration. Since the cost of such administration has been reduced from a net loss of nearly $200,000 per month at the first hearing date, May 1947, to approximately $3,000 on January 4, 1948, the date of the final hearing, it is believed that the project can be operated upon a paying basis with the present power users and when additional power is sold a profit should be realized.

8. That little difficulty will be experienced in disposing of the basic magnesium units for private industrial purposes when the Colorado River Commission and the War Assets Administration carry through the above recommendations—and the firm power is available to such industrialists at approximately 3 mills per kilowatt-hour—and while there has been unusual delay in such procedure, the committee strongly recommends that the units be transferred to private industry at the earliest possible date so that the property may remain on the tax roll and also be operating and available for emergency work.

These eight recommendations embody, for the most part, the preliminary recommendations made to the War Assets Administration following the first hearing in May 1947.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The wartime power contract covering the generator N–7, while it may have been justified under the exigencies created by the emergency, was certainly a bad contract from a long-range point of view, and has left the Government in a position of being required to make substantial payments until 1966 and receiving nothing in exchange therefor since 1945. Since it is probable that some power contracts will be entered into in the future to supply the plant, the committee earnestly recommends that the lesson to be learned from the wartime contract not be forgotten and that the same pitfalls be avoided.

2. There has been unjustifiable procrastination and delay on the part of administrative agencies—primarily Defense Plant Corporation and Reconstruction Finance Corporation—in taking steps to dispose of the Basic Magnesium plant, representing an investment of $140,000,000 of taxpayers' money for war purposes. In March 1944, when the plant was producing at its peak rate of 120,000,000 pounds of magnesium annually (112 percent of rated capacity), it was clear, first, that the plant would not be needed for magnesium production, either for the war or for postwar peacetime production, and, second, that it would have to be disposed of either as a going concern for postwar uses other than magnesium production or salvaged by dismantling and sale of the usable fixtures and personal property and either sale or abandonment of the residue. Although adequate power and authority at all times existed in the administrative agencies to take steps for disposal, no effective action was taken. The committee was amazed to learn that even at the date of hearings Reconstruction Finance Corporation was still in the process of taking an inventory, no steps had been taken to arrange for low-cost firm power, an accounting for the cost of operation was still incomplete, and no written leases were in effect. The committee was further amazed to learn that War Assets Administration apparently was not cognizant of the fact that the State of Nevada had a withdrawal privilege on a large amount of firm power at cost at the switchboard.

3. The interests of the taxpayers were disregarded in the failure of the administrative agencies. Defense Plant Corporation and Reconstruction Finance Corporation, until February 1, 1947, and War Assets Administration subsequent to that date and up until the time of the committee's investigation and hearings, to take effective action toward efficient and economical operation of the plant in semistand-by condition which has resulted in a net direct operating loss to the taxpayers estimated to be from one million to two and one-half million dollars annually. The committee is gratified that the War Assets Administration, after first taking the position that it was impossible to reduce the net operating losses at the Basic Magnesium plant, now estimates that as of September 1947 the net operating deficit will be reduced to the rate of $25,000 monthly.

4. The committee recommends that the disposal of the townsite be considered as an integral part of the whole problem and that no disposal thereof should be made which would interfere with or hinder the ultimate solution to the entire problem. The testimony of the witnesses as to the effect of the sale of the townsite independently, and the recommendations of the Industrial Research Corporation on the disposal of the town site should be carefully weighed by the responsible officials before a decision is reached and action is taken.

5. The committee is of the opinion that the suggested acquisition by the State of Nevada is unsound for several reasons. First of all, the evidence seems to clearly indicate that the State is not in a financial position to either acquire the plant or to underwrite the maintenance loss which might occur. Second, it is questionable whether the State ought to risk public funds in a speculative profit-making or loss-taking enterprise. Third, experience has shown that publicly operated enterprises of the character ordinarily handled by private capital have not been outstanding successes, and fourth, the committee feels that it is not necessary for the State to engage in this private business activity in order to accomplish the real benefits for this State in which it does have an intense interest, namely, the development of industry within its borders which would enhance the wealth of the State and employment of its citizens.

6. The committee is of the opinion that the best disposal plan presented is multiple occupancy of the plant with retention of central control of utility services in one responsible authority at least until it may be possible to dispose of these utilities to all of the plant occupants jointly. It is, of course, essential that disposal of individual units of the plant should not in any way interfere with complete utility service to the entire plant since such a disposal would defeat the ultimate goal.

7. It is apparent to the committee that low-cost firm power is an absolute essential to the successful disposal of the plant. No source of low-cost firm power seems available other than the State of Nevada, and therefore, immediate steps should be taken ultimately to secure such low-cost power from the State. The committee feels that a certain synchronization of action is essential in the matter of securing this power, since it requires 3 years for Nevada to withdraw sufficient power, it also requires approximately 3 years to install additional generating facilities and the State of Nevada cannot withdraw its share of power until it is guaranteed against loss by bond from its proposed consumer. The committee further recommends that immediate action be taken to secure an interim power contract, in order to provide a source of power during the period which will be required for Nevada to get its power, and that such contract should of course contain the most favorable terms possible, and certainly terms more favorable than in the previous power contracts. The committee recommends that serious consideration be given to the possibility of tying in Davis Dam power when available in order to have standby power to prevent power shut-downs. In the negotiations for interim power it should be understood that the contract will in no way interfere with, or increase the time required for Nevada's withdrawal of power, since this would defeat the very purpose desired. The committee feels that whatever steps possible should be taken to secure for the State of Nevada the power generated by N–7, since the Government is liable for the amortization payments on this unit until 1966 and this would seem to be an equitable solution to this situation. In any event, if this is not possible, a serious effort should be made to secure an increase in the rate of payment made for the use of N–7, in order to reduce the present loss being sustained by the Government. If it is possible, under all of the circumstances, the committee recommends that serious consideration be given to the transfer of the transmission facilities owned by the Government to the Bureau of Reclamation.

8. War Assets Administration has taken the position that the appraisal and utilization study made by the Industrial Research Corporation should remain confidential and for the sole use of War Assets Administration. This position seems to be based upon the belief on the part of War Assets Administration officials that if the information contained in the report was available to prospective tenants or customers of War Assets Administration, War Assets Administration would be unable to negotiate a bargain as favorable for the Government as it could if the report were withheld. The committee disagrees on grounds of policy with War Assets Administration in this regard. With possible exceptions which the committee cannot now foresee, the committee believes that all information in the possession of the Government bearing upon the desirability, feasibility or profitableness of a transaction with the Government should be available to individuals and corporations desiring to transact business with the Government. Whatever may be the proper attitude with respect to transactions in private enterprise, the committee believes that public property should be dealt with openly and with full knowledge available to all prospective customers and not by concealment of facts bearing either upon the economic soundness of the enterprise or the price to be paid. Accordingly, the committee recommends that the industrial survey report be made public and available to all who may be interested in its contents.

9. The committee is impressed with the possibility of disposing of the Basic Magnesium plant as a going concern to actual operators and avoiding any Federal or State operations where taxes are lost to the State and inefficient operation is inevitable. The rapid expansion in population and the industrial development in the Southwest has a tendency to interest the establishment of production facilities either by new companies or by existing companies whose production operations have heretofore been concentrated in the East. The establishment of an electrochemical or electrometallurgical center with the Basic Magnesium plant as its nucleus seems, to the committee on the evidence before it, to be feasible. The committee has been informed that several large and well-established chemical companies intend to establish operations near the southwestern market. The unfortunate and, so far, unsolved so-called "smog" condition in the Los Angeles area has caused such

companies to hesitate to invest large sums of money in establishing new facilities in the Los Angeles area. Henderson, Nev., being approximately 335 miles by rail from Los Angeles, is one possible desirable location for electrochemical and electrometallurgical companies desiring to serve the southern California market. In estimating costs and ability to compete, the primary unknown factor is the cost of power, which is one of the basic elements of cost in the electrochemical and electrometallurgical industry. An assurance of low-cost power might offset a disadvantage in other elements of cost which would induce companies to locate at Henderson, Nev., in the Basic Magnesium plant. The benefit to the State of Nevada, whose population is approximately 150,000, and which is practically devoid of manufacturing or industrial operations, would be tremendous. The benefit to the United States as a whole, resulting from a development of a hitherto undeveloped area and in the dispersal of industrial operations and in the realization of a substantial return from a large war asset, would, likewise, be tremendous. The committee, therefore, believes that the possibilities of disposing of the Basic Magnesium plant as a going concern should be fully and effectively explored and exploited. Nevertheless, the committee believes that against the above-stated desirable objective must be carefully weighed the continuation of large operating losses, and for that reason urges War Assets Administration to intensify its effort to dispose of the Basic Magnesium plant as a going concern and come to a conclusion as speedily as possible to the end that, if disposal as a going concern is not achievable, salvage operations can be commenced without undue delay.

A SUMMARY OF THE FACTS PERTAINING TO ELECTRICAL ENERGY

1. That the availability of low-cost power will determine the value of the Basic Magnesium plant. Such low-cost power might well mean the difference between the scrap value of the plant and its value as a going concern in the manufacture of chemical, electrochemical and electrometallurgical products, as well as other material peculiarly fitted to that area.

2. That the State of Nevada has a withdrawal privilege on approximately 750,000,000 kilowatt-hours per annum of electrical energy from Hoover Dam under special conditions more particularly outlined under the contracts between the Secretary of the Interior and the primary allottees of the power from the dam. More specifically, the State of Nevada and the State of Arizona are each entitled to 17.6259 percent of the firm power generated at the dam.

The cost of such power so withdrawn at the dam based upon 1947 costs would be 1.22 mills per kilowatt-hour for "falling water" plus the generating cost equalling approximately a total of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour at the switchboard.

3. That it is necessary that interim power be secured for the use of tenants at the Basic Magnesium plant during the period required to secure Nevada's allocation of power direct from Hoover Dam. The time delay is from 6 months to 3 years, depending upon the amount of electrical energy applied for.

4. That upon proper application, Nevada could become the user of at least one-third of the power to be generated at Davis Dam which would amount to approximately 300,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy. Such energy will be available about the year 1950–51 which coincides with the time required to withdraw the State's allocation of power from Hoover Dam. Such an allocation of power would amount to 1,050,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy available to the State of Nevada from the two sources.

5. The Eightieth Congress appropriated money for approximately 70 miles of transmission lines between Davis Dam and Hoover Dam. The Hoover Dam power plant now has transmission lines running to the Basic Magnesium plant. If the above-projected transmission line from Davis Dam should be constructed to the Basic Magnesium plant and then connected with the two circuits already constructed from Hoover Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant, there would be three independent transmission circuits from two independent sources of power which is considered, from a construction standpoint, an exceptionally safe arrangement, needing little if any stand-by power.

6. With the above three independent power circuits constituting the power transmission facilities from two independent sources operating under the control of the Bureau of Reclamation which department now controls both dams, the power allocated to Nevada could then be used and operated as reciprocal stand-by power, and little if any stand-by power would be necessary to facilitate or care for the operation of the Basic Magnesium plant facilities.

7. That to coordinate the power from the two sources in the ratio of about 1 kilowatt-hour of energy from Davis Dam to two or more kilowatt-hours of energy from Hoover Dam would result in the right proportions for efficient operation.

8. That the advent of the Davis Dam power upon the completion of that project at about the time the State of Nevada's allocation should be withdrawn from Hoover Dam could well eliminate any penalty for existing transmission lines rendered idle through the withdrawal of Nevada's allocation of electrical energy from Hoover Dam. The Board of Arbitration provided for in existing regulations under the Boulder Dam Project Adjustment Act to pass on inequities, obviates any necessity for delay in such withdrawal.

9. That the Colorado River Commission of Nevada is the legally designated agency that may apply to the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw Nevada's allocation of power, and is authorized to require such arrangements as may be necessary to safeguard the State from loss by the prospective user of such electrical energy.

10. That to assure current operation at the Basic Magnesium plant it is necessary for the Colorado River Commission of Nevada to immediately negotiate with the primary power allottees for such interim power as may be required for the use of tenants pending the availability of the essential part of the State's allocation of electrical energy.

11. That the contract between the Government, the State of Nevada, and the primary allottees for power from Hoover Dam making available a portion of the State of Nevada's share of the power for use at the then new wartime Basic Magnesium plant contained a provision, approved by the State of Nevada, that such power reverted to primary allottees immediately after the war ended.

This proviso placed the State of Nevada in such position that they now must again observe the time limit in withdrawing power for any peacetime operation, and if such proviso were strictly construed with interim power not available it could destory the usefulness of the Basic Magnesium plant during the 3-year period required to legally withdraw Nevada's allotment of power.

12. That in 1946 a 5-year contract for interim power was entered into with the Southern California Edison Co. and the State of Nevada. In such contract Nevada agreed to relinquish its rights to make an effective withdrawal of Nevada's allocation of power during the life of the contract, thereby effectively preventing the State from utilizing its own low-cost power for an additional 2-year period.

13. That the tenants at the plant are currently paying roughly two and one-half times the rate per kilowatt hour for power that it costs the Los Angeles Southern California Edison Co. and the bureau of light and power at the dam 10 miles away.

14. That the representatives of the bureau of water and power, and of the Southern California Edison Co. agreed, at the hearings in Las Vegas on August 21, 1947, to recommend to their companies that they enter into negotiations with the Colorado River Commission of Nevada for a new interim power contract pending the availability of Nevada's share of Hoover and Davis Dam power supply.

15. That all evidence showed conclusively that the value of the wartime plant to Nevada, to the Southwest, and to the Federal Government is dependent upon a power supply at a price enough below that available at tidewater so that it can be utilized in the production of the chemical, electrochemical, and electrometallurgical products and other materials—pay the freight to the markets, and leave a margin of profit.

SUPPORTING AND HISTORICAL DATA AS DISCLOSED BY THE RECORD

A permanent and adequate supply of power for industries which might be located in the Basic Magnesium plant requires the making of two arrangements.

First. Generating capacity must be provided in the Boulder power plant so that the State of Nevada can make available power which it has the right to withdraw from use by primary power allottees.

Second. Provision must be made for stand-by capacity so that emergency outages as well as normal outages for inspection and maintenance can be provided for.

The State of Nevada should acquire what is known as the N7 generator installed during the war to furnish power to the Basic Magnesium plant and the cost would be much less than installing a new one—and, in addition, time is an important factor.

An additional new unit in the Boulder plant would cost about $5,000,000. The annual charges in connection with such a unit will be approximately as follows:

Amortization	$193,000
Provision for replacements	57,700
Operation and maintenance	50,000
Total	300,700

In addition to paying the above generating charges, the State of Nevada would also be required to insure the payment of the falling water charges, which at the present time are at the rate of 1.22 mills per kilowatt-hour. On the basis of an annual usage of 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours, the generating charges would amount to approximately .75 mill per kilowatt-hour, or a total cost of 2 mills per kilowatt-hour for power supplied at a high voltage bus at the Hoover power plant before provision is made for stand-by capacity.

Unless an unusually high load factor type of load can be secured for Basic Magnesium, more than 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year cannot be practically handled by one additional unit in the power plant, if all of the power is to come from this source. Four hundred million kilowatt-hours is about twice the present usage at Basic Magnesium.

Davis Dam, 1950

With the estimated completion by 1950 of the Bureau of Reclamation's hydroelectric development at Davis Dam, it appears that possibilities for securing an adequate supply of power at Basic Magnesium with stand-by capacity will be present in a manner not heretofore contemplated. With the completion of the Davis plant, the Bureau of Reclamation will undoubtedly find it convenient to arrange for stand-by for that plant and the connected plant at Parker Dam. Ways and means of fully interchanging power from these two Bureau developments with the

Hoover power plant would undoubtedly be advantageous to the Bureau of Reclamation. It would appear, therefore, that some reasonable agreement could be reached whereby both the Bureau of Reclamation and the industries at the Basic Magnesium plant could be provided with stand-by capacity.

Cost of power, Hoover-Davis Dams

The State of Nevada has made application for 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year from the Davis Dam. If uses at Basic Magnesium should increase beyond 400,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year to the extent that these 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours from Davis were required, the resulting cost per kilowatt-hour would be somewhat as follows:

400,000,000 from Hoover at 2 mills	$800,000
200,000,000 from Davis at 4½ mills	900,000
Total for 600,000,000 kilowatt-hours	1,700,000
	Mills
Average cost per kilowatt-hour	2.83

In the event that the N–7 generator can be secured by the State of Nevada, then the cost of power should be even lower than the 2.83 mills per kilowatt-hour and the time interval should also be reduced.

If a new unit is ordered for Hoover within the next 6 months, however, it is probable that power from that unit will become available about the same time that power is available from Davis Dam.

The Bureau of Reclamation in its request for an appropriation, which has now been granted by Congress, for the fiscal year 1948, included an item for starting construction of a transmission line from Davis Dam to Hoover Dam. That line will now be constructed. With present contemplated deliveries of materials, it is probable that this line will also become available at about the same time that the Davis power plant is completed. Other arrangements necessary to provide a firm source of power must be initiated at an early date if all arrangements are to be effected as outlined.

Assuming that these arrangements will be made, there still remains the question of an interim power supply for the industries at Basic Magnesium for the next 3-year period, or such part of that 3-year period as is required for the withdrawal of the Nevada power. Apparently the only possibility for such a supply lies in suitable arrangements with the southern California allottees of Hoover power. Negotiations for such power supply would be the responsibility of the State of Nevada.

The 1946–47 rate of power from the Hoover power plant covering falling water only was 1.22 mills per kilowatt-hour for the firm power and 0.376 mills per kilowatt-hour for the secondary power.

The generating costs to deliver the power using this falling water and delivering the power to the switchboard would be about three-quarters of a mill per kilowatt-hour. This is for the generating equipment, on about a 60-percent load factor. This cost would be graded down as the load factor goes up.

The transmission lines to take this power from Hoover Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant at Henderson where the power is used, were financed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The equipment at Hoover Dam was installed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The N–7 generator was put in by the Bureau of Reclamation and its cost underwritten until 1966 by the RFC. The 220,000-volt switchyard equipment was put in by the Bureau of Reclamation under the same arrangement. The cost amounted to about $4,000,000 for the equipment installed by the Bureau only.

Coordinate Hoover-Davis Dam power—Reduce stand-by

In the use, then, of this power, and in coordinating the use of the Davis Dam power with the Hoover Dam power to make the lowest possible rate to the Basic Magnesium plant and to make for full utilization, it is necessary to build this transmission line from Davis Dam to Hoover Dam or to the Basic Magnesium plant.

Three circuits are involved here. Very seldom does any industrial establishment have three circuits available and also a source of stand-by furnished by a coordination of supply from two sources. That should provide for the lowest possible cost for power and highest guaranty of continuity of delivery.

It was important in this hearing to make a determination how low-cost firm power could be made available on long-term contracts because there now exists a demand for such power, and the possibility of an oversubscription in the next few years. If such oversubscription should become a fact there is the future prospect of another development upstream commonly known as the Bridge Canyon, so it appears that there is a never-ending source of power development on the Colorado River if properly coordinated.

The transmission lines from Hoover Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant are about 12 miles long, and the contemplated power line from Davis Dam will be approximately 70 miles in length. The Bureau of Reclamation will control and operate the 230-kilovolt transmission line from Davis Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant. At present there are also two kilovolt circuits to Hoover Dam which were constructed by the RFC, and included with this equipment are three banks of transformers of 75,000 kilovolts each, which cost about $400,000 each. This expensive equipment requires very specialized technique in its care and use.

There are, therefore, two reasons why these transmission lines could appropriately be turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation by the RFC to operate in connection with the other transmission line from Davis Dam. They could be operated at a minimum of cost because the Bureau of Reclamation is now equipped and properly staffed to operate. They have had some 40 years of experience in building and operating such equipment and the training of men therefor. In the event of break-downs they have the available equipment for replacement and by over-all control have the facilities to coordinate the power from the various installations on the Colorado River.

If the present owning or operating agency should turn control of these lines over to the Bureau of Reclamation, any transmission charges from Hoover Dam to the Basic Magnesium plant might be eliminated; at least any cost that did arise would not be chargeable to the Colorado River Commission or the State of Nevada. If any charges did arise, they would rightfully belong to the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Bureau of Reclamation has the duty to coordinate the use of all available power supply on the Colorado River, not only as to Hoover Dam but as to Davis Dam also upon its completion, to Parker Dam, as will also be the case if Bridge Canyon is constructed in the future. With the Bureau's general control, they then are in a better position than any other agency to allocate and control any incidental costs that might arise.

Hoover Dam

The Federal Government has followed a long-adopted principle by publicly financing irrigation districts in disposing of the power generated by their projects—and leased the use of the water released through the dam to municipalities and power companies for the generation of power. Such was the case in the building of the Hoover Dam.

The Black Canyon (Hoover) Dam is 727 feet high, its crest length is 1,282 feet. Its thickness is 45 feet at the top and 660 feet at the base. Lake Mead, the reservoir formed back of the dam, is 115 miles long and has an area of 146,500 acres and stores 32,359,274 acre-feet of water. The ultimate expected installations will require for driving the generators fifteen 115,000 horsepower and two 55,000 horsepower vertical hydraulic turbines. The generator equipment will comprise eleven 60-cycle and four 50-cycle units, each rated 82,500 kilowatts, two 60-cycle 40,000 kilowatt generators and two 2,400 kilowatt house generators driven by two 3,500 horsepower Pelton water wheels which will provide station-service energy. The main turbines each exceed in capacity the largest previously manufactured units; namely the 90,000 horsepower units built for the Dnieprostroy plant in Russia.

On January 1, 1947, twelve of the 82,500 kilowatt and one of the 40,000 kilowatt units had been installed. When the plant is complete the total installed capacity, including house units, will be 1,332,300 kilowatts.

Boulder Canyon project

The Boulder Canyon Project Act (H. R. 5773) became law in December 1928. It was put into effect by public proclamation in June 1929, and the contract for construction of the dam, powerhouse and incidental works was awarded in April 1931, by the Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, the Government's agent under the act, after securing firm contracts from the sale of power and water to repay the cost with interest over a 50-year amortization period. The dam and appurtenant works required 5 years to construct and the first power was generated in October 1936.

The principal features of the original act pertaining to the generation of electric power were as follows:

The Government would install power units as required by purchasers; 50-year contracts, subject to readjustment at the end of 15 years and each 10 years thereafter, all to be entered into by the Secretary of the Interior with States, municipalities, corporations, political subdivisions, and private companies for the sale (or lease) of water or electric energy at rates adequate in his judgment to assure payment of all expenses of operation and maintenance of the dam, power plants, and appurtenant structures, and the repayment to the United States, within 50 years from the date of completion, of the cost, plus interest at 4 percent (the cost of the generating machinery plus 4 percent compound interest to be repaid the Government in 50 yearly installments); the ownership of the property to remain forever vested in the United States.

Advances were made by the Secretary of the Treasury for construction and were to be limited to $165,000,000; $70,000,000 to the dam, $38,000,000 for power plants, $38,500,000 for the All-American Canal, and $17,700,000 for interests during construction. Final costs are not yet available.

Expenditures for the canal are to be repaid by the land benefited as provided under the Reclamation Act, and $25,000,000 of the total expenditures are allocated to flood control repayable out of 62½ percent of the revenues in excess of those required for operating and maintenance expenses, interest, and amortization as described above.

In June 1930 Secretary Wilbur announced that contracts had been signed for leases of the falling waters on the basis of firm electric power at the rate of 1.63 mills per kilowatt-hour, a rate sufficient to provide revenues in accordance with the requirement of the act.

Contracts and dates

The original Boulder Canyon Project Act was approved December 21, 1928. The power

contracts entered into under the original act were as follows:

Lease of power privilege, United States, city of Los Angeles, and Southern California Edison Co., dated April 26, 1930, as amended September 23, 1931.

Contract for electric energy, Metropolitan Water District, dated April 26, 1930, as amended May 31, 1930.

Contract for electric energy, the Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corp., dated November 12, 1931.

Contract for electric energy, Southern Sierras Power Co., dated November 5, 1931.

Contract for electric energy, city of Pasadena, dated September 29, 1931.

Contract for electric energy, city of Glendale, dated November 12, 1931.

Contract for electric energy, city of Burbank, dated November 10, 1931.

In addition to this, a contract was entered into with the State of Nevada for initial delivery of energy to the customers of the State, such as Southern Nevada Power Co. and Lincoln County Power District No. 1:

Schedule of allocations

	Percentage of total firm energy
State of Nevada	18.0
State of Arizona	18.0
Metropolitan Water District	36.0
City of Los Angeles	14.9054
Southern California Edison Co	7.2
Southern Sierras	.9
Los Angeles Gas & Electric	.9
City of Burbank	.5896
City of Glendale	1.8867
City of Pasadena	1.6182

In the event the State of Nevada or Arizona would not use the total amount allocated to it, the city, the Southern California Edison Co., Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corp., and Southern Sierras Co. agreed to take and/or pay for the amounts unused by the States in the ratio of 50 percent, 40 percent, 5 percent, and 5 percent, respectively. The total firm energy declared available at the time of beginning operations was 4,330,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year, diminishing annually by 8,760,000 kilowatt-hours. After the project was repaid with 4 percent interest each of the States of Arizona and Nevada was to receive 18¾ percent of such excess revenues and the balance was to be kept in a separate fund to be expended within the Colorado River Basin, as prescribed by Congress.

Rates: The primary allottees agree to pay 1.63 mills per kilowatt hour for firm energy and 0.5 mill per kilowatt-hour for secondary energy delivered at transmission voltage at Hoover Dam. Rates were subject to readjustment, upward and downward, as the Secretary would find justified by competitive conditions at distributing points for competitive centers.

Major features of lease: The power plant would be operated (under general supervision of a director appointed by the Secretary) by the city and the Southern California Edison Co. as lessees. Allottees would compensate the United States for the use of the leased machinery and equipment installed in the power plant, maintain in operating condition, and provide for repairs and replacements. The compensation for the use of machinery was to be based on repayment within 10 years with interest at 4 percent.

BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1940

The principal items of the Boulder Canyon Project Act pertaining to the generation and sale of electric power have been, to a large extent, revised under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940.

Allocations and contracts

In conformity therewith and pursuant thereto, many contracts have been entered into by allottees and users of electrical energy, and following is a list of contracts now in existence:

Power contract, Metropolitan Water District, dated May 29, 1941.

Power contract, Nevada-California Electric Corp., dated May 29, 1941.

Power contract, State of Nevada, dated May 29, 1941.

Power contract, city of Burbank, dated May 29, 1941.

Power contract, city of Glendale, dated May 29, 1941.

Power contract, city of Pasadena, dated May 29, 1941.

Power contract, Arizona Power Authority, dated November 23, 1945.

NOTE.—The city of Los Angeles purchased the Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corp. and acquired its rights of that party to Boulder contracts. The Southern Sierras Co. changed names to Nevada-California Electric Corp.

The allocations under the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act changed slightly to account for the 50,000,000 kilowatt-hours that were allocated to the city of Los Angeles and the percentages resulted as follows:

	Percent
State of Nevada	17.6259
State of Arizona	17.6259
Metropolitan water district	35.2517
City of Burbank	.5773
City of Glendale	1.8475
City of Pasadena	1.5847
City of Los Angeles	17.5554
Southern California Edison Co	7.0503
California Electric Power Co	.8813

The city of Los Angeles, the Southern California Edison Co., and the Nevada-California Electric Corp. continued to be obligated to take and/or pay for any allocation of the State of Nevada or Arizona unused by either in the following ratio of 55 percent, 40 percent, and 5 percent, respectively.

Rates: Firm and secondary energy

Rates are readjusted annually to account for actual costs of operation and maintenance, availability of secondary energy, and other miscellaneous items, with the following resulting energy rates:

Year of operation	Firm energy rates	Secondary energy rates
June 1 to May 31—	*Mills per kilowatt-hour*	*Mills per kilowatt-hour*
1937-38	1.163	0.340
1938-39	1.163	.340
1939-40	1.163	.340
1940-41	1.163	.340
1941-42	1.163	.340
1942-43	1.172	.343
1943-44	1.190	.357
1944-45	1.254	.398
1945-46	1.244	.392
1946-47	1.220	.376
1947-48	1.277	.413
1948-49	1.343	.454

STATUS OF THE BASIC MAGNESIUM PROJECT, JULY 14, 1948

Subsequent to the investigations and preliminary report of the special subcommittee, which included hearings in Washington, D. C., and in Las Vegas, Nev., through 1947 and January 1948, the Colorado River Commission of Nevada has informed members of the subcommittee that the three principal recommendations of the subcommittee had been adopted and were being put into effect:

1. That the Colorado River Commission had applied for one-third of the power to be generated at Davis Dam—65,000 to 70,000 kilowatts of electrical energy—to be utilized in conjunction with Hoover Dam power.

2. The second letter of intent to the Colorado Commission of Nevada from the War Assets Administration to transfer the Basic Magnesium plant to the State of Nevada contained a provision (section 21) that the transfer of the property to the State "shall be made subject to the agreement to permit the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior to negotiate for the acquisition of the entire transmission system." Congress included the necessary provisions in the 1948 appropriation legislation to transfer the Bureau.

3. That the Colorado River Commission had arranged to take over the N7 generator at Hoover Dam—and that the Commission had applied for the State of Nevada's allotment of power so that within a minimum of time the commission could make firm contract commitments to industrialists and prospective users of power at a definite rate per kilowatt-hour and horsepower year in accordance with the load factor and pertinent contract features.

The proper proportion of the cost of construction of the Davis Dam properly chargeable to the international water treaty between Mexico and the United States through the necessity of reregulation of the Colorado River water supply is now being computed and I will introduce the proper legislation in the United States Senate in the Eighty-first Congress in 1949 as announced earlier this year.

Practically the entire capacity of the Davis Reservoir as now designed would have been necessary for reregulation in any case according to the information now available so that with the proper legislation the cost of Davis Dam power be materially reduced.

State ownership

The subcommittee of the national defense committee recommended that the Basic Magnesium plant be sold and transferred direct to private industrialists, which would have been a very simple matter if the Colorado River Commission of Nevada had been in position to have made contracts for a firm power supply at a stipulated cost within the range of feasibility for such industrial uses within the area. However, since the commission had not made the necessary arrangements to enter into such contracts, and since the War Assets Administration has transferred the plant to the State of Nevada through a letter of intent and acceptance procedure, I intend to cooperate with the Governor of Nevada, who is chairman of the commission, in every possible way to further the success of the undertaking.

Through transfer to the State the approximately $102,000 annual taxes have been lost to the State and county—and past experiences with State ownership and operation of large industrial enterprises have not been happy.

The investigation and hearings by the subcommittee disclosed there is little doubt that the plant units can be disposed of in a very profitable manner when the Colorado River Commission has completed its work in connection with the proper withdrawal and coordination of the low-cost power supply necessary for the operation of the units.

The work of the commission in this connection should be diligently pursued toward the objective of disposal of the plant units to private industry and return to the tax rolls of the State and county and operation in the regular business field.

Letter of intent

The letter of intent, dated March 17, 1948, and signed and accepted by the Colorado River Commission on March 31, 1948, follows (transfer of the Basic Magnesium plant by the War Assets Administration to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada):

MARCH 17, 1948.

COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION,
Carson City, Nev.

(Attention Gov. Vail Pittman.)

GENTLEMEN: Reference is made to the proposal dated October 7, 1947, wherein the War

Assets Administration, acting for and on behalf of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under and pursuant to Reorganization Plan 1 of 1947 (12 F. R. 4534), and the powers and authority contained in the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 765), and WAA Regulation One, as amended (11 F. R. 408), hereinafter called seller, offered the State of Nevada, acting by and through its Colorado River Commission, hereinafter called purchaser, an opportunity to negotiate for the purchase or lease of the entire holdings of the United States Government known as Plancor 201, Basic Magnesium plant, located at Henderson, Nev. On November 5, 1947, the Colorado River Commission, through its secretary, Mr. Alfred Merritt Smith, advised that such commission, at a formal meeting held on October 7, 1947, had determined that it desired to negotiate for the purpose of taking over this property. Subsequent to negotiations, it was determined that the entire facility would be sold and transferred to the State of Nevada, acting by and through its Colorado River Commission, upon the following terms and conditions:

1. Title shall be vested in the Colorado River Commission in absolute fee ownership with the purchaser being obligated to pay the seller at the time of the execution of the instruments of transfer. One dollar in cash and thereafter, as an additional consideration all of the net rentals, revenues, or other emoluments derived from the operation of the property through sale, lease, or otherwise (except returns on minerals) for a period of 20 years, or until a sum of $24,000,000 has been paid to the seller, whichever is earlier.

2. The conveyance of the property shall be in absolute ownership with the purchaser having the full right of sale or lease of the property conveyed to it, or any part thereof, subject to the approval of the seller upon terms and conditions to be mutually agreed upon.

3. The seller shall reserve all minerals and mineral rights for its exclusive benefit and all income from such minerals or mineral rights, either through bonuses, royalties, or sales, shall go to the seller. This reservation shall be subject to the understanding that any development of the property for mineral purposes shall be conducted in such manner as to not unreasonably interfere with the use of this property as an industrial site.

4. Seller shall retain title to all chapels located within the boundaries of this facility. The ultimate determination as to which denomination may purchase these chapels shall be made by the Chief of Chaplains in accordance with the provisions of War Assets Administration Regulation 5, Order 16. The seller shall also retain title to the hospital and adequate grounds therefor. It is proposed to transfer the hospital to Rose de Linn Hospital, a corporation, with agreement that hospital facilities be made available to Henderson residents.

5. Net rents, revenues, profits, and other emoluments shall be turned over to the seller for the period of years hereinabove set out, as proceeds of this disposition, within the meaning of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and shall be deemed to mean all gross rent, revenue, and other emoluments of any kind received by the purchaser in leasing, operation, or sale of all or any part of the facility and including, but not limited to, furnishing utilities or rendering services in connection with the operation of the facility, less deductions for (a) the usual and ordinary costs (including direct labor, materials, and overhead) of current upkeep, insurance, maintenance, and operation of the facility by the purchaser; (b) administrative costs at the facility not to exceed quarterly the sum expended for such costs during the last quarter of 1947 which has been estimated to be $50,000; (c) costs of promotional work and other activities in obtaining tenants or making sales, which costs shall not exceed $20,000 per year. Administrative costs allowable in (b) above shall be limited to the following departments: Executive, cashier, purchasing, accounting, billing and statistics, personnel, time-keeping and pay roll and disposal negotiations and which include the following expenses: Salaries of the above departments, travel expenses of employees on official business, office supplies and expenses, postage, telephone rental and tolls, telegrams, auditing expenses, legal and collection expenses, taxes (other than ad valorem), bad debts, and sundry general expenses. Any administrative costs not covered by the foregoing shall be subject to the approval of seller.

6. In the event the revenue produced from the property through sale, lease, or operation does not provide sufficient funds for the proper upkeep and maintenance of the property, the purchaser shall have the right and option at any time to (a) supply the deficiency in the amount necessary for upkeep and maintenance from its own funds, or (b) to reconvey the plant and property to the seller subject to such dispositions as may have been made and such leases as may be outstanding upon 3 months' written notice of its intention, and in the event the option to reconvey is exercised the purchaser shall, upon reconveyance being effected, be released from any and all further responsibility with respect to the property.

7. An arbitration committee shall be appointed for the purpose of settling any controversial questions of fact that may arise in carrying out any of the provisions of this letter of intent. This arbitration committee shall consist of three persons; one to be appointed by each party to this letter of intent and the third to be appointed by the senior judge of the circuit court of appeals for the Ninth Federal Circuit. If either party hereto shall refuse or neglect to appoint an arbitrator within 30 days after the other party shall have appointed an arbitrator and served written notice thereof upon the other party requiring it to appoint an arbitrator, then, upon request to the senior judge of the circuit court of appeals for the Ninth Federal Circuit, said judge shall appoint such arbitrator within a period of 20 days. The finding or an award of a majority of the arbitrators shall be binding upon the parties.

8. It is understood and agreed that seller shall be granted 1 year from and after the date of the execution of this letter of intent, or until the Nevada State Legislature shall meet and enact legislation to permit the Colorado River Commission to sell or dispose of subject facilities, whichever date may first occur, within which to obtain a bona fide purchaser for this entire facility from private industry who will agree to continue the operation of the plant in productive industrial enterprises. In the event seller procures such a purchaser from private industry within the period hereinabove set out purchaser agrees to reconvey same to such purchaser as seller may designate upon 60 days' written notice. The entire electric transmission and distribution systems, the water supply system, and the sewerage disposal system which are covered by that certain letter of intent entered into by and between the War Assets Administration and the Colorado River Commission on September 16, 1947, are hereby excluded specifically from the transfer provided for in this paragraph. In the event this facility is reconveyed to seller within 1 year under the provisions of this paragraph, an accounting shall be made at the time of such reconveyance.

9. At any time after 3 years from the date of the execution of this letter of intent, the arbitration committee, duly appointed as hereinabove set forth in paragraph 7, may meet at the discretion of the seller and determine on an equitable basis the total minimum payment to be made by purchaser under the terms of this agreement, which shall in no event exceed $24,000,000.

10. In the event the revenue produced from the property, whether through sale, lease, or operation, is not adequate to provide sufficient funds for payments to seller as hereinabove set out in paragraphs 5 and 9 and extraordinary maintenance as provided in paragraph 14 for a period of 3 years, seller shall have the right to require reconveyance of the property upon 3 months' written notice to purchaser by the seller.

11. Purchaser shall be obligated to promote and develop sales or leases for the property in good faith at no less than the minimum values to be established and if such values are adhered to seller will approve the disposal. If at any time seller should determine that purchaser is not exercising diligence and reasonable effort in disposing of any of the property, seller shall serve notice to that effect on purchaser and call upon purchaser to appoint an arbitrator to meet with two other arbitrators, as provided in paragraph 7 hereof, who shall constitute an arbitration committee for the purpose of determining if the purchaser has not been promoting disposal of the property in good faith and with diligence. Should this arbitration committee find that the purchaser is unable to fulfill its obligation in this respect, then seller shall have the right to either (a) develop bona fide disposals for any part of the property in line with the minimum value and upon recommendation of such disposal purchaser will consummate the disposal immediately, seller to receive the net proceeds from all disposals after allowable deductions set forth in paragraph No. 5 herein, or (b) seller may require the purchaser to reconvey all the property which has not been sold subject to any outstanding leases.

12. The Munitions Board has placed a portion of this facility under the provisions of the National Security Clause. In the event the Munitions Board does not remove this restriction prior to the date of actual transfer, purchaser hereby agrees to accept this facility subject to all conditions contained therein.

13. On such portions of the property or facilities to which the national security clause is not applicable, the purchaser shall have the right to erect structures or make any improvements it may desire on the property, subject to the approval of seller, and shall have the right to deduct from any rents, revenues, or any moneys received from the lease of such new structures or improvements, (a) interest at the rate of 5 percent per annum on the amount invested on any construction and improvements, and (b) 5 percent per annum of the cost thereof for the amortization of the same with any balance remaining to be considered as a part of the gross rents, revenues, and emoluments from the facility.

14. The purchaser shall establish a fund in the amount of $300,000 for the purpose of providing extraordinary maintenance and other contingencies not covered by existing leases. This fund shall be created by permitting the purchaser to reserve not in excess of $75,000 for any 1 year from the net rents, revenues, and emoluments. Any expenditures made from this fund shall have prior approval of seller and this fund shall become the property of seller in the event of reconveyance.

15. Purchaser shall be required to remit within 45 days after the close of each quarter year the net rents, revenues, and other emoluments received from the property after deduction from such net revenues, one-quarter of the annual amount of the extraordinary maintenance fund as set out in paragraph 14 above, all such remittances to be accompanied by proper accounting statements signed by a duly authorized

representative of purchaser. Should there remain no net rents, revenues, or other emoluments at the close of a quarter after allowable deductions are made, a proper accounting statement to that effect shall be submitted. Purchaser shall further be required to submit to seller within 120 days after the close of each calendar year a statement duly certified by the State auditor of the State of Nevada, or a certified public accountant selected and compensated by the purchaser, and approved by seller, verifying or correcting the accuracy of the quarter-annual statements submitted by the purchaser for such calendar year. In the event that it is found there has been an error in the net revenue paid or due, it shall be adjusted at the time of the next quarter-annual statement.

16. Any sums remaining in operating maintenance funds provided for hereinabove at the time of final settlement will be turned over to the seller along with any other moneys which may be due at that time, provided that the total amount to be paid to seller pursuant to this letter of intent shall not exceed the sum of $24,000,000 as required in paragraph 1 hereof.

17. Purchaser shall be responsible for necessary insurance coverage, taxes, maintenance, and other expenses of this facility from and after the date that purchaser is put into possession of this property. The minimum insurance requirements shall be approved by seller but in any event there shall be ample coverage on all leased portions of the plant and all buildings and facilities essential in its operations.

18. Included at the present time in plant inventories are certain items of machinery, equipment, and spare parts which are not considered to be essential to future operation of subject facility. Title to such items shall be retained in seller and seller shall dispose of and remove such items at its own expense. There are other items of machinery, equipment, and spare parts presently located at subject facility which are considered to be a part of the realty or which may be essential to future use, operation, maintenance, or disposal of the plant. Title to the latter machinery, equipment, and spare parts shall be conveyed to purchaser. Plant site records at the date purchaser is placed in possession of the premises adjusted by mutual agreement as to the surplus items, will be the basis of such conveyance of title to purchaser. Opportunity will be granted to purchaser to verify plant site records but such verification, as well as determination of surplus and transfer of title shall be completed within 6 months from the date of this agreement.

19. The seller shall not warrant, expressly or impliedly, that future use by purchaser or others of any equipment, machinery, or other facilities incorporated in or others of any process to be practiced at said plant, is free from patent infringements or obligations to pay royalties, and does not assume any liability to protect, defend, or save harmless purchaser or others against any claims, demands, or causes of action predicated on such use arising out of any United States patent. Purchaser agrees to hold harmless and defend the Government in any suit under any United States patent directed to the sale of the future use of any equipment, machinery, or other facilities incorporated in or at any processes to be practiced in said plant or for the collection of profits, damages, or royalties arising out of such sale or use. Purchaser assumes and agrees to indemnify the Government against any and all existing obligations (including obligations to pay royalties) affecting the future use, transfer, or resale of the equipment, machinery, or other facility which were entered into expressly or impliedly by seller with the approval or on behalf of Defense Plant Corporation or Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Seller reserves any secret processes, technical information, and know-how which may have been developed in the operation of subject plant for the production of magnesium, except insofar as purchaser or its nominee might desire to use such secret processes, technical information, and know-how for the production of magnesium at the Basic Magnesium plant located at Henderson, Nev. In the event such secret processes, technical information, and know-how are made available to purchaser for the production of magnesium at captioned facility purchaser agrees not to disclose such secret processes, technical information, and know-how and to impose like obligations on its successors or nominees.

20. A complete list of leases, options to purchase, and all agreements of every kind and character heretofore made by representatives of the United States Government, to other than the purchaser, shall be supplied to purchaser by seller, and such leases and agreements shall be assigned to the purchaser by appropriate assignment agreements effective as of the date of delivery of possession of the premises hereunder; and purchaser agrees to take this Government-owned facility subject to all commitments so listed and assigned.

21. The transfer of this property shall be made subject to the agreement to permit the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior to negotiate for the acquisition of the entire transmission system. Such acquisition shall be subject to the provisions of a letter of intent entered into by and between the parties hereto dated September 16, 1947, when letter of intent shall be suspended upon the execution of this agreement. In the event this facility shall be reconveyed to seller prior to termination of the letter of intent dated September 16, 1947, such contract shall be reactivated and remain in full force and effect until the termination date thereof.

22. Six months after the execution of the firm power contracts under which an adequate supply of power will be assured for the operation of this facility, purchaser will submit a concrete plan for advertising sale of this facility. This plan shall be submitted to seller for approval. In the event seller approves the plan submitted, purchaser hereby obligates itself to advertising the facility for sale in accordance with such plan within 4 months from the date of such approval. Failure to comply with this provision shall be cause for termination of this agreement or reconveyance of the property to the seller at its option.

23. Seller shall place purchaser in possession of the premises on a date to be determined mutually by War Assets Administration and purchaser, and the purchaser from after such date shall be responsible for all maintenance and upkeep of the property.

24. It is mutually agreed that seller shall retain the right to keep a representative or representatives on the premises until the full purchase price is paid or for such shorter term as may be determined by seller. Such representative or representatives shall have control over seller's interest in this facility and purchaser shall consult with this representative regarding all matters requiring the approval of seller. Seller shall vest such representative or representatives with adequate authority to make decisions and sign documents at the plant site which will facilitate all actions. Purchaser further agrees to furnish adequate office space together with necessary heating, light and such other usual facilities essential to the operation of an office to seller's representative without cost.

25. Purchaser will obtain at its own expense and affix to the quitclaim deed transferring title such revenues and documentary stamps as may be required by law, and will pay all recording fees incidental to recordation. Seller will make available for purchaser's inspection and use such abstract of title and other title papers as are in its custody, and will cause to be transferred to purchaser whatever title insurance policies seller now has covering the plancor involved, but it is understood that seller will not be obligated to furnish any later or continuation title report, title insurance, or pay for any title expense pertaining to this transaction.

26. Upon the expiration of the present agreement between seller, Southern California Edison Co., and the Department of the Interior, providing for the use by the Southern California Edison Co. of sections G–7 and T–7 located at Hoover Dam and the assumption by Southern California Edison Co. of the generating costs pertaining thereto, seller will transfer to purchaser, on a mutually agreeable basis, whatever rights seller may have to the use of said electrical equipment.

27. Purchaser warrants that it has not employed any person to solicit or secure this sale upon any agreement for a commission, percentage brokerage or contingent fee.

28. Purchaser agrees that in the performance of the terms of this sale that it will comply with and give all stipulations and representations required by applicable Federal laws, and that it will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

29. No Member of or Delegate to Congress or Resident Commissioner shall be admitted to any share or part of this sale or to any benefit that may arise therefrom.

30. It is understood and agreed that when and if you accept and approve this letter of intent, a formal contract, in accordance with the provisions hereof, will be drawn and executed as promptly as possible.

31. This letter of intent is executed in quadruplicate and it is requested that you indicate your acceptance hereon by having the chairman and secretary of the Colorado River Commission execute and return to this Administration three counterparts hereof.

Sincerely yours,

COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION.

Requested loan for housing repair

A request has recently been received by the War Assets Administration from the Colorado River Commission of Nevada for an advance or a loan of $35,000 for deferred maintenance on the Henderson housing project "to be repaid from the first net proceeds from the operation of the project." The amount is to be added to the maximum purchase price of $24,000,000, making the total maximum amount of $24,035,000.

The War Assets Administration reports informally that apparently the request can be granted under certain conditions, but if such a request were repeated it might result in tighter control of the operation of the plant by the Commission.

The matter of operation and maintenance was covered in at least 2 of the 31 paragraphs in the letter of intent. Paragraph 6 provides that "In the event the revenue produced from the property through sale, lease, or operation does not provide sufficient funds for the proper upkeep and maintenance of the property, the purchaser shall have the right and option at any time to (a) supply the deficiency in the amount necessary for upkeep and maintenance from its own funds, or (b) to reconvey the plant and property to the seller subject to such dispositions as may have been made and such leases as may be outstanding upon 3 months' written notice of its intention."

Section 10 further provides that "In the event the revenue produced from the property, whether through sale, lease, or operation, is not adequate to provide sufficient funds for payments to seller as hereinabove set out in paragraph 14 for a period of 3 years,

seller shall have the right to require reconveyance of the property upon 3 months' written notice to purchaser by the seller."

POWER WITHDRAWAL BY THE NEVADA-COLORADO COMMISSION FOR USE WITHIN THE STATE OF NEVADA

The following correspondence in relation to the further withdrawal of Nevada's allocation of power generated at Hoover (Boulder) Dam; and is in line with the recommendations of the Special Subcommittee of the Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program:

DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER,
Los Angeles, July 2, 1948.

Hon. JULIUS A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KRUG: Under date of May 6, 1948, the State of Nevada, acting through its Colorado River Commission, notified the city of Los Angeles and this department as an operating agency at Hoover Dam power plant that the State would require for its use at the power plant on June 1, 1951, 82,500 kilovolt-amperes additional generating capacity. This notice was given pursuant to article 17 (1) of the contract for the operation of Boulder power plant, dated May 29, 1941. Nevada's requirement in this regard, as stated in the notice, has been transmitted to the director of power at Boulder City, Nev.

To meet this requirement the State of Nevada stated in the notice its willingness to take over the obligations incident to sections G–7 and T–7 at the power plant if that section is made available for its use on June 1, 1951, when the present arrangement with Southern California Edison Co., relative to the use of the sections, terminates. Nevada's offer to take over the obligations connected with sections G–7 and T–7 is subject to there being effected certain changes in the rights and obligations of the Metropolitan water district of southern California related to the sections. The district has informed Nevada that it will acquiesce in the desired changes.

This department, pursuant to its duties as operating agent for the United States at the Hoover Dam power plant, recommends and requests that as early as is appropriate you make arrangements for the use, commencing June 1, 1951, of these sections for Nevada, such use being subject, of course, to the rights of the Metropolitan water district of southern California.

Although War Assets Administration, as the successor to Defense Plant Corporation, is primarily responsible for sections G–7 and T–7, and should be a party to the negotiations for their use, this recommendation and request is addressed to you as the one having the authority to arrange for such use.

Respectfully,

SAMUEL B. MORRIS,
General Manager and Chief Engineer.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1948.

Mr. SAMUEL B. MORRIS,
General Manager and Chief Engineer
Department of Water and Power,
Los Angeles, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. MORRIS: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 2, relative to effectuating changes in the use of sections G–7 and T–7 in the Hoover Dam power plant looking toward the use of these sections for Nevada, commencing June 1, 1951.

Negotiations to effectuate the necessary arrangements with regard to these sections will be conducted by Regional Director Moritz, with the assistance of Regional Counsel Coffey. As you suggest, the War Assets Administration will be a party to these negotiations.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. WARNE,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, July 26, 1948.

Hon. JESS LARSON,
Administrator, War Assets
Administration.

MY DEAR MR. LARSON: In connection with the use of sections G–7 and T–7 in the Hoover Dam power plant, I enclose for your information a copy of a letter dated July 2, 1948, from Mr. Samuel B. Morris, General Manager and Chief Engineer, Department of Water and Power of the city of Los Angeles, together with a copy of this Department's reply thereto.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. WARNE,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I expect to follow through and keep the Senate of the United States and my own State of Nevada advised of the progress of this program.

STATEMENT ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF WATER DIVISION AND COMPACTS IN THE SEVEN STATES OF THE COLORADO RIVER BASIN, INCLUDING A DEFINITION OF THE TERMS LOWER AND UPPER BASINS, LOWER AND UPPER DIVISIONS, COLORADO RIVER COMPACT, AND THE BOULDER DAM PROJECT ACT IN SUPPORT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 145, INTRODUCED TO FACILITATE THE CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT AND BENEFICIAL USE OF THE WATER AND POWER OF THE COLORADO RIVER SYSTEM

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in view of the pending legislation for the continued development of the Colorado River Basin States through the development and beneficial use of the waters of that great river system, and my extreme interest in such continued development dating back to the introduction of the Swing-Johnson bill later—1928—to become the Boulder Dam Project Act, I am prompted to request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point my statement made before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The statement was made in connection with Senate Joint Resolution No. 145, which was introduced to facilitate such development.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE W. MALONE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA, ON COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 145

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I will make my statement brief since I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, Dams, and Electric Power of the Public Works Committee and must return to that meeting.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to show, in support of Senate Joint Resolution 145 in which I joined, that no State of the seven States in the Colorado River Basin, including my own State of Nevada, has a definite allocation of water under the existing conditions.

COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

The Colorado River Compact divides the water of the Colorado River System between the upper and lower basins. This compact was approved by six of the States of the basin in accordance with the provisions of the Boulder Dam Project Act before the construction of a dam could be started. I will present the evidence upon which I concluded that an agreement between the lower basin States on the division of the water allocated to that basin is impossible. Therefore, the only logical remaining method would be through a court of competent jurisdiction.

The statement made by Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, is a very fair outline of all of the history of the project that he has reviewed. I have not read the brief by Senator MCFARLAND, but I assume it outlines all of those things which were done by the commissions and the Members of the Congress of the United States during the hectic days of 1927 to 1928 when the Boulder Dam project was finally passed and marked the first major development on the Colorado River System.

Many of the things, however, that we would probably each recall are subject to interpretation. Each State, at the time I first attended the Commission meetings early in 1927, had its own water and power set-up, including their own engineers; and it soon became apparent that there was no way of getting anything done except to go along with the compact and amend the then Swing-Johnson bill to treat the interested States fairly in the division of the water and power benefits from the project. I, therefore, as secretary of the Colorado River Commission for Nevada, directed all of my efforts, with the power of the State of Nevada behind me, to that end.

AGREEMENTS

Mr. Chairman, it will be found as you delve into this matter that not only is it impossible to make new agreements, but the old agreements already made, including the interpretation of the original Colorado River Compact will be questioned and, no doubt, submitted to the court many times in the future for interpretation.

At that time I was State engineer of Nevada, engineer member of the Public Service Commission, and Secretary of the Colorado River Commission. We found immediately that the original bill did not provide any benefits from the project for the States of Arizona and Nevada where the project was located, that it was simply a power development and water storage on the Colorado River for the sole benefit of California.

Mr. Chairman, it has been evident to me since the first water meeting I attended in Los Angeles, Calif., early in 1927, before I became a member of the Nevada-Colorado River Commission, that the lower basin States would never agree upon a division of the waters of the Colorado River.

The reason was perfectly obvious; there was more land than water, and that the limit of any State's development is the limit of that State's water supply.

I do not want to see any State injured through any action of the Federal Government, and certainly not by any action of mine. Therefore, since an agreement is very unlikely, an adjudication by a court of competent authority seemed the only way.

ORIGINAL CONFERENCES

I want to mention in particular some men that were in this fight from the beginning. One was in your own State, Mr. Chairman—Mr. Delph Carpenter. Mr. Carpenter wrote the Colorado River compact I was informed on the best of evidence at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in 1922, with Herbert Hoover as chairman of the Seven Basin States Organization. It was the first real organized attempt to develop the Colorado River through a division of the water through a compact signed by a representative of each State on November 24, 1922.

I have often chided Delph Carpenter about the compact, that no one could understand it, therefore he was probably going to get it adopted. I personally felt that as long as no State was discriminated against in the matter of water division and the benefits from the power development, which was the

purpose of the nine amendments that I offered at that time, that we would get the first step in the development of the river. Then the rest would be growing pains; and I think, Mr. Chairman, that that is exactly where we are now. We anticipated these growing pains, and the next step must be taken just as carefully as the first step, which was the development at Boulder Dam, now known as Hoover Dam. Each step must be just as carefully worked out so that no State will be injured without its day in court.

In the beginning, the men on the committee included Senators McNary, of Oregon, Thomas, of Idaho, Johnson and Shortridge, of California, and Kendrick, of Wyoming, as well as Pittman and Oddie, from my own State of Nevada; Dill, of Washington, and Henry Ashurst, of Arizona, were on the then Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the Senate (now the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs). These men wanted to start the development of the Colorado River. Over in the House was Leatherwood, of Utah, Arentz, of Nevada, Morrow, of New Mexico, Lewis Douglas, of Arizona, and White, of Idaho. They are all men who have gone on other jobs or have since died, but they did do this initial job and, Mr. Chairman, it was a good job. Senator HAYDEN is the only Member of the United States Senate who was a member of this body and this committee on January 20, 1928, when I first appeared before it on behalf of the Boulder Dam development.

SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 186, SEVENTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT

There is one thing that I would like to clear up for the benefit of the committee, and I am sure that everyone knows it, if they would review the Colorado River compact. There are five States in the lower basin—not three—and, by the way, this Senate document to which I refer was prepared by me in 1927. It was then printed as a Senate document in 1928. It is called Senate Document No. 186, Seventieth Congress, second session. It is still used as a reference work by many of the commissions. I did not prepare it alone. The State engineers of the other six States in the basin assisted me in the work through acting as consultants, as well as the Bureau of Reclamation engineers.

Senator MILLIKIN. What is this document now that you are talking about, Senator?

Senator MALONE. Colorado River Development, Senate Document No. 186, Seventieth Congress, second session. On page 31 of that document, you will find the definition of the upper and lower divisions and of the upper and lower basins. Much has been said about upper and lower basins and I think an explanation would be helpful. The Colorado River Basin is a seven-State affair, and the term "upper division" means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The "lower division" means the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada. Lees Ferry is the dividing point between the divisions.

"The term 'upper basin'"—and this is where a misunderstanding exists—"means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico and Utah and Wyoming"—you see, Utah and New Mexico come into the upper basin—"within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system above Lees Ferry."

BASINS AND DIVISIONS

The first is an arbitrary division and the next is a drainage division. The lower basin then, instead of only meaning just the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, means those parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River system below Lees Ferry. So, there are five States interested in the division of the waters of the lower basin, instead of only three States, which further complicates this situation and, as a matter of fact, the advance consent given by the United States Senate in the Boulder Dam project for a water-division treaty could not be binding upon all of the States of the lower basin even if it had been agreed upon and ratified by the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, since Utah and New Mexico were excluded.

International water obligations

We all are familiar with the compact. It is provided that out of that upper basin States, the 7,500,000 acre-feet and the lower basin States 7,500,000 acre-feet, and the additional 1,000,000 acre-feet come the international water obligations. They were determined by treaty as coming out of the waters of both basins equally, after certain surplus water allocated to the lower basin may be exhausted.

To pass the Swing-Johnson bill at that time it was necessary to have a six-State ratification paragraph put in it, because, as CARL HAYDEN has just said, Arizona did not until much later ratify the seven-State compact. There has never been, I want specifically to point out, a lower-basin agreement in accordance with the approval (advance) of the Water Division, in the Boulder Dam Project Act, found on page 9 of this Senate document. There was an advance approval by the United States Senate for the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada to enter into an agreement dividing the 7,500,000 acre-feet annually apportioned to the upper basin—paragraph (a) of article III of the Colorado River compact plus certain surplus water, but the States never agreed so the provision remained ineffective.

THE ADVANCE APPROVAL—INTERSTATE COMPACT—NEVER RATIFIED

"There shall be apportioned to the State of Nevada 300,000 acre-feet and to the State of Arizona 2,800,000 acre-feet for exclusive beneficial consumptive use in perpetuity, and (2) that the State of Arizona may annually use one-half of the excess or surplus waters unapportioned by the Colorado River compact, and (3) that the State of Arizona shall have the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of the Gila River and its tributaries within the boundaries of said State, and (4) that the waters of the Gila River and its tributaries, except return flow after the same enters the Colorado River, shall never be subject to any diminution whatever by any allowance of water which may be made by treaty or otherwise to the United States of Mexico but if, as provided in paragraph (c) of article III of the Colorado River compact, it shall become necessary to supply water to the United States of Mexico from waters over and above the quantities which are surplus as defined by said compact, then the State of California shall and will mutually agree with the State of Arizona to supply, out of the main stream of the Colorado River, one-half of any deficiency which must be supplied to Mexico by the lower basin, and (5) that the State of California shall and will further mutually agree with the States of Arizona and Nevada that none of said three States shall withhold water and none shall require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses, and (6) that all of the provisions of said tri-State agreement shall be subject in all particulars to the provisions of the Colorado River compact, and (7) said agreement to take effect upon the ratification of the Colorado River compact by Arizona, California, and Nevada."

I will call the chairman's attention to the fact that New Mexico and Utah are left out of this provision, and there never was such a compact entered into even by the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada; so naturally the provision in the act is null and void, since no action was ever taken by such States.

I will not read the remainder of the agreement but simply cite it for reference. I do not think it is necessary to put anything further in the record on that subject, since it has never been ratified, and is not effective.

I want to call attention further that the two basins are in the same situation, that is to say, while the water is divided between the upper and lower basins by the compact, and also the upper and lower divisions, that there has never been any division or allocation of the water between the lower basin States which include five States, and as between the upper basin States, which include four States, and until such a division is made by the consent of the States concerned, then it is my conclusion that no State, including my own State of Nevada, could say that it really had any specific amount of water.

On page 36 of this document, under an explanation by Delph E. Carpenter, of Colorado, appears a review of the Colorado River compact. Delph Carpenter was well and favorably known among the old-timers, and perhaps not by the more recent participants because he has been practically paralyzed for the last 15 years. However, he was one of the most brilliant men that I ever had the opportunity of knowing. In his explanation or review of the Colorado River compact, he says that provision was made that all future controversy between two or more States of each group are specifically reserved for separate consideration and adjustment by separate commissions or by direct legislation, whenever such questions may arise, if they ever do. Also, appropriations of water are covered.

COLORADO RIVER COMPACT AND APPROPRIATIONS

The West is very careful about anything that affects appropriations of water. Present perfected appropriations of water are not disturbed, but such rights take their water from the apportionment to the basin in which they are located. In other words, if California or Arizona and Nevada claimed that they had used water and it was theirs by appropriation, it would come out of the lower basin water and the upper basin States would not be affected.

On page 38 there is provision for future appor'onment of water. In the "Disposition of the waters of the Colorado River under the Colorado River compact", by Delph E. Carpenter, as found on page 38 of the same document, we have this provision; it is a very learned explanation of the entire document, but sufficient for this testimony I cite a paragraph on the first page:

"The Colorado River compact allocates 16,000,000 acre-feet to uses in the United States and sufficient for the international burden, whatever it may be, and then sets apart the unallocated surplus for future apportionment by the States after 40 years."

The 16,000,000 acre-feet adds up to seven and one-half million allocated to the upper basin, the four upper basin States, and seven and one-half million to the lower basin States, the five States that I mentioned, and not the three, and then 1,000,000 acre-feet in addition to the lower basin if it is available. If there is additional water, it would be called unallocated surplus and would not be under the compact apportioned until after 40 years.

"In other words, the compact specifically allocates 16,000,000 acre-feet plus the international burden, as designated burdens upon the whole supply of the river and then dedicates the unallocated surplus to future apportionment between all seven of the States. Of the 16,000,000 aggregate 7,500,000 plus 1,000,000 acre-feet per annum (beneficial consumptive use) is permanently allocated to the lower basin. These permanent allocations include all water necessary to supply all present appropriations, wherever the same may be and whether from the main stream or from the Green, the Gila, or any other tributary."

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is not my language. It is the language of the man who wrote the compact and whom I consider one of the most brilliant attorneys in the United States, certainly on water matters. That is his explanation of the compact, which he himself wrote and which the representatives of the seven States of the basin signed at that time, and which was later to become a highly controversial matter. Finally, the Boulder Dam Project Act was passed based on the approval of the six States of the basin, as already outlined.

DELPH E. CARPENTER—COLORADO

Total water available in the entire basin for apportionment, out of which would come this unallocated surplus and the water for any international treaty, is estimated in the beginning on page 38 on the "Disposition of the waters of the Colorado under the Colorado River compact," by Delph E. Carpenter, the water is supplied, reading from his explanation:

"The river is supplied by its tributaries from the Green to the Gila. Without tributaries there would be no river.

"The water supply of the river consists of all water which of nature and undisturbed by works of man would pass Yuma, the point below the last tributary. It is impossible to tell the exact amount of this total supply in any year, owing to interference by diversions, but it has been estimated at from 20,000,000 to 24,000,000 acre-feet average.

"This aggregate natural water supply may be divided into (1) that part entering the river above Lees Ferry and contributed by those streams which drain the upper basin; and (2) that part entering the stream between Lees Ferry and Yuma and contributed by streams which drain the lower basin."

You see, he again emphasizes that basins mean drainage, and drainage above Lees Ferry is the upper basin and the lower basin means that area draining to the river below Lees Ferry. Divisions mean an arbitrary division of the four States above Lees Ferry and the three States below Lees Ferry.

Any subsidiary compact of the lower basin would be, according to Mr. Carpenter, "the water available to the lower basin, water there originating and Lees Ferry delivery, is to be used in the lower basin to care for the lower-basin allocation, 8,500,000 acre-feet, and the entire international burden, unless there is a deficiency for international supply, in which case the waters allocated to each basin are to be called upon to the extent of one-half of the deficiency."

Mr. Carpenter says:

"The States of the lower basin should enter into a subsidiary compact making (1) local allocation of the aggregate 8,500,000 acre-feet (out of the whole river supply) allocated to the lower basin by the compact; (2) provision for supplying the entire international burden, if, when, and for the amount by treaty determined; and (3) disposition of the unallocated surplus pending and subject to future allocation between the seven States. They should also make provision for temporary use of allocated water escaping from the upper basin, without prejudice to the rights of the upper basin."

That is the five lower-basin States.

INDUSTRIAL ENCYCLOPEDIA—11 WESTERN STATES

Mr. Chairman, in order to save the time of the committee, I also prepared—and it seems I have a habit of preparing reports for reference over the past 20 years—what is called an Industrial Encyclopedia of the 11 Western States. That was edited and published in 1944; the data included in it, however, is up to 1943. I would like, in order to make available the included reference work on the Colorado River, to make a part of the record beginning in 1922, "November 24, Colorado River compact, executed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., Herbert C. Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, acted as chairman of the Seven Colorado River Basin States Conference." It enumerates from that date the Colorado River development events up until 1944.

Senator MILLIKIN. Will you make clear to the reporter exactly what you want put in there, and it will be put in.

Senator MALONE. Yes; I will.

(It is as follows:)

"1922: November 24, Colorado River compact, executed at Santa Fe, N. Mex.; Herbert C. Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, acted as chairman of the Seven Colorado River Basin States Conference.

"1923: C. H. Birdseye and United States Geological Survey party survey canyons.

"1924: Weymouth report rendered in eight manuscript volumes.

"1924: Second Boulder Dam bill (Swing-Johnson) introduced in Congress.

"1924: Cosby report on Colorado River issued.

"1925: The State of Nevada, by legislative act, March 13, 1925, approved the Colorado River six-State compact.

"1925-23: December 21, third Swing-Johnson bill introduced in Congress, H. R. 6251. Identical bill, S. 1868, was introduced by Senator JOHNSON in the Senate about this date. H. R. 6251 was replaced February 27, 1926. These two bills are referred to as the third Swing-Johnson bill.

"1927: Special advisers made report to the Secretary of the Interior.

"1927: Conference of lower division States—Arizona, California, and Nevada—at Los Angeles attended by the Colorado River commissions of the three States (new Nevada Colorado River Commission).

"1927: Conference of Governors on Colorado River.

"1928. Fourth Boulder Dam bill—Boulder Canyon Project Act (Swing-Johnson bill) introduced in both Houses of Congress.

"1928: January 20, GEORGE W. MALONE, report and testimony before the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee of the United States Senate, title of the report, 'Boulder Canyon Lower Colorado River Power and Water Setup,' Nevada Colorado River Commission. The report and the testimony recommended that nine amendments be made to the then pending Swing-Johnson bill.

"1928: Senate Document No. 186, Colorado River Development, December 11, Seventieth Congress, second session, by GEORGE W. MALONE, State engineer of Nevada.

"1928: The fourth Swing-Johnson bill was passed by the Senate December 14, by the House December 18, including eight of the nine amendments proposed by the Nevada Colorado River Commission, and approved and signed by President Coolidge, December 21.

"1929: The State of Utah signed the Colorado River Compact.

"1929: President Hoover issued proclamation declaring six-State ratification of Colorado River Compact in effect and declaring Boulder Canyon Project Act effective this date, June 25, 1929.

"1929: July 5, 1929, Nevada submitted bid for all of the power to be produced from Boulder Dam, together with a use curve showing ultimate use for 483,000 horsepower for mining, agriculture, and electrochemical products to support the State's request for a withdrawal provision for power to use in the State. The withdrawal provision was later inserted in the power contracts and the bid was withdrawn.

"1929-30: Biennial report—State engineer of Nevada—covering developments to date including legislation and amendments to the original Swing-Johnson bill.

"1930: Contract signed by Secretary Wilbur with Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for delivery of water April 24. Contract signed by Secretary Wilbur with Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for electrical energy April 26, amended May 31, providing withdrawal of power by Arizona and Nevada to extent of 36 percent, in accordance with the amendments to the Swing-Johnson bill proposed by the Colorado River Commission of Nevada.

"1930: Contract signed by Secretary Wilbur with city of Los Angeles and Southern California Edison Co. for electrical energy April 26, amended May 28, and Department of Water and Power of City of Los Angeles, made party to contract in addition to city of Los Angeles, providing for the withdrawal of power for use within the States of Arizona and Nevada in accordance with amendments to the Swing-Johnson bill finally known as the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

"1930: Second deficiency appropriation bill appropriating $10,660,000 to start Boulder Dam work passed by House and Senate July 3.

"1930: July 7, 1930, the Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, issued an official order to Dr. Elwood Mead, Commissioner of Reclamation, to 'start work on Boulder Dam today.'

"1930: Secretary Wilbur drives first spike starting railroad and construction of Boulder Dam at Las Vegas, Nev., September 17, and issues order that dam be called Hoover Dam.

"1931: $15,000,000 appropriated by Congress for construction of dam.

"1931: Bureau of Reclamation opens bids for construction of Boulder Dam and powerhouse March 4 and awards contract to Six Companies, Inc., which starts work March 11.

"1932: $23,000,000 appropriated for continuing construction of dam.

"1932: The engineers divert the river, November 14.

"1933: $46,000,000 appropriated for construction of dam.

"1933: Secretary of Interior, Harold L. Ickes, announced that the name of the dam would again be Boulder Dam. Start concrete pouring in dam. Diversion tunnels, coffer dams, excavation for the dam completed.

"1934: Penstock tunnels completed; installation of 30-foot diameter outlet pipes started.

"1935: January—Conference of the seven States of the basin, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and California. The conference was held at Phoenix, Ariz., on a further division of water from the Colorado River. Arizona has never signed the Seven-State Compact and now wants to secure a contract for water.

"1935: Complete pouring concrete in dam February and start storing water.

"1935: February—Report of the Colorado River Commission of Nevada; 'Including a study of proposed uses of power and water from Boulder Dam,' 1927 to 1935.

"1935: Boulder Dam starts to impound water in Lake Mead February 1.

"1935: Last concrete placed in dam May 29.

"1935: President Franklin D. Roosevelt dedicates the dam September 30.

"1936: First generator goes into full operation October 22.

"1936: Second generator goes into operation November 14.

"1936: Third generator goes into operation December 28.

"1937: Two more generators go into operation March 18 and August 16.

"1938: Storage reaches 24,000,000 acre-feet and Lake Mead stretches 115 miles upstream.

"1938: Two more generators go into operation June 26 and August 31; total 7.

"1939: Storage reaches 25,000,000 acre-feet, more than 8,000 billion gallons.

"1939: Two more generators, June 19 and September 12; total 9. Installed capacity reaches 700,000 kilowatts, making Boulder's hydroelectric power plant the largest in the world.

"1940: Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act, providing for the acceptance of $300,000 an-

nually to each of the States of Arizona and Nevada in lieu of the 37½ percent provided for in the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and eliminating the periodical readjustment of the sale price of power.

"1940: Three more generators ordered.

"1940: All-American canal placed in operation.

"1940: Metropolitan water district's Colorado River aqueduct successfully tested.

"1941: One additional generator began operating in October.

"1942: Two more generators began operating in August and December.

"1942: Basic Magnesium, largest magnesium plant in the world, began taking power from Boulder Dam and water from Lake Mead.

"1943: Rated capacity of power plant of 952,300 kilowatts operated at overload in June to produce more than 1,000,000 kilowatts.

"1943: Basic Magnesium takes more than 100,000,000 kilowatt-hours in June.

"1943: Industrial service report—11 Western States, August, by the Industrial West Foundation, GEORGE W. MALONE, managing director.

"1944: Additional generator scheduled for operation in October."

Senator MALONE. To make clear my next point and to show the highly controversial nature of the Boulder Dam legislation as introduced under the Swing-Johnson bill as early as 1923, and finally passed and called the Boulder Dam Project Act late in 1928, as explained by Senator HAYDEN, I would like to make a part of the record excerpts from the 1929-30 biennial report of the State engineer of Nevada. This simply shows the recommendations that were made for amendments to the pending Swing-Johnson bill and those accepted at the time, and has a direct bearing on the next point I am about to make, ending on page 87 and beginning on page 86.

Senator MILLIKIN. Again, you will make that clear to the reporter?

Senator MALONE. Yes.

(It is as follows:)

"The Boulder Dam Project Act as finally passed, including the power contracts, provides revenue for Arizona and Nevada in lieu of taxes and power to use for the development of the States. According to the Secretary of the Interior the revenue derived will amount to over $700,000 to each State annually after the completion of the project, and each State can withdraw, if, as, and when wanted, up to 117,000 firm horsepower of the electrical energy for use in the State, paying cost at the switchboard when so withdrawn. It is thought that the use of this power will increase the taxable wealth of the State several millions of dollars.

"When the State (GEORGE W. MALONE, State engineer and Colorado River commissioner) administration took over the work of the Colorado River Commission early in 1927 the then pending Swing-Johnson bill, proposing to construct the Boulder Dam on the Colorado River, did not provide any revenue for the States of Arizona and Nevada, nor power from the project to develop those States, but did provide that the All-American Canal in Imperial Valley, costing $38,500,000 should be paid for by revenue from the power from the project in addition to the dam and power plant. Provision was later made for the lands benefited to underwrite the cost of the project. (One of the amendments to the Swing-Johnson bill—later the Boulder Dam Project Act—offered by GEORGE W. MALONE).

"By unanimous action of the Commission, early in 1927 it was agreed to make a thorough study of the Colorado River set-up, employing such assistance as found advisable, to determine the exact position the State should take relative to the pending legislation for the development of that river, so that our position would be found to be fair to all concerned and supported by the facts.

"SAN FRANCISCO POWER CONFERENCE—GEORGE W. MALONE, CHAIRMAN

"Accordingly a conference was called for the three lower basin States, Arizona, California, and Nevada, in San Francisco, November 19 to December 16, 1927, at which time the power angle of the undertaking was thoroughly reviewed and a report subsequently issued for Nevada (by the State engineer of Nevada, chairman of the conference) definitely determining the effect of such development and making certain definite (9) recommendations for the protection of our State and to aid the legislation by gaining the support, insofar as possible, of the upper basin States. The State engineer acted as chairman of that conference.

"The conference, in addition to the members of the Colorado River Commission of the three lower States, included such outstanding power experts as H. W. Crozier, consulting electrical engineer, employed by our Commission; E. S. Scattergood, chief engineer of the Los Angeles Bureau of Power and Light, and L. S. Ready, former engineer for the California Railroad Commission, employed by Los Angeles; Charles Cragin, chief engineer of the Salt River project, Arizona, and B. F. Jacobsen, consulting engineer of Los Angeles, employed by Arizona.

"From the results of this conference a report was made, January 1, 1928, by the Nevada Colorado River Commission, known as the Boulder Canyon lower Colorado River power and water set-up, and from the conclusions drawn from this report nine definite recommendations were made, all calculated to distribute the benefits from the project among the interested States in an equitable manner.

"NINE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE THEN PENDING SWING-JOHNSON BILL

"On January 20, 1928, the State engineer of Nevada (GEORGE W. MALONE) appeared before the United States Senate Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation and presented a statement made up from this report, including the nine recommendations, viz:

"1. That Nevada and Arizona should benefit from the proposed development, at least to the extent that she would benefit if developed by private capital, second only to Government payments and any reasonable reserve.

"2. That the power be not sold as low as the repayments to the Government will permit, but should be sold at a competitive figure comparable with the cost of power available elsewhere for these markets.

"3. That arrangements be made for the sale of the power so that fair offers may be had, and that legitimate bidders be not handicapped.

"4. That suitable readjustment periods be arranged for the power charges per kilowatt-hour and also for the proper charges for other service rendered.

"5. That proper charges be made for other service rendered flood control, silt control, irrigation-water storage and domestic-water storage.

"6. That the States shall have the right to withdraw, upon proper notice, certain blocks of power to be used within their own States.

"7. That a board be arranged for, from the three lower States, to assist the Secretary of the Interior, or any agency supervising the sale of the power and other service rendered, in an advisory capacity to fix the proper charges per kilowatt-hour for power and proper charges for other service rendered.

"8. That an attempt be made to equalize in some manner among the three States the benefits of reclamation financing.

"9. That after the Government advancement is entirely repaid the benefits from this development accrue to the States.

"The State engineer was then cross-examined at length by members of the Senate committee, which testimony appears in full in the hearings before the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, United States Senate, Seventieth Congress, first session, on S. 728 and S. 1274. (January 20, 1928.)

"Senate Document No. 186 (70th Cong., 1st sess.), Colorado River Development, containing 200 pages and 67 maps and illustrations, was prepared by the Nevada State engineer to make available to our Senators and Congressmen complete information for use in the congressional fight. This report was subsequently printed by the Government as a Senate document and was widely distributed as the official document on the Colorado River development.

"EIGHT RECOMMENDATIONS ACCEPTED

"When the Swing-Johnson bill was finally reported out of the Senate committee, and including the amendments on the floor of the Senate, eight of the nine recommendations were included in the legislation as finally passed and called the Boulder Dam Project Act, and, together with the power contracts made by the Secretary of the Interior in conformance with the act, as amended, provide:

"1. That 37½ percent of all the money the project makes above the payments due the Government each year after construction is finished is to be paid to Arizona and Nevada. The Secretary of the Interior has announced that those payments will amount to over $700,000 per year to each of the States. (Would at this time—1948—have amounted to more than $1,500,000 annually to each State if the 1940 Adjustment Act had not been passed.)

"2. That the power be sold at a competitive price.

"3. That the Federal Water Power Act be made a part of the act insofar as determining between conflicting bidders is concerned, so that any agency may bid for the power (priority to States and municipalities).

"4. That there shall be a readjustment of the charges for power after the first 15 years from the date of signing the contracts and every 10 years thereafter, either up or down, as the competitive price may indicate.

"5. That a charge be made for domestic water in Los Angeles and other southern California cities. (No charge was included in the original act.)

"6. That the States shall have the right to withdraw, upon certain notice, 18 percent or 117,000 firm horsepower each for use in the States (now approximately 140,000 kilowatts). This power can be withdrawn and turned back when not needed and withdrawn again as often as necessary by giving such notice and paying the cost at the switchboard when used.

"7. That an advisory board to assist the Secretary in the construction, management, and operation of the project, consisting of one duly authorized Commissioner from each of the seven States, may act in an advisory capacity with the Secretary of the Interior. (GEORGE W. MALONE was appointed by the Secretary for the State of Nevada.)

"8. That the All-American canal, costing $38,500,000, shall be underwritten by the lands benefited and not be paid for by the power from the dam. (This increases the revenue of the States, and investigations shall be made by the Government in Arizona, Nevada, and the upper basin States to determine feasible irrigation projects for development.)

"Recommendation No. 9, providing for turning the project over to the States when the cost to the Government has been repaid was not included in the act. It was said that while that policy had been adopted in the case of irrigation districts it would be 50 years before the Government would be repaid, and during that time a general policy toward this type of project would be adopted.

"In connection with the Nevada amendments, we quote, in part, from a dispatch

from Washington over Universal Service, which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner of September 19, 1930, viz:

"'The outstanding features of these amendments were the provision for revenue for Arizona and Nevada from the project in lieu of taxes after its completion, and the privilege of withdrawing power at cost at the switchboard for use in those States when needed. The original Swing-Johnson bill did not provide either revenue or power for the States of Arizona and Nevada, wherein the project is located, and this fact formed the basis for objection to the project.

"'At a hearing of the United States Senate Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation held in Washington, January 20, 1928, GEORGE W. MALONE, secretary of the Nevada Colorado River Commission, made nine recommendations for changes in the bill as offered, all those recommendations being calculated to distribute the benefits of the project among the interested States.

"'Eight of these recommendations were included in the Boulder Dam Project Act as finally passed and, as a result, Arizona and Nevada each will receive, according to the Secretary of the Interior, a revenue of over $700,000 annually after the project is completed. In addition, through these amendments, Arizona and Nevada will be allowed to withdraw such amounts of power as they may need within their States up to 117,000 firm horsepower, paying cost at the switchboard for its use.'"

BOULDER DAM ADJUSTMENT ACT, 1940

Senator MALONE. Before I make my next point, and the last one, there was what was called the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act of 1940, with which I think the Chairman is familiar, since it was agreed to by the seven States. To save the time of the committee, I would like to have the explanation of that amendment, which it really was, an amendment to the Boulder Dam Project Act, called the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act of 1940, incorporated in the record, beginning with the heading "Precedent" on page 88, and ending on page 90, as marked.

Senator MILLIKIN. Do you want the tables in there?

Senator MALONE. No, Mr. Chairman; they simply outline the payment over the years. They would not be a part of it.

(It is as follows:)

"PRECEDENT

"The precedent for the 'revenue in lieu of taxes' from a Federal power development within a State was founded in the long-adopted principle in the revenue from the sale of public lands, and from the oil and gas leases located on the public lands, providing for 37½ percent of such revenue to be paid direct to the State in which such lands are located, on the theory that where such lands are held by the Federal Government the State cannot levy taxes but is entitled to a proportion of any income in lieu thereof. The Boulder Canyon Project Act, in section 4, paragraph (b) of the original act, provided for 37½ percent to be paid to the States of Arizona and Nevada wherein the project is located.

"In order to insure adequate provision for the States it was further provided in section 5, paragraph (a) of the act that 'contracts made pursuant to subdivision (a) of this section shall be made with a view of obtaining reasonable returns and shall contain provisions whereby at the end of 15 years from the date of their execution and every 10 years thereafter, there shall be readjustment of the contract, upon the demand of either party thereto, either upward or downward as to price, as the Secretary of the Interior may find to be justified by competitive conditions at distributing points or competitive centers.'

"The above provisions of the original act, approved December 21, 1928, provided the foundation for the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act of 1940, which was negotiated by the seven Colorado River Basin States and approved by the States of Arizona and Nevada, paying $300,000 annually to each of the States of Arizona and Nevada in lieu of the 37½ percent provided for in the original act.

"KILOWATT-HOURS—COST—REVENUE

"Table No. 10 prepared annually by the Bureau of Reclamation in determining the rates to be charged for power from the Boulder Canyon project for the ensuing year applies to the fiscal year 1943–44 and shows at a glance the expected number of kilowatt-hours of firm and secondary energy for sale from 1943 to 1987, inclusive, and the actual sales for the years 1937–42. (Table No. 10 p. 88 of section VIII–A—Power Section of the Industrial Encyclopedia, published in 1944.)

"It shows the price per kilowatt-hour (1.190 mills for firm and 0.357 for secondary power) necessary for both firm and secondary energy to provide the annual operation and maintenance, amortization payments to the Government, and the $300,000 to each of the States of Arizona and Nevada agreed upon through the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act.

"REVENUE TO NEVADA AND ARIZONA—ORIGINAL ACT

"At the original price per kilowatt-hour agreed upon in contracts for the power under the original Boulder Canyon Project Act passed in 1928, 1.63 mills for firm power and 0.50 for secondary, the return for the fiscal year 1943–44 would have been increased by approximately $2,000,000, 37½ percent of which—or approximately $800,000—would have been added to the $600,000 annual payments to the States of Arizona and Nevada, agreed to under the Boulder Canyon Adjustment Act, making a total to the two States of $1,400,000 or $700,000 each.

"The 1.63 mills per kilowatt-hour for firm power established in the original contracts was based on the availability of oil at that time to the 'distributing points or competitive centers' at $0.75 to $0.80 per barrel. The price of such oil is now quoted (1944) at $1.10 per barrel, which would indicate an upward adjustment of the price per kilowatt-hour in 1945 at the end of the 10-year period under the original Boulder Canyon Project Act. However, since the Adjustment Act has been accepted, no such additional revenue can now be secured. (The price of oil is now approximately $2 per barrel.)

"TABLE 11.—*Comparative revenue to the States of Arizona and Nevada under the original and under the adjusted Boulder Canyon Project Act*

Price per barrel of oil	$0.80	$1.10	$1.35
Assumption kilowatt-hours per barrel	500	500	500
Annual revenue to Arizona and Nevada under 1928 Boulder Canyon Project Act and power contracts	$1,400,000	$2,345,000	$3,133,000
Annual revenue to Arizona and Nevada under 1940 Adjustment Act [1]	$600,000	$600,000	$600,000

[1] $600,000 annual payments in lieu of taxes accepted by the States of Arizona and Nevada in place of the more than $3,000,000 annual revenue provided under the original Boulder Canyon Project Act.

Source—Bureau of Reclamation.

"ADJUSTMENT ACT

"The principal items of the Boulder Canyon Project Act pertaining to the generation and sale of electric power have been, to a large extent, revised under the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940.

"One of the principal revisions of the Boulder Dam Project Act under the 'Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1940' referred to above was the acceptance by the States of Arizona and Nevada of a definite annual payment of $300,000 each, in place of the 18¾ percent as provided under the Boulder Canyon Project Act passed in December, 1928, which, according to the Bureau of Reclamation would have paid to the two States over the 50-year period $62,468,000, or an average of $624,680 to each State annually. This lesser amount was accepted presumably on the theory that the oil and gas used to generate the power 'at distributing points or competitive centers' would cost less in 1945, the date of the first 'readjustment of the contract,' than when the contract was first made.

"The Boulder Canyon Readjustment Act authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate 'charges on the basis of computation thereof for energy generated at Boulder Dam,' during the period from June 1937 to May 31, 1987. This, in addition to other net revenues, was to be adequate for the following purposes:

"1. To meet the cost of operation and maintenance and replacement.

"2. To provide $500,000 annually for additional development of the Colorado River.

"3. To provide $300,000 annually each for Arizona and Nevada.

"4. To repay the Treasury with interest at 3 percent loans for the construction of the project, exclusive of the $25,000,000 allocation to flood-control payment which is to be deferred until the end of the 50-year period subject to such action as Congress might then determine.

"The cost of generating equipment is to be repaid with interest at 3 percent within 50 years from the installation date. On May 29, 1941, the rate for firm power was reduced from 1.63 mills to 1.163 mills, and the rate for secondary power was reduced from 0.5 mill to 0.34 mill.

"These rates are subject to adjustment from time to time as conditions warrant.

"Another item of importance in the Adjustment Act is provision whereby the Government may arrange for an exchange of power to the Metropolitan Water District from the Parker and Davis Dams in place of the Boulder Dam power allotted it. This provision makes possible an over-all efficient operation of the plant in Black Canyon and the nearby downstream plants. The city of Los Angeles and the Southern California Edison Co. are established as United States operating agents for the Boulder power plant.

"ELECTRIC ENERGY ALLOCATION

"The basic firm energy has been allocated as follows: 17.6259 percent each to Arizona and Nevada; 35.2517 percent to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for pumping water through its Colorado River aqueduct; 17.5554 percent to the city of Los Angeles; a total of 4.0095 percent to Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena; 7.0503 percent to the Southern California Edison Co.; and 0.8813 percent to the California Electric Power Co. Energy allocated to, but not used by, Arizona and Nevada, and subject to withdrawal by them upon giving proper notice, has for the present been assigned to other users as follows: 55 percent to the city of Los Angeles; 40 percent to the Southern California Edison Co.; and 5 percent to the California Electric Power Co. The California Pacific Utilities Co. of California has contracted for a maximum of 20,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year and the Citizens Utility Co., of Kingman, Ariz., has contracted for a maximum of 50,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year of the present unused portion of the Metropolitan Water District's power allotment. These contracts run until 1954, at which time the Metropolitan Water District may need its full allotment.

"HISTORICAL

"Boulder Dam, officially named Hoover Dam by the then Secretary of the Interior

Ray Lyman Wilbur, and changed back to Boulder Dam again by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes when he took office in 1933 (and changed again to Hoover Dam by Congress last year), was the first of the federally financed, large, multiple-purpose projects to be authorized by Congress and constructed by the Government in the 11 Western States, and the only one in the entire United States on which the cost was completely underwritten before construction was begun.

"The Boulder Canyon Project Act was passed by the United States Senate on December 14, 1928, by the House on December 18, and signed by President Calvin Coolidge on December 21, and made effective through proclamation by Herbert Hoover in June 1929. It, together with the contracts for the use of the power provided for in the act, definitely set the precedent for a State in which a project is located to receive a cash benefit in lieu of taxes, and for withdrawal of power to be used within the State when and if needed, even though such power might be used elsewhere in the meantime.

"The above review traces the history of the Colorado River and its development in some detail, together with its effect upon that growth of the Southwest and the 11 Western States, from the date of the discovery of the region by Francisco de Ulloa in 1539 to the use of Boulder Dam by the Basic Magnesium Co. of more than 100,000,000 kilowatt-hours from the completed Boulder Dam in June of 1943."

Senator MALONE. One of these amendments—and I will not try to explain all of them, because they are a matter of history and ready reference—but they all were directed toward the division of the power and the revenue features of Boulder Dam, now known as Hoover Dam, between Arizona, California, and Nevada. The dam is located between Arizona and Nevada, and the contracts were largely made for the sale of power in California. There was no development at all near the dam then available in either Arizona or Nevada.

In lieu of a direct sale of power to the States of Arizona and Nevada—the two States were given a withdrawal privilege to secure 36 percent of such power if, as, and when needed.

Mr. Chairman, we were laboring and sweating blood over the construction of Boulder (Hoover) Dam, just like they are doing now on the water division. It was important to each of the States to start the river development just as it is now very important to each of the States that a division of the water be made. If a division by compact is impossible, then the only recourse is to a judicial body. That is the reason that I joined in the resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 145.

ALL-AMERICAN CANAL NOT PAID FOR BY POWER FROM DAM

In the original Swing-Johnson bill was included the All-American Canal. For 5 years, every time Boulder Dam project was mentioned, the All-American Canal was a part of it. I came into the picture new and fresh in early 1927, and was chairman of the Lower Basin States Power Conference for several months. We met 40 days in San Francisco at one time and debated the entire problem in a very friendly conference, but no actual agreement came out of it. You will understand that there were just too many claims.

That All-American Canal always bothered me. I prepared amendments to the bill which were offered by Senators Pittman, Oddie, and others, both in committee, and on the floor of the Senate. In the debate in the committee, Senator Johnson was in his prime at that time, and everyone admits that, whether they agreed with Senator Johnson or not, he was a fighter. He said to me in cross examination, "We would be glad to give Nevada and Arizona money in lieu of taxes if there were such an amount of money available, but there is no such amount."

I said, "Senator," which is all a matter of evidence at that time, I think January 20, 1928, "what about the All-American Canal?" "It has no more to do with the Boulder Dam project than any other reclamation project. Why pay for it out of Boulder Dam power? In our State when we want a reclamation project, we borrow the money from the Government, build the project, and repay the Government over a period of years." That is exactly what the committee did. They took the All-American Canal out of the picture, which left the $37,500,000; then I went on to explain that there would be no ditches to clean in Imperial Valley once the river cleared up and washed the silt out of the river so that the $500,000 a year expended in cleaning the ditches would be unnecessary, and that will be available money.

Then, $1,000,000 per year was being expended in rebuilding levies along the lower Colorado, because with 150,000 second-feet flow, the valley (Imperial) was endangered, but with the Boulder Dam storage project holding the flow to 40,000 second-feet the 1,500,000 or at least a large part of such expenditure would be saved. So, as a result, they gave us, Arizona and Nevada, 37.5 percent of all of the money the project made above the payments due the Government each year when amortization payments should start. The Secretary of the Interior announced that these payments amount to $700,000 per year to each State.

REVENUE IN LIEU OF TAXES COMPROMISE

In the Adjustment Act, Arizona and Nevada accepted $300,000 a year in lieu of the $700,000 per year to each State and then went on to make other adjustments to which all seven States agreed. The revenue payments being based upon the cost of oil for steam power—the payments to each State would have been more than one and one-half million per year at this time if the original act had not been amended. I recommended that such an attempt be made to equalize in some manner among the three States, the benefits of reclamation and financing. What they actually did, was to require the All-American Canal costing $38,000,000, to be underwritten by the lands benefited in Imperial Valley. I note that this Readjustment Act also increased the revenue of the upper basin States, and provided that an investigation shall be made by the Government in Arizona and Nevada and the upper basin States to determine feasible agricultural projects for development. No projects have ever been paid for out of power or are being paid for out of power due to that amendment which I suggested to the then Senate Reclamation and Irrigation Committee on January 20, 1927.

NO SPECIFIC RIGHT TO WATER WITHOUT AGREEMENT

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I am very desirous of seeing fair play, not only for California and Arizona but for my own State of Nevada. The 300,000 acre-feet of water that we are supposed to have allocated to our State was always simply taken for granted since it was not very much water, and therefore, no one ever paid it much attention, but we do not at this time have any water allocated to the State of Nevada through agreement by the lower basin States and neither does California or Arizona under the compact; and since there has been no agreement between the lower basin States, either under the provisions of the Boulder Dam Project Act or otherwise, which I want to emphasize again includes 2 States that have not been mentioned, New Mexico and Utah, then it is wide open, except for the appropriations that are mentioned by Delph Carpenter, original appropriations already put to use, which would come out of the basin where the State is located.

I want to say again that all of these men that were in the fight—and I remember them all kindly; Delph is paralyzed and only his wife can understand him when he tries to talk; Mr. Scattergood, one of the finest engineers that I ever saw, and Bill Matthews, an attorney for Los Angeles, who is kindly remembered, and many others that I am unable at the moment to name—all contributed their share as they went through. They were fighting for their State but ready to concede something here and there to make the compact work, and to start the river development.

Senator MILLIKIN. I want to get this very clear. Does not Nevada claim the right to 300,000 acre-feet of water?

Senator MALONE. We do claim it but it has never been a part of any agreement. There have been conferences over a long period of time. I must have attended 30 or 40 such conferences during the 8½ years I was State engineer of Nevada, and Colorado River Commissioner, I should say, one such conference was held for several weeks in your city of Denver; but no agreement was ever reached.

Senator MILLIKIN. Let me pursue the matter a little further. Does not Nevada at this time claim the right to 300,000 acre-feet?

Senator MALONE. A claim is all it is. There is no right, and nothing could ever be attached as a right, because there has been no agreement between the States.

Senator MILLIKIN. As of this time, Nevada has no fixed right of any kind to water out of Colorado River?

Senator MALONE. No; and no other State has. Therefore, this matter is very complicated, and it is a matter then of interpretation of the compact, and even Delph Carpenter's learned discussion would have no bearing except to enlighten some of us in our conferences and in our discussions with each other, as to what the author of the compact had in mind, which might or might not affect the court's interpretation.

Senator MILLIKIN. May I ask this, Senator: You raised a very interesting angle in this business. Do your views coincide with those of the Senior Senator from Nevada?

Senator MALONE. Unfortunately, I think he is in the hospital, and I have not discussed this with him, but we did agree that the only way there could be an equitable division of the waters, as a matter of fact, if a project were to be constructed now in any State, that would take a large amount of water, the only way such a division probably could be secured within a reasonable time would be by a court adjudication. I cannot speak for him now as to his current opinion I understand that he submitted a written statement.

Senator MILLIKIN. Do your views coincide with those of the Governor of Nevada?

Senator MALONE. That I could not say, because I have not conferred with him on this particular matter. I understand Mr. Smith, who took my place as State engineer of Nevada, and worked for me a number of years before that time, will be here Saturday.

Senator MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the California representatives whether they have the same theory of Nevada's rights as those expressed by the Senator from Nevada

Mr. SHAW. I might add to what Senator MALONE has said, Mr. Chairman, that Nevada does have two contracts with the Secretary of the Interior, naming the quantities of 300,000 acre-feet in the aggregate, qualified by the clause "subject to availability for use in Nevada." That does to some extent throw the matter again wide open. Nevada, I believe, considers that the quantity named is within reasonable limits and is properly to be expected to belong to Nevada.

This, I think, might be said on the subject, and I think Senator MALONE would probably go along with the idea, that so long as there is no compact and no adjudication, everyone in the lower basin is subject to being sniped at, and subject to having political determinations either in the executive departments or in Congress affect the working out of actual projects either to Nevada's benefit or detriment. The same is true as to Arizona and as to California.

Senator MILLIKIN. I think that we are still missing the point that I am driving at. I think Senator MALONE has made it very clear. The Chair would like to know whether California is in agreement with the statement of Senator MALONE to the effect that Nevada, at the present time, has no right to 300,000 acre-feet or any other number of feet of water from the Colorado River.

Mr. SHAW. It has contracts. We are then bound to determine whether those contracts confer a right. There has been debate on that subject as to whether they confer water rights or whether they are something of a different category.

Senator MILLIKIN. Has California resolved its views as to whether it does or does not have a right? I am speaking of Nevada's right, if it has one.

Mr. SHAW. I am unable to answer that question positively.

Senator MALONE. I might clear that matter up further. I did not mean that the State of Nevada has not advanced a claim, and I do not mean that California has not advanced a claim, and that Arizona may have advanced a claim, but I do mean that none of us have any particular amount of water that we can say unequivocally belongs permanently to Nevada or any other State until a compact is signed by the lower basin States, or the water has been adjudicated by a competent authority.

Senator MILLIKIN. I think the Senator has made that clear. The reason I am probing this, I have been under the opinion that it was conceded by all parties that Nevada had a right to 300,000 acre-feet of water, and, of course, if that is not correct, we certainly should throw all of the clarification we can on it.

Senator MALONE. In every conference I have sat in, Mr. Chairman—you see out of the seven and one-half million and the additional million to the lower basin States, the 300,000, a small amount, was generally taken for granted but there has been nothing agreed upon officially or signed; so, if someone did question it, some new man representative of Arizona or California or Utah or New Mexico, in the lower basin, it would throw a cloud on any claim we have, and if it were never adjudicated and no compact ever signed giving us 300,000 acre-feet, then financing any projects under it would be serious.

Senator MILLIKIN. I may have misinterpreted the Senator's testimony, but the impression is that the Senator himself has thrown a doubt on it, and if that is not correct, that ought to be made very clear.

Senator MALONE. That is correct. I myself believe implicitly that even your own State of Colorado has no specific amount of water that it can call its own in the upper basin until you would either agree by compact between the four upper basin States or until it has been adjudicated by a competent authority.

Senator MILLIKIN. I would like to ask the representatives of the upper States whether there is any claim that Nevada does not have 300,000 acre-feet of water by way of fixed firm right?

Mr. BREITENSTEIN. We concede that the Nevada contract gives her the right to use 300,000 acre-feet of the Colorado River water. When you talk about a right, Senator, we get into complications. A water right is a right of use, and it is not a right to a can of tomatoes.

Senator MILLIKIN. I suggest that under the compact that is not at all correct. The purpose of the compact, one of the purposes of the compact, was to avoid the necessity for us to mature a right by use.

Mr. BREITENSTEIN. Your compact defines beneficial consumptive use of water. Now, Nevada has the right, as we see it, to use beneficially or consume beneficially 300,000 acre-feet of water per year.

Senator MILLIKIN. Is that contested by any of the States in the upper basin?

Mr. BREITENSTEIN. Not that I know of.

Senator MILLIKIN. Is that contested?

Mr. BREITENSTEIN. I have never heard of that contested by any person speaking for an upper basin State.

Senator MILLIKIN. How about the States in the upper division?

Senator MALONE. Would Mr. Breitenstein identify himself for the record?

Mr. BREITENSTEIN. My name is Jean S. Breitenstein. I am a lawyer, and I am attorney for the Colorado Water Conservation Board, which is the water agency of the State of Colorado charged with the protection of or conservation of water resources of the State.

Senator MALONE. I would like to ask Mr. Breitenstein a question. Does the upper basin have anything to do whatever with the division of the lower basin water?

Mr. BREITENSTEIN. No, sir.

Senator MALONE. What difference does it make whether you advance a claim to the water allocated under the compact to the lower basin, or that you do not? The upper basin States have no interest in the lower basin water.

Senator MILLIKIN. Well, the Chair's purpose was to find out whether Nevada's right, if she has one, has been generally accepted or whether it has been a matter of opinion and possibly conflict.

Senator MALONE. I want to say again, that the upper basin States have only one obligation, and that is to turn down 7,500,000 acre-feet of water annually, or 75,000,000 acre-feet in any 10-year period. The lower basin States have nothing whatever to do with the waters remaining in the upper basin and the upper basin States have nothing to do with the 7,500,000 turned down to the lower basin.

Senator MILLIKIN. I was not proposing to raise that question. I was simply trying to find out what the state of opinion is around here as to all of the States on the river, as to whether Nevada has a fixed right to a certain amount of water.

Now, as I understand it, the upper basin States do not challenge that right. If I am not correct in that, I would like to have someone correct me. As I understand it, California has not yet matured her conclusions as to whether that is or is not correct. Is that right?

Mr. SHAW. There are legal questions involved there as to the nature of these contracts from the Secretary of the Interior that I would rather not attempt to express a view on without pretty careful consideration, Senator.

May I add two thoughts, if you please. In a sense, each of the States on an interstate river has a right to equitable apportionment, that is, a right to a share of the whole use of the river. Now, that is something which must be taken into account in answering your question. I would like to make a little comparison. The State of Nevada has a secretarial contract under section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. It has two contracts aggregating 300,000 acre-feet. The States of Utah and New Mexico have no such contracts. Their position is therefore less advanced and less secure and less definite than that of the State of Nevada.

Senator MALONE. Could I ask a question of the witness? Are you referring to the paragraph that I read, where the Congress of the United States merely consents to a division of the waters, that that gave us a claim?

Mr. SHAW. I was not referring to that paragraph.

Senator MALONE. Will you tell me the one to which you refer?

Mr. SHAW. I was referring to the law of equitable apportionment, and that is something—if I may just complete the thought—undetermined and unadjudicated and still in full consideration of the Senator's question must be taken into account.

Senator MILLIKIN. Will you hold up just a moment? Does Arizona challenge the right of Nevada to 300,000 acre-feet?

Mr. CARSON. No; we do not. We have put in the Arizona contract this clause:

"Arizona recognizes the right of the United States and the State of Nevada to contract for the delivery from storage in Lake Mead for annual beneficial consumptive use within Nevada, for agricultural and domestic uses, of 300,000 acre-feet of the water apportioned to the lower basin by the Colorado River compact, and in addition thereto, to make contract for like use of one twenty-fifth of any excess or surplus water available in the lower basin and unapportioned by the Colorado River compact, which waters are subject to further equitable apportionment after October 1, 1963, as provided in article III (f) and III (g) of the Colorado River compact."

Now, since Utah and New Mexico have been mentioned here, I would like to read the next paragraph in this contract.

Senator MILLIKIN. This is a contract between Arizona and the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. CARSON. Yes.

Senator MILLIKIN. What is the date of that contract?

Mr. CARSON. The 9th of February 1944. It was ratified by the Arizona Legislature:

"Arizona recognizes the rights of New Mexico and Utah to equitable share of the water apportioned by the Colorado River compact in the lower basin and also water unapportioned by such compact; and nothing contained in this contract shall prejudice such rights."

Mr. SHAW. Would you be kind enough to read the next section?

Mr. CARSON. That was (g).

Now, I would like to offer this entire contract for the record.

Senator MILLIKIN. It will be put in the record.

Mr. CARSON. It appears on page 240 of the Bridge Canyon project hearings on Senate bill 1175.

Mr. ELY. We have already entered that as an exhibit to our testimony.

Senator MILLIKIN. Since it has been offered, would that be sufficient?

Mr. CARSON. I would like to have it entered.

Senator MILLIKIN. Put it in at this point, even at the risk of encumbering the record. I do not like to have to make all sorts of cross-references all of the time to find the material.

Mr. CARSON. All right.

Then, in Arizona's view Nevada has a firm right to 300,000 acre-feet, plus one twenty-fifth of the surplus which comes from our half of the surplus, and the division is made in the lower basin by virtue of the California Limitation Act in article IV of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, which the Senator from Nevada did not read, but which limits California to 4,400,000 acre-feet.

Now then, that leaves for Nevada and Arizona the balance of the 7,500,000 acre-feet of III (a) water apportioned to the lower basin, plus that small part of Utah and New Mexico, which are in the lower basin, and there is no dispute between Arizona and Utah or New Mexico over that water, nor with Nevada.

Mr. SHAW. Could I have paragraph (h) of that contract read?

Senator MALONE. I would like to have section (h) read.

Mr. SHAW. With the chairman's permission, I would like to read into the RECORD the subsection of this contract immediately following the two which counsel for Arizona read.

Senator MALONE. Is this a contract or is it something adopted by the State legislature?

Mr. SHAW. It is a secretarial contract, approved by the State legislature of Arizona:

"Arizona recognizes the right of the United States and agencies of the State of California to contract for storage and delivery of water from Lake Mead for beneficial consumptive use in California, provided that the aggregate of all such deliveries and uses in California from the Colorado River shall not exceed the limitation of such uses in that State required by the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act and agreed to by the State of California by an act of its legislature, upon which limitation the State of Arizona expressly relies."

Now, I wish to make these two comments. Obviously, the formulas adopted in this contract for recognition of the rights of Nevada, Utah, and New Mexico and California are wide open to the questions, the legal questions, which have been presented. They are not self-defining numerical quantities in all respects. They are subject to the provisions of section 10 of the same contract, and "neither article 7 which contains these three subdivisions which have been read, nor any other provision of this contract shall impair the right of Arizona and other States and the users of water therein to maintain, prosecute or defend any action respecting, and is without prejudice to, any of the respective contentions of said States and water users as to (1) the intent, effect, meaning, and interpretation of said compact and said act; (2) what part, if any, of the water used or contracted for by any of them falls within article III (a) of the Colorado River compact; (3) what part, if any, is within article III (b) thereof; (4) what part, if any, is excess or surplus waters unapportioned by said compact; and (5) what limitations on use, rights of use, and relative priorities exist as to the waters of the Colorado River system; provided, however, that by these reservations there is no intent to disturb the apportionment made by article III (a) of the Colorado River compact between the upper basin and the lower basin."

We, on the part of California, and I do not want to have any mistake about this, do not challenge the right of the State of Nevada or the privilege of the State of Nevada, or whatever you may call it, to use 300,000 acre-feet of water. Nevada, however, without any adjudication, is standing out here deriving what comfort it can from this contract, but without any definition by any court or any compact of its exact rights.

GOV. VAIL PITTMAN'S LETTER—NO LOWER BASIN COMPACT

Senator MILLIKIN. I believe, Senator MALONE, I should bring to your attention the letter of Governor Pittman of May 10, 1948, to this subcommittee. In the course of the letter the following appears:

"Nevada is seriously concerned as to the effect of congressional action upon the promotion and development of projects in the other States in the lower basin, which may have undesirable repercussions upon Nevada's allotment of water and power.

"In the absence of an effective allocation of water between the States of the lower basin, these States may rely upon their respective State water codes, and their rights as established by priority of beneficial use could result in depriving Nevada of a part of the water to which the State is entitled under the Colorado River compact and section 4 (a) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act. The amount of water Nevada would receive under this agreement (300,000 acre-feet), while very small compared with the proposed allocations to Arizona and California, is vitally important to the welfare of southern Nevada. The danger of loss of a portion of this water to Nevada is accentuated by the necessity of supplying water to the Republic of Mexico as required by the Mexican Water Treaty of 1945.

"Nevada has a contract executed by the Secretary of the Interior under the project act for 17.6259 percent of all firm hydroelectric power produced at Hoover Dam. The necessity of conserving as much of this energy as possible is of the greatest importance to Nevada. The electric power is imperatively needed for present operation and development of natural resources in mining and irrigation, which are rapidly expanding, and for the operation of Basic Magnesium project which is now being acquired by Nevada from War Assets Administration where industries of great benefit to the State and to the national welfare are in operation; and others are negotiating for space and power."

I shall make the whole letter available to you, Senator, but here is another part that I want to refer to:

"Nevada's past experience conclusively leads me to believe that a three-State compact or agreement cannot be reached and further discussions will prove futile. Our State for many years has spent much time and money in efforts to bring the three-State compact into being, completely without results. At last Nevada discontinued negotiations and on March 30, 1942, contracted directly with the Bureau of Reclamation for 100,000 acre-feet of water from Lake Mead storage as water was urgently needed for the wartime Basic Magnesium project. Meantime, Arizona petitioned Secretary Ickes for a contract of withdrawal of up to 2,800,000 acre-feet from the main stream, that State's entire allotment, less certain deductions and qualifications in the contract. This led Nevada to contract for an additional 200,000 acre-feet, the limit of our right under the authorized three-State contract. The right is only for withdrawal of stored water when it is available."

Now, for whatever bearing that may have I thought that you should have that directly before you.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. No doubt the governor sent me a copy, but in the press of other business it did not reach me. It has not been called to my attention. He says the same thing in his letter that I have just said for the record. What I want to say again is that I appreciate very much the protection afforded by the contract that the Legislature of Arizona has ratified, but as you can see, California still leaves the gate wide open, and the only way it could bind the State of Arizona would be through a compact with Nevada, ratified by the legislatures of both States, and even then the remaining three States of the lower basin would in no way be bound. I think California questions the 4,400,000 acre-feet limitation indicated by the Boulder Dam Project Act, and there are various ways, you understand, that you can compute water. One might be through gross diversions, and others through beneficial consumptive use, and you will find that in Delph Carpenter's explanation of the compact it is always beneficial consumptive use. Arizona, for example, computes their use of the Gila River waters in a certain manner—other computations use a different formula—neither I nor the State of Nevada can say what method should be used, but a court of competent jurisdiction can resolve the question.

Consumptive use means that in Colorado, for example, or the upper basin, you could and probably will divert the water, a considerable part of it, several times, and you have in Colorado one of the highest duties of water of any State in the West, primarily because you have such a large return flow. I am talking about beneficial consumptive use; I think it is only a little over an acre-foot or between an acre-foot and 2 acre-feet per acre. Whereas, if it were diverted and never returned to the stream system, it might be several times that, but your return flow is such that your beneficial consumptive use is very low.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO WATER TREATY

I want to say a further word about this. Highly complicating this entire picture is the 1,500,000 acre-feet allocated to Old Mexico. That has been ratified by the Senate of the United States and it is duly signed, and there is nothing that anyone can do about it. I examined personally the lands in Old Mexico in 1927 and 1928. I have a peculiar habit of looking at things that I have to do something about. They never at any time, in my judgment, irrigated over 30,000 to 40,000 acres at one time, but they had about 200,000 acres under cultivation due to irrigating a part of it for 2 or 3 years, and then shifting to other parts of the land.

But now instead of the three-quarters of a million acre-feet, which is at least 100,000 acre-feet more than anyone thought they would ever be allocated and certainly that much more than they had ever utilized at any one time prior to the construction of the dam, they get 1,500,000 acre-feet. The 1,500,000 acre-feet must come from some place. It immediately dissipates any idea that there is going to be any large unallocated surplus, or maybe even very little of that 1,000,000 acre-feet that is allocated to the lower basin, in addition to the 7,500,000 acre-feet to the lower basin to be delivered at Lees Ferry by the upper basin. Through all of the negotiations—and you understand that I am not passing on these questions—we tried to meet the necessary problems in the interest of harmony and to get development started on the Colorado River, feeling that the rest of it would be growing pains—just like we are going through now. I do not want to hurt any State in the basin, either the upper or lower basin.

Therefore, I want it clearly understood that in my opinion there is not now any allocation to any specific State in the basin. I know the Secretary of the Interior has made these contracts, and they have made them with California, and they are about to make them or have made them with Arizona, and they have made two with us, but the Secretary of the Interior in the last 15 years has had a habit of taking on a good deal of authority—and I think the chairman is fully familiar with all of the ramifications of that habit—and that all of the Department's actions do not have the weight of law.

The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, was entirely unfamiliar with water law in the West, and this is no disparagement of him, and the present Secretary, Mr. Krug, is entirely unfamiliar with our methods of water use in the West, and therefore it comes back to the old saying, "No one can talk quite so convincingly on a subject as someone entirely unhampered by the facts."

ONLY LOWER BASIN COMPACT OR AGREEMENT CAN DIVIDE THE WATER

I cannot settle this problem between Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah. Only those States can settle it through a compact—or the rights can be adjudicated by a competent authority.

I want to make this point, that Delph Carpenter, when he says what the compact

means—and he leaves for the moment aside what the States ratified—he is just like GEORGE MALONE or our chairman or anyone else; he is just 1 out of 140,000,000 making up the United States. What he says, and he wrote the compact, and he evidently meant it to mean that it included the Gila River, and it included every stream and every foot of watershed in it and to be based on beneficial consumptive use, but nevertheless, that is only Delph Carpenter, and I have the highest regard for him. We used to call him the "silver fox of the Rockies." However, the questions of fact must still be left to the court if there is a disagreement.

MOVE ONE STEP AT A TIME—GROWING PAINS

What we did at that time seemed right to us, but there are so many interpretations of even the compact itself, as you have seen here this morning, that it is my earnest opinion that the way to save time and to utilize the waters of that basin, in view of the fact that I agree wholeheartedly with the Governor, who has, along with Tom Smith, our State engineer, sat in these conferences almost continuously since I left the Commission, that there would probably never be an agreement between the lower basin States in the division of water.

I concur in that position, and I think my friends from Arizona and California would also concur. Therefore, it is very important that the Government of the United States not assist anyone, Nevada, Arizona, California, New Mexico, or Utah, in establishing priorities that might be inimical to the rights of any other State until such determination is made either by compact or adjudication.

I have been advised that if a compact is not possible the quickest way to determine the rights would be through an adjudication by the Supreme Court, and should not hold us up, perhaps, more than a year, which, in view of the fact that the Boulder Canyon project was held up 7 years, even after Mr. Hoover called the States together in Santa Fe, N. Mex., since it has taken the States of the West many years on all major projects to arrive at the proper solution, the time element would not be out of line when the importance of the subject is considered.

What I am saying is that rather than deprive California and Arizona and Nevada or any other State of their proper rights, 1 year more or less is relatively unimportant, and if they are unable to do it for themselves, there should be a competent body to do the job. Now, it did make some difference in my thought on the subject when the Bureau of Reclamation came in and said that they were going to pump the water from Parker Dam to central Arizona instead of taking it out of the Bridge Canyon, because if it were taken out of Bridge Canyon, I think the Governor of Nevada, Mr. Vail Pittman, has very well covered it, that would divert a large amount of water without any adjudication, compact, or determination of rights above Boulder and Davis Dams where power is developed and then used for irrigation; and, of course, acts as flood control. They are truly multiple-purpose dams, but it would change materially the matter of repayments by reducing the power development upon which the project was originally financed.

I want to make this one point again. Not in any part of the lower river basin with which I am familiar has power developed on the main stream been used to finance an irrigation district. The Bridge Canyon project, if it is built, will produce a lot of power. The water will go through the Bridge Canyon, then on through Hoover and Davis Dams. The power will be available to the basin States, wherever it can be economically transmitted. I understand at Parker it will take about a third of this power to pump the water back into central Arizona. Approximately one-third of the power is used for that purpose, and then the revenue from the power, the power is fixed at a price that will repay the Government for the Central Arizona project. It is an exact parallel, as I see it, to the All-American canal that the Congress rejected, through denial of the use of Boulder Dam revenue with which to repay the Government for the cost of the All-American canal.

I am not suggesting what should be done. I am merely outlining what has been done, and I think in order to meet the future developments on the river it is necessary for the committee to know what has been done and what precedents have been established and the real points at issue.

I heartily agree with the Senator, the chairman, in his conclusion that if you are going to write a book on this subject, you had better do it during the first 2 weeks before you become burdened with details, or else you had better wait several years, because once you begin to find out the real problems, you will be very reluctant to make a definite decision between the States on water rights. As a matter of fact, on none of these things, either in the Industrial Encyclopedia of the Eleven Western States, or in Senate Document 186 have I drawn conclusions. I have merely put down the evidence, so that anyone can refer to the documents as interpreted by the men on the job at the time, and the actions of the Congress of the United States, and make up their own mind.

I want to adopt that attitude all of the way through. As we go along certain precedents are set and become common procedure—fair to the States involved—so that Congress has finally established a definite method of procedure.

The reason that I joined with other Senators in the joint resolution then was because the necessary adjudication, in the absence of a compact, could be made only by the Supreme Court in my opinion, since I felt that the States would never make it. Just as my Governor has said in his letter. He had not communicated with me before writing the letter, but we agree on principle.

Mr. Chairman, unless there are further questions, I think that that concludes my statement.

Senator MCFARLAND. There is just one matter that I would like to call Senator MALONE's attention to, and I am sure that he is familiar with it, and that is (b) under article IV of the compact, which reads:

"Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes."

Then I would like to ask him if he is not familiar with the fact that the Colorado-Big Thompson in Colorado is financed largely from power generated?

Senator MALONE. I am referring to the power developed on the main lower basin stream where two or more States are interested; also following a compact or an adjudication the amount that any one State might divert would be determined.

Senator MCFARLAND. I do not care to go into it any further.

Senator MILLIKIN. I think that that is extraneous to the immediate matter.

Senator MALONE. I am entirely familiar with the provision which the Senator just read.

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly clear that not a single one of the seven States in the entire Colorado River watershed has a firm right to the use of any specific amount of water until such time as the water allocated to the upper and lower basins, respectively, under the Colorado River compact has been divided between the States in the respective basins either through interstate agreements or compacts—or by a court of competent jurisdiction.

It is equally clear to me that the lower basin States, Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah will not, within any reasonable time, agree upon such a division. I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, joined in the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution No. 145 to hasten the further development of the Colorado River.

Senator MILLIKIN. Thank you very much, Senator.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this outline contains a rather complete record of progress of the Colorado River development with appropriate references in the interest of a better general understanding of the subject and a full ultimate development of that great river system.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it is my desire to address the Senate on the subject of bringing inflation under control. Before doing so, however, I wish to report favorably from the Committee on Banking and Currency House bill 6959 to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with an amendment, and I submit a report (No. 1773) thereon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the bill just reported by the Senator from Vermont is the housing bill, is it not?

Mr. FLANDERS. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I feel that since the bill has been reported it should be a matter for debate as early as possible in the Senate. Therefore, if no Senator wishes to suggest why I should not do so, I shall ask unanimous consent, and now do ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6959.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to that procedure, but I think probably in fairness to the Members of the Senate there should be a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. I was just about to state that if any objection was raised, I should be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum, although perhaps it would not be necessary to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether there will be any objection.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished acting majority leader and the distinguished minority leader that a Member of the Senate is going to object to consideration of the bill. I further wish to state that I shall insist upon a quorum call in order that the Senator interested may be protected. He is a Member on this side of the aisle.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I understand that I do not lose the floor by this procedure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will not lose the floor.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is necessarily absent in the State of Tennessee, because of a primary and general election which is being held today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Before the quorum call I had proposed a unanimous-consent request temporarily to lay aside the unfinished business and proceed to the consideration of House bill 6959. At that time it was suggested by the chairman of the committee [Mr. TOBEY] that he thought possibly an objection would be made to the present consideration of the bill. I did not know that when I proposed the unanimous-consent request. I now renew the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Housing Act of 1948."

DECLARATION OF NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require a production of residential construction and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious cumulative housing shortage, to eliminate slums and blighted areas, to realize as soon as feasible the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, and to develop and redevelop communities so as to advance the growth and wealth of the Nation. The Congress further declares that such production is necessary to enable the housing industry to make its full contribution toward an economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. The policy to be followed in attaining the national housing objective hereby established shall be: (1) Private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can; (2) governmental assistance shall be utilized where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve more of the total need and (3) governmental aid to clear slums and provide adequate housing for groups with incomes so low that they cannot otherwise be decently housed in new or existing housing shall be extended only to those localities which estimate their own needs and demonstrate that these needs cannot fully be met through reliance solely upon private enterprise and upon local and State revenues, and without such aid.

TITLE I—FHA TITLE VI AND TRANSITIONAL PERIOD AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

TITLE VI AMENDMENTS

(a) Section 603 (a) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$5,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,750,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased to not to exceed $6,150,000,000";

(2) By striking out the second proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That no mortgage shall be insured under section 603 of this title after April 30, 1948, except (A) pursuant to a commitment to insure, issued on or before April 30, 1948, or (B) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under section 603 of this title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage, and no mortgage shall be insured under section 608 of this title after March 31, 1949, except (i) pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before March 31, 1949, or (ii) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under section 608 of this title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage:".

(b) Section 608 (b) (3) (B) is amended by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That the principal obligation of the mortgage shall not, in any event, exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located; and".

(c) (1) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended by striking out "$1,500 per room" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,100 per family unit";

(2) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended by striking out the colon and the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(d) Section 609 is amended—

(a) By striking out all of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding purchase contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator providing for the purchase and delivery of the houses to be manufactured, which contracts shall provide for the payment of the purchase price at such time as may be agreed to by the parties thereto, but, in no event, shall the purchase price be payable on a date in excess of 30 days after the date of delivery of such houses, unless not less than 20 percent of such purchase price is paid on or before the date of delivery and the lender has accepted and discounted or has agreed to accept and discount, pursuant to subsection (i) of this section a promissory note or notes, executed by the purchaser, representing the unpaid portion of such purchase price, in which event such unpaid portion of the purchase price may be payable on a date not in excess of 180 days from the date of delivery of such houses;".

(b) By striking out the first and second sentences of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost, exclusive of profit, of manufacturing the houses, which are the subject of such purchase contracts assigned to secure the loan, less any sums paid by the purhaser under said purchase contracts prior to the assignment thereof. The loan shall be secured by an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts and of all sums payable thereunder on or after the date of such assignment, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses then owned and in the possession of the borrower."

(c) By adding at the end of subsection (f) the following new sentence: "The provisions of section 603 (d) shall also be applicable to loans insured under this section and the reference in said section 603 (d) to a mortgage shall be construed to include a loan or loans with respect to which a contract of insurance is issued pursuant to this section."

(d) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) (1) In addition to the insurance of the principal loan to finance the manufacture of housing, as provided in this section, and in order to provide short-term financing in the sale of houses to be delivered pursuant to the purchase contract or contracts assigned as security for such principal loan, the Administrator is authorized, under such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe, to insure the lender against any losses it may sustain resulting from the acceptance and discount of a promissory note or notes executed by a purchaser of any such houses representing an unpaid portion of the purchase price of any such houses. No such promissory note or notes accepted and discounted by the lender pursuant to this subsection shall involve a principal obligation in excess of 80 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses; have a

maturity in excess of 180 days from the date of the note or bear interest in excess of 4 percent per annum; nor may the principal amount of such promissory notes, with respect to any individual principal loan, outstanding and unpaid at any one time, exceed in the aggregate an amount prescribed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to include in any contract of insurance executed by him with respect to the insurance of a loan to finance the manufacture of houses, provisions to effectuate the insurance against any such losses under this subsection.

"(3) The failure of the purchaser to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or notes executed by the purchaser and accepted and discounted by the lender under the provisions of this subsection, shall be considered as a default under this subsection, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance, as provided in subsection (d) of this section except that debentures issued pursuant to this subsection shall have a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan plus interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of default to the date the application is filed for the insurance benefits.

"(4) Debentures issued with respect to the insurance granted under this subsection shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date application is filed for the insurance benefits and shall bear interest from such date.

"(5) The Administrator is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this subsection, in addition to the premium charge authorized under subsection (h) of this section. Such premium charge shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the original principal of such promissory note or notes and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

(e) Section 610 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Administrator is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any of the so-called Greenbelt towns, or parts thereof, including projects, or parts thereof, known as Greenhills, Ohio, Greenbelt, Md., and Greendale, Wis., developed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, or of any of the village properties under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and any mortgage executed in connection with the first resale, within 2 years from the date of its acquisition from the Government, of any portion of a project or property which is the security for a mortgage insured pursuant to the provisions of this section."

(f) Title VI is amended by adding after section 610 the following new section:

"SEC. 611. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under other sections of this title, and in order to assist and encourage the application of cost-reduction techniques through large-scale modernized site construction of housing and the erection of houses produced by modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Administrator as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) cover property, held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator, upon which there is to be constructed or erected dwelling units for not less than 25 families consisting of a group of single-family or two-family dwellings approved by the Administrator for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That during the course of construction there may be located upon the mortgaged property a plant for the fabrication or storage of such dwellings or sections or parts thereof, and the Administrator may consent to the removal or release of such plant from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may approve;

"(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(A) not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the completed property or project, exclusive of any plant of the character described in paragraph (2) of this subsection located thereon, and

"(B) not to exceed a sum computed on the individual dwellings comprising the total project as follows:

"(i) $8,100 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each single-family dwelling, and

"(ii) $12,500 or 90 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each two-family dwelling.

"With respect to the insurance of advances during construction, the Administrator is authorized to approve advances by the mortgagee to cover the cost of materials delivered upon the mortgaged property and labor performed in the fabrication or erection thereof;

"(4) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time: *Provided*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest, not exceeding 4½ percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, if he finds that the mortgage market demands it. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"(c) Preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for veterans of World War II and their immediate families and for hardship cases as defined by the Administrator shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(d) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 608 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

TITLE II AMENDMENTS

(g) Sections 203 (b) (2) (B) is amended by striking out "$5,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,300."

(h) Section 203 (b) (2) (C) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$8,600" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,500";

(2) By striking out "$6,000" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,000";

(3) By striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,000."

(i) Section 203 (b) is amended by striking out in paragraph No. (3) the following: "of the character described in paragraph (2) (B) of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "on property approved for insurance prior to the beginning of construction."

(j) Section 203 (b) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) (C), inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or," and adding the following new paragraph:

"(D) not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 90 percent of the appraised value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance (or 95 percent if, in the determination of the Administrator, insurance of mortgages involving a principal obligation in such amount under this paragraph would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities for families of moderate income), of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence the construction of which is begun after March 31, 1949, and which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That the Administrator may by regulation provide that the principal obligation of any mortgage eligible for insurance under this paragraph shall be fixed at a lesser amount than $6,000 where he finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability: *And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages insured under this paragraph the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 10 percent (or 5 percent, in the case of a 95-percent mortgage insured pursuant to this paragraph (D)) of the appraised value in cash or its equivalent, or shall be the builder constructing the dwelling in which case the principal obligation shall not exceed 85 percent of the appraised value of the property."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph No. (3), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 30 years in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(3) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph No. (5), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 4 percent per annum in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(k) (1) Section 203 (c) is amended (1) by striking out in the last sentence the words "section or section 210" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "title"; and (2) by striking out in said sentence (i) the words "under this section", and (ii) the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

(2) Section 603 (c) is amended by striking out in the next to the last sentence the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

(l) Section 204 (a) is amended—

(1) By striking out, in the last sentence, the following: "prior to July 1, 1944,";

(2) By inserting between the first and second provisos in the last sentence the following: *"And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages which are accepted for insurance under section 203 (b) (2) (D) or under the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2) of this act, there may be included in the debentures issued by the Administrator on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by the Administrator an amount, not in excess of two-thirds of such cost or $75 whichever is the greater:".

(m) (1) Section 207 (b) is amended by amending paragraph numbered (1) to read as follows:

"(1) Federal or State instrumentalities, municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, or limited dividend or redevelopment or housing corporations restricted by Federal or State laws or regulations of State banking or insurance departments as to rents, charges, capital struc-

ture, rate of return, or methods of operation; or".

(2) Section 207 (c) is amended by amending the first sentence to read as follows:

"(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage on any property or project shall involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(1) not to exceed $5,000,000, or, if executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph numbered (b) (1) of this section, not to exceed $50,000,000;

"(2) not to exceed 80 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed, including the land; the proposed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Administrator: *Provided*, That, except with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph numbered (b) (1) of this section, such mortgage shall not exceed the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project, exclusive of public utilities and streets and organization and legal expenses; and

"(3) not to exceed $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use."

(n) (1) Section 207 (h) is amended by striking out, in paragraph numbered (1), the words "paid to the mortgagor of such property", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund."

(2) Section 204 (f) is amended by inserting in clause numbered (1), immediately preceding the semicolon, the following: "if the mortgage was insured under section 203 and shall be retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund if the mortgage was insured under section 207."

TITLE I AMENDMENTS

(o) Section 2 is amended:

(1) By striking out "$165,000,000" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$175,000,000";

(2) By striking out "$3,000" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,500";

(3) By striking out the first proviso in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $10,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure used or to be used as a hotel, apartment house, dwelling for two or more families, hospital, orphanage, college, or school:".

(4) By striking out the last sentence of subsection (b).

SEC. 102. In order to aid housing production, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans to and purchase the obligations of any business enterprise for the purpose of providing financial assistance for the production of prefabricated houses or prefabricated housing components, or for large-scale modernized site construction. Such loans or purchases shall be made under such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Corporation may determine: *Provided*, That to the extent that the proceeds of such loans or purchases are used for the purchase of equipment, plant, or machinery the principal obligation shall not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of such equipment, plant, or machinery: *And provided further*, That the total amount of commitments for loans made and obligations purchased under this section shall not exceed $50,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and no financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

SEC. 103. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of section 500 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*And provided further*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest than otherwise prescribed in this section for loans guaranteed under this title, but not exceeding 4½ percent per annum, if he finds that the loan market demands it."

TITLE II—SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI HOME LOANS AND FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION INSURED MORTGAGES

SEC. 201. Section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "which are insured after April 30, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under section 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "which are insured after April 30, 1948, under title II, or title VI of this act, or guaranteed after April 30, 1948, under section 501, or section 502, or section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended."

SEC. 202. Paragraph (E) of the proviso of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause No. (2) the figure "25" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "50."

TITLE III—HOUSING RESEARCH

SEC. 301. To assist in progressively reducing housing costs and increasing the production of better housing, and in making available necessary data on housing needs, demand, and supply, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall—

(a) undertake and conduct a program with respect to technical research and studies to develop, demonstrate, and promote the acceptance and application of new and improved techniques, materials, and methods which will permit progressive reductions in housing construction and maintenance costs, and stimulate the increased and sustained production of housing. Such program may be concerned with improved and standardized building codes and regulations and methods for the more uniform administration thereof, standardized dimensions and methods for the assembly of homebuilding materials and equipment, improved residential design and construction, new and improved types of building materials and equipment, and methods of production, distribution, assembly, and construction, and sound techniques for the testing thereof and for the determination of adequate performance standards, and may relate to appraisal, credit, and other housing market, data, housing needs, demand and supply, finance and investment, land costs, use and improvement, site planning and utilities, zoning and other laws, codes and regulations as they apply to housing, other factors affecting the cost of housing, and related technical and economic research;

(b) prepare and submit to the President and to the Congress estimates of national housing needs and reports with respect to the progress being made toward meeting such needs, and correlate and recommend proposals for such executive action or legislation necessary or desirable for the furtherance of the national housing objective and policy established by this act, together with such other reports or information as may be required of the Administrator by the President or the Congress.

(c) encourage localities to make studies of their own housing needs and markets, along with surveys and plans for housing, urban land use and related community development, and provide, where requested and needed by the localities, technical advice and guidance in the making of such studies, surveys, and plans.

SEC. 302. In carrying out research and studies under this title, the Administrator shall utilize, to the fullest extent feasible, the available facilities of other departments, independent establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government; and the Secretary of Commerce or his designee shall hereafter be included in the membership of the National Housing Council. The Administrator is further authorized, for the purposes of this title, to undertake research and studies cooperatively with agencies of State or local governments, and educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations. The Administrator shall disseminate the results of research and studies undertaken pursuant to this title in such form as may be most useful to industry and to the general public.

SEC. 303. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV—RENTAL HOUSING AIDS FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME AND VETERANS

MORTGAGE INVESTMENT AIDS; VETERANS' COOPERATIVES

SEC. 401. (a) Section 207 (c) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of paragraph No. (2) as amended by this act, inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and adding the following new proviso: "*And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph No. (2), a mortgage with respect to a project to be constructed in a locality or metropolitan area where, as determined by the Administrator, there is a need for new dwellings for families of lower income at rentals comparable to the rentals proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project (or, in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members) may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed, except that in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II, the principal obligation may be in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed; and."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of the second sentence, inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and adding the following: "except that with respect to mortgages insured under the provisions of the second proviso of paragraph No. (2) of this subsection, which mortgages are hereby authorized to have a maturity of not exceeding 40 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage, such interest rate shall not exceed 4 percent per annum."

(3) By adding the following additional sentence at the end thereof: "Such property or project may include such commercial and community facilities as the Administrator deems adequate to serve the occupants."

(b) Section 207 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the number "2" appearing in clause (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "1."

(c) Section 207 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(q) In order to assure an adequate market for mortgages on cooperative-ownership projects and rental-housing projects for families of lower income and veterans of the character described in the second proviso of paragraph numbered (2) of subsection (c) of this section, the powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association, and of any other Federal corporation or other Federal agency hereafter established, to make real-estate loans, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with projects of the character described in said proviso."

EQUITY INVESTMENT AIDS

SEC. 402. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE VII—INSURANCE FOR INVESTMENTS IN RENTAL HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE

"SEC. 701. The purpose of this title is to supplement the existing systems of mortgage insurance for rental housing under this act by a special system of insurance designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing at rents within the capacity of families of moderate income. To effectuate this purpose, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the investor, to insure as hereinafter provided, and, prior to the execution of insurance contracts and upon such terms as the Administrator shall prescribe, to make commitments to insure, the minimum annual amortization charge and an annual return on the outstanding investment of such investor in any project which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided in an amount (herein called the 'insured annual return') equal to such rate of return, not exceeding 2¾ percent per annum, on such outstanding investment as shall, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, be fixed in the insurance contract or in the commitment to insure: *Provided*, That any insurance contract made pursuant to this title shall expire as of the first day of the operating year for which the outstanding investment amounts to not more than 10 percent of the established investment: *And provided further*, That the aggregate amount of contingent liabilities outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure made pursuant to this title shall not exceed $1,000,000,000.

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 702. (a) To be eligible for insurance under this title, a project shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The Administrator shall be satisfied that there is, in the locality or metropolitan area of such project, a need for new rental dwellings at rents comparable to the rents proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project.

"(2) Such project shall be economically sound, and the dwellings in such project shall be acceptable to the Administrator as to quality, design, size, and type.

"(b) Any insurance contract executed by the Administrator under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the project and the investor for such insurance, and the validity of any insurance contract so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an investor from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such investor.

"PREMIUMS AND FEES

"SEC. 703. (a) For insurance granted pursuant to this title the Administrator shall fix and collect a premium charge in an amount not exceeding one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year for which such premium charge is payable without taking into account the excess earnings, if any, applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment. Such premium charge shall be payable annually in advance by the investor, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Administrator under this title at par plus accrued interest: *Provided*, That, if in any operating year the gross income shall be less than the operating expenses, the premium charge payable during such operating year shall be waived, but only to the extent of the amount of the difference between such expenses and such income and subject to subsequent payment out of any excess earnings as hereinafter provided.

"(b) With respect to any project offered for insurance under this title, the Administrator is authorized to charge and collect reasonable fees for examination, and for inspection during the construction of the project: *Provided*, That such fees shall not aggregate more than one-half of 1 percent of the estimated investment.

"RENTS

"SEC. 704. The Administrator shall require that the rents for the dwellings in any project insured under this title shall be established in accordance with a rent schedule approved by the Administrator, and that the investor shall not charge or collect rents for any dwellings in the project in excess of the appropriate rents therefor as shown in the latest rent schedule approved pursuant to this section. Prior to approving the initial or any subsequent rent schedule pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall find that such schedule affords reasonable assurance that the rents to be established thereunder are (1) not lower than necessary, together with all other income to be derived from or in connection with the project, to produce reasonably stable revenues sufficient to provide for the payment of the operating expenses, the minimum annual amortization charge, and the minimum annual return; and (2) not higher than necessary to meet the need for dwellings for families of moderate income.

"EXCESS EARNINGS

"SEC. 705. For all of the purposes of any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, 50 percent of the excess earnings, if any, for any operating year may be applied, in addition to the minimum annual return, to return on the outstanding investment but only to the extent that such application thereof does not result in an annual return of more than 5 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year, and the balance of any such excess earnings shall be applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment: *Provided*, That if in any preceding operating years the gross income shall have been less than the operating expenses, such excess earnings shall be applied to the extent necessary in whole or in part, first, to the reimbursement of the amount of the difference between such expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and such income, and, second, to the payment of any premium charges previously waived hereunder.

"FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

"SEC. 706. With respect to each project insured under this title, the Administrator shall provide that, after the close of each operating year, the investor shall submit to him for approval a financial and operating statement covering such operating year. If any such financial and operating statement shall not have been submitted or, for proper cause, shall not have been approved by the Administrator, payment of any claim submitted by the investor may, at the option of the Administrator, be withheld, in whole or in part, until such statement shall have been submitted and approved.

"PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

"SEC. 707. If in any operating year the net income of a project insured under this title is less than the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return, the Administrator, upon submission by the investor of a claim for the payment of the amount of the difference between such net income and the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return and after proof of the validity of such claim, shall pay to the investor, in cash from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, the amount of such difference, as determined by the Administrator, but not exceeding, in any event, an amount equal to the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return.

"DEBENTURES

"SEC. 708. (a) If the aggregate of the amounts paid to the investor pursuant to section 707 hereof with respect to a project insured under this title shall at any time equal or exceed 15 percent of the established investment, the Administrator thereafter shall have the right, after written notice to the investor of his intention so to do, to acquire, as of the first day of any operating year, such project in consideration of the issuance and delivery to the investor of debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year. In any such case the investor shall be obligated to convey to said Administrator title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and, in the event that the investor fails so to do, said Administrator may, at his option, terminate the insurance contract.

"(b) If in any operating year the aggregate of the differences between the operating expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and the gross income for the preceding operating years, less the aggregate of any deficits in such operating expenses reimbursed from excess earnings as hereinbefore provided, shall at any time equal or exceed 5 percent of the established investment, the investor shall thereafter have the right, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, to convey to the Administrator, as of the first day of any operating year, title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and to receive from the Administrator debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(c) Any difference, not exceeding $50, between 90 per centum of the outstanding investment for the operating year in which a project is acquired by the Administrator pursuant to this section and the total face value of the debentures to be issued and delivered to the investor pursuant to this section shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Administrator to the investor from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund.

"(d) Upon the acquisition of a project by the Administrator pursuant to this section, the insurance contract shall terminate.

"(e) Debentures issued under this title to any investor shall be executed in the name of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Administrator, by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. Such debentures shall be dated as of the first day of the operating year in which the project for which such debentures were issued was acquired by the Administrator, shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the insurance contract was executed, but not to exceed 2¾ per centum per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature on the 1st day of July in such calendar year or years, not later than the fortieth following the date of the issuance thereof, as shall be determined by the Administrator and stated on the face of such debentures.

"(f) Such debentures shall be in such form and in such denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and may include such provisions for redemption as shall be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be issued in either coupon or registered form.

"(g) Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, shall be payable out of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, which shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed, as to both the principal thereof and the interest thereon, by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the Housing Investment Insurance Fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or the interest on any debentures so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon, to the extent of the amount so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real and other property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power, for the protection of the housing investment insurance fund, to pay out of said fund all expenses or charges in connection with, and to deal with, complete, reconstruct, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts for the management of, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash or credit or lease in his discretion, in whole or in part, any project acquired pursuant to this title; and, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator shall also have power to pursue to final collection by way of compromise or otherwise all claims acquired by, or assigned or transferred to, him in connection with the acquisition or disposal of any project pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract for hazard insurance, or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of any project acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such purchase or contract does not exceed $1,000.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 709. The investor, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, may terminate, as of the close of any operating year, any insurance contract made pursuant to this title. The Administrator shall prescribe the events and conditions under which said Administrator shall have the option to terminate any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, and the events and conditions under which said Administrator may reinstate any insurance contract terminated pursuant to this section or section 708 (a). If any insurance contract is terminated pursuant to this section, the Administrator may require the investor to pay an adjusted premium charge in such amount as the Administrator determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges which such investor otherwise would have been required to pay if such insurance contract had not been so terminated.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 710. There is hereby created a housing investment insurance fund which shall be used by the Administrator as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. For this purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Administrator such funds as the Administrator shall deem necessary, but not to exceed $10,000,000, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, inspection and other fees, service charges, and any other income received by the Administrator under this title, together with all earnings on the assets of such housing investment insurance fund, shall be credited to said fund. All payments made pursuant to claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, cash adjustments, the principal of and interest on debentures issued under this title, expenses incurred in connection with or as a consequence of the acquisition and disposal of projects acquired under this title, and all administrative expenses in connection with this title, shall be paid from said fund. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all approved claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, and, in the event said fund fails to make any such payment when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the investor the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Moneys in the housing investment insurance fund not needed for current operations under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of said fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed by, the United States. The Administrator may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under this title. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 711. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Administrator under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 712. The Administrator may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title, including, without limiting the foregoing, rules and regulations relating to the maintenance by the investor or books, records, and accounts with respect to the project and the examination of such books, records, and accounts by representatives of the Administrator; the submission of financial and operating statements and the approval thereof; the submission of claims for payments under insurance contracts, the proof of the validity of such claims, and the payment or disallowance thereof; the increase of the established investment if the investor shall make capital improvements or additions to the project; the decrease of the established investment if the investor shall sell part of the project; and the reduction of the outstanding investment for the appropriate operating year or operating years pending the restoration of dwelling or nondwelling facilities damaged by fire or other casualty. With respect to any investor which is subject to supervision or regulation by a State banking, insurance, or other State department or agency, the Administrator may, in carrying out any of his supervisory and regulatory functions with respect to projects insured under this title, utilize, contract with, and act through, such department or agency and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 713. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) 'Investor' shall mean (1) any natural person; (2) any group of not more than 10 natural persons; (3) any corporation, company, association, trust, or other legal entity; or (4) any combination of 2 or more corporations, companies, associations, trusts, or other legal entities, having all the powers necessary to comply with the requirements of this title, which the Administrator (i) shall find to be qualified by business experience and facilities, to afford assurance of the necessary continuity of long-term investment, and to have available the necessary capital required for long-term investment in the project, and (ii) shall approve as eligible for insurance under this title.

"(b) 'Project' shall mean a project (including all property, real and personal, contracts, rights, and choses in action acquired, owned, or held by the investor in connection therewith) or an investor designed and used primarily for the purpose of providing dwellings the occupancy of which is permitted by the investor in consideration of agreed charges: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting the inclusion in a project of such stores, offices, or other commercial facilities, recreational or community facilities, or other nondwelling facilities as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or desirable appurtenances to such project.

"(c) 'Estimated investment' shall mean the estimated cost of the development of the project, as stated in the application submitted to the Administrator for insurance under this title.

"(d) 'Established investment' shall mean the amount of the reasonable costs, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, carrying out all works and undertakings for the development of a project and shall include the premium charge for the first operating year and the cost of all necessary surveys, plans, and specifications, architectural, engineering, or other special services, land acquisition, site preparation, construction, and equipment; a reasonable return on the funds of the investor paid out in course of the development of the project, up to and including the initial occupancy date; necessary expenses in connection with the initial occupancy of the project; and the cost of such other items as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the development of the project, (1) less the amount by which the rents and

revenues derived from the project up to and including the initial occupancy date exceeded the reasonable and proper expenses, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, operating and maintaining said project up to and including the initial occupancy date, or (2) plus the amount by which such expenses exceeded such rents and revenues, as the case may be.

"(e) 'Physical completion date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which the Administrator determines that the construction of the project is substantially completed and substantially all of the dwellings therein are available for occupancy.

"(f) 'Initial occupancy date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which 90 percent in number of the dwellings in the project on the physical completion date shall have been occupied, but shall in no event be later than the last day of the sixth calendar month next following the physical completion date.

"(g) 'Operating year' shall mean the period of 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date and each succeeding period of 12 consecutive calendar months, and the period of the first 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date shall be the first operating year.

"(h) 'Gross income' for any operating year shall mean the total rents and revenues and other income derived from, or in connection with, the project during such operating year.

"(i) 'Operating expenses' for any operating year shall mean the amounts, as approved by the Administrator, necessary to meet the reasonable and proper costs of, and to provide for, operating and maintaining the project, and to establish and maintain reasonable and proper reserves for repairs, maintenance, and replacements, and other necessary reserves during such operating year, and shall include necessary expenses for real-estate taxes, special assessments, premium charges made pursuant to this title, administrative expenses, the annual rental under any lease pursuant to which the real property comprising the site of the project is held by the investor, and insurance charges, together with such other expenses as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the project, but shall not include income taxes.

"(j) 'Net income' for any operating year shall mean gross income remaining after the payment of the operating expenses.

"(k) 'Minimum annual amortization charge' shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment, except that, in the case of a project where the real property comprising the site thereof is held by the investor under a lease, if (notwithstanding the proviso of section 703 (a) hereof) the gross income for any operating year shall be less than the amount required to pay the operating expenses (including the annual rental under such lease), the minimum annual amortization charge for such operating year shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment plus the amount of the annual rental under such lease to the extent that the same is not paid from the gross income.

"(l) 'Annual return' for any operating year shall mean the net income remaining after the payment of the minimum annual amortization charge.

"(m) 'Insured annual return' shall have the meaning ascribed to it in section 701 hereof.

"(n) 'Minimum annual return' for any operating year shall mean an amount equal to 3½ percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(o) 'Excess earnings' for any operating year shall mean the net income derived from a project in excess of the minimum annual amortization charge and the minimum annual return.

"(p) 'Outstanding investment' for any operating year shall mean the established investment, less an amount equal to (1) the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge for each preceding operating year, plus (2) the aggregate of the excess earnings, if any, during each preceding operating year applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization in accordance with the provisions of section 705 hereof."

SEC. 403. Sections 1 and 5 of the National Housing Act, as amended, are hereby amended by striking out "titles II, III, and VI" wherever they appear in said sections and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, VI, and VII."

TITLE V—SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY TO AID HOUSING COST REDUCTIONS

SEC. 501. In extending financial assistance under this title, the Administrator shall give consideration to the extent to which the appropriate local public bodies have undertaken a positive program of encouraging housing cost reductions through the adoption, improvement, and modernization of building and other local codes and regulations so as to permit the use of appropriate new materials, techniques, and methods in land and residential planning, design, and construction, the increase of efficiency in residential construction, and the elimination of restrictive practices which unnecessarily increase housing costs.

LOANS

SEC. 502. (a) To assist local communities in eliminating their slums and blighted areas and in providing maximum opportunity for the redevelopment of project areas by private enterprise, the Administrator may make temporary and definitive loans to local public agencies for the undertaking of projects for the assembly, clearance, preparation, and sale and lease of land for redevelopment. Such loans (outstanding at any one time) shall be in such amounts not exceeding the expenditures made by the local public agency as part of gross project cost, bear interest at such rate (not less than the applicable going Federal rate), be secured in such manner, and be repaid within such period (not exceeding forty-five years from the date of the notes or bonds evidencing the loans), as may be deemed advisable by the Administrator. Such loans may be made subject to the condition that, if at any time or for any period during the life of the loan contract, the local public agency can obtain loan funds from sources other than the Federal Government at an interest rate lower than provided in the loan contract, it may do so with the consent of the Administrator at such time and for such period without waiving or surrendering any rights to loan funds under the contract for the remainder of the life of such contract, and, in any such case, the Administrator is authorized to consent to a pledge by the local public agency of the loan contract, and any or all of its rights thereunder, as security for the repayment of the loan funds so obtained from other sources.

(b) To obtain funds for loans under this title, the Administrator may, on and after the 1st day of July 1948, issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, in an amount not to exceed $10,000,000, which limit on such outstanding amount shall be increased by $200,000,000 on the 1st day of July 1949, and by further amounts of $200,000,000 on the 1st day of July in each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, respectively.

(c) Notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator under this title shall be in such forms and denominations, have such maturities, and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Administrator issued under this title and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such notes and other obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

(d) Obligations, including interest thereon, issued by local public agencies for projects undertaken pursuant to this title, and the income derived by such agencies from such projects, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States.

CAPITAL GRANTS

SEC. 503. (a) The Administrator may make capital grants to local public agencies to enable such agencies to make land in project areas available for redevelopment at its fair value for the uses specified in the redevelopment plans. The aggregate of such capital grants with respect to all the projects of a local public agency which are assisted under this title shall not exceed two-thirds of the aggregate of the net project cost, and the capital grants with respect to any individual project shall not exceed the difference between the net project cost and the local grants-in-aid required with respect to the project pursuant to section 504.

(b) The Administrator may, on and after the 1st day of July 1948, contract to make capital grants with respect to projects to be assisted pursuant to this title aggregating not more than $100,000,000, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $100,000,000 on the 1st day of July in each of the years 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively. Such contracts for capital grant shall be made subject to the condition that no funds shall be disbursed by the local public agency prior to July 1, 1949, in payment for the purchase of land in connection with the project being assisted under the contract. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all capital grants contracted for under this title, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to provide for such payments.

REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCAL GRANTS-IN-AID

SEC. 504. Every contract for capital grant under this title shall require local grants-in-aid in connection with the project involved which, together with the local grants-in-aid to be provided in connection with all other projects of the local public agency on which such contracts have theretofore been made, will be at least equal to one-third of the aggregate net project costs involved (it being the purpose of this provision and section 503 to limit the aggregate of the capital grants made by the Administrator with respect to all the projects of a local public agency which are assisted under this title to an amount not exceeding

two-thirds of the difference between the aggregate of the gross project costs of all such projects and the aggregate of the total sales prices and capital values referred to in section 510 (f) of land in such projects).

LOCAL DETERMINATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

SEC. 505. Contracts for financial aid shall be made only with a duly authorized local public agency and shall require that—

(1) the redevelopment plan for the project area be approved by the governing body of the locality in which the project is situated, and that such approval include findings by the governing body that (i) the financial aid to be provided in the contract is necessary to enable the land in the project area to be redeveloped in accordance with the redevelopment plan; (ii) the redevelopment plans for the redevelopment areas in the locality will afford maximum opportunity, consistent with the sound needs of the locality as a whole, for the redevelopment of such areas by private enterprise; and (iii) the redevelopment plan conforms to a general plan for the development of the locality as a whole;

(2) when land acquired or held by the local public agency in connection with the project is sold or leased, the purchasers or lessees shall be obligated (i) to devote such land to the uses specified in the redevelopment plan for the project area; (ii) to begin the building of their improvements on such land within a reasonable time; and (iii) to comply with such other conditions as the Administrator finds are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title;

(3) there be a feasible method for the temporary relocation of families displaced from the project area, and that there are available or are being provided, in the project area or in other areas not less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families displaced from the project area, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of such displaced families: *Provided*, That, in view of the existing acute housing shortage, each such contract shall further provide that there shall be no demolition of residential structures in connection with the project assisted under the contract prior to July 1, 1950, if in the opinion of the local governing body such demolition would result in undue hardship for the occupants of the structures.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 506. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator, notwithstanding any other law, shall—

(1) appoint a Director of Urban Redevelopment to administer under his general supervision the provisions of this title;

(2) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended as of the date of enactment of this act;

(3) maintain an integral set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended as of the date of enactment of this act, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That such financial transactions of the Administrator as the making of loans and capital grants and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government;

(4) make an annual report to the President, for transmission to the Congress, for each fiscal year, ending on June 30, to be transmitted not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which such report is made.

(b) Funds made available to the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be deposited in a checking account or accounts with the Treasurer of the United States. Receipts and assets obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this title shall be available for any of the purposes of this title, and all funds available for carrying out the functions of the Administrator under this title (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administrator in connection with the performance of such functions.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(1) sue and be sued;

(2) foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any project or part thereof in connection with which he has made a loan or capital grant pursuant to this title. In the event of any such acquisition, the Administrator may complete, administer, dispose of, and otherwise deal with, such project or part thereof: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local law of the inhabitants on such property;

(3) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any real property so acquired and owned;

(4) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix;

(5) obtain insurance against loss in connection with property and other assets held;

(6) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, amount of capital grant, or any other term, of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this title;

(7) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this title such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this title will be achieved. No provision of this title shall be construed or administered to permit speculation in land holding.

(d) Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any contract for services or supplies on account of any property acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such contract does not exceed $1,000.

SEC. 507. If the land for a low-rent housing project assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is made available from a project assisted under this title, payment equal to the fair value of the land for the uses specified in accordance with the redevelopment plan shall be made therefor by the public housing agency undertaking the housing project, and such amount shall be included as part of the development cost of the low-rent housing project.

SEC. 508. The President may at any time, in his discretion, transfer to the Administrator any right, title, or interest held by the Federal Government or any department or agency thereof in any land (including buildings thereon) which is surplus to the needs of the Government and which a local public agency certifies will be within the area of a project being planned by it. When such land is sold to the local public agency by the Administrator, it may be sold at a price equal to its fair value for the uses specified in accordance with the redevelopment plan: *Provided*, That the proceeds from such sale shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

PROTECTION OF LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 509. In order to protect labor standards—

(1) any contract for financial aid pursuant to this title shall contain a provision requiring that the wages or fees prevailing in the locality, as determined or adopted (subsequent to a determination under applicable State or local law) by the Secretary of Labor, shall be paid by any contractor engaged on the project involved; and the Administrator may require certification as to compliance with the provisions of this paragraph prior to making any payment under such contract;

(2) the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the act of June 13, 1934 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 40, secs. 276b and 276c), shall apply to any project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title;

(3) any contractor engaged on any project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title shall report quarterly to the Secretary of Labor, and shall cause all subcontractors to report in like manner, within 15 days after the close of each quarter and on forms to be furnished by the United States Department of Labor, as to the number of persons on their respective pay rolls on the particular project, the aggregate amount of such pay rolls, the total man-hours worked, and itemized expenditures for materials. Any such contractor shall furnish to the Department of Labor the names and addresses of all subcontractors on the work at the earliest date practicable.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 510. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

(a) "Redevelopment area" means an area within which a project area is located and of such extent and location that the total area is appropriate for development or redevelopment.

(b) "Redevelopment plan" means a plan, as it exists from time to time, for the development or redevelopment of a redevelopment or project area, which plan shall be sufficiently complete (1) to indicate its relationship to definite local objectives as to appropriate land uses and improved traffic, public transportation, public utilities, recreational and community facilities, and other public improvements, and (2) to indicate proposed land uses and building requirements in the project area: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall take such steps as he deems necessary to assure consistency between the redevelopment plan and any highways or other public improvements in the locality receiving financial assistance from the Federal Works Agency.

(c) "Project" may include (1) acquisition of land within (i) a slum area or other deteriorated or deteriorating area which is predominantly residential in character, or (ii) any other area which is to be developed or redeveloped for predominantly residential uses and which prior to such development or redevelopment constitutes a deteriorated or deteriorating area or open urban land which because of obsolete platting or otherwise impairs the sound growth of the community or open suburban land essential for sound community growth; (2) demolition and removal of buildings and improvements; (3)

installation, construction, or reconstruction of streets, utilities, and other site improvements essential to the preparation of sites for uses in accordance with the redevelopment plan; and (4) making the land available for development or redevelopment by private enterprise or public agencies (including sale, initial leasing, or retention by the local public agency itself) at its fair value for uses in accordance with the redevelopment plan. For the purposes of this title, the term "project" shall not include the construction of any of the buildings contemplated by the redevelopment plan, and the term "redevelop" and derivatives thereof shall mean develop as well as redevelop.

(d) "Local grants-in-aid" shall mean assistance by a State, municipality, or other public body, or any other entity, in the form of (1) cash grants; (2) donations, at their cash value, of land, demolition or removal work, or site improvements in the project area; and (3) the cost or cash value of the provision by a muncipality or other public body of parks, playgrounds, and public buildings or facilities (other than low-rent public housing) which are primarily of direct benefit to the project and which are necessary to serve or support the new uses of land in the project area in accordance with the redevelopment plan.

(e) "Gross project cost" shall comprise (1) the amount of the expenditures by the local public agency with respect to any and all undertakings necessary to carry out the project (including the payment of carrying charges, but not beyond the point where the project is completed), and (2) such local grants-in-aid as are furnished in forms other than cash.

(f) "Net project cost" shall mean the difference between the gross project cost and the aggregate of (1) the total sales prices of all land sold, and (2) the total capital values (i) imputed, on a basis approved by the Administrator, to all land leased, and (ii) used as a basis for determining the amounts to be transferred to the project from other funds of the local public agency to compensate for any land retained by it for use in accordance with the redevelopment plan

(g) "Going Federal rate" means the annual rates of interest (or, if there shall be two or more such rates of interest, the lowest thereof) specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 20 years or more, determined at the date the contract for loan is made. Any contract for loan made may be revised or superseded by a later contract, so that the going Federal rate, on the basis of which the interest rate on the loan is fixed, shall mean the going Federal rate, as herein defined, on the date that such contract is revised or superseded by such later contract.

(h) "Local public agency" means any State, county, municipality, or other governmental entity or public body which is authorized to undertake the project for which assistance is sought. "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States.

(i) "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

TITLE VI—LOW-RENT HOUSING

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES AND DETERMINATIONS; TENANCY ONLY BY LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

SEC. 601. (a) The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following additional subsections to section 15:

"(7) In recognition that there should be local determination of the need for public low-rent housing, the Authority shall not make any contract for financial assistance pursuant to this act with respect to any urban low-rent housing initiated after July 1, 1948—

"(a) unless the public housing agency has submitted an analysis of the local housing market demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Authority (i) that there is a need for such low-rent housing which cannot be met by private enterprise; and (ii) that a gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing (through new construction and existing structures) a substantial supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing toward meeting the need of an adequate volume thereof; and

"(b) unless the governing body of the locality involved has approved the provision of such low-rent housing, and the contract for financial assistance provides that the Authority shall approve the maximum income limits to be fixed with respect to the admission and continued occupany of families in such housing, and that such maximum income limits as so approved shall at no time be changed without the prior approval of the Authority.

"(8) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for urban low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall provide that a duly authorized official of the public housing agency involved shall make periodic written statements to the Authority that an investigation has been made of each family admitted to the low-rent housing project involved during the period covered thereby, and that, on the basis of the report of said investigation, he has found that each such family at the time of its admission (a) lived in an unsafe, insanitary, or overcrowded dwelling or had been displaced by a slum-clearance or land assembly and clearance project or by off-site elimination in compliance wtih the equivalent elimination requirement hereof, and (b) had a net family income not exceeding the maximum income limits theretofore fixed by the public housing agency (and approved by the Authority) for admission of families of low income to such housing: *Provided*, That the requirement in (a) shall not be applicable in the case of the family of any veteran or serviceman (or of any deceased veteran or serviceman) where application for admission to such housing is made not later than 5 years after July 1, 1948.

"(9) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for urban low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall require that the public housing agency make periodic reexaminations of the net incomes of families living in the low-rent housing project involved; and if it is found, upon such reexamination, that the net incomes of any families have increased beyond the maximum income limits theretofore fixed by the public housing agency (and approved by the Authority) for continued occupany in such housing, such families shall be required to move from the project.

"(10) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for urban low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall require that, as between families of equally low income otherwise eligible for admission to such housing, the public housing agency shall not discriminate against any such families because their incomes are derived, in whole or in part, from public assistance. In selecting tenants the question of greatest need shall be given due consideration."

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law except provisions of law hereafter enacted expressly in limitation hereof, the Public Housing Administration, and any State or local public agency administering a low-rent housing project assisted pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937 or title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it under said acts where such action is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such housing accommodations are administered.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

SEC. 602. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) By adding the following new subsection to section 10:

"(g) Every contract made pursuant to this act for annual contributions for low-rent housing projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall require that the public housing agency in selecting tenants shall give preference, as among applicants eligible for occupancy of the dwelling and at the rent involved, to families of veterans and servicemen (including families of deceased veterans or servicemen), where application for admission to such housing is made not later than 5 years after July 1, 1948. As among applicants entitled to the preference provided in this subsection, first preference shall be given to families of disabled veterans whose disability is service-connected."

(b) By adding the following new subsection to section 2:

"(14) The term 'veteran' shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable. The term 'serviceman' shall mean a person in the active military or naval service of the United States who has served therein on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947."

(c) By adding the following sentence at the end of section 2 (1): "In determining net income for the purposes of tenant eligibility, the Authority is authorized, where it finds such action equitable and in the public interest, to exclude amounts or portions thereof paid by the United States Government as pension or other compensation for disability or death occurring in connection with military service."

COST LIMITS

SEC. 603. The first sentence of section 15 (5) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "No contract for any loan, annual contribution, or capital grant made pursuant to this act shall be entered into by the Authority with respect to any low-rent housing project completed after January 1, 1948, having a cost for construction and equipment of more than $1,250 per room (excluding land, demolition, and nondwelling facilities); except that in any city or metropolitan district, as defined by the Bureau of the Census, the population of which exceeds 500,000 and in Alaska, any such contract may be entered into with respect to a project having a cost of construction and equipment of not to exceed $1,500 per room ($2,200 per room in the case of Alaska), excluding land, demolition, and nondwelling facilities, if in the opinion of the Authority such higher cost per room is justified by reason of higher costs of labor and materials and other construction costs: *Provided*, That if the Administrator with respect to any contract for financial assistance made before December 31, 1951, finds that in the geographical area of the low-rent housing project involved (i) it is not feasible under the aforesaid cost limitations to construct the project without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability, and (ii) there is an acute need for such hous-

ing, he may prescribe in such contract cost limitations which may exceed by not more than $250 per room the limitations that would otherwise be applicable to such project hereunder."

PRIVATE FINANCING

SEC. 604. In order to stimulate increasing private financing of low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects, the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) The last proviso of subsection (b) of section 10 is repealed, and subsection (f) of said section is amended to read as follows: "Payments under annual contributions contracts shall be pledged as security for any loans obtained by a public housing agency to assist the development or acquisition of the housing project to which the annual contributions relate."

(2) The following is added after section 21:

"PRIVATE FINANCING

"SEC. 22. To facilitate the enlistment of private capital through the sale by public housing agencies of their bonds and other obligations to others than the Authority, in financing low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects, and to maintain the low-rent character of housing projects—

"(a) Every contract for annual contributions (including contracts which amend or supersede contracts previously made) may provide that—

"(1) upon the occurrence of a substantial default in respect of the covenants or conditions to which the public housing agency is subject (as such substantial default shall be defined in such contract), the public housing agency shall be obligated to convey to the Authority the project, as then constituted, to which such contract relates;

"(2) the Authority shall agree to reconvey the project, as constituted at the time of reconveyance, to the public housing agency by which it shall have been so conveyed or to its successor (if such public housing agency or a successor exists) upon such terms as shall be prescribed in such contract and as soon as practicable: (i) after the Authority shall be satisfied that all defaults with respect to the project have been cured, and that the project will, in order to fulfill the purposes of this act, thereafter be operated in accordance with the terms of such contract; or (ii) after the termination of the obligation to make annual contributions available unless there are any obligations or covenants of the public housing agency to the Authority which are then in default. Any prior conveyances and reconveyances shall not exhaust the right to require a conveyance of the project to the Authority pursuant to subparagraph (1), upon the subsequent occurrence of a substantial default.

"(b) Whenever such contract for annual contributions shall include provisions which the Authority, in said contract, determines are in accordance with subsection (a) hereof, and the annual contributions, pursuant to such contract, have been pledged by the public housing agency as security for the payment of the principal and interest on any of its obligations, the Authority (notwithstanding any other provisions of this act) shall continue to make annual contributions available for the project so long as any of such obligations remain outstanding and may covenant in such contract that in any event such annual contributions shall in each year be at least equal to an amount which, together with such income or other funds as are actually available from the project for the purpose at the time such annual contribution is made, will suffice for the payment of all installments, falling due within the next succeeding 12 months, of principal and interest on the obligations for which the annual contributions provided for in the contract shall have been pledged as security: *Provided*, That such annual contributions shall not be in excess of the maximum sum determined pursuant to the provisions of this act; and in no case shall such annual contributions be in excess of the maximum sum specified in the contract involved, nor for longer than the remainder of the maximum period fixed by the contract.";

(3) Section 2 (10) is amended to read as follows:

"(10) The term 'going Federal rate' means the annual rate of interest (or, if there shall be two or more such rates of interest, the lowest thereof) specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 20 years or more, determined, in the case of loans or annual contributions, respectively, at the date of Presidential approval of the contract pursuant to which such loans or contributions are made: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this act, the going Federal rate shall be deemed to be not less than 2½ percent";

(4) Section 9 is amended by striking the period at the end of said section and adding a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That in the case of projects initiated after July 1, 1948, loans shall not be made for a period exceeding 40 years from the date of the bonds evidencing the loan: *And provided further*, That, in the case of such projects or any other projects with respect to which the contracts (including contracts which amend or supersede contracts previously made) provide for loans for a period not exceeding 40 years from the date of the bonds evidencing the loan and for annual contributions for a period not exceeding 40 years from the date the first annual contribution for the project is paid, such loans shall bear interest at a rate not less than the applicable going Federal rate.";

(5) Section 10 (c) is amended by striking the period at the end of the last sentence and adding a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That, in the case of projects initiated after July 1, 1948, contracts for annual contributions shall not be made for a period exceeding 40 years from the date the first annual contribution for the project is paid: *And provided further*, That in the case of such projects or any other projects with respect to which the contracts for annual contributions (including contracts which amend or supersede contracts previously made) provide for annual contributions for a period not exceeding 40 years from the date the first annual contribution for the project is paid, the fixed contribution may exceed the amount provided in the first proviso of subsection (b) of this section by 1 percent of development or acquisition costs.";

(6) The first sentence of section 10 (c) is amended to read as follows: "Every contract for annual contributions shall provide that whenever in any year the receipts of a public housing agency in connection with a low-rent housing project exceed its expenditures (including debt service, administration, maintenance, establishment of reserves, and other costs and charges), an amount equal to such excess shall be applied, or set aside for application, to purposes which will effect a reduction in the amount of subsequent annual contributions.";

(7) Section 14 is amended by inserting the following after the first sentence: "When the Authority finds that it would promote economy or be in the financial interest of the Federal Government, any contract heretofore or hereafter made for annual contributions, loans, or both, may, with Presidential approval, be revised or superseded by a contract of the Authority so that the going Federal rate on the basis of which such annual contributions or interest rate on any loans, or both, respectively, are fixed shall mean the going Federal rate, as herein defined, on the date of Presidential approval of such revised or superseding contract: *Provided*, That contracts may not be revised or superseded in a manner which would impair the rights of the holders of any outstanding obligations of the public housing agency involved for which annual contributions have been pledged.";

(8) Section 20 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. The Authority may issue and have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount not to exceed $800,000,000. Such notes or other obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Authority with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the notes or other obligations by the Authority. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes or other obligations of the Authority issued hereunder and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of the securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.";

(9) Section 2 (5) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) The term 'development' means any or all undertakings necessary for planning, land acquisition, demolition, construction, or equipment, in connection with a low-rent housing or slum-clearance project. The term 'development cost' shall comprise the costs incurred by a public housing agency in such undertakings and their necessary financing (including the payment of carrying charges, but not beyond the point of physical completion), and in otherwise carrying out the development of such project. Construction activity in connection with a low-rent housing project may be confined to the reconstruction, remodeling, or repair of existing buildings."

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 605. Section 10 (e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting the following after the first sentence thereof: "with respect to projects to be assisted pursuant to this act, the Authority is authorized, in addition to the amount heretofore authorized, to enter into contracts, on and after the 1st day of July 1948, which provide for annual contributions aggregating not more than $32,000,000 per annum, which limit shall be increased by further amounts of $32,000,000 on the 1st day of July in each of the years 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively: *Provided*, That the contracts for annual contributions with respect to projects initiated after July 1, 1948, shall not provide for the development of more than 500,000 dwelling units without further authorization from the Congress."

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 606. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By adding to section 6 the following new subsection:

"(e) With respect to all projects under title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, references

therein to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall include all amendments to said act now or hereafter adopted.";

(2) By deleting from the proviso in section 10 (a) and in section 11 (a) the following: ", unless the project includes the elimination" and substituting the following: "unless, subsequent to the initiation of the project and within a period specified by the Authority, there has been or will be elimination";

(3) By amending the second sentence of subsection 13 (a) to read as follows: "The Authority may bid for and purchase at any foreclosure by any party or at any other sale, or acquire (pursuant to section 22 or otherwise) any project which it previously owned or in connection with which it has made a loan, annual contribution, or capital grant; and in such event the Authority may complete, administer, dispose of, and otherwise deal with, such projects or parts thereof, subject, however, to the limitations elsewhere in this act governing their administration and disposition.";

(4) By renumbering sections 22 to 30, inclusive, so that they become sections 23 to 31, inclusive.

SEC. 607. Any low-rent or veterans' housing project undertaken or constructed under a program of a State or any political subdivision thereof and with the express purpose indicated in the State legislation of converting the project to a project with Federal assistance (if and when such Federal assistance becomes available), shall be approved as a low-rent housing project under the terms of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, if (a) a contract for State financial assistance for such project was entered into prior to January 1, 1949, (b) the project is or can become eligible for assistance by the Public Housing Administration in the form of loans and annual contributions under the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and (c) the State or the public housing agency operating the project in the State makes application to the Public Housing Administration for Federal assistance for the project under the terms of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided*, That loans made by the Public Housing Administration for the purpose of so converting the project to a project with Federal assistance shall be deemed, for the purposes of the provisions of section 9 and other sections of the United States Housing Act of 1937, to be loans to assist the development of the project.

TITLE VII—FARM HOUSING

ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

SEC. 701. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized, through such agency officers and employees as he may determine and subject to the terms and conditions of this title, to extend financial assistance to owners of farms in the United States and in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and in Puerto Rico, to enable them to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace dwellings and facilities incident to family living on their farms to provide them, their tenants, lessees, sharecroppers, and laborers with decent, safe, and sanitary living conditions as specified in this title.

(b) For the purposes of this title and the acts amended hereby, the term "farm" shall mean a parcel or parcels of land operated as a single unit which is used for the production of one or more agricultural commodities and which customarily produces such commodities for sale and for home use of a gross annual value of not less than $400. The Secretary shall promptly determine whether any parcel or parcels of land constitutes a farm for the purposes of this title whenever requested to do so by any interested Federal, State, or local public agency, and his determination shall be conclusive.

(c) In order to be eligible for the assistance authorized by paragraph (a), the applicant must show (1) that he is the owner of a farm which is without a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling and related facilities adequate for himself and his family and necessary resident farm labor, or for the family of the operating tenant, lessee, or sharecropper; (2) that he is without sufficient resources to provide the necessary housing on his own account; and (3) that he is unable to secure the credit necessary for such housing from other sources upon terms and conditions which he could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

LOANS FOR DWELLINGS ON ADEQUATE FARMS

SEC. 702. (a) If the Secretary determines that an applicant is eligible for assistance as provided in section 701 (c) and that the applicant has the ability to repay in full the sum to be loaned, with interest, giving due consideration to the income and earning capacity of the applicant and his family from the farm and other sources, and the maintenance of a reasonable standard of living for the owner and occupant of said farm, a loan may be made by the Secretary to said applicant for a period of not to exceed 33 years from the making of the loan with interest at a rate not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the unpaid balance of principal.

(b) The instruments under which the loan is made and the security given shall—

(1) provide for security upon the applicant's equity in the farm and such additional security or collateral, if any, as may be found necessary by the Secretary reasonably to assure repayment of the indebtedness;

(2) provide for the repayment of principal and interest in accordance with schedules and repayment plans prescribed by the Secretary;

(3) contain the agreement of the borrower that he will, at the request of the Secretary, proceed with diligence to refinance the balance of the indebtedness through cooperative or other responsible private credit sources whenever the Secretary determines, in the light of the borrower's circumstances, including his earning capacity and the income from the farm, that he is able to do so upon reasonable terms and conditions;

(4) be in such form and contain such covenants as the Secretary shall prescribe to secure the payment of the loan with interest, protect the security, and assure that the farm will be maintained in repair and that waste and exhaustion of the farm will be prevented.

LOANS FOR DWELLINGS ON POTENTIALLY ADEQUATE FARMS

SEC. 703. If the Secretary determines (a) that, because of the inadequacy of the income of an eligible applicant from the farm to be improved and from other sources, said applicant may not reasonably be expected to make annual repayments of principal and interest in an amount sufficient to repay the loan in full within the period of time prescribed by the Secretary as authorized in this title; (b) that the income of the applicant may be sufficiently increased within a period of not to exceed 10 years by improvement or enlargement of the farm or an adjustment of the farm practices or methods; and (c) that the applicant has adopted and may reasonably be expected to put into effect a plan of farm improvement, enlargement, or adjusted practices which, in the opinion of the Secretary, will increase the applicant's income from said farm within a period of not to exceed 10 years to the extent that the applicant may be expected thereafter to make annual repayments of principal and interest sufficient to repay the balance of the indebtedness less payments in cash and credits for the contributions to be made by the Secretary as hereinafter provided, the Secretary may make a loan in an amount necessary to provide adequate housing on said farm under the terms and conditions prescribed in section 702. In addition, the Secretary may agree with the borrower to make annual contributions in the form of credits on the borrower's indebtedness in an amount not to exceed the annual installment of interest and 50 percent of the principal payments accruing during any installment year, up to and including the tenth installment year, subject to the conditions that the borrower's income is, in fact, insufficient to enable the borrower to make payments in accordance with the plan or schedule prescribed by the Secretary and that the borrower pursues his plan of farm reorganization and improvement or enlargement with due diligence.

This agreement with respect to credits of principal and interest upon the borrower's indebtedness shall not be assignable nor accrue to the benefit of any third party without the written consent of the Secretary and the Secretary shall have the right, at his option, to cancel the agreement upon the sale of the farm or the execution or creation of any lien thereon subsequent to the lien given to the Secretary, or to refuse to release the lien given to the Secretary except upon payment in cash of the entire original principal plus accrued interest thereon less actual cash payments of principal and interest when the Secretary determines that the release of the lien would permit the benefits of this section to accrue to a person not eligible to receive such benefits.

OTHER SPECIAL LOANS AND GRANTS FOR MINOR IMPROVEMENTS TO FARM HOUSING

SEC. 704. In the event the Secretary determines that an eligible applicant cannot qualify for a loan under the provisions of sections 702 and 703 and that repairs or improvements should be made to a farm dwelling occupied by him or his tenants, lessees, sharecroppers, or laborers, in order to make such dwelling safe and sanitary and remove hazards to the health of the occupant, his family, or the community, the Secretary may make a grant, or a combined loan and grant, to the applicant to cover the cost of improvements or additions, such as repairing roofs, providing toilet facilities, providing a sanitary water supply, supplying screens, or making other similar repairs or improvements. No assistance shall be extended to any one individual under the provisions of this section in the form of a loan or grant or combination thereof in excess of $1,000 for any one unit or dwelling owned by such individual or in excess of $2,000 in the aggregate to any one such individual, and the grant portion with respect to any one unit or dwelling shall not exceed $500. Any portion of the sums advanced to the borrower treated as a loan shall be secured and be repayable in accordance with the principles and conditions set forth in this title. Sums made available by grant may be made subject to the conditions set cut in this title for the protection of the Government with respect to contributions made on loans by the Secretary. In the case of such loan or grant with respect to a dwelling not occupied by the owner of the land, the Secretary may, as a condition precedent to the grant, require that the landowner enter into such stipulations and agreements with the Secretary and the occupants of the dwelling as will make it possible for the occupants to obtain the full benefits of the grant.

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND RESEARCH

SEC. 705. In addition to the financial assistance authorized in sections 701 to 704, inclusive, the Secretary is hereby authorized to furnish to all persons, without charge or at such charges as the Secretary may determine, technical services such as building plans, specifications, construction supervision and inspection, and advice and information regarding rural dwellings and other farm buildings. The Secretary and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator are authorized to cooperate in research and technical studies in the rural-housing field. In furnishing such services and information, the Secretary

may utilize, through the Agricultural Extension Service, the facilities and services of State agencies and educational institutions.

PREFERENCE FOR VETERANS

SEC. 706. As between eligible applicants for assistance under this title, the Secretary shall give preference to veterans (defined for the purposes of this title to mean persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II).

LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES AND COMMITTEES TO ASSIST SECRETARY

SEC. 707. (a) Wherever a local public agency now exists or may be hereafter created which possesses authority to assist low-income persons and families outside of urban areas to obtain decent, safe, and sanitary housing and related facilities, the Secretary is authorized, and after agreement with such agency is directed, to utilize the facilities of such local public agency for the purpose of making the benefits of this title available to the eligible owners or operators situated upon farms (as defined in section 701) lying within the boundaries of said local public agency.

(b) Wherever the facilities of a local public agency are not utilized, the Secretary may utilize the services of any existing committee of farmers operating (pursuant to laws or regulations carried out by the Department of Agriculture) in the county or parish where the farm is located. In any county or parish where the facilities of a local public agency are not utilized and in which no existing satisfactory committee is available, the Secretary is authorized to appoint a committee composed of three persons residing in the county or parish. Each member of such committee shall be allowed compensation at the rate of $5 per day while engaged in the performance of duties under this title and, in addition, shall be allowed such amounts as the Secretary may prescribe for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses. One member of the committee shall be designated by the Secretary as chairman. The Secretary shall prescribe rules governing the procedure of local public agencies and committees utilized pursuant to this section, furnish forms and equipment necessary for the performance of their duties, and authorize and provide for the compensation of such clerical assistance as he deems may be required by any committee.

(c) The local public agency or committee utilized pursuant to this section shall examine applications of persons desiring to obtain the benefits of this title and shall submit recommendations to the Secretary with respect to each application as to whether the applicant is eligible to receive the benefits of this title, whether by reason of his character, ability, and experience, he is likely successfully to carry out undertakings required of him under a loan or grant under this title, and whether the farm with respect to which the application is made is of such character that there is a reasonable likelihood that the making of the loan or grant requested will carry out the purposes of this title. The local public agencies or committees shall also certify to the Secretary their opinions of the reasonable values of the farms. The local authorities and committees shall, in addition, perform such other duties under this title as the Secretary may require.

GENERAL POWERS OF SECRETARY

SEC. 708. (a) The Secretary, for the purposes of this title, shall have the power to determine and prescribe the standards of adequate farm housing, by farms or localities, taking into consideration, among other factors, the type of housing which will provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for the needs of the family using the housing, the type and character of the farming operations to be conducted, and the size and earning capacity of the land.

(b) The Secretary may require any recipient of a loan or grant to agree that the availability of housing constructed or improved with the proceeds of the loan or grant under this title shall not be a justification for directly or indirectly changing the terms or conditions of the lease or occupancy agreement with the occupants of such housing to the latter's disadvantage without the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 709. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary shall have the power to—

(a) make contracts for services and supplies without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, when the aggregate amount involved is less than $300;

(b) enter into subordination, subrogation, or other agreements satisfactory to the Secretary;

(c) compromise claims and obligations arising out of sections 702 to 705, inclusive, of this title and adjust and modify the terms of mortgages, leases, contracts, and agreements entered into as circumstances may require, including the release from personal liability, without payment of further consideration, of—

(1) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants for loans who have agreed to assume the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title; and

(2) borrowers who have transferred their farms to other approved applicants for loans who have agreed to assume that portion of the outstanding indebtedness to the Secretary under this title which is equal to the earning capacity value of the farm at the time of the transfer, and borrowers whose farms have been acquired by the Secretary, in cases where the Secretary determines that the original borrowers have cooperated in good faith with the Secretary, have farmed in a workmanlike manner, used due diligence to maintain the security against loss, and otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to their loans, to the best of their abilities;

(d) collect all claims and obligations arising out of or under any mortgage, lease, contract, or agreement entered into pursuant to this title and, if in his judgment necessary and advisable, to pursue the same to final collection in any court having jurisdiction: *Provided*, That the prosecution and defense of all litigation under this title shall be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General and the legal representation shall be by the United States attorneys for the districts, respectively, in which such litigation may arise and by such other attorney or attorneys as may, under law, be designated by the Attorney General;

(e) bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or other sale or otherwise to acquire the property pledged or mortgaged to secure a loan or other indebtedness owing under this title, to accept title to any property so purchased or acquired, to operate or lease such property for such period as may be necessary or advisable, to protect the interest of the United States therein and to sell or otherwise dispose of the property so purchased or acquired by such terms and for such considerations as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable and to make loans to provide adequate housing for the purchasers of such property;

(f) utilize with respect to indebtedness arising from loans and payments made under this title all the powers and authorities given to him under the act approved December 20, 1944, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes" (58 Stat. 836), as such act now provides or may hereafter be amended;

(g) make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

OBLIGATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 710. The Secretary may issue notes and other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury in such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to make loans under this title but not in excess of $25,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1948, an additional $50,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1949, an additional $75,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1950, and an additional $100,000,000 on or after the 1st day of July 1951. The notes and other obligations issued by the Secretary shall be secured by the obligations of borrowers and the Secretary's commitments to make contributions under this title and shall be repaid from the payment of principal and interest on the obligations of the borrowers and from funds appropriated hereunder. The notes and other obligations issued by the Secretary shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, and shall be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the notes or obligations by the Secretary. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes and other obligations of the Secretary of Agriculture issued hereunder and for such purpose is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act are extended to include any purchases of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the notes or other obligations acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes or other obligations shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

SEC. 711. In connection with loans made pursuant to section 703, the Secretary is authorized, on or after July 1, 1948, to make commitments for contributions aggregating not more than $500,000 per annum and to make additional commitments on or after July 1 of each of the years 1949, 1950, and 1951 which shall require aggregate contributions of not more than $1,000,000, $1,500,000, and $2,000,000 per annum, respectively.

SEC. 712. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary (a) such sums as may be necessary to permit payments on notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary under section 710 equal to (i) the aggregate of the contributions made by the Secretary in the form of credits on principal sums due on loans made pursuant to section 703 and (ii) the interest due on a similar sum represented by notes or other obligations issued by the Secretary; (b) an additional $1,000,000 for grants made pursuant to section 704 on or after July 1, 1948, which amount shall be increased by further amounts of $2,500,000, $4,000,000, and $5,000,000, on July 1 of each of the years 1949, 1950, and 1951, respectively; and (c) such further sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of sections 701 and 712, inclusive, of this title.

TITLE VIII—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. (a) Effective upon the date of enactment of this act, the Housing and Home

Finance Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $16,500 per annum, and the members of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner shall each receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

(b) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "Federal Housing Administration;" immediately after the semicolon which follows "United States Housing Corporation": *Provided*, That, as to the Federal Housing Administration, the audit required by section 105 of said act shall begin with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, and the exception contained in section 301 (d) of said act shall be construed to refer to the cost of audits contracted for prior to July 1, 1948.

SEC. 802. In carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties—

(a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Administrator may make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out such functions, powers, and duties and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. The Administrator may delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees as he may designate, and may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. The Administrator shall cause to be prepared for the Housing and Home Finance Agency an official seal of such device as he shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

(b) The Public Housing Administration shall sue and be sued only with respect to its functions under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, as amended. The Public Housing Commissioner may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall hereafter be made hereunder, and shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees of the Public Housing Administration as he may designate; and make such rules and regulations as he may find necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. Funds made available for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Administration (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administration.

(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board (which term as used in this section shall also include and refer to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board), the Federal Housing Commissioner, the Public Housing Commissioner, and the National Home Mortgage Corporation, respectively, may, in addition to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities conferred elsewhere in this act—

(1) with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, accept and utilize equipment, facilities, or the services of employees of any State or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization and, in connection with the utilization of such services, may make payment for transportation while away from their homes or regular places of business and per diem in lieu of subsistence en route and at place of such service, in accordance with the provisions of 5 U. S. C. 73b–2;

(2) utilize, contract with, and act through, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, any Federal, State, or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, and any funds available to said officers for carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties shall be available to reimburse any such agency or organization; and, whenever in the judgment of any such officer necessary, he may make advance, progress, or other payments with respect to such contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes;

(3) make expenditures for all necessary expenses, including preparation, mounting, shipping, and installation of exhibits; purchase and exchange of technical apparatus; and such other expenses as may, from time to time, be found necessary in carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase or contract by said officers (or their agencies), respectively, for services or supplies if the amount thereof does not exceed $300: *And provided further*, That funds made available for administrative expenses in carrying out the functions, powers, and duties imposed upon the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (except those imposed pursuant to titles II and V hereof), the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, by or pursuant to law may at their option be consolidated into single administrative expense fund accounts of said officers or agencies for expenditure by them, respectively, in accordance with the provisions hereof.

ACT CONTROLLING

SEC. 803. Insofar as the provisions of any other law are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall be controlling.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 804. Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this act, all powers and authorities conferred by this act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. Notwithstanding any other evidences of the intention of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the controlling intent of Congress that if any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act or its applications to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provisions of this act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 212) to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the President of the United States has called us together in extraordinary session to take measures for stopping the continued advance of inflation. The existence of inflation is no longer denied by anyone. We no longer speak of it as a prospective danger, as did many, even when it was in full activity in the initial stages. With our characteristic American ability to change our mental attitudes at the drop of a hat, we have shifted from thinking of inflation as a prospective danger into the mood of concluding that it has gone so far that a bust is inevitable. We did not take seriously enough the building up of a situation which might more easily have been remedied in its first stages, and we regard as inevitable consequences, which in a later stage, might still perhaps be brought under control by wise, resolute, and difficult decisions and actions.

The President has not only called us into session to consider this grave situation, but has likewise presented an administration bill which he desires that we enact into law. It is our duty to analyze that bill and see if it meets the requirements of practicability and effectiveness.

Before doing so, it is well to make clear to ourselves the structure and mechanism of inflation. The structure of inflation is based upon a large and growing supply of money seeking in the market for a restricted or more slowly growing supply of things to buy. The solutions of the problem therefore seem to lie in bringing the money supply under control, increasing the supply of things which the holders of the money seek to purchase, imposing voluntary restraints on the desire to purchase, or imposing involuntary restraints on the ability to purchase, as by rationing.

When this situation of increased money and restricted supply of things to be purchased, which situation may be called the structure of inflation, arises, there is a distinct and active mechanism by means of which prices are increased. This mechanism is the well-known cost of living, wage, profit, price spiral whose third revolution we are now enduring.

Remedies conceivably lie in the restriction of the money supply and the increase in production of things to be bought. It is likewise conceivable that if voluntary or involuntary brakes are put upon the mechanism of the spiral of inflation, a better opportunity may be given to bring money and goods into balance.

With these thoughts in mind, let us examine the administration bill.

Title I relates to the regulation of consumer credit. Consumer credit is one of the means by which the money supply is increased. As we all realize, a

major part of the money available to the United States consumer, whether for business or personal purposes, is not in the form of paper money or metal coins. It is largely composed of bank deposits generated by the extension of bank credit. One of the elements in this expanded credit and consequent deposits is consumer credit, made up in large measure of charge accounts and installment credit.

At this point I should like to call the attention of Members of this body to the monthly publication Economic Indicators prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by the Council of Economic Advisers and printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Each Member of the Senate receives, or should receive, this publication each month as it is printed. On page 29 are statistics and charts indicating the growth of consumer credit, and particularly the growth of installment credit which has risen since the end of the war from around $2,400,000,000 to $7,000,000,000. This is a substantial increase in the money supply. It is particularly dangerous in that it assigns future income to present purchases. On December 17, 1947, the Senate wisely passed Senate Joint Resolution 157 restoring the authority to the Federal Reserve System to bring consumer credit under control. Most unwisely, in my judgment, the House did not concur in that bill, and in consequence this important and dangerous increment to the money supply has been allowed to go on. This is a responsibility which the Congress must bear rather than the administration.

Title I in the administration bill, S. 2910, which seeks to remedy this condition seems to be well thought out and should have our earnest consideration. It may well be that amendments may be introduced by the Banking and Currency Committee, but I would hope that the committee would report it out to the Senate and that the Senate will repeat its wise course earlier this year and pass it on for a more judicious consideration by the House.

Title II of the administration bill relates to bank reserves. By a mechanism which I assume to be understood in general terms by the Members of this body, the extension of bank credit can be controlled by limiting bank reserves. That authority is vested in the Federal Reserve System. The limits of possible action of this sort have nearly been reached, and the bill proposes to make legal for a period of 2 years still further increases in reserve requirements.

There are many who have felt that by this means alone the money supply could be reduced and inflation arrested. This is true. It is in fact only too true. By drastically curtailing the extension of bank credit, it is possible to reduce the money supply and end an inflation, but it is a matter of extreme difficulty to do this in any measured and controlled way. The relationship between the volume of credit resulting from a given restriction on reserves is not a mathematical relationship. It is a psychological relationship in large measure, and arises through the hopes, fears, ambitions, and recklessness of millions of prospective borrowers, as well as through the medium of the mental reactions of the lenders.

As another way to control reserves, the Federal Reserve System can alter the rediscount rate. The Treasury can likewise affect interest rates by the terms on which it offers its securities for public sale, particularly the short-term paper. It could indubitably arrest the inflation by allowing the long-term bonds to seek a natural level, instead of maintaining them at par through unlimited purchase by the Federal Reserve System. The latter three measures do not require legislation to put them into effect. Of the three, the unpegging of Government bond prices is the most dubious and the most likely to lead to a train of undesired consequences. This brings us as legislators back to the proposal to raise the limits on reserve requirements as the particular responsibility for the consideration of this Congress.

The Banking and Currency Committee has under consideration both the proposal in this bill, which is supported by the present chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and also the earlier proposal for special reserves offered by the then chairman, Mr. Marriner Eccles, to the committee some months ago. Both proposals merit consideration. Either proposal must be administered very carefully if disaster is to be avoided, and by disaster I would mean results unexpectedly sudden or unexpectedly drastic coming from a given degree of reserve control. Mr. President, I may say that, since I prepared these remarks, it appears evident that both Mr. Eccles, the remainder of the Board, and the Secretary of the Treasury have agreed on the administration program.

Testimony so far given before the Banking and Currency Committee seems to indicate that within the administration itself there was formerly a confusion of counsels so that it, until this time, has been unwise to make recommendations as to the control of bank credit. With these confused counsels, it is not strange that the Congress was unable to meet administration desires with regard to bank credit control. We must now, however, take this matter in hand as our own responsibility, and enact legislation for the guidance of the administration in this important field of money supply.

One other point needs careful consideration. It is the considered opinion of the former head of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. Marriner Eccles, that the entire banking system of the country must be brought under these new reserve requirements. If not, he feels assured that the Federal Reserve System itself will be seriously weakened by the handicaps placed on the member banks, as compared with nonmember banks. The present Chairman of the Board of Governors, Mr. Thomas McCabe, testified that he was willing to take that chance. More recent action of the Board of Governors supports the view that new reserve restrictions must apply to nonmember as well as member banks. There are questions of constitutional law involved which are being considered by the Banking and Currency Committees and on which the Houses of Congress will have to pass judgment.

I mentioned earlier the delicacy and danger in entrusting the control of inflation entirely to Government action in the field of supply of bank credit. The delicacy required is great. The danger is great. I can only express my present view with regard to this by saying that I feel confident that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is well aware of the delicacy and the inherent danger and can be depended upon to act cautiously and wisely if the additional authority is given it.

Title III of the administration bill deals with prices and wages. This is the most contentious title in the bill. In view of the break-down of price ceilings and the broad expansion of black markets in the later months of OPA, general opinion will assuredly be lined up against this proposal, although it is, on its face, the obvious way to deal with price increases.

Last fall, as the result of the price hearings, and in the early weeks of the second session of this Congress, I was convinced of the possibility and the wisdom of indirect price control by means of rationing. I do not now believe that that remedy for the high cost of living is practical.

The proposals, which were supported by Mr. JAVITS, of New York, in the House and myself in the Senate, related to the rationing of meat; and so far as I was concerned, these proposals were based on a particular situation which existed at that time, and from which present conditions differ in important respects.

At the time when meat rationing would have been effective we had finished with the second round of wage and price increases. There was a pause in the upward rise of the cost of living, or at least a slowing up of the rise which was in evidence from December through April. Of the factors which contributed to the preceding rise to the then existing higher level and to the subsequent rise, food was by far the most important; and in food, the element of meat and meat products constituted the most uncontrollable factor. It seemed clear at the time that if this uncontrolled element could be brought under some measure of control it might be expected to stabilize for a considerable period the whole cost of living. Could that have been done, it seemed reasonable to expect that organized labor might refrain from initiating the third round of wage increases based on the rising cost of living. With organized labor refraining from further demands, it seemed reasonable to expect that business would refrain from further price increases and might even, in the case of those industries and businesses which were in a good profit position, offer substantial price reductions. This would in turn and in time affect the cost of living in a favorable way and help to stabilize our whole economy. We might perhaps have put an end for an extended period to the whole inflationary process by thus putting brakes on what I have called the machinery of inflation. Could

this have been done, sufficient time would have been granted to attack in an orderly and successful way the fundamental factors of purchasing power and production which were out of line with each other.

The possibility of thus bringing inflation under control appeared the more sure, since important business groups showed a willingness to play their part. In the fall, for instance, the Ford Motor Co. and the International Harvester Co. both made substantial reductions in the price of their products. Some weeks later General Electric announced reductions in the cost of the items of their output which went into consumer use, particularly in the case of electrical household equipment. The largest lumber company in the world, the Weyerhaeuser Co., announced a decrease of 10 percent in the cost of lumber. Business did show a willingness to go along with the program.

Furthermore, William Green, for the American Federation of Labor, in an editorial in the January issue of the American Federationist made certain significant statements. With much else that was sensible, he said:

> Because the practice of tail-chasing gets us nowhere, the American Federation of Labor has urged unions to base demands for wage increases on increases in output. Such union efforts need the cooperation of management and individual managements need the cooperation of others in the industry. All need the cooperation of credit and banking agencies, and these agencies, in turn, need the cooperation of those controlling our fiscal policies and governmental appropriations.
>
> Some representative of a responsible national interest could call together representatives of all functional groups, so that all could have a common understanding and agree upon how to deal jointly with problems of inflation and then accept responsibility for doing their specific shares, including periodic reports on progress. These reports should be reviewed by the national representative group for the purpose of evaluating progress and adjusting the program.
>
> This is the democratic way forward which would strengthen—not weaken—free enterprise.

Thus spoke the President of the American Federation of Labor. There was therefore an encouraging measure of cooperation by industry and by one of the great branches of organized labor. There was no cooperation on the part of the Congress in the part it had to play in giving a measure of stability to the cost of living, on which the whole project for slowing up the machinery of inflation was based. The meat-rationing bills were never reported out of the two committees of the House and Senate to which they were referred. The opportunity was lost. In my judgment, the opportunity does not now exist for accomplishing the same results that might have been accomplished 6 or 8 months ago. The expected and feared third round of inflation is still in progress. There is no visible tapering off on which an arrest of the rise of the cost of living might be based. Furthermore, with the unfortunate experience which the industry leaders in the lowered-price movement suffered, they might not feel justified in supporting the project a second time.

Ford and International Harvester were forced by rising wage and material costs to raise their prices again. Weyerhaeuser met with no response from other members of the great lumber industry who sat cynically by to see how long Weyerhaeuser would stick it out. General Electric was faced with further rising costs of material and labor, which made the continuance of their program impossible.

It may be that the group of conditions which made meat rationing favorable at the time it was proposed will recur at some future time or that other means of price control of a restricted group of foods or commodities may be selected with similar grounds for useful result. In my own judgment, that fortunate combination of circumstances does not now exist. Price control would soon break down because the useful, widespread effects would not meet with the same evidently useful results and the same widespread support of manufacturers, organized labor, and consumers that might have been expected some months ago.

I am frank to say that the wage section of title III puzzles me. Reading it with all the intelligence that I can muster, I cannot make it out a project for wage control at all. It seems to be just another section of the price-control undertaking relating to the conditions under which prices will be permitted to rise in case wage advances have been voluntarily or involuntarily granted. This looks to me very much like an artfully mistitled section of a title III which really relates to price control and price control only. The proposed wage board can disapprove of an unwise wage increase, but it cannot forbid it. All it can do is to say "Tut! tut!" This is unfortunate, since the matter of restraint in wage increases is the nucleus of the problem of the inflationary spiral.

In brief, there is nothing in title III that I would be willing to support on the basis of any information or experience available to me at the present moment.

Perhaps something can be said in favor of title IV—priorities and allocations. The proposals relate, it would seem, more directly to capital goods and the raw materials for them than to the consumer goods which are such an intimate part of the inflationary spiral. The Chief Executive certainly asks for tremendous power over a section of the economy which is of great importance but which is not as vitally concerned as are the consumer-goods industries and consumer-goods materials—like those relating to food, clothing, and shelter. The power asked for is indeed enormous if the word "facility" in this title means what I suppose it to mean—namely, factories, warehouses, and productive machinery.

There is no product or group of products which appear to need allocation and inventory control as much as do raw and semifinished iron and steel. Such pressing needs as freight cars and housing must be supplied. As to housing, there is need for a flow of pig iron to pipe foundries and of steel rod to nail mills which shall balance out with the available supply of other materials and of the labor supply to give a maximum construction of housing units without inflationary effects.

Title V relates to rent control. It was the intent of the Rent Control Act of 1948 gradually but definitely to relinquish this element of the cost of living to the responsible control of State and local governments. This to my mind is a wise and appropriate policy. It is wise because the centralized administration of rent control has resulted in such abnormalities and injustices as to make it doubtful whether proper centralized rent control is at all feasible. It is appropriate because houses, the cost of building and maintaining them, and the rents received for occupying them, are not materials or facilities in interstate trade in which the Federal Government must in the nature of the case enter as the controlling agency. Federal rent control has proved highly unsatisfactory. If the local assumption of responsibility provided for in the present law is not satisfactory, the responsibility for the bad conditions goes right back to the citizens of the State in which the bad conditions exist. In this situation in which interstate relationships do not exist, the citizens of the local community must hold their own government responsible.

Title VI relates to the regulation of commodity exchanges. Here is another controversial question on which I must confess that my own point of view has changed with further study of the problem. I am no longer convinced that speculation can for a long period of time keep a commodity market above its natural level. It may indeed maintain it for a longer than natural period at a high level, in which case it will naturally drop to a deeper and longer-extended low level after the impossible task of maintaining it has been given up. It has to be remembered that the bear influences in the great commodity markets are as active as are the bull operators.

What I am inclined to believe is that there are waves of speculation in which large numbers of amateur speculators become involved, whose operations tend to make the ups and downs of the market more violent than they would otherwise be. If further controls of such markets as the grain exchanges are undertaken, I have become convinced that a part of the objective should be to control the ease of access to speculation on the part of the general public rather than to restrain professional operations. I know that this is not the popular point of view, but it is one which I have come to accept.

It is perhaps appropriate to call attention to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation in its purchases, particularly with relation to the purchases of grain. If this Government body were a private individual or firm, it would lay itself open very strongly to the suspicion that its purchases, in their timing and volume, were made with an eye to the effect of those purchases on the price of the commodity. These interests, unfortunately, may be in reverse from those of the consumer and taxpayer. There seems to have been at times an endeavor to maintain the price of wheat, as an example, to the detriment of the

taxpayer in the bill he has had to pay for relief and to the detriment of the consumer in its effect on his cost of food. If the exchanges are to be controlled, I suggest that investigation should also be made as to controlling the Commodity Credit Corporation.

It is astonishing that the only clear reference to action reducing food costs appears to be this dubious one of curtailing commodity exchange margins. Price supports and production quotas would seem to be due for a thorough analysis and overhauling, from prima facie evidence. In spite of the fact that food, almost completely agricultural in origin, is the most intractable element in the cost of living, the administration bill passes it hastily by. Perhaps it is too hot a subject. Perhaps Republicans as well as Democrats dare not look the problem of food prices in the face. Your speaker's knowledge and experience has lain with industry rather than with agriculture since he ceased farm work as a boy of 16; but he cannot help wondering if we may not be leaving a major source of high living costs unexamined and uncorrected. Should not the House at least recede from its position on the Aiken bill and permit that to come into full effect January 1 of 1949?

I wish to corroborate what might be inferred from the emphasis of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on the price of potatoes and the destruction of potatoes, to say that among my own constituents there is no single situation which makes housewives and their husbands more angry than seeing a load of low-priced potatoes for feed going past the house when they are having to pay prices far larger than any price they ever expected to pay for a bag of potatoes. If I understand the Aiken bill—and I do not claim to understand it from beginning to end, because perhaps that requires a specialist—I am clearly convinced that that bill would remove the abuses which exist in the present price-support policies which have been legislated with regard to potatoes.

So much for the administration bill. Only a small part of it is useful and it cannot be expected to play a major part in the control of inflation. Let us now take a broader view and see what else can be done.

We may well wonder whether we are not misapprehending our present economic situation as being a temporary crisis for which crisis remedies may properly be proposed, when instead of that our inflation is, in fact, a chronic evil which must be expected to be endemic in any condition of long continued high employment and production. This I believe to be true, and I regret to say that with the best thought I have been able to bring to the problem, I have been coming to the conclusion that the fundamental remedies lie only in part within the jurisdiction of Government and that a large burden of the responsibility of control lies with organized labor and with industry.

Can we have full employment without inflation? We can easily see how the full employment, which has now lasted for years, tends toward inflation. We can see that when a worker is confident of getting a new job if he looks for one and decides to quit his old one, he will be quite insistent when he seeks for an increase in his wage rate, whether he makes that demand directly as an individual or through the labor organization to which he belongs. We can also see how, when workers are fully employed and pay rolls reach unprecedented heights, the manufacturer and the merchant, in the face of this unprecedented purchasing power, feel no particular necessity for reducing prices or keeping profits under control. They likewise feel less necessity for resisting wage demands if access to a reservoir of credit is wide open. That many firms have been content with moderate profits is a tribute to their long-range judgment, but this high quality is by no means universal and is not the ruling factor in these inflationary times. Full employment, therefore, is the fertile soil in which thrive and flourish wages, profits, and resulting prices, resulting high cost of living, and a finally resulting demand for still higher wages. This is the mechanism of inflation which we commonly call the inflationary spiral.

It is easy to see how a considerable pool of unemployment, say six or eight million out of our present employment of 60,000,000 would tend to slow down or reverse this inflationary movement. If an employed workman were not sure of another job, he would not be so insistent on higher wages. With a considerable percentage of his potential customers unemployed, the manufacturer or merchant would lack assurance that increased prices would bring increased profits to him instead of a prospective loss. He could not safely raise prices without losing his market.

Shall we, then, reluctantly accept unemployment as a cure for inflation? Or shall we try other ways? Let us examine some of these other ways.

The inflation spiral generates an increasing supply of purchasing power but under the conditions assumed and now existing, that purchasing power meets a stationary or only slowly rising output of goods and services. Remedies, therefore, would seem to lie in decreasing purchasing power or increasing the output of goods and services, or both.

The Government can do something about the supply of purchasing power. It can balance its budget; it can do better than balance its budget, it can accumulate a surplus. This reduces purchasing power. It can use that surplus either to pay off indebtedness or to be held as a Treasury surplus. If the indebtedness paid off is held by the Federal Reserve Banks, the purchasing power remains extinguished. If it is bank held, then there is still an opportunity to reduce the current purchasing power in the market by reducing the volume of outstanding bank credit, which constitutes the major portion of our money supply.

The accumulation of this budgetary surplus can be done by increasing taxation or reducing Government expenditures, or both. Increasing taxation draws money away from those who are taxed and thus prevents them from spending as much. This is anti-inflationary. Another expedient is available, but not as yet tried in this country. We can impose compulsory saving in lieu of increasing taxes. There would then be an opportunity to expand taxpayers' purchasing if deflation gets out of hand. Reduced expenditures mean the elimination of workers from Government jobs and their return to private business. This can result in increased civilian production. This also is anti-inflationary.

There are other methods by which government can reduce purchasing power which we have already considered. It can recover and exercise its powers to control installment buying, though this Congress refused permission to the administration to do so. It can, in connection with the refinancing of the national debt, raise the interest rates for business as a whole, thus cutting down the extension of credit. It would be difficult to do this without lowering Government bonds below par, so that this possibility is one which is not immediately attractive. It can raise reserve requirements for the banking system to a point where the total of outstanding loans is arrested or decreased. In fact, by these and other means, the Government can clearly restrict the available credit to such an extent indeed as to surely end an inflation. Then why not do it?

The answer to this question is quite simple, and I have already stated it. Let me state it again. Doing it is a very delicate operation indeed. The line between overdoing it and underdoing it is difficult to discover. As I have said earlier, the factors involved are largely psychological rather than mathematical. If the means of credit restriction employed show too little result, there is danger that the addition of another increment to credit restriction may result in a definite and disastrous slump, which involves unemployment, underproduction, and real distress. Government can end inflation. There is no question about that. The question is, can it do it safely? About that there is a great deal of question indeed. We are not without experience in this matter. The Government feared inflation in 1937. Early in the year it took measures to prevent it. Inflation was promptly squelched, but so were employment, production, and recovery. The Governors of the Reserve Board, in their sphere of activity, may surely be counted on to proceed with greater caution.

So much for the reduction of purchasing power. This is the less attractive of the two methods anyway. By far the more attractive is some method by which more goods are produced to meet the available purchasing power.

The Government can do something about this. In general, the increase in our standard of living, resulting from higher production per man-hour of our workers, has not been a result of longer hours or harder work on the part of those employees in production and distribution. On the contrary, we work far fewer hours than we did a generation ago, and our work physically is far easier. The higher production and the higher

standard of living have been obtained by better business management, improved and cheaper products, and more productive machinery and methods. The basis of our improvement in output, therefore, largely depends on a heavy and wise investment of profits in the development and manufacture of new products, with new equipment, and by new methods.

To revive this process, which is the long-time and time-tried method of improving the material condition of the inhabitants of this country, is dependent largely on tax policies appropriate to the undertaking. To devise and put into effect these tax policies must be a matter of continued study by the responsible committees of Congress and of willingness by the House and Senate to put them into effect. That willingness will not exist unless a substantial part of the electorate has become convinced of the general social value, and the particular value to them, of profits of industry wisely directed to this social end.

In this connection industry has definite responsibilities. In addition to those for conservative pricing which have already been mentioned, they have to see that profits are wisely used in increasing their productive capacity. It is admittedly difficult to do this, since the great business profits about which we read are in many cases unavailable as actual cash for purchases and investment. Without increase in the physical amount of inventories, of work in process or of accounts receivable, dollar signs against all these items may have very large increases, and those increases would all go to swell the profit side of the profit-and-loss statement. Yet in reality these increases, due to inflation, represent in many cases a necessity for bank borrowing, and do not at all represent funds which can be drawn on either for dividends or for reinvestment, in spite of the fact that they appear on the profit side of the ledger.

It is therefore not going to be easy in all cases to apply what look like excellent profits to this desirable purpose of increasing productive capacity by wise investment.

There is a further complication. Many conservative firms properly take into account the fact that their reserves for depreciation and obsolescence are based on replacement costs of earlier years, which will have to be very materially raised in view of present costs of machinery and equipment. With that in mind, there has been a very understandable tendency to increase depreciation allowances. The unfortunate thing is that the very act of doing this is one of the incentives for price increases where at least price maintenance is highly desirable. The effort to protect the company against inflation, therefore, tends to increase the inflation against which protection is sought. In its own way this action parallels that of the wage earner who seeks by higher wages to compensate for an inflation which his higher wages will only encourage. Would it not be wise for both groups to rely on the wisdom of action which seeks to arrest the spiral rather than to put more pressure behind it?

What can labor do to increase the output of goods? As has been said in connection with industry, the real contribution to increasing the standard of living has been made by industry itself in improved management, equipment, and product. Is there anything that labor, organized and unorganized, can do? There is something that the workers can do.

With full employment and with our current equipment and business organization, we have reached the limit of production on the basis of the 40-hour week. This is the rock bottom on which the whole machinery of inflation is founded. With that limitation on output, nothing that is done in the way of increasing incomes will do more than increase prices, except as wage increases to the higher paid enable them to take away a still larger share from the underpaid. Inflation can bring a net advantage to the higher paid; but, as the immoral nature of that advantage is clearly seen, we may feel assured that the process will become unsatisfactory to many of those who are now so ardently pursuing it.

But if increased incomes only increase prices for the community as a whole, what can labor do about increasing output? Has the time not come for the body of workers to consider this question? What matters most, leisure or goods and services? If we want to preserve our leisure, the only way we can increase our goods and services is by the slow process of the accumulation of profits applied to more efficient production. If, on the other hand, we wish a more rapid increase in the material good things of life, the remedy is near at hand. The remedy is longer working hours.

Those working hours are, of course, always available under the penalty of overtime payment. That overtime payment would have to be given up in most industries before it would be possible to run the extra hours. Do the working people of this country care enough for more goods and services to work longer hours without overtime? That is not a question for the management group to decide. It is a question for the workers, organized and unorganized, to decide for themselves: whether or not they want the Fair Labor Standards Act amended to permit this. We may well remember that this act was passed in a time of acute unemployment to spread work. Is it appropriate to a time of full employment?

The question has been raised as to whether longer hours would have any beneficial effect on prices. This is to say, would they have any effect on reducing inflation? The effect would not be as direct or easily understood as would the effect on the standard of living. There would, however, be definitely a beneficial effect possible on the price level.

There are very few manufacturing or mercantile firms in which the present working week could not be moderately increased without increases in salaries, in taxes, in insurance, in depreciation, and in numerous others of the fixed expenses. This means that the longer hours would reduce unit costs and could reduce prices. The reductions in costs are not great enough to take care of time and a half for overtime in most industries, but on a full-time basis they would make possible a definite reduction in prices in most industries.

As previously stated, this decision lies in the hands of labor and not of management.

Business and labor then have a heavy responsibility and it is to be found primarily in the negotiations for wages and working conditions, which are continuously going on between these two groups. The demand is for statesmanship of a high order, between both the employers and employees.

As a matter of fact these negotiations, particularly in the case of the nation-wide industries and the nation-wide labor organizations, are no longer private matters. They cannot be. The whole well-being of all the people depends on arriving at wise decisions in all such cases.

A fallacy which leads to harmful demands is that corporate profits can be redistributed to employees on a generous scale. Those profits in 1947 amounted to about $28,700,000,000 before taxes—a very tidy sum indeed. Why not distribute the greater part of that in increased wages? For one thing the Government needs the $11,700,000,000 it collected in taxes, and the added billions it collected in double taxation on the dividends paid to stockholders. Furthermore dividends must be paid if capital is to flow into production in a free economy; and as we have already seen, about the only hope for a continued rise in living standards, apart from longer hours and increased worker efficiency, is a revived flow of profits into new materials and products and more efficient plant and equipment.

The most serious soul-searching must be done by the unions with the more highly paid membership who customarily spearhead the demands for still higher wages. These unions should rest on their oars. It is the low-income groups who must come up. As they are left farther and farther behind they have to concentrate all their energies on the bare necessities of minimum food, clothing, and shelter. They are lost as customers. They become a menace to prosperity. They are the hapless, hopeless means by which inflation in due time ends in a bust.

But equally responsible are the employers. The manufacturer or merchant, in these delicate times, whose profits permit reasonable dividends and reinvestment, who yet raises his prices to more than offset wage and material increases—such a man is likewise driving our inflation into a disastrous and inescapable bust.

In accepting these hard facts, are we throwing the free-enterprise system overboard? At first sight, it looks as though we are. It was Adam Smith's conviction that the summation of all the selfish activities, of all the factors in business operations, resulted in the general good. It would appear that we can no longer hold to that point of view, when we ask business and labor to make their deci-

sions with the general interest in mind, as well as their own immediate self-interest.

We have one recent example of labor negotiations which bears the earmarks of having been decided, in part at least, on the basis of the general interest. I am referring to the contract recently negotiated between General Motors and the United Automobile Workers. To the extent that the general interest did enter into these negotiations, were the interests and the principles of private enterprise thrown overboard?

This is an important question. Should we say that grim necessity is leading us away from private enterprise or that only lip service can be rendered to that principle in guiding our decisions?

As for myself, I do not believe that this recognition of the general interest involves the neglect of the private interest. I hold the opposite view and for a very simple reason. The private interest is involved in the public interest. If the public interest is not served, the private interest ends in disaster. What we are faced with here is the distinction between short-range private interests and long-range private interests. As we grow in experience and intelligence, we should see further and further into our long-range interests, and except as we do this, our short-range interests will lead us into disaster.

Our safety thus depends on the development of statesmanship in our people as a whole. Only thus can we escape continued and ultimately explosive inflation, which will lead into social revolution with its accompanying physical distress and lowered standard of living to the people as a whole. We have a great challenge laid before us. That challenge we must meet with courage, with wisdom, and with determination.

Mr. President, I wish it were possible for me to present more simple means for controlling inflation. I wish it were possible, as perhaps our President hoped, for us to be called into session, pass a law, and then go home with the job done. Such a simple remedy is impossible. It is impossible because the cause and the responsibilities are broad-spread over the whole Nation and all of its citizens; and many areas of personal responsibility cannot be reached except by devices of totalitarian control which we have never tried even in wartime. The remedies can only be applied by a government whose citizens are able and willing to do their part.

To summarize, the fundamental remedies lie in the increase of production to meet an adequate but controlled purchasing power, in the interim control of the wage-cost-profit-price spiral while these longer-range adjustments are being made, and in wise fiscal controls which must be applied more slowly but can be applied more safely than the more drastic monetary remedies. I have already suggested the titles of S. 2910 which will be useful in this regard. They relate to the regulation of consumer credit and the control of bank reserves or other means of restraining the expansion of credit. This is not enough.

We have a responsibility for wages laid on organized labor and for prices laid on business which must be conscientiously met in the long-range self-interest of both labor and business. Neglect of these will start the machinery of depression.

The worker must ponder and accept the means of increased production, so far as hours of work are concerned, while he and the ordinary citizen gain understanding of the tax reforms on which their material improvement ultimately depends.

With these conditions met, government in its fiscal and monetary policies, and particularly in its fiscal policies, can lay the foundations for the more long-range solution to the problems involved in controlling the destructive process of inflation and redirecting its elements to the advantage of our society.

This is a hard way. We only deceive ourselves if we trust ourselves entirely to easier ways. Intelligence, good will, and courage will win.

THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1948

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there have been so many questions asked in regard to the Agricultural Act of 1948, which was passed by the Congress last June, that I desire at this time to discuss some of the purposes and the provisions of this act.

There has been some misunderstanding created concerning this legislation due to the fact that the interpretations of some people seem to have been based upon an analysis of the original bill, which was introduced for the purpose of holding hearings and obtaining testimony from experts and farm leaders, rather than upon the law as it was finally approved by the Congress.

I am not going to attempt a section-by-section analysis of the law now because this ground has been well covered by Chairman Hope of the House committee, and a comprehensive statement thereon will be found on pages A4564 to A4567 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Rather, I wish to discuss the reasons for certain provisions of the bill and the effect which those who sponsored the measure believe that such provisions will have upon the agricultural and general economy of our country.

Everyone recognizes the fact that a healthy agriculture is essential to the general welfare of our entire economy. We know from experience that when agriculture becomes distressed our whole economy is in very serious trouble.

We know from experience that when agriculture does not produce sufficient quantities of food and fiber to meet the needs of our consumers, our industries, and the export demand, the effect upon prices is definitely inflationary and it becomes more difficult for low-income persons and those living on fixed incomes to make both ends meet.

It is common knowledge also that the United States has for over a century been using up its capital assets or the natural resources of the soil and that this practice must now be reversed if we as a Nation are to continue to be self-sustaining.

It was with these facts in mind that your Senate Committee on Agriculture proceeded with the development of a new and expanded agricultural program.

It is upon titles II and III of the Agricultural Act of 1948, which titles were titles III and IV of the bill S. 2318 as approved by the Senate, that I shall concentrate my remarks today.

Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1948 is the measure which was approved by the House and which, in general, continues the wartime support of basic and a few nonbasic commodities for one more year or until January 1, 1950, after which time the long-range price support program of the Senate will take effect.

As I have indicated, it was clear to the members of the committee that a well-rounded agricultural program should be one which would restore and maintain our soil resources, would provide our people with an adequate production of food and fiber at a fair cost, and would yield sufficient income to the farmer to enable him to maintain the farm and facilities at a high level of productive capacity and give him an income sufficient to support his family on a level comparable to that enjoyed by other economic groups.

Both Senate and House committees held extensive hearings on a long-range agricultural program. We did this under instructions and authority given us by the Congress in the summer of 1947.

While the committees of both Houses gave much consideration to all factors essential to a long-range farm program, the House placed greatest emphasis on the development of a long-range policy for land use and improvement.

The Senate devoted its main efforts toward a reorganization and consolidation of the soil-conservation agencies of the Department of Agriculture and toward the development of a long-range price-support program.

It was the opinion of the Senate committee that the cornerstone of a long-range farm program must be the assurance of an adequate income to the farmer.

Without a fair income it would be idle to talk of farm improvements and other things which require money.

It is also clear that a stabilized farm income is necessary if we are to achieve adequate production to meet consumer needs.

In adopting a long-range farm price-support program, the Congress has laid the cornerstone for what promises to be a most comprehensive and stable farm economy.

The two Houses of the Congress did not have the time necessary to develop and agree upon a long-range land-use policy and an expanded soil-improvement program.

Unlike the price-support program, which was urgent, a broadened land-use program was not necessary at this session to prevent our going backward.

In fact we are already making progress in the field of maintaining and improving our soil resources under existing laws.

The Soil Conservation Act of 1935 and the Triple-A Act of 1938, under which the agricultural conservation program now operates, are still the basic law of the land and progress is being made by both the Soil Conservation Service and the ACP in their fields.

The long-range price-support program, as approved by this Congress, may have its minor faults, but in it are permanently established certain indisputable principles which must endure.

Under the Agricultural Act of 1938, the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to support the prices of corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, and rice at prices ranging from 52 to 75 percent of parity. In 1941 peanuts were also included in this list.

These six crops are known as basic commodities. They are so called because they are produced in exportable quantities and are storable for reasonably long periods.

The other 151 kinds of agricultural commodities commonly produced in the United States are known as nonbasic commodities.

Many of these nonbasic commodities greatly exceed the basic commodities in dollar value. However, only a few of them are produced in exportable quantities and only a few lend themselves to long periods of storage without serious deterioration.

Many nonbasic commodities have been supported at 90 percent of parity during the war years under the provisions of the Steagall amendment of July 1, 1941.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recognized the desirability of permanent support levels for many nonbasic as well as the basic commodities.

Before setting up definite formulas for the support of farm commodities, it was found advisable to revise the criteria upon which farm-support prices are based.

Since support prices and the parity principle were first established in 1933, a percentage of parity has been used as the basis for extending such supports.

The base period established for the determination of parity prices for farm products was the years 1910–14.

At that time prices received by farmers were more in line with the prices received by other groups of our economy than at any other time.

This base period was wisely chosen, but as time went on changing conditions and methods of production made it inequitable or unfair to many farm commodities.

New crops which were of minor importance during that 5-year period, 1910–14, became of major importance, while the development of new machinery, the change in consumer appetites, and scientific advancements had an effect upon production costs and other factors in the agricultural field.

Under legislation authorized by the Congress in the last 15 years, many different base periods have been used for various agricultural commodities which are commonly produced in this country, and for which the original base period of 1910–14 proved to be unfair.

In fact, the 1910–14 base period became so out of line that at the present time only 47 of the 157 principal agricultural commodities produced in this country are using that period.

In order to bring the different farm commodities into the proper relationship with one another, it was felt wise to modify the parity formula in such a way that parity prices for various commodities would not constantly be getting out of line.

Provision is made, therefore, in the Agricultural Act of 1948 for a new parity formula using the latest 10 years as an adjusted base period.

Inasmuch as the original 1910–14 period is still the most equitable in relating agriculture as a whole to other factors of our economy, we tie the 10-year moving period to the 1910–14 period by means of a simple formula.

Under this formula, the average price for a farm commodity for the preceding 10 years is taken.

This is divided by the percentage which farmers received for all crops during this 10-year period in relation to the price received during the years 1910 to 1914.

The result is multiplied by the percentage of prices which farmers pay today in comparison with their costs during the 1910–14 period.

Several examples of the working of this formula are given in Representative HOPE'S analysis of the bill, so I shall not elaborate further on this subject.

Suffice it to say that we believe the new parity formula will establish the proper relationship between the various agricultural commodities, and it will not be necessary to establish new base periods for different commodities from time to time.

This formula has been worked out in the light of experience over the last 15 years. It will not in any way change parity prices for agriculture as a whole. It will simply change the relationship between different agricultural commodities from year to year.

Having established a new parity formula, it was then necessary to determine at what percentage of parity it was best to support agricultural commodities.

Contrary to the opinions of some, the farm support price program is not intended to guarantee the farmers costplus or even cost of production. It simply establishes a floor below which prices cannot fall, thus guaranteeing him against a complete collapse of the market and bankruptcy.

Your committee approached the determination of a price-support level with two principal objectives: First, to secure adequate production of those commodities which we need most, while discouraging overproduction of commodities which might happen to be in surplus; second, to seek for the farmer a fair percentage of parity of income, rather than to maintain a high level of support for specific commodities.

It has been found since the war that 90 percent of parity support for certain commodities amounts to an incentive to overproduce, while discouraging a desirable change to the production of commodities which are in short supply. The question of potato support prices has been referred to very frequently. I think there should be some explanation concerning the potato situation. I wish to say that if it were not for the support price given to potatoes some 6 or 7 years ago, potatoes now might conceivably be completely priced out of the market.

It will be recalled that at the beginning of the war, when industry was offered production incentives, agriculture was also offered production incentives. The Congress said to the farmers, "If you will produce more potatoes, even at the cost of converting your farm to the production of potatoes and buying the expensive machinery necessary, so that as a Nation we may save more grain for shipment overseas, then we, the Government, will guarantee you 90 percent of parity for the duration of the war and for 2 years thereafter."

In a few short years the farmers of the United States found out, with the aid of the incentive price, how to produce approximately 70 bushels of potatoes more to the acre. We are now producing more potatoes than we need; but in supporting the price of potatoes today the Government is simply carrying out an agreement which it made with the farmers in 1941, 7 years ago. That mandatory 90 percent support level ends with this year's crop, and next year the support will undoubtedly drop. The potato growers themselves have asked to have the price level lowered, because they realize that they are getting the bad end of public opinion by overproducing this particular crop and then expecting the Government to take it off their hands.

Mr. President, the committee aimed at an average support price level of 75 percent, which means that the farmer's income should not go below 75 percent of parity.

To achieve this, the long-range portion of the new act provides that the basic commodities should be supported within the range of 60 to 90 percent of parity for each commodity. I refer to the basic commodities—just six of them.

The level of support will be determined largely by the supply of the commodity according to a formula provided for in the law. When a crop becomes in heavy surplus, the support level goes lower, in order to discourage further overproduction. As supplies become short, the support level rises, in order to encourage production of commodities in short supply.

The only exception to this formula is found in the case of tobacco which, as a result of an amendment adopted on the floor of the Senate, will be supported at 90 percent of parity to cooperators so long as marketing quotas remain in effect.

Irish potatoes, as I have mentioned, shall be supported at such a level between 60 and 90 percent of parity, as the Secretary of Agriculture may consider necessary to attain an adequate supply.

With regard to wool, in consideration of the growing shortage in the world's supply, the Secretary is directed to support the price of wool at a level which will encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool. This will likely mean a support level of 90 percent of parity for a few years at least. For the first time the wool grower can now look forward with the assurance that he will not be ruined in his effort to make the United States more nearly self-sustaining with respect to this strategic commodity.

The Secretary is authorized to support the price of nonbasic commodities at any level up to 90 percent of parity, taking

into consideration, first, the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor; second, the price levels at which other commodities are being supported; third, the availability of funds; fourth, the perishability of the commodity; fifth, its importance to agriculture and the national economy; sixth, the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation; seventh, the need for offsetting temporary losses of export markets; and, eighth, the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand.

In other words, in supporting the price of potatoes or peaches or any other perishable commodity, the Secretary of Agriculture can require that culls be kept off the market. The reason for that is that in the past it has been reported that the Government has bought first-grade commodities, to keep them off the market and to support the price, and then those who have benefited by that procedure have dumped their culls on the market, in place of the others. That is a bad practice, and we think we have found a way to control it during the operation of this law.

The potato growers were particularly anxious to have placed in the bill greater controls over the marketing of commodities of inferior quality.

I wish to quote here from a statement I made on June 16 during consideration of Senate bill 2318, which will make clear the reason why the committee did not provide a fixed formula for the support of nonbasic commodities as well as for the basic commodities:

> A question entered the minds of the committee as to whether we should designate certain crops which should be supported at from 60 to 90 percent of parity, as the basic commodities are to be supported under the requirements of the bill.
>
> Then we realized that there were 151 farm commodities which were not basic. We did not know where to draw the line.
>
> We expect that important commodities—and I include field peas, beans, potatoes, soybeans, barley, and oats—will be supported at the same rate as the basic commodities, which is 60 to 90 percent of parity.
>
> But there are other nonbasic commodities, such as summer squash, which we would not want to support even at 10 percent of parity.
>
> Then there are peppers and tomatoes.
>
> Producers of various commodities have come to me suggesting that the commodity they produce should be supported.
>
> They were mohair producers from Texas, honey producers from Iowa, Minnesota, and other States, and producers of hops.
>
> We felt we had to leave such products to the discretion of the Secretary, but it is the belief of the committee that commodities which correspond closely to the Steagall commodities should be supported at a rate of from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

We believe that as a result of the adoption of a modernized parity formula, which will establish a proper relationship among agricultural commodities, and as a result of the setting up of a support price level which is tied to the supply, there can gradually be brought about a conversion of production from commodities which are in surplus to a greater production of commodities which are in short supply.

Operating normally, the Agricultural Act of 1948 will tend to encourage the marketing of grains, which promise to be in fairly heavy surplus in the not distant future, in the form of dairy products and meats, which are now in short supply.

An indirect but very important effect of encouraging the marketing of surplus grain in the form of meat, milk, and poultry, is that such a method of marketing will provide employment for many more people. When grain is marketed in the form of these products not only is a greater amount consumed, but more labor is required not only on the farm but in processing plants, merchandising establishments, and the services, besides providing the consumer with a higher standard of living.

In the event that all other means of holding down surpluses fail, the provision for quotas as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1948, is still retained but it is expected that quotas will be used only as a last resort in times of extreme depression or exceptionally large surpluses. Under the new law, quotas on grains may be voted when the total supply in the country reaches 120 percent of a normal supply as determined by formulas provided for in the act.

Quotas on cotton marketing may be proclaimed when the total supply reaches 108 percent of a normal supply.

Tobacco production, which has been under quotas for some years, will remain under the quota system until voted out by the producers themselves according to the provisions of the 1938 law, as amended by the 1948 act. Quotas on grains and cotton may also be voted when the average farm price does not exceed 66 percent of parity during three successive months of a marketing year.

It is believed that quotas will seldom be resorted to on grain because of the encouragement which the act provides for the marketing of grain in the form of meats, dairy, and poultry products. In the event that it is necessary to impose quotas on any crop, it would naturally follow that the farm income of the producers of such crop would drop because of the lower production permitted. Therefore, in order to make sure that farm income will not drop to unreasonably low levels, the Agricultural Act of 1948 provides that a 20-percent premium will be added to the support floor level whenever quotas are in force.

The law, however, does not permit support prices to exceed the 90 percent of parity level, except in the interest of national security. It is provided that whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines, after a public hearing, that national security requires a support level greater than 90 percent of parity, he may prescribe such level as "is necessary in order to increase or maintain the production of any agricultural commodity in the interest of national security."

There is also an escape clause provided for in paragraph (F), section 201, which will permit the Secretary, after public hearings, to adjust the parity price of any commodity should it be found that the parity price of such commodity is seriously out of line with other commodities. It is believed that this provision will seldom, if ever, need to be resorted to. The revision of the formula for determining parity prices will result in lowering the price of certain important commodities as much as from 10 percent to 20 percent below what they would be under the old parity formula or the one which is being used at present.

In order that such drop may not be too abrupt, the act provides that there shall be no reduction in 1 year greater than 5 percent of the old parity price during the transitional period. This provision will enable the producers of the surplus crops to convert to the production of other commodities over a reasonable period of time without incurring undue losses in the support level. Of course, after conversion from surplus production to the production of more needed commodities takes place, there will be a tendency for all agricultural commodities to find an equitable and comparable price level.

Some confusion has been created through printed articles criticizing the act for not providing the forward-pricing. The original bill before the Senate Agriculture Committee did not contemplate forward-pricing, but the act as passed by the Senate and agreed to by the House will permit forward-pricing of farm commodities.

Under the act, the Secretary can announce before planting time the minimum percentage level at which basic and nonbasic commodities will be supported. It is evident that critics of this provision of the bill have drawn their conclusions from the bill originally introduced rather than the act which was finally approved.

There has also been some criticism of the act by those who believe that it will force the Government extensively into the business of buying and selling farm commodities in supporting farm prices. These critics also have been drawing their conclusions from the bill which was introduced rather than the act itself. The act provides that the Secretary "is authorized to support prices of agricultural commodities to producers through loans, purchases, payments, and other operations."

This provision, authorizing the support of prices through payments, should go far in enabling the Secretary to keep out of the business of actually buying, taking title to, and selling farm commodities and thus hold to a minimum the amount of money necessary for the carrying out of the purposes of this act.

It was the intent of the Senate Agriculture Committee in writing the bill to encourage the handling of farm commodities through normal channels of trade to the maximum extent practicable. In fact, the committee believes that all means of securing markets for surpluses through the regular channels of trade should be exhausted before direct support should be resorted to. I quote from the last sentence of section 302 (a) of the act which reads:

> The Secretary shall in all cases give consideration to the practicability of supporting

prices indirectly, as by the development of improved merchandising methods, rather than directly by purchase or loan.

The Secretary is authorized to support prices for both basic and nonbasic commodities through the Commodity Credit Corporation, but it is further provided:

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not carry out any operation to support the price of any nonbasic agricultural commodity (other than Irish potatoes) which is so perishable in nature as not to be reasonably storable without excessive loss or excessive cost.

It is not intended that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall engage in the business of supporting commodity prices, where substantial losses may be expected. Any support operations of nonbasic commodities upon which losses may reasonably be expected are to be carried out by the Secretary through other means available to him, such as those provided by section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, and for this purpose the act provides that section 32 funds may accumulate to the extent of $300,000,000.

The act also provides means by which the Commodity Credit Corporation may dispose of any commodities acquired by it for certain purposes and at such prices as are provided for in the act.

Such means of disposal are found in section 302 (a) (4) h, which I quote:

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at less than (1) a price determined on a pricing basis for its stocks of such commodity on hand, which makes due allowance for grade, type, quality, location, and other factors and which is reasonably calculated to reimburse it for costs incurred by it with respect to such stocks; (2) a price half-way between the support price, if any, and the parity price of such commodity; or (3) a price equivalent to 90 percent of the parity price of such commodity, whichever price is the lowest, except that the foregoing restrictions shall not apply to (A) sales for new or byproduct uses; (B) sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil; (C) sales for seed or feed if such sales will not substantially impair any price-support program; (D) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or of nonbasic perishable commodities where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage; (E) sales for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity; (F) sales for export; (G) sales of wool; and (H) sales for other than primary uses.

It is believed that the disposal methods so prescribed will interfere with normal markets to a minimum degree if at all.

Mr. President, besides the Agricultural Act of 1948, the Eightieth Congress has enacted other legislation which will contribute greatly to the eventual completion of a sound program for agriculture.

Crop insurance will play a very important part in any complete program.

Unfortunately, the initial attempt at crop insurance authorized by the Congress in 1938 resulted in a loss of nearly a hundred million dollars, principally on cotton.

The Eightieth Congress has revised the Crop Insurance Act, putting it upon a sound experimental basis.

So far, the new program has proven workable and has operated without loss.

In a few years' time, we should know enough about crop insurance to broaden this program to a great degree.

The Eightieth Congress has also approved a new charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which gives permanent status to this important agency of Government, and with an authorization of $100,000,000 in capital stock.

One of the most important acts of this Congress intended to promote a prosperous agriculture has been the authorization of $800,000,000 in loans for rural electrification.

This is by far the largest authorization for this work given by any Congress.

At this rate, it will not be long before all farms in the United States, which can feasibly be provided with electric light and power, will have such light and power made available to them.

Large increases have also been made in appropriations for expanding a State-Federal secondary-road program.

Such an expansion in the farm-to-market highway program, which is five times as large as that appropriated for in any previous year, will greatly benefit both the farmers and consumers.

The Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act was amended in June 1948 with the expectation that greater impetus will be given to the ownership of farms by those who now occupy them as tenants.

Many other laws of lesser importance have been enacted in the interest of a prosperous agriculture.

Our work is not done, however, but we have made remarkable strides in the right direction.

We still have before us further consideration of a general land-use policy and soil-improvement program.

The organization of the United States Department of Agriculture requires further examination in the interest of economical and efficient operation.

A competent committee of the Hoover Commission is now engaged in making such study and will undoubtedly have valuable recommendations to make to the Eighty-first Congress.

The entire farm credit structure should be thoroughly reviewed with a view to providing adequate agricultural credit efficiently and at the least cost.

We have the problem of getting food from the farm to the consumers, particularly low-income consumers, at more reasonable cost and by equitable distribution with the least possible disturbance to the normal channels of trade.

The study of American agriculture is and should be a never-ending process, but I state unequivocally—and the record bears me out—that the Eightieth Congress has made remarkable progress toward a more productive and prosperous agriculture.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a brief statement.

MAW ATTACK ON DEWEY WILL HAVE LITTLE EFFECT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, recently, attention has been focused upon statements alleged to have been made by Governor Dewey, the Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States, relative to a school teachers' lobby.

The Democratic National Committee has issued statements by two New Deal governors, Governor Gruening, of Alaska, who is there by appointment of a Democratic President, and Governor Maw, of Utah.

The intent unquestionably was to turn the teachers of the United States against the Republican candidate. Governors Maw and Gruening are the committee's star witnesses. They were brought in to offset the Dewey denial.

The attempt of the Governor of my State, Herbert B. Maw, to picture Governor Dewey of New York as the enemy of the school teacher, through giving out what Mr. Maw claims were the remarks of Governor Dewey at a governors' conference held recently, has not been generally accepted at face value. His statement has been discussed by the famous veteran political writer, Gould Lincoln, in a feature article appearing in a recent issue of the Washington Star, an independent newspaper. Said Mr. Lincoln:

Even for election year midsummer politics this is on the childish side. Governor Dewey is the Republican nominee for President, otherwise neither Governor Maw nor the Democratic committee would have thought up such a charge. The school teachers of New York are better paid than the teachers in any other State of the Union or anywhere else in the world. The present salaries of the teachers are the results of increases given during Mr. Dewey's 6-year tenure of office as governor.

The Maw charge grows out of a desire to make political use of the antagonism of some of the more radical school teachers for Mr. Dewey because the New York Governor sponsored the Condon-Wadlin law enacted by the New York Legislature and approved by Governor Dewey which prohibits strikes by public employees. This was passed when public-school teachers in Buffalo were on strike.

It is not clear whether Governor Maw and the Democratic National Committee are in favor of permitting strikes by public employees, including school teachers. Perhaps it would help to clear the air if they would individually or collectively make a statement on that question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator knows, of course, that in the Taft-Hartley law there is a prohibition against striking by any Government employee. That law was voted for by a majority of the Democrats in the Senate. The same provision has been contained in a number of appropriation bills which have been approved by all the Democrats in the Senate. So that Governor Maw's position seems to be somewhat different from that of most of the Democrats in the Senate, at any rate.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for calling that fact to my attention.

I regret that the Governor of my State has brought himself into this controversy. It is not a pleasant thing to call to the attention of the people of the United States outside of Utah who may be fooled by what he has said, several facts in connection with the Governor.

In Utah he is regarded as a "coattail" governor, a governor who came into power in two elections on the coattails of Franklin D. Roosevelt. At each election Governor Maw ran from 48,000 to 50,000 votes behind his ticket—only getting by by narrow margins. This was generally regarded as a repudiation by thousands of Democrats who knew his record while he was a member of the State Legislature of Utah.

As far as Utah voters are concerned, no serious attention need be paid to what Governor Maw has said about Governor Dewey. It will not hurt Governor Dewey's chances in that State at all.

To the rest of the country it should be said that Governor Maw is the same person who made the charge that the Republican Congress was squeezing the lifeblood out of reclamation in the West and that it was destroying this program. It will be remembered that he said this in spite of the fact that the Eightieth Congress has made larger appropriations for both water and power development in the West than any other Congress in the history of the United States. The Republican record cannot be successfully challenged.

Governor Maw will also be remembered for making ultraconservative speeches at governors' conferences held outside Utah, while at home he so conducted himself that he became, and still is, the darling of radical New Dealers.

The article written by Mr. Lincoln is very interesting and instructive. I believe it is of sufficient interest that all Members of the Congress should have an opportunity to read it. I therefore request Mr. President, that the entire article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTACK ON DEWEY AS FOE OF TEACHERS IS CHILDISH—CAPITAL MADE OF BAN ON STRIKES BY NEW YORK PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

(By Gould Lincoln)

Utah's Governor Maw, through the Democratic National Committee, or vice versa, is undertaking to picture Governor Dewey of New York as the enemy of school teachers.

Even for election year midsummer politics this is on the childish side. Governor Dewey is the Republican nominee for President, otherwise neither Governor Maw nor the Democratic committee would have thought up such a charge. The school teachers of New York are better paid than the teachers in any other State of the Union or anywhere in the world. The present salaries of the teachers are the results of increases given during Mr. Dewey's 6-year tenure of office as Governor.

The Maw charge grows out of a desire to make political use of the antagonism of some of the more radical school teachers for Mr. Dewey because the New York Governor sponsored the Condon-Wadlin law enacted by the New York Legislature and approved by Governor Dewey which prohibits strikes by public employees. This was passed when public school teachers in Buffalo were on strike.

AIR SHOULD BE CLEARED

It is not clear whether Governor Maw and the Democratic National Committee are in favor of permitting strikes by public employees, including school teachers. Perhaps it would help to clear the air if they would individually or collectively make a statement on that question.

The Democratic administration, which has ruled in Washington for nearly 16 years, has been opposed to strikes by Goverment employees and properly so. President Truman, Governor Dewey's opponent in the Presidential race this year, has no use either for strikes by employees of these privately owned agencies which vitally affect the life of the American people. Indeed, Mr. Truman went so far as to ask of Congress legislation permitting him to draft railroad workers into the armed services so as to give him absolute power to keep them at work when a railroad strike was ordered.

It is a strange move now for the Democratic national organization to seek to indict Governor Dewey for being opposed to strikes by school teachers and other employees of the State. Governor Dewey, as a matter of fact, has an excellent record as Governor in his dealings with and attitude toward organized labor.

EWING HIT IN CHARGE

While this fantastic charge of unfriendliness to school teachers is laid against Governor Dewey, the Truman administration is accused by John W. Studebaker, for years United States Commissioner of Education, of preventing the Office of Education from "exposing the tactics and dangers of communism" in public and other schools. Mr. Studebaker complains that censorship was imposed on him and the Office of Education by Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, and also an officer of the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Ewing was a strong supporter of the nomination of President Truman and wanted to be his running mate.

Mr. Studebaker protested vigorously against this censorship. More recently he sent copies of a letter in which he made these charges against Mr. Ewing to members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. It was only on July 15 that Mr. Studebaker retired as Commissioner of Education. He charged that efforts were being made to soft-pedal the teaching of anticommunism in the schools.

The Office of Education is a part of the Federal Security Administration. If Mr. Studebaker's charges are true, it is another indication that the Democrats are playing up to the "Pinks" if not the Reds.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not intend to do more than state very briefly the present situation with respect to housing.

There are two bills before us, both substitutes for the House bill. I think that undoubtedly the debate on the subject will last some time, and Senators will wish to consider the bill so that they may understand exactly what the issues are. Therefore I shall not press for a vote this evening. When the Senate recesses, perhaps at 6 or 7 o'clock, it will recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. I hope that we may reach a vote on the housing question as early as possible tomorrow.

Mr. President, the general situation is that the House passed a bill before the recess in June, House bill 6959. That bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

The subcommittee of that committee prepared a bill, which appears in the so-called committee print which is before the Senate, and which I think Senators will find on their desks. That bill incorporates various portions of Senate bill 866, which was passed by the Senate and ignored by the House. I think it contains one or two provisions of H. R. 6959, and contains one or two additional measures which have come up attempting in general to straighten out difficulties which have arisen in the housing situation. I shall speak somewhat more at length on the bill a little later.

The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, however, rejected the subcommittee report, and by a vote of 7 to 5, I think it was, and substituted instead the original Senate bill 866 as it passed the Senate. So that the Senate now has before it H. R. 6959, with a committee amendment striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting S. 866. It is my understanding the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. MCCARTHY) will offer the subcommittee substitute which appears in the committee print, and the main issue in the Senate therefore will be between S. 866 as recommended by the committee as a substitute, and the subcommittee substitute.

The principal difference lies in the fact that the subcommittee substitute does not include any low-rent subsidized housing, nor does it include the urban redevelopment. Those are the main differences between the bills.

I merely desired to state the situation. I shall deal later with what is in the bills.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to propound one question. Is the bill which has now been reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency in the identical language of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which was passed in the last days of the last session?

Mr. TAFT. I think there are some minor differences. For instance, the paraplegic section has already been passed in a different bill, and I think there are one or two other changes.

Mr. TOBEY. There is no salient change at all.

Mr. LUCAS. No important changes?

Mr. TAFT. No.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I think I can answer rather more specifically the question asked by the Senator from Illinois. We eliminated section 603, which is the most inflationary provision in the T-E-W bill. Title II of FHA has demonstrated such strength that the inflationary 603 referring to poor-family housing is not required. We have also made certain corrections in the secondary mortgage-market provision, commonly known as the Jenner bill, passed on the last day of the regular session to replace title II of the T-E-W bill. I will say that the Jenner bill has met with administrative difficulties, and the changes we have made are changes which were suggested by the subcommittee in the subcommittee bill.

As stated, we also eliminated title VIII of the T-E-W bill, the paraplegic provision.

Mr. McCARTHY obtained the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. President, there is an admonition of the Scriptures to avoid vain repetitions. The action contemplated by taking a vote this afternoon is in my judgment another vain repetition. Here on my desk is paper, here are books, here are pamphlets, here are hearings, here is evidence, coming down through the years, 3 or 4 years, and embodied in these and many more I could bring here are countless and endless data and voluminous testimony on housing.

The Senate took these data to heart and twice passed a bill favoring the issues which are deleted from the housing bill by the substitute of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. So the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, as handled by the special committee, came in devoid of the two salients, namely, public housing and slum clearance, and those of us who from conviction believe that this Nation needs public housing and slum clearance to make a start in this great improvement in human affairs, stand solidly against the substitution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to call the Senator's attention to another very important provision left out of the substitute, that is, the one relating to rural housing.

Mr. TOBEY. I was just coming to that. That was considered on the floor of the Senate and adopted by the Senate last spring.

Here is the issue, Mr. President. We are going to vote today or tomorrow on whether, under the aegis of the Senator from Wisconsin, we shall strike from the housing bill provisions for public housing, slum clearance and urban rehabilitation. I think the issue is perfectly clear. I believe that the vote was 49 to 33 the last time the question was voted on, in April or May, when the Senate repudiated the effort to strike out public housing. We have taken our stand. Now gentlemen come to us and say, "If you pass this bill you will have no public housing."

Mr. President, I do not like ultimatums, and never did. They sometimes breed war. But I accept that challenge, wherever it comes from, that "if you pass this bill with public housing and slum clearance in it, which twice was passed, you are not going to get any housing legislation." But Mr. President, whoever is saying this may be playing poker. Let us find out who is controlling the interests of humanity in this country. Where has government of the people, for the people, and by the people gone if one man, the head of a powerful committee of one branch of Congress, may say, "We will not let the people's representatives vote on public housing, slum clearance, and urban rehabilitation"? That is the essence of the matter before us, and that is the issue. On that issue I accept the challenge. And I will see those from whence that challenge comes—well, Senators know where—in any part of the Capitol, any time. [Laughter.]

Now ladies and gentlemen in the galleries, and the public at large, and the Congress, let me say that there is just one duty on us this afternoon: That is to back up the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; repudiate any substitution for it, and carry it through, as we are all pledged to do, both great parties having pledged themselves to it, having expressed their deep interest in public housing for the common people of the country, and let us give homes to people who are underprivileged, so they can say, "It is a good land after all. Thank God for the privilege of living in America where home life is placed over everything else."

As Calvin Coolidge, when he was at the other end of the Avenue, so well said:

> Look well to the hearths of America. There all hope for our safety lies. If anything happens to the hearthstones, to the homes, the roofs over the people's heads, and if there will not be decent living there and an era of good feeling and contentment, look out for your country, my friends.

I believe it not only ought to be a matter of politics with us, but a principle of our religion.

Some 2,000 years ago it was said:

> Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ.

He, Paul, also said:

> We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves.

Is that not so? If anyone thinks it is not so there is something wrong with him. And, Mr. President, there is something wrong with any group or with any party that is not moved by those words.

We are here only 60 or 70 years, and then for us there will be no tomorrow on earth. Let it be said of the Eightieth Congress in this brief session: "They measured up to a great trust, they kept faith with the common people; they carried through consistently what they have done twice before."

A bas! Get out with your substitutes! We stand by the great principles of humanity, adequate public housing and slum clearance.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Hampshire takes his seat will he yield to me?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there anything that has occurred since the Senate adjourned that should change the vote of anyone who voted for this bill during the last session of Congress?

Mr. TOBEY. By no stretch of the imagination could I conceive of anything.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator, of course, has followed this matter very closely, and I was wondering whether or not he believed there was anything in the question of economy or politics or anything of that kind which would create any different vote from what we had here in the closing days of the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. TOBEY. The answer is "No." I may say to the Senator, while I am on my feet, that in my 15 years in both branches of Congress I have never seen any measure which had such a broad, bipartisan approach and support as there has been to this housing measure on the floor of the Senate of the United States. The record will show that.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from New Hampshire accepts the challenge of one individual in the Congress who has prohibited the representatives of the people from voting their convictions one way or the other upon what seems to me to be one of the most vital questions that face the American people today.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hill	Pepper
Bricker	Hoey	Reed
Bridges	Holland	Revercomb
Brooks	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Smith
Capehart	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capper	Knowland	Stennis
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Taylor
Cordon	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments, one labeled A and one labeled B. I should now like to call up amendment A and ask for its immediate consideration. In view of the length of the amendment, I ask unanimous consent that its reading be waived, and that it be printed in the RECORD. Senators will find the amendment on their desks in the committee print of House bill 6959, beginning on page 55 and continuing through page 94.

Before proceeding with this method of calling up the amendments, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to the fact that, as they know, there are various ways in which we can get a vote between the two bills at this time. I believe that the clearest way is by calling up my amendments, as perfecting amendments to the House bill,

as I propose to do unless there is objection on their part, so as first to perfect the House bill, and then let the Senator from Vermont make his motion to substitute the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am not clear as to the parliamentary procedure suggested. By unanimous consent the "measure"—or whatever term it was decided the other day to use—before the Senate, I understand to be the housing bill, as reported, which is House bill 6959, with a somewhat modified Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as an amendment, in a measure of substitution. Just what status does the proposal made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin have?

Mr. McCARTHY. May I give the Senator the picture?

Mr. FLANDERS. I am making a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request made by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator from Vermont reserving the right to object?

Mr. FLANDERS. I am inquiring as to the parliamentary situation, to find out whether or not such a course is feasible. I am directing the question to the Chair.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I merely asked for consent to print the amendment in the RECORD and waive its reading, because of the length of the amendment, and because Senators have the amendment on their desks.

Mr. FLANDERS. As I understand, that has been agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am calling up a perfecting amendment to the House bill, House bill 6959, at this time. As I stated, I do not feel strongly about handling it in this manner. If the Senator from Vermont has any serious objection, I should be glad to consider it. By following this procedure, which, of course, I have the right to follow, we can perfect the House bill by offering two amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that the Senator offer a substitute for the committee substitute. It seems to me that then the issue would be clear.

Mr. McCARTHY. The reason I have not done so is that a number of Senators feel that they would be obliged to offer perfecting amendments to the committee substitute.

Mr. TAFT. That is all right.

Mr. McCARTHY. A great deal of time would be wasted by so doing. I think we shall have a much clearer issue if we first offer our subcommittee bill in this fashion, as a substitute for the House bill. The only way I can do that——

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish. The only way I can do that, I think, is to offer it in the form of perfecting amendments. I have split the bill into two amendments. That will give us precedence in voting. As I say, I do not feel strongly about it. A number of Senators have told me that they would like to dispose of this issue first.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I very much fear that the Senator from Wisconsin is going to get us into an interminable parliamentary tangle. I am very much in favor of the revised Taft bill which the Senator wishes to offer as a substitute for what the committee actually reported.

There is only one clear, safe procedure to follow. First we have a House bill, and then we have a committee amendment to the House bill. Unless the Senator from Wisconsin offers a complete substitute for the committee amendment, there will be confusion about the voting, and we shall wind up with a futility. I beg the Senator from Wisconsin not to follow the procedure which he has indicated, by offering a number of separate perfecting amendments. Let us do the job with one amendment. The Senator has the entire bill before him. We discussed it in committee. The Senator knows what members of the committee are with him, and we know what is in that bill. I beg the Senator to proceed with the substitute, and have a clear-cut test, because in essence the bill which I want the Senator to offer as a substitute eliminates the public housing and redevelopment features of the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The remainder is a revision of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which the distinguished Senator from Ohio told us this morning was in his opinion an improvement over the original bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did not say that. Later I shall make plain what I said.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. We know that there are many good features in the bill which the Senator from Wisconsin is sponsoring, and which I am prepared to support; but unless he offers it as a substitute, we shall be in a parliamentary tangle, and we shall not know whether we are going or coming, by the time we act on a number of different amendments, and have the question raised as to amendments in the second degree and amendments in the third degree. Something we want may be ruled out as an amendment too far removed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am glad to have the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio and the suggestion of the Senator from Virginia. I believe those suggestions are well taken. For that reason, Mr. President, I now offer amendments A and B as one amendment, as a substitute amendment, not for the original House bill 6959, but as a substitute for the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

The amendment offered by Mr. McCARTHY is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act be cited as the "Housing Act of 1948."

TITLE I—FHA TITLE VI AND TRANSITIONAL PERIOD AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

TITLE VI AMENDMENTS

(a) Section 603 (a) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$5,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,750,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased to not to exceed $6,150,000,000";

(2) By striking out the second proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That no mortgage shall be insured under section 603 of this title after April 30, 1948, except (A) pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before April 30, 1948, or (B) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under section 603 of this title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage, and no mortgage shall be insured under section 608 of this title after March 31, 1949, except (i) pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before March 31, 1949, or (ii) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under section 608 of this title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage: *Provided further*, That no mortgage shall be insured under section 608 of this title unless the mortgagor certifies under oath that in selecting tenants for the property covered by the mortgage he will not discriminate against any family by reason of the fact that there are children in the family, and that he will not sell the property while the insurance is in effect unless the purchaser so certifies, such certifications to be filed with the Administrator; and violation of any such certification shall be a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not to exceed $500:".

(b) Section 608 (b) (3) (B) is amended by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That the principal obligation of the mortgage shall not, in any event, exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located; and".

(c) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$1,500 per room" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,100 per family unit"; and

(2) By striking out the colon and the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(d) Section 609 is amended—

(1) By striking out all of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding purchase contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator providing for the purchase and delivery of the houses to be manufactured, which contracts shall provide for the payment of the purchase price at such time as may be agreed to by the parties thereto, but, in no event, shall the purchase price be payable on a date in excess of 30 days after the date of delivery of such houses, unless not less than 20 percent of such purchase price is paid on or before the date of delivery and the lender has accepted and discounted or has agreed to accept and discount, pursuant to subsection (i) of this section a promissory note or notes, executed by the purchaser, representing the unpaid portion of such purchase price, in which event such unpaid portion of the purchase price may be payable on a date not in excess of 180 days from the date of delivery of such houses;".

(2) By striking out the first and second sentences of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost, exclusive of profit, of manufacturing the houses, which are the subject of such purchase contracts assigned to secure the loan, less any sums paid by the purchaser under said purchase contracts prior to the assignment thereof. The loan shall be secured by

an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts and of all sums payable thereunder on or after the date of such assignment, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses then owned and in the possession of the borrower."

(3) By adding at the end of subsection (f) the following new sentence: "The provisions of section 603 (d) shall also be applicable to loans insured under this section and the reference in said section 603 (d) to a mortgage shall be construed to include a loan or loans with respect to which a contract of insurance is issued pursuant to this section."

(4) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) (1) In addition to the insurance of the principal loan to finance the manufacture of housing, as provided in this section, and in order to provide short-term financing in the sale of houses to be delivered pursuant to the purchase contract or contracts assigned as security for such principal loan, the Administrator is authorized, under such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe, to insure the lender against any losses it may sustain resulting from the acceptance and discount of a promissory note or notes executed by a purchaser of any such houses representing an unpaid portion of the purchase price of any such houses. No such promissory note or notes accepted and discounted by the lender pursuant to this subsection shall involve a principal obligation in excess of 80 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses; have a maturity in excess of 180 days from the date of the note or bear interest in excess of 4 percent per annum; nor may the principal amount of such promissory notes, with respect to any individual principal loan, outstanding and unpaid at any one time, exceed in the aggregate an amount prescribed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to include in any contract of insurance executed by him with respect to the insurance of a loan to finance the manufacture of houses, provisions to effectuate the insurance against any such losses under this subsection.

"(3) The failure of the purchaser to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or notes executed by the purchaser and accepted and discounted by the lender under the provisions of this subsection, shall be considered as a default under this subsection, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance, as provided in subsection (d) of this section except that debentures issued pursuant to this subsection shall have a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan plus interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of default to the date the application is filed for the insurance benefits.

"(4) Debentures issued with respect to the insurance granted under this subsection shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date application is filed for the insurance benefits and shall bear interest from such date.

"(5) The Administrator is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this subsection, in addition to the premium charge authorized under subsection (h) of this section. Such premium charge shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the original principal of such promissory note or notes and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

(e) Section 610 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Administrator is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any of the so-called Greenbelt towns, or parts thereof, including projects, or parts thereof, known as Greenhills, Ohio; Greenbelt, Md.; and Greendale, Wis., developed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, or of any of the village properties under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and any mortgage executed in connection with the first resale, within 2 years from the date of its acquisition from the Government, of any portion of a project or property which is the security for a mortgage insured pursuant to the provisions of this section."

(f) Title VI is amended by adding after section 610 the following new section:

"SEC. 611. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under other sections of this title, and in order to assist and encourage the application of cost-reduction techniques through large-scale modernized site construction of housing and the erection of houses produced by modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Administrator as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) cover property, held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator, upon which there is to be constructed or erected dwelling units for not less than 25 families consisting of a group of single-family dwellings approved by the Administrator for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That during the course of construction there may be located upon the mortgaged property a plant for the fabrication or storage of such dwellings or sections or parts thereof, and the Administrator may consent to the removal or release of such plant from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may approve;

"(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(A) not to exceed 80 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the completed property or project, exclusive of any plant of the character described in paragraph (2) of this subsection located thereon, and

"(B) not to exceed a sum computed on the individual dwellings comprising the total project as follows: $6,000 or 80 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each single-family dwelling.

"With respect to the insurance of advances during construction, the Administrator is authorized to approve advances by the mortgagee to cover the cost of materials delivered upon the mortgaged property and labor performed in the fabrication or erection thereof;

"(4) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time: *Provided*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest, not exceeding 4½ percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, if he finds that the mortgage market demands it. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"(c) Preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for veterans of World War II and their immediate families and for hardship cases as defined by the Administrator shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(d) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 608 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

TITLE II AMENDMENTS

(g) Section 203 (b) (2) (B) is amended by striking out "$5,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,300."

(h) Section 203 (b) (2) (C) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$8,600" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,500";

(2) By striking out "$6,000" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,000";

(3) By striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,000."

(i) Section 203 (b) is amended by striking out in paragraph numbered (3) the following: "of the character described in paragraph (2) (B) of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "on property approved for insurance prior to the beginning of construction."

(j) Section 203 (b) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) (C), inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or", and adding the following new paragraph:

"(D) not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 90 percent of the appraised value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance (or 95 percent if, in the determination of the Administrator, insurance of mortgages involving a principal obligation in such amount under this paragraph would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities for families of moderate income), of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided*, That the Administrator may by regulation provide that the principal obligation of any mortgage eligible for insurance under this paragraph shall be fixed at a lesser amount than $6,000 where he finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability: *And provided further*, That with respect to mortgages insured under this paragraph the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 10 percent (or 5 percent, in the case of a 95 percent mortgage insured pursuant to this paragraph (D)) of the appraised value in cash or its equivalent, or shall be the builder constructing the dwelling in which case the principal obligation shall not exceed 85 percent of the appraised value of the property."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph numbered (3), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 30 years in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(3) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph numbered (5), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 4 percent per annum in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(k) (1) Section 203 (c) is amended (1) by striking out in the last sentence the words "section or section 210" and inserting in lieu

thereof the word "title"; and (2) by striking out in said sentence the words "under this section."

(2) Sections 203 (c) and 603 (c) of such act are amended by striking out in the last sentence and in the next to the last sentence, respectively, the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

(l) Section 204 (a) is amended—

(1) By striking out, in the last sentence, the following: "prior to July 1, 1944,";

(2) By inserting between the first and second provisos in the last sentence the following: *"And provided further,* That with respect to mortgages which are accepted for insurance under section 203 (b) (2) (D) or under the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2) of this act, there may be included in the debentures issued by the Administrator on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by the Administrator an amount, not in excess of two-thirds of such cost or $75 whichever is the greater:".

(m) Section 207 (b) is amended by amending paragraph numbered (1) to read as follows:

"(1) Federal or State instrumentalities, municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, or limited dividend or redevelopment or housing corporations restricted by Federal or State laws or regulations of State banking or insurance departments as to rents, charges, capital structure, rate of return, or methods of operation; or."

(n) Section 207 (c) is amended—

(1) By amending the first sentence to read as follows:

"(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage on any property or project shall involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(1) not to exceed $5,000,000, or, if executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, not to exceed $50,000,000;

"(2) not to exceed 80 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed, including the land; the proposed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Administrator: *Provided,* That, except with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, such mortgage shall not exceed the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project, exclusive of public utilities and streets and organization and legal expenses: *And provided further,* That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph No. (2), a mortgage with respect to a project to be constructed in a locality or metropolitan area where, as determined by the Administrator, there is a need for new dwellings for families of lower income at rentals comparable to the rentals proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project (or, in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporation, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members) may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed, except that in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II, the principal obligation may be in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed; and

"(3) not to exceed $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, except that in the case of projects of the character described in the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2), if the Administrator finds that the needs of the members of any such corporation could more adequately be met by per room cost limitations, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed $1,800 per room for such part of such project as may be attributable to dwelling use."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of the second sentence, inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and adding the following: "except that with respect to mortgages insured under the provisions of the second proviso of paragraph No. (2) of this subsection, which mortgages are hereby authorized to have a maturity of not exceeding 40 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage, such interest rate shall not exceed 4 percent per annum."

(3) By adding the following additional sentence at the end thereof: "Such property or project may include such commercial and community facilities as the Administrator deems adequate to serve the occupants."

(o) Section 207 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the number "2" appearing in clause (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "1."

(p) Section 207 (h) is amended by striking out, in paragraph No. (1), the words "paid to the mortgagor of such property", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund."

(q) Section 204 (f) is amended by inserting in clause No. (1), immediately preceding the semicolon, the following: "if the mortgage was insured under section 203 and shall be retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund if the mortgage was insured under section 207."

(r) Section 207 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(q) In order to assure an adequate market for mortgages on cooperative-ownership projects and rental-housing projects for families of lower income and veterans of the character described in the second proviso of paragraph No. (2) of subsection (c) of this section, the powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association and of any other Federal corporation or other Federal agency hereafter established, to make real-estate loans, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with projects of the character described in said proviso."

TITLE I AMENDMENTS

(s) Section 2 is amended:

(1) By striking out "$165,000,000" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000,000";

(2) By striking out "$3,000"' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,500";

(3) By striking out the first proviso in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided,* That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $10,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure used or to be used as an apartment house or a dwelling for two or more families;";

(4) By striknig out the last sentence of subsection (b).

SEC. 102. In order to aid housing production, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans to and purchase the obligations of any business enterprise for the purpose of providing financial assistance for the production of prefabricated houses or prefabricated housing components, or for large-scale modernized site construction. Such loans or purchases shall be made under such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Corporation may determine: *Provided,* That to the extent that the proceeds of such loans or purchases are used for the purchase of equipment, plant, or machinery the principal obligation shall not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of such equipment, plant, or machinery: *And provided further,* That the total amount of commitments for loans made and obligations purchased under this section shall not exceed $50,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and no financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

SEC. 103. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of section 500 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"And provided further,* That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest than otherwise prescribed in this section for loans guaranteed under this title, but not exceeding 4½ percent per annum, if he finds that the loan market demands it."

TITLE II—SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI HOME LOANS AND FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION INSURED MORTGAGES

SEC. 201. Section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "which are insured after April 30, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under section 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "which are insured after April 30, 1948, under title II, or title VI of this act, or guaranteed after April 30, 1948, under section 501, or section 502, or section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended."

SEC. 202. Paragraph (E) of the proviso of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause No. (2) the figure "25" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "50."

TITLE III—STANDARDIZED BUILDING CODES AND MATERIALS

SEC. 301. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall undertake and conduct technical research and studies to develop and promote the acceptance and application of improved and standardized building codes and regulations and methods for the more uniform administration thereof, and standardized dimensions and methods for the assembly of home-building materials and equipment.

SEC. 302. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator shall utilize, to the fullest extent feasible, the available facilities of other departments, independent establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government, and, notwithstanding any other law, shall appoint a Director to administer under his general supervision the provisions of this title.

SEC. 303. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV—EQUITY INVESTMENT AIDS

SEC. 401. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE VII—INSURANCE FOR INVESTMENTS IN RENTAL HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE

"SEC. 701. The purpose of this title is to supplement the existing systems of mortgage insurance for rental housing under this act by a special system of insurance designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing at rents within the capacity of families of moderate income. To effectuate this purpose, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the investor, to insure as hereinafter provided, and, prior to the execution of insurance contracts and upon such terms as the Administrator shall prescribe, to make commitments to insure, the minimum annual amortization charge and an annual return on the outstanding investment of such investor in any project which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided in an amount (herein called the 'insured annual return') equal to such rate of return, not exceeding 2¾ percent per annum, on such outstanding investments as shall, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, be fixed in the insurance contract or in the commitment to insure: *Provided*, That any insurance contract made pursuant to this title shall expire as of the first day of the operating year for which the outstanding investment amounts to not more than 10 percent of the established investment: *And provided further*, That the aggregate amount of contingent liabilities outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure made pursuant to this title shall not exceed $1,000,000,000.

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 702. (a) To be eligible for insurance under this title, a project shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The Administrator shall be satisfied that there is, in the locality or metropolitan area of such project, a need for new rental dwellings at rents comparable to the rents proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project.

"(2) Such project shall be economically sound, and the dwellings in such project shall be acceptable to the Administrator as to quality, design, size, and type.

"(b) Any insurance contract executed by the Administrator under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the project and the investor for such insurance, and the validity of any insurance contract so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an investor from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such investor.

"PREMIUMS AND FEES

"SEC. 703. (a) For insurance granted pursuant to this title the Administrator shall fix and collect a premium charge in an amount not exceeding one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year for which such premium charge is payable without taking into account the excess earnings, if any, applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment. Such premium charge shall be payable annually in advance by the investor, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Administrator under this title at par plus accrued insert: *Provided*, That, if in any operating year the gross income shall be less than the operating expenses, the premium charge payable during such operating year shall be waived, but only to the extent of the amount of the difference between such expenses and such income and subject to subsequent payment out of any excess earnings as hereinafter provided.

"(b) With respect to any project offered for insurance under this title, the Administrator is authorized to charge and collect reasonable fees for examination, and for inspection during the construction of the project: *Provided*, That such fees shall not aggregate more than one-half of 1 percent of the estimated investment.

"RENTS

"SEC. 704. The Administrator shall require that the rents for the dwellings in any project insured under this title shall be established in accordance with a rent schedule approved by the Administrator, and that the investor shall not charge or collect rents for any dwellings in the project in excess of the appropriate rents therefor as shown in the latest rent schedule approved pursuant to this section. Prior to approving the initial or any subsequent rent schedule pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall find that such schedule affords reasonable assurance that the rents to be established thereunder are (1) not lower than necessary, together with all other income to be derived from or in connection with the project, to produce reasonably stable revenues sufficient to provide for the payment of the operating expenses, the minimum annual amortization charge, and the minimum annual return; and (2) not higher than necessary to meet the need for dwellings for families of moderate income.

"EXCESS EARNINGS

"SEC. 705. For all of the purposes of any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, 50 percent of the excess earnings, if any, for any operating year may be applied, in addition to the minimum annual return, to return on the outstanding investment but only to the extent that such application thereof does not result in an annual return of more than 5 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year, and the balance of any such excess earnings shall be applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment: *Provided*, That if in any preceding operating years the gross income shall have been less than the operating expenses, such excess earnings shall be applied to the extent necessary in whole or in part, first, to the reimbursement of the amount of the difference between such expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and such income, and, second, to the payment of any premium charges previously waived hereunder.

"FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

"SEC. 706. With respect to each project insured under this title, the Administrator shall provide that, after the close of each operating year, the investor shall submit to him for approval a financial and operating statement covering such operating year. If any such financial and operating statement shall not have been submitted or, for proper cause, shall not have been approved by the Administrator, payment of any claim submitted by the investor may, at the option of the Administrator, be withheld, in whole or in part, until such statement shall have been submitted and approved.

"PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

"SEC. 707. If in any operating year the net income of a project insured under this title is less than the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return, the Administrator, upon submission by the investor of a claim for the payment of the amount of the difference between such net income and the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return and after proof of the validity of such claim, shall pay to the investor, in cash from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, the amount of such difference, as determined by the Administrator, but not exceeding, in any event, an amount equal to the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return.

"DEBENTURES

"SEC. 708. (a) If the aggregate of the amounts paid to the investor pursuant to section 707 hereof with respect to a project insured under this title shall at any time equal or exceed 15 percent of the established investment, the Administrator thereafter shall have the right, after written notice to the investor of his intentions so to do, to acquire, as of the first day of any operating year, such project in consideration of the issuance and delivery to the investor of debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year. In any such case the investor shall be obligated to convey to said Administrator title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and, in the event that the investor fails so to do, said Administrator may, at his option, terminate the insurance contract.

"(b) If in any operating year the aggregate of the differences between the operating expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and the gross income for the preceding operating years, less the aggregate of any deficits in such operating expenses reimbursed from excess earnings as hereinbefore provided, shall at any time equal or exceed 5 percent of the established investment, the investor shall thereafter have the right, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, to convey to the Administrator, as of the first day of any operating year, title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and to receive from the Administrator debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(c) Any difference, not exceeding $50, between 90 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year in which a project is acquired by the Administrator pursuant to this section and the total face value of the debentures to be issued and delivered to the investor pursuant to this section shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Administrator to the investor from the Housing Investment Insurance Fund.

"(d) Upon the acquisition of a project by the Administrator pursuant to this section, the insurance contract shall terminate.

"(e) Debentures issued under this title to any investor shall be executed in the name of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Administrator, by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. Such debentures shall be dated as of the first day of the operating year in which the project for which such debentures were issued was acquired by the Administrator, shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the insurance contract was executed, but not to exceed 2¾ percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature on the 1st day of July in such calendar year or years, not later than the fortieth following the date of the issuance thereof, as shall be determined by the Administrator and stated on the face of such debentures.

"(f) Such debentures shall be in such form and in such denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and may include such provisions

for redemption as shall be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be issued in either coupon or registered form.

"(g) Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, shall be payable out of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, which shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed, as to both the principal thereof and the interest thereon, by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the Housing Investment Insurance Fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or the interest on any debentures so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon, to the extent of the amount so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real and other property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power, for the protection of the Housing Investment Insurance Fund, to pay out of said fund all expenses or charges in connection with, and to deal with, complete, reconstruct, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts for the management of, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash or credit or lease in his discretion, in whole or in part, any project acquired pursuant to this title; and, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator shall also have power to pursue to final collection by way of compromise or otherwise all claims acquired by, or assigned or transferred to, him in connection with the acquisition or disposal of any project pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract for hazard insurance, or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of any project acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such purchase or contract does not exceed $1,000.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 709. The investor, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, may terminate, as of the close of any operating year, any insurance contract made pursuant to this title. The Administrator shall prescribe the events and conditions under which said Administrator shall have the option to terminate any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, and the events and conditions under which said Administrator may reinstate any insurance contract terminated pursuant to this section or section 708 (a). If any insurance contract is terminated pursuant to this section, the Administrator may require the investor to pay an adjusted premium charge in such amount as the Administrator determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges which such investor otherwise would have been required to pay if such insurance contract had not been so terminated.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 710. There is hereby created a Housing Investment Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Administrator as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. For this purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Administrator such funds as the Administrator shall deem necessary, but not to exceed $10,000,000, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, inspection and other fees, service charges, and any other income received by the Administrator under this title, together with all earnings on the assets of such Housing Investment Insurance Fund, shall be credited to said fund. All payments made pursuant to claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, cash adjustments, the principal of and interest on debentures issued under this title, expenses incurred in connection with or as a consequence of the acquisition and disposal of projects acquired under this title, and all administrative expenses in connection with this title, shall be paid from said fund. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all approved claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, and, in the event said fund fails to make any such payment when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the investor the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Moneys in the Housing Investment Insurance Fund not needed for current operations under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of said fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed by, the United States. The Administrator may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under this title. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 711. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Administrator under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 712. The Administrator may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title, including, without limiting the foregoing, rules and regulations relating to the maintenance by the investor of books, records, and accounts with respect to the project and the examination of such books, records, and accounts by representatives of the Administrator; the submission of financial and operating statements and the approval thereof; the submission of claims for payments under insurance contracts, the proof of the validity of such claims, and the payment or disallowance thereof; the increase of the established investment if the investor shall make capital improvements or additions to the project; the decrease of the established investment if the investor shall sell part of the project; and the reduction of the outstanding investment for the appropriate operating year or operating years pending the restoration of dwelling or nondwelling facilities damaged by fire or other casualty. With respect to any investor which is subject to supervision or regulation by a State banking, insurance, or other State department or agency, the Administrator may, in carrying out any of his supervisory and regulatory functions with respect to projects insured under this title, utilize, contract with, and act through, such department or agency and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 713. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) 'Investor' shall mean (1) any natural person; (2) any group of not more than 10 natural persons; (3) any corporation, company, association, trust, or other legal entity; or (4) any combination of two or more corporations, companies, associations, trusts, or other legal entities, having all the powers necessary to comply with the requirements of this title, which the Administrator (i) shall find to be qualified by business experience and facilities, to afford assurance of the necessary continuity of long-term investment, and to have available the necessary capital required for long-term investment in the project, and (ii) shall approve as eligible for insurance under this title.

"(b) 'Project' shall mean a project (including all property, real and personal, contracts, rights, and choses in action acquired, owned, or held by the investor in connection therewith) of an investor designed and used primarily for the purpose of providing dwellings the occupancy of which is permitted by the investor in consideration of agreed charges: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting the inclusion in a project of such stores, offices, or other commercial facilities, recreational or community facilities, or other nondwelling facilities as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or desirable appurtenances to such project.

"(c) 'Estimated investment' shall mean the estimated cost of the development of the project, as stated in the application submitted to the Administrator for insurance under this title.

"(d) 'Established investment' shall mean the amount of the reasonable costs, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, carrying out all works and undertakings for the development of a project and shall include the premium charge for the first operating year and the cost of all necessary surveys, plans and specifications, architectural, engineering, or other special services, land acquisition, site preparation, construction, and equipment; a reasonable return on the funds of the investor paid out in course of the development of the project, up to and including the initial occupancy date; necessary expenses in connection with the initial occupancy of the project; and the cost of such other items as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the development of the project, (1) less the amount by which the rents and revenues derived from the project up to and including the initial occupancy date exceeded the reasonable and proper expenses, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, operating and maintaining said project up to and including the initial occupancy date, or (2) plus the amount by which such expenses exceeded such rents and revenues, as the case may be.

"(e) 'Physical completion date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which the Administrator determines that the construction of the project is substantially completed and substantially all of the dwellings therein are available for occupancy.

"(f) 'Initial occupancy date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which 90 percent in number of the dwellings in the project on the physical completion date shall have been occupied, but shall in no event be later than the last day of the sixth calendar month next following the physical completion date.

"(g) 'Operating year' shall mean the period of 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date and each succeeding period of 12 consecutive calendar months, and the period of the first 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date shall be the first operating year.

"(h) 'Gross income' for any operating year shall mean the total rents and revenues and other income derived from, or in connection with, the project during such operating year.

"(i) 'Operating expenses' for any operating year shall mean the amounts, as approved by the Administrator, necessary to meet the reasonable and proper costs of, and to provide for, operating and maintaining the project, and to establish and maintain reasonable and proper reserves for repairs, maintenance, and replacements, and other necessary reserves during such operating year, and shall include necessary expenses for real estate taxes, special assessments, premium charges made pursuant to this title, administrative expenses, the annual rental under any lease pursuant to which the real property comprising the site of the project is held by the investor, and insurance charges, together with such other expenses as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the project, but shall not include income taxes.

"(j) 'Net income' for any operating year shall mean gross income remaining after the payment of the operating expenses.

"(k) 'Minimum annual amortization charge' shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment, except that, in the case of a project where the real property comprising the site thereof is held by the investor under a lease, if (notwithstanding the proviso of section 703 (a) hereof) the gross income for any operating year shall be less than the amount required to pay the operating expenses (including the annual rental under such lease), the minimum annual amortization charge for such operating year shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment plus the amount of the annual rental under such lease to the extent that the same is not paid from the gross income.

"(l) 'Annual return' for any operating year shall mean the net income remaining after the payment of the minimum annual amortization charge.

"(m) 'Insured annual return' shall have the meaning ascribed to it in section 701 hereof.

"(n) 'Minimum annual return' for any operating year shall mean an amount equal to 3½ percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(o) 'Excess earnings' for any operating year shall mean the net income derived from a project in excess of the minimum annual amortization charge and the minimum annual return.

"(p) 'Outstanding investment' for any operating year shall mean the established investment, less an amount equal to (1) the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge for each preceding operating year, plus (2) the aggregate of the excess earnings, if any, during each preceding operating year applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization in accordance with the provisions of section 705 hereof."

SEC. 402. Sections 1 and 5 of the National Housing Act, as amended, are hereby amended by striking out "titles II, III, and VI" wherever they appear in said sections and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, VI, and VII."

TITLE V—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. (a) Effective upon the date of enactment of this act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $16,500 per annum, and the members of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner shall each receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

(b) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "Federal Housing Administration;" immediately after the semicolon which follows "United States Housing Corporation": *Provided*, That, as to the Federal Housing Administration, the audit required by section 105 of said act shall begin with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, and the exception contained in section 301 (d) of said act shall be construed to refer to the cost of audits contracted for prior to July 1, 1948.

SEC. 502. In carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties—

(a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Administrator may make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out such functions, powers, and duties and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. The Administrator may delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees as he may designate, and may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. The Administrator shall cause to be prepared for the Housing and Home Finance Agency an official seal of such device as he shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal. The Secretary of Commerce or his designee shall hereafter be included in the membership of the National Housing Council.

(b) The Public Housing Administration shall sue and be sued only with respect to its functions under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, as amended. The Public Housing Commissioner may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall hereafter be made hereunder, and shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees of the Public Housing Administration as he may designate; and make such rules and regulations as he may find necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. Funds made available for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Administration (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administration. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law except provisions of law hereafter enacted expressly in limitation hereof, the Public Housing Administration, or any State or local public agency administering a low-rent housing project assisted pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937 or title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it where such action is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such housing accommodations are administered, and, in determining net income for the purposes of tenant eligibility with respect to low-rent housing projects assisted pursuant to said acts, the Public Housing Administration is authorized, where it finds such action equitable and in the public interest, to exclude amounts or portions thereof paid by the United States Government for disability or death occurring in connection with military service.

(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board (which term as used in this section shall also include and refer to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board), the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, may, in addition to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities conferred elsewhere in this act—

(1) with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, accept and utilize equipment, facilities, or the services of employees of any State or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization and, in connection with the utilization of such services, may make payments for transportation while away from their homes or regular places of business and per diem in lieu of subsistence en route and at place of such service, in accordance with the provisions of 5 U. S. C. 73b–2;

(2) utilize, contract with, and act through, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, any Federal, State, or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, and any funds available to said officers for carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties shall be available to reimburse any such agency or organization; and, whenever in the judgment of any such officer necessary, he may make advance, progress, or other payments with respect to such contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes;

(3) make expenditures for all necessary expenses, including preparation, mounting, shipping, and installation of exhibits; purchase and exchange of technical apparatus; and such other expenses as may, from time to time, be found necessary in carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase or contract by said officers (or their agencies), respectively, for services or supplies if the amount thereof does not exceed $300: *And provided further*, That funds made available for administrative expenses in carrying out the functions, powers, and duties imposed upon the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, by or pursuant to law may at their option be consolidated into single administrative expense fund accounts of said officers or agencies for expenditure by them, respectively, in accordance with the provisions hereof.

ACT CONTROLLING

SEC. 503. Insofar as the provisions of any other law are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall be controlling.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 504. Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this act, all powers and authorities conferred by this act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. Notwithstanding any other evidences of the intention of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the controlling intent of Congress that if any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act

or its applications to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provisions of this act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to make an inquiry which perhaps I should address to the Chair. Several Senators who have an amendment to offer to the bill are interested in this point. Would the suggestion made by the Senator from Wisconsin preclude us from offering a separate amendment to the bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know the parliamentary rules too well, so I would ask the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well; I address my inquiry to the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entitled to offer amendments to the committee substitute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me suggest that if the Senator does what he now proposes to do, if he offers a complete substitute for the committee substitute, both substitutes will be open to amendment before the final vote, of course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. And a Senator may offer an amendment to either the committee substitute or to the McCarthy substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, some days ago, at the request of the Senate leadership, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] appointed a three-man subcommittee to discuss the question of housing with the House Banking and Currency Committee. In accordance with that suggestion, the Senator from New Hampshire appointed the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] to meet with the House Banking and Currency Committee. We met with them. Several of the other members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee were present. We thought we had a rather fruitful discussion.

The House Banking and Currency Committee leadership took the position at that time that a special session is not the time at which to pass slum-clearance legislation or long-range public housing legislation. Regardless of whether we agree or disagree with that position, that was their position. They are very firm in that position.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the House leadership advised him that they did not feel that this special session was the time at which to pass legislation providing for slum clearance and public housing?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY. Is that what the Senator said?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me refresh the Senator's memory for a moment, if he will permit, and let me ask him if this is true: Does the Senator ever remember any time since he has been a Member of the Senate when the House leadership even condescended to smile on legislation on that subject? As a matter of fact, they have had a rod in pickle as to those matters, to be used against them whenever they showed their heads. They have doomed them to extinction, so far as they are concerned, always.

Mr. McCARTHY. As the Senator recalls, I submitted proposed legislation on slum clearance last year; and the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] submitted proposed legislation very similar to it. At the time when we considered the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, as the Senator knows, I submitted various amendments to the public housing features of that bill.

Finally we compromised. As the Senator knows, I supported the slum-clearance and public-housing provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. So I wish that understood.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course, but the point is that in the past the House leadership has never favored that. It has not changed a bit. I wish the Members of the Senate to have that point clearly in mind.

Let me say, if the Senator will permit a question for 30 seconds, that if Senators wish to handle this matter properly, they should vote down every single amendment, in order to keep public-housing and slum-clearance provisions in the bill. Senators must not be deceived by words and verbiage that would result in removing those features from the bill. We should provide for public housing and for slum clearance; and in order to do that, we should vote down every amendment which would remove those provisions from the bill.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. President, as I have stated, the House leadership took the position that they would not accept public-housing legislation at this time or slum-clearance legislation. One of the members of the House of Representatives Banking and Currency Committee telephoned to me within the last 10 minutes and called to my attention one of the reasons why they take that position. He called my attention to part of the Republican Party platform dealing with housing, namely:

> We recommend Federal aid to the States for local slum-clearance and low-rental housing programs only where there is a need that cannot be met either by private enterprise or by the States and localities.

That is a different approach from the one you have been fighting for. Whether that approach would meet with the approval of the Senator from New Hampshire, I do not know; but again I point out that the House states bluntly that it will not accept slum-clearance legislation or public-housing legislation at this time. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire understands my point.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; I understand.

Mr. McCARTHY. So the point is that if we are to have any housing legislation at this session, at least the House will not agree to have slum-clearance and public-housing provisions included in it.

We now have before us what the subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has agreed upon. We feel that the thing this bill will accomplish, above all else, will be the stimulation of the production of low-cost housing. By this bill we shall make the loans for lower-cost housing much more liberal than they previously have been made. We attempt to tighten up credit on the more expensive homes.

Let me review the bill briefly. First of all as to title VI—the much-disputed title—we have dropped from that title the section dealing with "for sale" housing. We felt that was too inflationary and that it stimulated the production of the more expensive types of homes.

However, we have retained section 608, the one dealing with rental housing. We provide for an additional $800,000,000 authorization.

I may say that we have talked to any number of men in the Housing Administration; and although their position is that they favor, as does the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], slum clearance and public housing, nevertheless they tell us that unless section 608 is reactivated there will be a great slump in home building during the present year. I think there is no doubt about that.

We have retained section 609. That is the section dealing with loans to prefabricated housing manufacturers. Substantially the only change which has been made, as compared with the law now in existence, is one to make it possible for the prefabricated housing manufacturers to get the loans which Congress intended them to get.

I may say that everything we have in this bill, everything that it contains, I believe, is endorsed 100 percent by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and, I believe, by everyone else interested in housing. If I misstate the Senator's position, I hope he will tell me so. I think the position the Senator from New Hampshire takes is that although everything we provide for in this bill is good and although it is an improvement over those sections of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill previously referred to, nevertheless the bill is incomplete unless public housing and slum clearance are provided for.

One of the new provisions we have made in this bill is for a 95-percent guaranty of loans on homes which cost $6,300 or less. Of course, the purpose is obvious. It is, in effect, to force contractors to concentrate on the lower-cost homes, because unless we make loans easier to

obtain on such homes, many persons will not be able to buy them, and there would be no use in building less expensive homes.

We have retained section 610, which merely has to do with the insurance of loans on war housing and loans on Greenbelt housing and loans for the purchase of the TVA village properties. I understand the Appropriations Committee has taken action indicating congressional desire that there be a disposal of those TVA villages.

We have retained section 611 of the T-E-W bill, but have made one major change, feeling that 611 as presently contained in the T-E-W bill is too inflationary. The maximum cost of a home under 611 of the present bill I believe is $9,000 or thereabouts. We have reduced that to $7,500. We have reduced the construction guaranty from 90 percent to 80 percent in an attempt to make that particular section of the bill less inflationary. I undertsand there is still some difference of opinion as to whether we should enact this section even in its present form, but our subcommittee unanimously agreed we should, in view of the fact that it concentrates solely on cheaper housing.

I might say I invite Senators to interrupt me at any time as I run through the measure, if they feel I am not making the provisions clear.

The title II provisions are substantially the same as title——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield merely for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I am not quite clear as to which draft the Senator is reading from in giving the numbers. I do not find those numbers in either of the drafts before me on the desk.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am referring to House bill 6959.

Mr. FLANDERS. The committee print, if the Senator will excuse me.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; it is the committee print.

Turning to page 55, under title I we deal with title VI of the National Housing Act. I know it is confusing. I am referring to what is in title I of the committee print, which deals with title VI of the National Housing Act. That is the emergency section which was passed during the late days of the war.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Before leaving this particular title, will the Senator point out the difference between the substitute he is offering and the committee substitute? Wherein is there a distinct difference?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator knows that we have three bills before us.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. We have the House bill, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and our subcommittee bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the Senator asking for a statement of the difference between this and the House bill, or between our bill and the T-E-W bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am asking for the difference between this and the House bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. The House bill has nothing in it whatever in regard to title VI, the reason for that being that the House sent over a separate bill extending title VI. Their bill extending title VI also included the so-called for-sale housing. We have eliminated that, so that practically the only difference is that we have eliminated the liberal loans on the for-sale housing. We have cut the authorization also from $1,600,000,000 to $800,000,000. The Housing and Home Finance Agency tell us that with the elimination of the for-sale housing, the authorization of $800,000,000 instead of $1,600,000,000 is sufficient.

Again the purpose is to keep the contractors from concentrating on the more expensive houses, and to try to make the bill less inflationary.

Passing to title II, one very important change is there made. It will be recalled that in the closing days, the Senate passed what I believe is known as the Jenner bill, a bill providing for a secondary market and also setting up a veterans' cooperative.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to suggest that wherever the Senator refers to any part of the bill, he give the page number. There is a good deal of confusion in the minds of those not familiar with this draft, as to the bill titles and the titles of the original housing act.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Vermont. I am referring now to page 64, title II amendments, which also refers to title II of the National Housing Act. I may say in passing in connection with this, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] contacted the committee during the construction of the bill and urged additional aid for veterans in the veterans' cooperative, and additional aid by way of a secondary market. His intelligent help in that regard was very much appreciated by myself and by the other members of our subcommittee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. There is considerable difficulty and I think some confusion as to how long the Senate will continue in session and as to whether or not there will be a vote on any of the pending measures. I am not sure from what certain Senators have said whether we will be able to adjourn at a certain hour, and whether any votes will be taken. In order to clarify the matter, if the Senator will permit, I suggest that the Senate continue in session as long as it would like to do so, but not vote on any of the amendments until tomorrow at 1 o'clock.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the acting majority leader trying to get rid of my audience?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I want the audience to remain. However, I feel that in order to expedite matters, with other legislation coming before us, that if we could remain in session as long as we care to debate the issue tonight, I would then make the suggestion that the Senate convene tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m., the debate to continue from that hour until 1 o'clock, the time to be divided equally between the proponents and opponents, to be controlled for the proponents by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and for opponents being in charge of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. By so doing, even though the debate were exhausted, as we hope it may be, by the time the session ends tonight, the amendments would then be printed and would be on the desks, and Senators would know exactly what they were voting on tomorrow, without any difficulty.

If the Senator from Wisconsin will yield further, I may say that I took this suggestion up with the acting minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] with the idea of ascertaining whether he thought such a request would meet with favor. I should like to ask him whether he feels that such a unanimous-consent request should be made, and whether, if made, he believes unanimous consent would be given?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the acting majority leader that I have canvassed the situation pretty well on this side of the aisle. Senators on the floor have no serious objection to such a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. In order to make it binding, it would be necessary to waive a quorum call. I should like to ask the distinguished acting minority leader whether he would feel that Senators on his side of the aisle would be willing to do that, in order to get the request before the Senate immediately.

Mr. LUCAS. I should, of course, very much dislike to do that. Under the circumstances, however, if the Senator from Nebraska wants to take the chance, the Senator from Illinois will also take a chance.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me, I ask unanimous consent that a quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Secondly, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 1 o'clock tomorrow the Senate vote upon the pending measure, together with any amendments thereto, that amendments offered shall be germane to the subject matter, and that when the Senate recesses at the conclusion of this afternoon's session, it reconvene at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow. Further, I would include the provision that the time between the hours of 11 a. m. and 1 p. m., shall be equally divided between proponents and opponents of the measure, to be controlled for proponents by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and for opponents by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I know what the Senator intends, but I doubt if he included both the bill as reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency and the amendments now being submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes; I include the bill reported, the substitute committee bill, and all amendments thereto, to be voted on at 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is our intention also to remain in session at least until 7 o'clock tonight, if it takes that long, to debate the amendments now before the Senate. At that hour I should like very much if possible to recess, if we reach that hour, in view of the fact that we are to reconvene at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the two Senators from Oregon [Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE] and the two Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. CAIN] intend to propose an amendment to the substitute bill offered to the pending bill by the Senator from Wisconsin, and if that substitute bill does not prevail, then, to the substitute bill reported by the committee. I send to the desk the amendment proposed to be offered, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Wisconsin has a very good bill which should be acceptable to everyone. It has been ably explained. If the Senator from Wisconsin will accept an amendment I should like to offer at this time, which would do away with the tax on trailers, since 90 percent of them are now used for housing, I shall be glad to offer it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator's amendment provides that the tax imposed by subsection (b) shall not apply in the case of trailer-coaches of the housing type sold prior to July 1, 1950, and after the close of the month in which falls the date of the enactment of this subsection.

May I inquire of the Senator from Nevada as to the amount of the tax which is now imposed on that type trailer?

Mr. MALONE. It is 7 percent, the same as on automobiles. As a matter of fact, the Government itself takes most of the trailers for housing for veterans, because trailers are mobile and can be moved readily from place to place.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, while I cannot very well speak for the entire subcommittee which is responsible for the drafting of the bill, I personally think there is nothing objectionable in the Senator's amendment, and I should not oppose it personally. I do not know what position the other members of the committee will take.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment. It can be called up later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada offers an amendment to substitute for the committee substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, which the clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. —. Section 3403 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The tax imposed by subsection (b) shall not apply in the case of trailer coaches of the housing type (including parts or accessories therefor sold on or in connection therewith or with the sale thereof) sold prior to July 1, 1950, and after the close of the month in which falls the date of the enactment of this subsection."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think that amendment should lie over for consideration tomorrow, and not be voted on at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. According to the Chair's understanding of the unanimous-consent agreement, it is implicit that there be no amendment voted on this afternoon. That is the Chair's understanding of the agreement.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, continuing my remarks, I believe I had previously stated that the title II amendments on page 64 of the committee print are substantially the same as the title II amendments of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, except for the attempt to concentrate on the lower cost homes and to tighten up credit on the more expensive home.

There is one other very important change. The veterans' cooperative measure passed by this body in the closing days of the last session provided guaranteed loans to veterans' cooperatives. Apparently, because of an oversight, there was no change made in the old room limitation. The room limitation was $1,350. Obviously such a limitation cannot be applied at this time. Originally we had increased that to an $8,100 per unit limitation. However, the commissioner of housing of New York, through the office of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and with the Senator, called our attention to a very sizable project which is under construction in New York by the United Veterans' Mutual Housing Co., Inc., known as Bell Park Gardens. If I am incorrect in my statements, I hope the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] will correct me. I understand that much planning has gone into that particular project. I understand that veterans have paid down some money. I understand there are commitments from a bank in the amount of—I do not know how many millions of dollars, but I believe it is over $7,000,000. The commitments have been made at 3½ percent interest.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I simply desire to cite some facts pertaining to the particular project to which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin refers. The first of such projects, an 800-apartment garden-type project, planned for Bayside, Queens, under section 608, at the beginning of this year, on the basis of $1,800 per room, cannot be built at any lesser mortgage figure. Some 600 veterans have made down payments averaging $1,000, almost $600,000 being now on deposit. One of the largest New York banks made a $7,250,000 mortgage commitment at 3½ percent, an interest rate no longer available. An option on the 40 acres of land was obtained at the very reasonable price of $8,000 per acre. Anyone who is familiar with that section of New York knows that that is a very reasonable price. A reputable contracting firm agreed to construct the project at figures which have since increased. All of this was based on the $1,800 per room mortgage then available under section 608, and the good faith and prestige of the State of New York—its word to some 600 individual veterans who are willing to help themselves by personally financing their own apartments without one cent of public funds as a means of obtaining badly needed housing within the private-enterprise system—now hang in the balance.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I understand that loan commitments have been made totaling in excess of $1,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. IVES. The amount is $7,250,000.

Mr. McCARTHY. That commitment has been made at the rate of 3½ percent. Since the increase in interest rates, I gather that the bank would be very happy to get out from under the contract. A firm contract was made with a builder. Since that time costs have increased, and I assume the building contractor would be happy to have a release of that contract.

Mr. IVES. I should like to point out that unless this provision in the present statutes is made, this whole project will go down in defeat and failure, and there will be no project.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what I was coming to. Unless we pass some housing legislation at this time, that is just one of the projects which will be dropped. It can be multiplied by 50, 100, 500—I do not know how many times. But unless we pass some housing legislation, the building of homes for veterans will cease over night.

For the record, and so that the FHA may be thoroughly apprised of what the Senate has in mind, I wish very briefly to detail the amendments we made to the bill, to cover Bell Park Gardens and other like projects.

There was an $8,100 per unit limitation, but we find in these cooperatives that it is often necessary to have apartments of 5 or 6 or 7 rooms. In such a situation obviously a per-unit limitation is unworkable. We have therefore provided that where a veterans' cooperative is concerned, the head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency may shift from the per-unit limitation to a per-room limitation of $1,800 per room, and that will take care of the situation in Bell Park Gardens and countless other like situations.

There is another substantial change, and I think this is especially important

in view of the Federal Reserve Board's recent memorandum issued to the member banks to tighten up on home loans. With the Federal Reserve System tightening up on home loans, and many State banks following that lead, as they often do, we find that in many areas it is almost impossible to get loans for low-cost homes. So what we are doing in this bill at this time—and this meets with the approval of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who originally introduced the bill—is to increase the secondary market from 25 percent of the portfolio to 50 percent.

We have taken title I from the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which deals almost exclusively with what is known as title I, class 3 homes. There are very few of those in large cities; they are rural and semirural homes. We have increased the loan limitation from $3,000 to $4,500. The T-E-W bill increased the authorization from $165,000,000 to $175,000,000. In this bill we have increased it to $200,000,000. In other words, there is a $35,000,000 increase in the authorization. The loan being a 10-percent loan, the increase of value of low-cost homes covered by this increase would total $350,000,000. Again, that is aimed toward inducing the contractors to get down in the low-cost housing field.

I think we have one of the most important sections of the bill, from a long-range standpoint, on page 74, starting in line 18, entitled "Standardized Building Codes and Measurements." As all Senators know, the Joint Housing Committee, which spent many thousands of dollars traveling across the country attempting to study thoroughly the housing situation in order to find out what the really serious road blocks in the way of housing were, agreed, I think, unanimously, that one of the most serious road blocks in the way of low-cost housing is the greatly outmoded cost-increasing restrictive codes in some 2,000 different metropolitan areas. We feel that this has contributed to keeping the building industry roughly 50 years behind the times.

We think this situation cannot be corrected except with some Federal cooperation, so in this bill we set up within the Housing and Home Finance Agency a section whose sole job will be to work toward the standardization of codes and the standardization of measurements and building materials. That, of course, calls also for some research, which will cost money, how much we do not know, but regardless of how much it costs we feel it will be money very well spent. It will call for research in connection with accomplishing these two objectives, namely, standardization of codes and standardization of building materials. It does not call for any other research except that type of research.

We have taken the yield-insurance program from the T-E-W bill in toto and put it in this bill on page 75. There is a great deal of difference of opinion as to how much good this yield-insurance program may do. So far we have met with no one who says it will do any harm. As Senators know, simply stated, the yield-insurance program merely says to the equity investor—not the man who borrows money, but the equity investor, "If you will build rental units and set the rent to yield roughly 3½ percent on the investment, we will guarantee you a 2¾ percent return." It is not anticipated by our committee or by the Bureau of the Budget that this will cost the taxpayer a single cent. A number of insurance companies say this will induce them to come into the rental market and start to producing cheaper rental housing.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Has the committee made a study to determine whether or not the renters can pay the rent which will yield the rate of interest the Senator is mentioning on the money invested by the trust funds?

Mr. McCARTHY. How low in rentals the equity investor can get I do not know. In one city he may produce rental units which will rent at $60, in another city rental units which will rent for $35 or $40. We know that if we take the formula the FHA uses in setting rents on section 608 projects, and compare that with the formula used in setting rents under the yield insurance plan, there will be a saving of 20 percent, I think it is, at any rate, it is a substantial saving. These are not my figures, they are figures from the Deparment, and I have used them in the RECORD heretofore.

Let me briefly explain. In setting the rental on the section 608 projects, in view of the fact that the builder must borrow the money and pay interest on it, and pay insurance, they must set a higher return than as though he were using his own money. The return is roughly 6 or 6½ percent, according to the formula used. Actually if one will sit down and take his pencil he will find it is 8 or 9 percent. In other words, in the section 608 projects rental units are being produced in which the rents are set to yield an 8 or 9 percent return. If we can get investors to come in under this yield insurance section of the bill, we will have rental units on which the return will be only 3 or 3½ percent, and it will produce units that will rent for less money.

Mr. WATKINS. If the rental is not sufficient to make the return, the United States Government then will have to pay the difference, will it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. We have gone into this matter very thoroughly, and the Bureau of the Budget has gone over it. If times are even seminormal, or even with a depression, it is not estimated that this will cost the taxpayers anything, for the reason that the returns are set to yield 3½ percent.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not think the Senator caught my question. Assuming that the rentals, with the premiums, or whatever is charged for the insurance, are not sufficient to take care of what will have to be made up under the insurance program, the Treasury of the United States will have to make up the difference, as I understand.

Mr. McCARTHY. If we had a depression so great that these rental units were empty, or if the renters could not pay a rental to yield 3½ percent, the Treasury Department would have to make up that deficit. Before that happens, however, every section 608 project in the vicinity will be empty, and the Government itself will be really in the housing business. So that before it costs us anything under the yield insurance plan we can be quite certain that we will have taken back every section 608 project. I do not think that will happen.

Mr. WATKINS. My observation is that in the event the returns on rentals are not sufficient to make up the insured income, the Treasury Department will have to take care of it, anyway, and it will in effect be a subsidy.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct, I will say to the Senator, but——

Mr. WATKINS. What is the difference between that and the public housing provision under which some help is provided for the low-income group?

Mr. McCARTHY. First let me give the reason for yield insurance. Many insurance companies under their charters, under their contracts with their policyholders, under various State laws, cannot go into the field of building rental housing. This type of bill will enable them to do that. There have been very extensive studies, starting back with the Taft committee in 1944, and as yet we have had no witness come before the committee and say that this plan will cost the taxpayer money. Now with that unanimity of feeling I cannot feel that we need to be too disturbed about it. There is no doubt that if we get such a depression that every apartment house in the country is empty, and every renter is unable to pay his rent, then certainly this project will cost money. But if that time comes, we would not be much disturbed about this matter.

Mr. WATKINS. I will ask the Senator whether a study has been made to determine whether or not these apartments can be rented at a sum which the low income group can pay, and which will still yield the amount of guaranteed return?

Mr. McCARTHY. Such a study has been made. I might say we are deeply indebted to Columbia University for the aid it gave. They lent us Mr. Jones full time. They gave us unlimited help. I will say that a study has been made, and that all of us who gave some time studying this particular proposition are fully convinced that the equity investor who is satisfied to take 3½ percent on his money can produce rental units for less than the man who borrows money and pays 4½ percent, pays an insurance premium, and who must make a profit. The purpose of this is to get cheaper rental units, and try and get equity money in the market. As we all know there is practically no equity money in the market today and I think until we do get equity money into the market we will have difficulty in getting rents down.

Mr. WATKINS. Has the Senator received any explanation from firms or institutions which have this type of money as to whether they are willing to enter into a program of this kind?

Mr. McCARTHY. At the time of the hearings on the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill only one of the insurance

companies said it would commence building under this particular program. Since that time we went over the matter with all the major insurance companies to find what their objection was to the yield insurance program in the original T-E-W bill. They had some minor objections, none of any great importance. They were mostly questions of bookkeeping. We think we have successfully met those objections. We have been led by various insurance companies to believe we have done so. While we have no firm commitments by any insurance companies that they will start to build, we feel that this program will at least open the door to let them come in and build. In other words, we are in a position where nothing can be lost and everything can be gained.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it the Senator's opinion, then, that this particular provision will furnish the means for housing such as the public housing feature of the T-E-W bill seeks to provide?

Mr. McCARTHY. Very definitely not.

Mr. WATKINS. It is not intended to accomplish that purpose?

Mr. McCARTHY. Very definitely not. At least it would not provide rental units for the group that I would like to see taken care of by way of public housing.

We have the same salary provisions that were in the T-E-W bill that was passed by the Senate, and we also have a provision for the eviction of over-income tenants in the present 190,000 public housing units. We do not provide that they must be evicted instanter. We provide that the FPHA, the local housing agency, shall evict them in an orderly manner, and I understand they have a program of evicting 5 percent each month on 6 months' notice.

I have one amendment which I have taken the liberty of adding to the bill without having first consulted the other two members of the subcommittee. I do not believe they are present. If they disagree with this amendment, I shall feel forced to remove it from the bill. I hope they will agree to it.

First, I propose to give the reason for the amendment. I have had countless numbers of veterans and veterans' wives call on me and tell me that they go to these federally financed projects. They apply for an apartment. Everything is all set. They can get the apartment until they make the mistake of saying that they have one or two children. Once they mention children they are ruled out as far as getting an apartment is concerned.

The main reason why we are furnishing these liberal loans to stimulate the production of rental housing is so that the veterans and their families and the rest of our lower-income groups can be properly housed, and if a man can apply for a Federal loan, take advantage of all these Federal funds, and then say, "I am going to defeat the purposes of the bill by having an absolute bar against anyone who is raising a family," then there is no need of passing any housing legislation at all.

I shall read my proposed amendment:

Provided further, That no mortgage shall be insured under section 608 of this title unless the mortgagor certifies under oath that in selecting tenants for the property covered by the mortgage he will not discriminate against any family by reason of the fact that there are children in the family, and that he will not sell the property while the insurance is in effect unless the purchaser so certifies, such certification to be filed with the Administrator; and violation of any such certification shall be a misdemeanor punishable by fine of not to exceed $500.

In closing, Mr. President, I will say that while I, myself, supported the slum-clearance provision, spent weeks drafting what I thought was a good slum-clearance provision, while I supported the public housing provision as it was finally written, and I voted for it then, and I would vote for it again. I will say I know the one way in which we can kill all housing legislation and make sure that there will be no housing legislation at this session, is to include a public housing and slum-clearance provision in the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have been very much interested in reading the program of Mr. Eccles for preventing inflation, and in connection with housing I notice this provision in his program:

Housing: The Federal Government should not, by what seem to me political reasons, encourage a housing program in excess of the amount of labor and materials available and encourage further inflationary trends.

I should like to ask whether or not the Senator from Wisconsin feels that the measure he proposes does take those trends into account.

Mr. McCARTHY. What we have tried to do is to redraft the bill in the light of what has happened since the original introduction of the bill, taking into account the inflationary forces. That is the reason why we have liberalized the loans on the lower cost housing. We tried to tighten up the credit on the more expensive homes.

Mr. BREWSTER. So as to encourage the more moderate classes of homes, having consideration for the so obviously limited supply of materials that the President's board reported was available.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is true. And in effect what I think it will do, is to channelize the scarce materials into the cheaper, lower cost homes, because if a contractor cannot sell a $14,000 or $16,000 home under the liberal loan provision that we all of us had in mind some time ago—if we say, "You can no longer get these liberal loans for the expensive homes, but we will make the loans more liberal for the homes that cost five or six or seven thousand dollars," what will happen is that the scarce material will be channelized into that type of housing where it is most needed.

Mr. President, I think that covers substantially all the bill. Again I urge the Senate——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Would it be safe for any Senator to conclude that the Senator from Wisconsin is in fact recommending the passage at this time by the Senate of an improved Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, less public housing and slum clearance?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that is a fair statement. I might say that we had the very intelligent assistance of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in redrafting the sections of the bill, keeping in mind his view that some provisions of the original bill were very inflationary.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield

Mr. FLANDERS. The things which are left out of the committee print are those he mentions, namely, urban redevelopment and public housing; also farm housing; also a strong provision for research in the reduction of housing costs, rather than the limited provisions in this bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that he and I and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr TAFT] met prior to the introduction of the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The Senator and I agreed—in fact, all four of us unanimously agreed—that the farm-housing section of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill was the most badly drafted section of the bill, that it was not really a farm-housing provision at all. The Senator and I agreed at that time with the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Ohio that instead of submitting that type of inadequate, badly thought out, so-called farm-housing legislation we should strike the farm-housing provision, and that in place thereof we should have a section to the effect that the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Agriculture Department should study the question of farm housing and recommend to the Congress what they would consider a sensible farm-housing provision, in the light of the changed conditions since the farm-housing section was drafted in 1944.

Let me make this clear: I am not criticizing the farm-housing section as of 1944. Perhaps as of that time it might have been well, but the Senator and I agreed that it should not be in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, so I wish the Senator would not use that as an argument against what we are doing here.

Mr. FLANDERS. But the Senate disagreed with us.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. In the opinion of the junior Senator from Wisconsin title VII, covering farm housing, was very badly drawn, was it not?

Mr. McCARTHY. Very badly drawn in the light of conditions of 1948, not in the light of 1944 conditions, when it was originally drawn.

Mr. CAIN. Yet title VII appears to be presently before us, as a result of the action which a majority of the Banking and Currency Committee took this morning. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Did the Senator from Washington correctly understand the Senator from Wisconsin to say that he and the Senator from Vermont have been in agreement that that title should be

stricken from what has always been called the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] met in the Banking and Currency Committee room, and we agreed that instead of having that particular section in the bill we should substitute a section providing for study by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Agriculture. I am sure that if the Senator from Vermont will sit down and study the farm-housing section he will be as convinced as I am that it is completely deceptive, and that it would do the farmer no good at all. It was drafted in 1944.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that he should address his objections to that provision not to me, but to the United States Senate, which put it in the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in closing——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Let me return for a moment to my original inquiry. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Wsconsin that the recommendation to which he is presently addressing himself includes every possible incentive to the acceleration of housing construction in this country?

Mr. McCARTHY. In the lower-price field. There is no incentive whatever for the construction of more expensive homes. I think it includes every conceivable incentive for the production of low-cost homes.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is asking the Senate, therefore, for a good many reasons, temporarily to lay aside the controversial social and welfare questions of low-rent housing and slum-clearance, in favor of enacting legislation which will immediately accelerate housing construction.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; and I am asking the Senate to take into consideration the condition which exists as of today. If we vote public housing and slum clearance into a bill, regardless of how wholeheartedly we may favor those two things, that means that we shall have no housing legislation at all, because I know that the House leadership is not bluffing when it says, "We will not take any public housing or slum clearance." I had hoped that it would at least take slum clearance. I think the proposed slum-clearance program is a good, sensible program, which we should ultimately adopt. I believe that ultimately we should adopt a public-housing program. But I believe that we should make an about-face as to the type of tenants to whom the units are made available. But I do not believe that anything is to be gained by going into a lengthy discussion of that question.

I may be mistaken, but I understand that there will be introduced, either by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or some other Senator, at the beginning of the next session, a long-range public housing and slum-clearance provision. I hope to work with other Senators on that program. I hope that possibly a sensible slum-clearance-public-housing provision, either along the lines of the present Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, or along the lines suggested in the Republican platform, which is a different program, will be enacted.

Let me repeat that if we put slum clearance and public housing into this bill, we are saying to the 800 veterans who have deposited $1,000 each to get an apartment in the Bell Park Gardens——

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish. We shall be saying to those 800 veterans, and saying to a countless number of other veterans all over the country, "This year you shall not have housing, because of our feeling that unless we can get public housing and slum clearance we will not take anything." Despite the fact that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and every other Senator, so far as I can determine, wholeheartedly endorses every single provision in my proposed amendments, I think it would be extremely short-sighted and vicious for this body to say to the veterans of this country that because of our emotional feeling about public housing—and I know that the Senator from New Hampshire is very sincere—we are not going to take any housing. We shall be saying to those veterans, "We are not going to help you at all unless we can get a few federally owned and operated apartments."

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, addressing myself to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, there are two or three subtitles which I wish to take up with him.

The first is his dogmatic statement—I know that he is sincere—that unless we take this bill, we can get nothing. On that basis he has been assiduously interviewing Senators and trying to get votes by saying, "If you do not take this, you get nothing." That is very far from the truth. I challenge that statement. Where is the authority for it? Who told the Senator that?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will give the Senator my authority.

Mr. TOBEY. Come across.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sure that if the Senator will check the matter he will agree with me. I have been informed that the majority of the House Rules Committee will not at this time take a bill with public housing or slum clearance in it. I am sure that they are serious.

Mr. TOBEY. I know that they are serious. So am I.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe that the Senator also feels that they are serious.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from New Hampshire? Was it not——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator yield? Will Senators please address the Chair?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Wisconsin yielded to me, did he not?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Wisconsin yields to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. On that basis I address myself to the Senator from Wisconsin, and ask him who is this House leadership. Who are they? Is it JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Representative from Michigan? Is it RALPH A. GAMBLE, of New York; is it JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., the Speaker of the House? Who is it? I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to name them.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to do so. There is no question about this matter. I think Representative WOLCOTT represents the majority in the House of Representatives in matters of housing, and he has authorized me to say that they simply will not accept public housing provisions. He told us this, and the Senator from New Hampshire was present, I believe. He said, "We will give you gentlemen of the Senate a blank check in drafting housing legislation if you will keep out of this bill provisions as to public housing and slum clearance, and if you do not go too far in the research section."

Both the Senator from New Hampshire and I may disagree as to the wisdom of that; we may think that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] should be in favor of public housing and slum clearance. But the point is that, as of today, we face a situation in which we shall not get housing legislation of any sort unless we proceed along those lines.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I have a feeling of compassion in my heart for the Senator from Wisconsin for what is coming to him right now. What he is saying to us, Mr. President, is that some pooh-bah in the House of Representatives has said to us, "Unless you take this, you get nothing."

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, no.

Mr. TOBEY. That is what the Senator said he said.

Let me complete my statement, Mr. President. Does not the Senator know that the entire House Banking and Currency Committee voted out the bill with public-housing and slum-clearance provisions in it; but then, by the subtle influence of some leadership over there, which I think I can name, they went to the chairman of the Rules Committee and told him what should be done, and he obeyed the orders; and as a result, the will of the people and the democratic process are set at naught, and one man's will is to rule; one man, sitting at the door of legislation says, "They shall not pass."

Mr. President, in this democracy of ours, if we are to see to it that, as Lincoln said at Gettysburg, "Government of the people, by the people, and for the

people shall not perish from this earth," then I say that if we bow to that challenge from the House of Representatives and let them put this over, then every piece of legislation coming to the Senate in the future can be the subject of similar high-handed, high-binding methods. Mr. President, for myself I refuse to accept it.

The Senator from Wisconsin knows that the bill containing public-housing and slum-clearance provisions was reported by the House committee; but now it is strangled in the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, and the will of the Senate and of the House committee and of the people of the country is thwarted.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator should not scold me.

Mr. TOBEY. I was simply telling the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me make clear that I did not intend, and never have intended, to intimate that the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Representative WOLCOTT, speaks for himself alone. I think he is speaking for a vast group of Republicans.

Mr. TOBEY. I will tell the Senator who he is speaking for.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will please address the Chair.

Mr. TOBEY. I addressed the Chair. I wanted to tell the Senator who they were.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator to wait just a minute, please.

As I said, Representative WOLCOTT is speaking for the majority; and there are a number of Members of the House of Representatives who have been firmly convinced that, in view of the tremendous shortage of building materials, it would be disastrous to the home-building program if we were now to commence a public-housing program. They look at the present administration of many of the public housing units. For example—begging the pardon of the Senator from Michigan—they can look at the unit in Detroit, in which until 3 months ago at least, a man making $24,000 a year was living—in a subsidized apartment—and was paying $45 a month for it, while at the same time we had come before us at our committee hearings in Detroit any number of veterans' widows who had 2 or 3 children and were living with them in one-room, basement apartments. There are in that project a considerable number of men making over $10,000 a year, while veterans are walking the streets, looking for a place in which to live. One veteran told me he was paying $15 a week for one basement room for himself and his wife and their two children—while a man making over $10,000 a year was paying $45 a month for this subsidized housing.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator.

The Senator has aroused my righteous indignation. I share with him the same kind of indignation that he has for such an extravagant situation as the one he has described, but the Senator from Wisconsin knows that is not a matter related to this bill. That is a matter of administration, and it can be corrected as such. It does not involve this proposed legislation.

Will the Senator from Wisconsin please confirm the statement I make now; will he please state whether I am correct in saying that the House Banking and Currency Committee, chairmaned by the Honorable JESSE WOLCOTT, of Michigan, reported the bill with public housing provisions in it and slum clearance provisions in it; and is it the Senator's understanding and knowledge, and is it not confirmed now by me, that thereafter the House Rules Committee said, "Regardless of whether it was reported by the committee, it will never come up on the floor of the House"; and the Senator himself was told, "It is either this or nothing."

If that be true, and if we accept it and act in accordance with it, the democratic processes will have gone by the wind. The Senator knows that to be so. JESSE WOLCOTT is a friend of mine, and I esteem him highly; but he is not alone in this matter. In my opinion, it is a triumvirate; it is the Speaker of the House, JOSEPH W. MARTIN; and CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, sometime candidate for President; and JESSE WOLCOTT. Those are the big three, and they issue the dictum, "They shall not pass."

I suggest that if we bow to them we shall be saying, "Whenever you want to block something in the future, just play the same game."

Mr. President, let us find out who is running this country. If we accept the attempt that is made in this case, the result of our action will be that the people will be the victims of an oligarchy composed of from one to three men.

Mr. McCARTHY. My point is—and the Senator will agree with me, I think—that if no housing legislation is passed, that will be just as bad——

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I refuse to yield until I finish this sentence.

I started to say that the men who have been mentioned by the Senator from New Hampshire are highly respected by me. I think the Senator's statements are very unfortunate. The Members of the House of Representatives who take that position are just as serious in doing so as we are in taking the position that we take. As a matter of fact, they have good reason to feel justified in their position. When they look at the situation in public housing, as I have said, they find that the situation is extremely foul. We cannot blame the present Administrator too greatly, I believe. The conditions which brought about the present situation were largely beyond his control. During the wartime period we had a great parade of public housing administrators. We had thrown into public housing many jobs and different kinds of bookkeeping systems, all of which helped create the present chaotic condition. But the point is that today, when those men look at public housing they see that it is not being administered as it should be. They know it is not being administered for the individuals about whom the Senator is concerned. They find that public housing is now being administered for the benefit of a favored few.

The matter of money is important. The General Accounting Office called in what they considered to be one of the top accounting firms. The Members of the House of Representatives can look at the report of that accounting firm, which shows that, as of that time, the Public Housing Administration kept no record of receipts, no record of expenditures, no record of accounts due, no record of accounts payable. They can look at those matters; and they can find, for example, that someone in the Public Housing Administration entered on the books an item of $647,000, or thereabouts; and when questioned about it by a committee headed by one of the Democratic Senators, that man said, "Well, we had to enter it to balance the books." That is the type of administration that has been had.

Moreover, they can look at reports to the effect that in the Los Angeles area, $97,000 worth of lumber and scarce material simply disappeared; and when the Administrator was questioned about it and was asked whether he knew whether it went to someone's lakeshore home, or was stolen, or just what happened to it, he said, "I do not have any idea."

When those men see public housing so badly administered, I do not think we can question their motives when they say it will not solve the housing problem to give that same administration additional billions of dollars and when they refuse to accept public housing.

I think it is very unfair of the Senator from New Hampshire to question the motives of the Members of the House of Representatives who take a position contrary to his.

I repeat that if, as the Senator from New Hampshire says, those men are blocking housing legislation in the manner in which the Senator from New Hampshire claims they are, then the Senator from New Hampshire also is blocking it by saying that unless we pass public housing legislation we shall have no housing legislation.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator yields to the defense. The charge made by the Senator from Wisconsin is that the Senator now speaking is equally guilty with the triumvirate or anybody else in the House in blocking housing legislation. That is the charge. Here comes the answer. The fact remains that nothing of the sort is true in the slightest degree. All the Senator from New Hampshire is trying to do in his Committee on Banking and Currency is to report a bill reflecting the views of the Senate, a bill thrice passed by the Senate embodying both slum clearance and public housing. I may say, after having conferred with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], that he is in favor of the bill.

What the Senate is going to do is this: They are going to pass a separate bill tomorrow, which will be in accordance with their views. The matter will be taken care of 100 percent.

Coming down to the question of unfairness, all I ask is that the fairest thing

in the world, the democratic process, be enthroned in this day and generation under the Capitol dome. All we ask for is that the bill be passed here by the Senate, be sent to the House, and go to conference. Under the rules of the House and Senate, that is where it should go.

But the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin said, "I know it never will go to conference; they will not let it." So we are met with the dictum, "You can not take this bill to conference", and the democratic processes are set at variance, in effect nullified. Let the bill pass in the Senate and go to conference; then let the minds of the conferees work, and let them produce what we want, which is a piece of legislation pro bono publico. That is what we propose to do. If that is unfair, make the most of it. I can not follow the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator from New Hampshire will bear with me, he speaks of the democratic processes. We have certain rules in the House, the same as here. There is a rule that the bill must go to the Rules Committee. If the Rules Committee sees fit, it will report the bill and it will go to the floor. That rule has been in existence ever since the establishment of Congress. It has been in existence under both Democratic and Republican administrations. We have never seen fit to change the rule.

Mr. TOBEY. We have nothing to do with it here.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say that if the majority of the Rules Committee say the bill shall not go to the floor, it will not go to the floor. That is the democratic process—the majority rule. The majority of that committee feel as strongly, if not more strongly against the recent use of public housing than you feel for it. Apparently the majority of that committee are committed against public housing as it is now administered. That is their right. They feel this program should not be passed at this time.

I call the Senator's attention to this, and I ask whether if I am correct: If we pass the public-housing section, that will not produce a single unit within the next year. If I may refresh the Senator's memory on that, we have had testimony before us. I am sure if he will check with the FPHA they will tell him so. They will tell him the only public-housing units that can possibly be activated before July 1 of next year would be some of the 15,000 units that had been planned but not built prior to the war. They will tell the Senator, I am sure, that not a single public-housing unit can be obtained within the next year, if this bill is passed.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator.

Everything is a matter of growth. The child from conception through the 9 months in the mother's womb, until it is born into this world, is a matter of growth. The apple blossom, up to the fully matured fruit, is a matter of growth. Legislation that starts with a great objective for human happiness and human prosperity is a matter of growth. We conceive the idea, we pass a bill in the Senate; the House passes it, the President signs it, and it becomes a law and, lo and behold, the mechanics are started whereby a great, Nation-wide slum-clearance project can come into effect. Of course it takes time, but it is elementary that the longer we wait, the longer it will take.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from New Hampshire and I must agree that if he is successful he will have done perhaps more than anyone else to make it impossible for these 800 young men, veterans in Bell Park Gardens, to live in decent homes as well as other hundreds of thousands of veterans in a like situation. Do not get me wrong. I am not accusing the Senator of malice. I do not know of any man who has a warmer heart than the Senator. I hate to see it so badly misdirected.

If I may close on this, I may say that if the Senator is successful in carrying through the line of action which he is now advocating, it will mean there will be thousands, perhaps millions of veterans who simply will not have a decent place in which to live, as the result of the action taken by the Senate here today. We have a bill before us, of which I am sure the Senator heartily approves. I am sure he will agree that it will channelize scarce materials into the construction of cheaper homes. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that if my bill is passed, many veterans next year will be paying less rent than they would pay had this bill not been passed. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that under my bill an unlimited number of veterans' cooperatives can be established for the production of cheap housing, both for rental and for sale, and that, unless the bill is passed, that will be impossible. Again I say that with the great consideration which the Senator has for the poor man, realizing that this is a poor man's bill, he help us get it through the Senate even though it does not contain everything he desires. In view of the consideration which the Senator has for the poor man, I sincerely hope he will reconsider and will not take action which would endanger any and all housing legisation at this time.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 30 seconds only?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG rose.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I inquire who has the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire, if he addresses the Chair, or the Senator from North Dakota, if he addresses the Chair. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, did the Senator from North Dakota wish me to yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG. No; I have a speech I should like to make.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall be through in a minute.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin does not move me a bit by his impassioned plea, because his premises are entirely wrong, and therefore his conclusions are wrong. All these things for veterans about which he talks are in the bill the committee offers, including the uniform building codes, the agreements about materials. Nothing is lost. They are in the bill. But so far as this question goes, let us get down to brass tacks. The bill provides a mutual housing proposition for veterans. That is not going to be lost. It is going to go through. The Senator from New York knows it is going to go through, and so does the Senator from Wisconsin. I will state how it is going to go through.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. IVES. I do not think the Senator from New York knows that it is going to go through.

Mr. TOBEY. He knows it is intended to go through.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York has been advised that the committee of which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire is chairman is going to consider it, and that it is expected the committee will vote favorably upon it. The Senator from New York hopes very much that it will be passed by the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. I think that, as nearly as anything is certain beyond death and taxes, I can assure the Senator it will be passed. He has a good case. We in the committee are all for it, and it will go through. It will not be lost. Nothing virtuous or good or fine or worth while in housing will be lost by passing the bill the Senator from Vermont and I sponsor and which the Senate has passed thrice before.

So I want to thank my colleague for his many courtesies in yielding. Under great stress of tempers and dispositions the best of feeling prevails. I make the prediction that tomorrow at 1 o'clock when it comes time for the portcullis to fall, the distinguished Senate will live up to its custom, its mores, and its work last May, that it will again pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and send it to the House, and say, "Let the housing bill go to conference, under the democratic processes, or else let the responsibility be on your heads."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to Senate bill 2927, a bill which I have already introduced in the special session of the Congress, dealing with GI housing. I should appreciate it very much if the Senator overnight would give his personal attention to the bill. It is the present intention of the junior Senator from Oregon to offer Senate bill 2927 tomorrow as a substitute for title II of the bill which the Senator has reported. I do not want to take time tonight to discuss it, but I have had inserted in the RECORD my reasons for supporting Senate bill 2927. I would appreciate it if my good friend from New Hampshire would check it over so we may discuss it tomorrow morning prior to the convening of the Senate.

The particular portion of title II of the bill to which I take exception will be found on page 28, line 12, providing that no loan may be purchased if made prior to the effective date of the act. The difficulty which confronts the GI's involves the accumulation of loans in the banks in connection with purchases prior to the effective date of the act, and unless they can find a secondary market for their paper the GI's will not be helped very much by title II of the Senator's bill.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I find that the bill to which the Senator adverts was not referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. I am a member of that committee. The bill was made ready at a late hour yesterday afternoon; in fact, at the very close of my speech yesterday on another subject I introduced the bill along with my explanatory remarks. It has been impossible to get a meeting of my committee in time to attempt the consideration of the bill. I am sure there will certainly be no serious objection on the part of the Senate or of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee to looking over the bill to see the points it contains involving the provision of the Senator's bill in connection with the subject.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall be very glad to do that, and will guarantee to give an answer to the Senator in the morning. I hope to be able to cooperate heartily.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber during the prior discussion, but was present during most of it. Do I correctly understand that there has been a public announcement by the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the Speaker of the House, and the Rules Committee that if the Senate shall pass the bill—the passage of which was one of the reasons we were called into session—involving and containing provisions relating to slum clearance and public housing, the House will not accept the bill? Is that correct?

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] said he was told by Representative WOLCOTT that the bill would not go to conference and the democratic process would not be carried through.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have been told that a majority of the Rules Committee are against it. I have a definite impression that that is a correct statement. We also can canvass our Banking and Currency Committee to find out what type of legislation will come through, and we find that nothing but a bill with public housing can pass thru that committee. I tried to make similar canvass of the Rules Committee of the House. I am told that for what are considered by them good and sufficient reasons they will not pass a public housing bill which, during a period of scarcity, might disrupt the whole building industry. Whether they are right or wrong, I do not know, but that is the way those men feel, and they do have some good reasons to feel that way. I know a majority of the committee will not favor a bill which contains public-housing and slum-clearance provisions. I think every Senator here knows that to be so. Every Senator knows, if the Senator from New Hampshire is successful on the floor of the Senate in having his amendment accepted, that there will be no housing legislation passed by the House.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I want to inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin whether it is the case—I do not say it is not the case—that since the Senate has on many occasions expressed a desire to have in a housing bill slum clearance and public housing in some degree, why it would not be better for the Senate to have the members of the Rules Committee turn down the Senate measure? I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will answer that question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair would like to have the debate proceed in order, if it is humanly possible.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from New Hampshire gladly yields to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Rules Committe of the House has already turned down such a bill. If we send it to them the second time I am firmly convinced they will do the same thing again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then the public is to understand that the reason public housing and slum clearance are not in the housing bill is because a majority of the Rules Committee is opposed to it. I think we ought to get this clear. Is it a majority of the committee, or a majority of the Members of the House?

Mr. McCARTHY. Do not ask me to delve into the minds of the Representatives. We both know that the Rules Committee has once refused to report the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. It is completely senseless therefore, in the closing days of this session, to say we will give them the same measure in the hope that they will change their minds.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am not arguing the merits of the question. I want to place the responsibility for the failure of slum clearance and public housing where it belongs, not on the United States Senate, which has approved such measures, I think, three times.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Washington and to my friend from Wisconsin that the Rules Committee turned thumbs down. Let it stand that way; but let us send the bill over and let it go to conference. There is nothing dogmatic in our position. We should let the conference prevail. Is not that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. In spite of the fact that I have been listening with the greatest care, even when two or three Senators were speaking at once, the thing which is not clear in my mind and on which I should like to interrogate the Senator from Wisconsin is this: Has notice been served upon us that the House will not allow a bill to go to conference which contains provisions regarding public housing and urban redevelopment?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have been served no notice. Any one who will read the RECORD will know that we now have a housing bill before us, a bill which the House Rules Committee has already refused to report. The Senator's solution of the housing shortage is to send the House the same bill which the Rules Committee, exercising the power which it is entitled to exercise, has refused to report. I have been informed by Representative WOLCOTT that a majority of the Rules Committee has not changed its mind. From my contact with the Rules Committee, I do not believe the members have changed their minds. I have not been served any public notice by anyone.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I inquire whether the Senator knows it to be a fact that the Rules Committee has no authority over the question whether a conference will be granted in the case of a difference between the two Houses on the subject?

Mr. McCARTHY. I should suggest that the Senator ask one of the older parliamentarians that question.

Mr. FLANDERS. May I inquire of any Senator who has any knowledge on that subject?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Washington for the purpose of answering the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have had some experience in the House. I know of no time when the Rules Committee has had any authority to determine whether a bill should go to conference.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I think the RECORD will show that some time ago the Senator from Wisconsin said he was authorized to state that the bill would not go to conference. I think the Senator has told me in debate that he was told by the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee that the bill would not go to conference.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am firmly convinced that the bill would not go to conference. I know that a majority of the members of the House Rules Committee are against the Senator's idea of what should be contained in a public-housing bill. The majority does not know of any emergency calling for the construction of more public housing to be administered as the present units are being administered. We both know that we can pass a good housing bill which will help the poor man. We know that if we send over to the House again the same bill which we sent there previously, there will be no housing legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit

the Chair to submit what he believes to be a pertinent observation?

Mr. TOBEY. I should be delighted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has not interrupted the debate, because no point of order has been made, but the Chair feels, in fairness to the rules of the Senate and to the Senate, and by way of suggestion to the Senators themselves, that one of the very fundamental points in our established procedure is that Senators shall not refer to Members of the other branch of the Congress or to proceedings therein.

There is no specific rule on the subject; but Jefferson's Manual, as carried in our own manual, and as used as guidance for our conduct, reads as follows:

> It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House, or the particular votes or majorities on it there, because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independency, not to be influenced by the proceedings of the other; and the quoting them might beget reflections leading to a misunderstanding between the two Houses.

May the Chair respectfully say that the precedents of the Senate are legion on this subject, and without a single exception of which the Chair is advised, whenever a point of order has been made against reference to Members of the other House, the point of order has been sustained. The Chair could put a number of decisions of that character into the RECORD if it were deemed desirable.

There can be no question about the nature and extent of these precedents. The Chair feels that there has to be some latitude in the application of the precedents and procedures when, as in the present instance, it is the question of some pertinence, in respect to our own discussion, as to what the attitude of the House may be. But the Chair would like to beg of Senators, in continuing this debate, to stay, so far as possible, within the spirit of this clear and essential rule, so that if a point of order is subsequently made Senators will not be taken by surprise.

The Chair submits these observations in the greatest of good faith and without any reflection on any Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. May the Senator from New Hampshire say that he thanks the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate for his admonition, and for his tolerance in this debate? The only excuse or justification the Senator from New Hampshire would have would be that he has a deep, passionate, and earnest feeling in the matter, because when I reflect that this very far-reaching piece of legislation has three times come before the Senate, of which I am proud to be a Member, and the Senate has three times passed the legislation, it is difficult to keep from projecting my mind across the Capitol when I see barriers raised, and from almost saying, "Thou art the man, the guilty person."

Without more ado, I guarantee to the distinguished presiding officer that I shall be governed entirely by his admonition, and I thank him for calling my attention to the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. YOUNG obtained the floor.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I have been waiting since almost high noon to make a 10-minute speech, and I am rather reluctant to yield further.

Mr. MYERS. Very well.

PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I desire to address myself briefly to two of the points which President Truman gave as his reasons for the calling of this special session of Congress.

The first point I wish to discuss is the long-range agricultural bill requested by the President in his special message. Apparently Mr. Truman, because of his heavy political schedule in recent weeks, overlooked the fact that Congress had passed a long-range farm program which was signed by him. That bill, in my opinion, was the most constructive piece of legislation that any Congress had passed for many years looking toward the future security of those engaged in the farming occupation. It had then and has now the complete support of all three major farm organizations.

It is a bit difficult to understand why the President would now be asking for a long-range farm program when one has already been passed which meets with the complete approval of the farmers of the United States and the major farm organizations, and I should like to state that it had nearly the unanimous support of the Republicans in both Houses.

The second point to which I wish to address myself briefly is on the matter of alleged high prices for farm commodities, also covered in President Truman's call for a special session of Congress. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a front-page story in this morning's Washington Post under the following headlines: "Hog prices reach new high; Brannan asks positive action."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> CONGRESS GETS WARNING—HOG PRICES REACH NEW HIGH; BRANNAN ASKS POSITIVE ACTION
>
> While live hog prices were setting a new all-time high at Chicago yesterday, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan told Congress meat prices will go higher through the summer "unless some positive action is taken."
>
> Hog prices at Chicago hit $31.50 a hundred pounds, 40 cents above the previous high mark reached Monday. Continued scarce supplies from country feeders accounted largely for the upturn.
>
> Brannan told the Senate Banking Committee meat supplies will continue tight and added:
>
> "We can expect little relief from the price pressures now current until the closing months of 1949."
>
> The committee is studying the anti-inflation program recommended by President Truman. Republican leaders have said Congress will not provide the President with the rationing and price control authority he asked last November and again at the extra session.
>
> Brannan insisted an analysis of the current situation indicates immediate measures should be taken to bring "meat prices under control and to make meat available to all our people."
>
> "We are handicapped by the fact that the necessary authority to do this was not granted last November, or even last January," he said.
>
> Brannan said meat consumption is likely to average somewhat lower next year than in this, perhaps about 140 pounds per person, compared with the estimated current rate of 145 pounds.
>
> The Secretary said the principal reduction will be in beef. Pork supplies, he said, should be somewhat larger and all meat prices are likely to "average higher next year than this year."
>
> Brannan said average per capita food consumption in the Nation will run about the same in 1949 as in 1948. This is about 12 per cent above that of the prewar years 1935–39.
>
> Meanwhile, the Agriculture Department said Thanksgiving turkeys will cost more than ever this year. The holiday birds retailed at about 60 cents a pound last November here in Washington.
>
> The Department also said there is no prospect of lower chicken and egg prices before next year.

Mr. YOUNG. This article, Mr. President, is based on the testimony of Secretary Brannan before the Senate Banking Committee yesterday. Mr. Brannan, according to this article, told the Banking and Currency Committee that immediate measures should be taken to bring meat prices under control and to make meat available to all our people. "We are handicapped by the fact that the necessary authority to do this was not granted last November or even last January," he said. This position taken by Secretary Brannan indicates either a total lack of information on the past program of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to food production or it is a statement that only a pure demagog would make while in possession of the facts, as I believe Mr. Brannan was. I believe Mr. Brannan is fully aware of the fact that the United States Department of Agriculture in setting its goals for 1948 production of grains and all meats actually asked for a drastic reduction. Mr. President, let me quote from the first paragraph of a press release put out by the United States Department of Agriculture as of October 22, 1947:

> A national goal of 50,000,000 pigs for the spring of 1948 was suggested to farmers today by the United States Department of Agriculture, which at the same time re-emphasized its request for feeding hogs to lighter weights. This goal compares to the 1947 pig crop of 53,000,000 pigs, a reduction of 3,000,000 or nearly 6 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at the end of my remarks the full press release by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the United States Department of Agriculture deliberately set out about a year ago to reduce the supply of not only pork but all other meats. The farmers complied with these regulations, and as a result, we are now short of meat and consequently prices have risen. In this same bulletin setting 1948 production goals for farmers, the United States Department of Agriculture asked for the following

additional reduction in food supplies. Let me quote just a part of them:

Egg production, 1947 goals, 4,559,000 dozen of eggs; 1948 goal, 4,200,000 dozen. Chickens to be raised, 1947 production, 742,047,000; 1948 goal, 693,104,000; turkeys, 1947 production, 34,667,000; 1948 goal, 30,507,000—

That was actually requested by the Department of Agriculture—

slaughter cattle and calves, 1947 production 36,000,000; 1948 goal, 32,000,000.

Mr. President, I have tried to demonstrate that the United States Department of Agriculture clearly set out a year ago to reduce the meat supply available to the American people for 1948. Some of it perhaps was justified to make more grains available for European aid, but I sincerely object to statements such as that by Secretary Brannan yesterday which are designed to appeal politically to the consumers of the United States without telling them the true facts.

Let us see if all this reduction in meat supplies was justified even for European aid, in the light of present circumstances. On July 1, 1947, we had a carry-over of 83,813,000 bushels of wheat and on July 1, 1948, we had a carry-over of 194,890,000 bushels. Thus while the administration was planning to reduce the meat supplies available to the consumers, they actually, through total lack of wisdom and understanding, created nearly 2½ times the wheat carry-over of a year ago—a wheat carry-over which is already burdensome to American wheat producers. That extra carry-over of wheat would have raised enough hogs to have provided all the extra meat American consumers wanted.

Mr. President, the American farmer is doing his level best to meet the consumers' needs, and I think doing a remarkable job of it; one which would never be accomplished if price controls were again placed upon products which the farmer produces. For example, in 1938, after 5 years of New Deal administration, the average consumption of meat in the United States was 126 pounds per person. In 1947, even though handicapped severely by the war years, the farmers made available to the consumers 155 pounds of meat per person, or a gain of nearly 30 pounds for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Secretary Brannan, even though he has no farm background, should know as Secretary of Agriculture that it takes several months to increase the production of poultry. The production of pork can be tremendously stepped up within a period of only a year. In the matter of beef, that is a longer range program. The imposition of price controls would very seriously hamper increased production of beef, and, in my opinion, would only stave off the evil day.

This Nation is favored with one of the biggest grain crops ever produced in its history. European grain production also is practically double that of last year. This abundant grain crop can and will produce abundant and reasonably priced meats for the consumers of the United States if not hampered and restricted by price regulations, and, even worse, ill-advised United States Department of Agriculture programs.

Mr. President, to give some indication of how drastic the grain prices have dropped in the last 6 months, let me read the following telegram received yesterday from R. F. Gunkleman, one of the leading grain dealers in North Dakota. This telegram was in response to a request on my part to give me grain prices as of February 1, 1948, and as of August 1, 1948. The telegram reads:

FEBRUARY 1.

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate:

January 31 Card Fargo heavy wheat, $2.71 plus, up to 38 cents protein premium; No. 2 yellow corn, $2.35; top malting barley, $2.53; No. 3 white oats, $1.19; No. 2 rye, $2. Today's close same. Grains: Wheat, $1.95, protein premiums up to 36 cents—

That is a drop of about $1 a bushel in wheat, or approximately 30 percent—

corn, $1.68—

Which is very much below 6 months ago—

barley, $1.33—

Again about 30 percent reduction—

oats, 55 cents—

Which is about a 50-percent reduction—

rye, $1.34. Grain markets demoralized due to heavy receipts.

R. F. GUNKELMAN.

Mr. President, this telegram gives a clear picture of how grain prices have dropped in the last 6 months, and even in the face of this production and abundant supplies, the President of the United States is asking for price controls when he, coming from a farm State, should know that these abundant and far cheaper grains will automatically be translated in a matter of months into abundant meat supplies—that is, if not hampered, as I stated, by a police state of regulations.

Perhaps I should go a bit further to state that practically all grain prices are below parity. That means under yardsticks set up by the United States Congress practically all grains are now below the cost of production, and in several instances below support levels. The answer to abundant and reasonable food prices is not to be found in either police-state regulations or special sessions of Congress called for purely political reasons. All we need to do is to let the farmers produce as they want to, unhampered by administration goals which in one year seek to reduce the food supplies of the American consumers, and when they have accomplished these goals of reducing supplies, then to ask for price controls. The answer, in my opinion, is a constructive program not only of increased production of meats but all other food supplies.

This can and will be accomplished if the administration does not again actually ask for short supplies.

Greatly increased poultry supplies can be had within a matter of months. Pork supplies can be greatly increased within a matter of a year, and beef supplies, through large-scale feeding of the abundant and cheaper supplies of grain, will also, in the matter of 6 months, greatly increase.

It does not, Mr. President, require a political session of Congress to accomplish this. All we need is a little common sense and constructive action on the part of the administration. Demagogic speeches by administration officials high in the United States Government designed purely as an appeal for votes from uninformed people is doing a real injustice not only to the United States farmer, who is doing a remarkable job in producing foods, but also to the consumers and all else concerned.

EXHIBIT A

SPRING PIG GOAL FOR 1948 IS ANNOUNCED

A national goal of 50,000,000 pigs for the spring of 1948 was suggested to farmers today by the United States Department of Agriculture, which at the same time reemphasized its request for feeding hogs to lighter weights. This goal compares to the 1947 pig crop of 53,000,000 pigs, a reduction of 3,000,000 or nearly 6 percent.

Officials stated that much larger quantities of grain could be saved by feeding hogs to lighter weights this winter and next spring than by asking for a greater reduction in pigs to be produced next spring. They said the suggested figure is the highest level of 1948 spring pig production they believed could be justified as a goal in view of the extent to which drought cut the 1947 corn crop and considering the present and prospective needs of European nations for cereals. On the other hand, they emphasized, that with prospects for smaller output of other meats in 1948–49, pork production for that period should be maintained at as high a level as can be justified with available feed supplies.

In setting the goal of 50,000,000 pigs, the Department recognized that, in view of the present feed situation, this number is about as many as can be expected next spring, and it is not likely that a goal requesting more would be attained. Officials pointed out that 1948 spring pigs will make our pork and lard supply from October 1948 through March 1949 and will get the greater portion of their feed from the 1948 corn crop, which with average weather would be much larger than this year's crop.

1948 goals with comparisons

Livestock	1937–41 average	1942–46 average	1947 indicated	1948 suggested goal	Percent 1948 goal is of—		
					1937–41 average	1942–46 average	1947 indicated
Milk produced on farms.....mil. lbs..	107,855	119,179	120,000	120,000	111	101	100
Eggs produced on farms.....mil. dos..	3,255	4,552	4,559	4,200	129	92	92
Hens and pullets on farms Jan. 1 thous. head..	376,566	477,714	436,535	400,000	106	84	92
Chickens raised (farm produced)...do....	665,430	866,443	742,047	690,104	104	80	93
Turkeys raised (farm produced)....do....	30,636	37,162	34,667	30,507	100	82	88
Sows to farrow, spring.....do....	7,534	9,502	8,709	7,936	105	84	91
Spring pigs.....do....	46,801	59,130	53,151	50,000	107	85	94
Cattle and calves on farms Jan. 1..do....	67,488	82,114	81,050	76,352	113	93	94
Slaughter.....	24,643	31,309	36,000	32,000	130	102	89
Sheep and lambs on farms Jan. 1...do....	45,879	43,404	32,542	31,500	69	73	97

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] to the brief comment I am about to make. I call his attention, as I did that of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], to my bill S. 2927, which deals with GI housing problems. I would say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I would appreciate it if he would examine the bill between now and the session tomorrow, because I here and now reserve the right to offer S. 2927 as an amendment to his substitute bill, as well as to the housing bill reported to the floor of the Senate by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

It will not be possible to have a hearing on my bill S. 2927 by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare between now and the time we meet tomorrow. A meeting simply cannot be arranged because many Senators are busy on other affairs; but we can, I think, since the subject matter is covered in two substitute bills now pending before the Senate, consider it on the floor of the Senate.

The reason I shall offer the bill as an amendment is that I think that neither one of the housing bills now pending covers the points which should be covered as presented in S. 2927, because they do not, in my judgment, give to the GI's the secondary market for their paper which they must have if they are going to secure the necessary loans from the banks with which to pay for houses, or build new houses.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] if he will before tomorrow morning obtain an informal expression from the Veterans' Administration or the Bureau of the Budget, or some other agency, as to roughly the amount of authorization which would be required, and roughly the total amount of loans which would be covered by the Senator's bill. I have glanced over it three times and frankly I am confused as to the effect of the bill. I am not asking the Senator to do it tonight, but if he could before the Senate convenes tomorrow obtain an expression from some of the Government agencies, either the Bureau of the Budget or the Veterans' Administration, I would certainly appreciate it.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that I shall endeavor to secure the information he desires.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have not had the privilege of reading the Senator's bill. Of course we have in the pending legislation a provision for secondary mortgages for GI loans. We are liberalizing the provision which was made during the last night of the last session. There is a danger involved in connection with this matter. There are now, counting FHA loans, something like $7,000,000,000 of mortgage paper guaranteed by the FHA or by the Veterans' Administration in the hands of the banks. We simply cannot invite the Government to take that all over. The limitation contained in our bill is $840,000,000, which goes fairly far. The Senator may think that the provisions are not quite liberal enough; yet there is serious danger that the banks will try to unload on the Government all the poorest veterans paper they have. I believe that members of the committee in both the House and Senate feel that the question must be approached with a great deal of care.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I certainly share the reservations expressed just now by the Senator from Ohio. As he knows, I being a member of his committee, we had those fears when the so-called Jenner bill was before us. However, I am advised—I hope correctly—that with some modification of lines 12 and 13 on page 28 of the bill we can meet the need for a secondary market now required by the veterans without running serious danger of having $7,000,000,000 worth of such paper dumped on the market. All I can say is that the various veterans' organizations have called to my attention the fact that the bill we passed in the closing hours of the previous session of the Eightieth Congress is not giving the veterans the relief which they need by way of a secondary market.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is quite correct. Of course, this provision does liberalize the terms. It doubles the number that any bank may sell.

RECESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, under the order already entered, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, August 6, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 5, 1948:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in Paris, France, beginning September 21, 1948:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont.
John Foster Dulles, of New York.
Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York.
Philip C. Jessup, of New York.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in Paris, France, beginning September 21, 1948:

Benjamin V. Cohen, of New York.
Ray Atherton, of Illinois.
Willard L. Thorp, of Connecticut.
Ernest A. Gross, of New York.
Francis B. Sayre, of the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. Howard Lambdin, pastor of St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, which art in Heaven, we bow in quiet reverence before Thee today as we turn our minds to thoughts of highest levels. We desire to draw closer to Thee, that we might hear Thy voice giving us encouragement and wise guidance as we begin our activities in this day's session.

Our minds get disturbed and confused with many problems—hard-to-solve problems—and with many responsibilities—difficult and trying ones to our ways of thinking—yet, dear Father, we know we can come to Thee for that extra strength which we feel we need in the turmoil of these days.

We know that if we will but trust Thee Thou wilt see us through successfully, even through the hard places which seem to grow more numerous from day to day.

We ask Thy blessing on us all, and on all the peoples of our Nation whom we seek to serve honestly and with appreciation of their confidence in us. May we strive to do our part to bring about a real peace on earth, with good will toward men of all nations, and help to establish good feeling and brotherly kindness in the earth. We pray in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Owing to the business before the House today, the Chair will not entertain requests for 1-minute addresses, but will receive requests for extensions of remarks.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 12 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the

Appendix of the RECORD and include a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 190, introduced by him on April 27.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by George Sokolsky.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McGARVEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill which he is introducing today.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune under the heading "The Fake Emergency," and in the other an editorial, The Great Blunder.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article he prepared for the Christian Century magazine.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the State-aid director.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by the minority whip, Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, which appeared in the Newark Sunday News August 1.

TRAIN NEW TROOPS NEAR THEIR HOMES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we are not at war, and there is no need for some of the practices which were considered advisable in the training of troops during the war.

I refer particularly to the Army's wartime method of breaking up the contingent of draftees from a city, town, or district and scattering it to points remote from the place of induction.

As an example, a man now employed as a secretary by me was sent with a group of 60 inductees from his home city of 85,000 population in Massachusetts to Camp Devens, also in Massachusetts, for 3 days. He was shipped to Miami Beach for basic training, and thence to Jefferson Barracks, Mo., for advanced training.

All this could have been done at Camp Devens or at one of the other training centers in New England.

Perhaps the Army's intent was to sever any lingering connection with homes immediately and completely. Perhaps it was to emphasize the national unity of our armed forces by assembling, as far as possible, a cross section of the Nation in each military unit. In any case, dispersion was realized.

During World War I, an original division like the Twenty-sixth or Yankee Division was composed almost entirely of Massachusetts men. Certain companies or batteries were made up of men coming from the same city. This developed a local or regional pride among the various divisions.

However, in the case of the man drafted from Massachusetts in World War II, who spent 6 months at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., which had a constantly changing military population of over 40,000, in all that time he met only 3 men from his home city in Massachusetts. And his city sent thousands of men to the Army.

We are faced with a far different situation today. We are simply training men for peacetime military service. They are not on the assembly line leading to inevitable combat. The inescapable urgencies of war are not with us.

I believe that one of the reasons why so many young men rushed to join the National Guard was not only to escape the continuous training and formal military life which they would be subject to as draftees but for the opportunity offered of taking such training at armories and camps either located in or near their communities.

Furthermore, they considered the National Guard as an arrangement whereby they could fulfill their obligations to national defense without interruption of their home life, their work experience, or their education.

There is no doubt that much of the opposition to the general idea of compulsory military training comes from the mothers of the United States. Unless the exigency of war is near and the need for such training is clearly and unmistakably evident, they oppose a policy which roots youngsters of an impressionable age out of their homes and into the segregated military life, divorced from the normal restraints and constructive influences of home life.

There are others, such as clergymen and educators, who fear that such dislocations would damage the social pattern of our national life.

It is not my purpose to argue against the idea of military training itself, because national defense requires a certain amount of cooperation and sacrifice.

Rather I seek some adjustment whereby the needs of the services will be met without a complete severance of home ties.

To that end I ask that the Secretary of National Defense assure the Congress and the country of a change in policy whereby the trainee shall be assigned to a camp as close to his home as is possible.

This will enable the trainee to visit home at least on week ends or will enable his folks to visit him.

Such a recognition of human needs on the part of the military will do much to develop a democratic army and will strengthen relationships between the military and the civilians.

The young men and their families ask for this small concession which will not interfere with the training part of the preparedness program.

I cannot see how the military can object to it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

TALK, TALK, EVERYWHERE—BUT NOT A BIT OF HELP

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 27 this special session of Congress heard the President's message and his recommendations for action by this Congress to control inflation and to solve the housing problem. An apt description of what has transpired in Congress since, can be put in these words, "Talk, talk, everywhere—but not a bit of help." We have heard in the Halls of Congress, and on the radio, and read in the press, every conceivable reason for our distressing economic plight. Everyone and everything has been blamed for the soaring prices and the lack of housing, but no solution has been brought to the floor of this House in the form of a bill which it can enact into legislation.

Yesterday a motion was adopted, permitting the passage of legislation under a suspension of the rules which would preclude debate and amendments and preclude motions to recommit any bills that might be offered. The motion was offered we were told because we are now going into the closing days of this special session. The majority leader of the House then told us that he did not know what the program was for those closing days. I hate to think that the motion was offered and passed because those in control of this House are fearful that somebody might come up with a good idea and offer it as an amendment to a pending bill, as a result of which we might stop the rising cost of living or possibly solve the housing shortage.

Repeatedly on the floor of the House we have been told that this country is not suffering from a high cost of living, but that it is suffering from the high cost of government.

I have carefully reviewed the history of legislation in the Eightieth Congress. I have been unable to find any legislation proposed seeking to eliminate the cost of social security, of unemployment insurance, of veterans' benefits, or of national defense. Nor have I seen any proposed legislation providing that the members of one political party in Government office should be paid any less than the members of any other party. Nor have I seen a single piece of legislation providing for the elimination of any of the services that are so necessary to the proper management and operation of our Government.

Let us stop all this talk. Let us get down to business. Let us do something.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the News and Courier, Charleston, S. C., of August 4.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts in each.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix.

THE LATE HONORABLE W. W. VENABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he will make one exception to the rule previously announced, in order to permit the announcement of the death of a former Member.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, the people of Mississippi, and especially the Fifth Congressional District, were saddened and grieved to learn of the passing on Monday, August 2, 1948, of a former Member of this House, and one of our most distinguished and beloved citizens, the Honorable W. W. (Webb) Venable, who served the Fifth Congressional District of Mississippi, which I now have the honor of representing, from January 4, 1916, to March 3, 1921.

Judge Venable began the practice of law in Meridian, Miss., where he formed the firm of Bordeaux and Venable. He served as prosecuting attorney of Lauderdale County from April to October 1910, at which time he was appointed district attorney. On January 1, 1915, he resigned, having been appointed to the bench. He served as judge of the tenth judicial district of Mississippi from 1915 until his resignation in December 1916 when he was elected as a Democrat to the Sixty-fourth Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Samuel A. Witherspoon. He was devoted to duty, and served ably and with distinction in every position to which he was honored.

In mourning his passing, the Meridian Star, one of Mississippi's greatest newspapers, stated:

Termed by the late President Woodrow Wilson as "one of the great statesmen of his time," Mr. Venable won national attention in the Congress for his ability in debate and oratory. His speech in defense of President Wilson after the end of World War I was considered one of the most classic addresses ever made before the Congress.

Throughout his life, Judge Venable was a student of law, literature, philosophy, and religion. He was a man of the highest Christian character, and for years before his death was a teacher of the Martin Bible class of the Clarksdale, Miss., Baptist Church. He was considered by all who knew him as one of the most outstanding attorneys in Mississippi. His passing has brought great sorrow to Mississippians, and our State and the Nation have lost one of their most distinguished citizens.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to the memory of William Webb Venable, late Representative from Mississippi, who was born in Clinton, Hinds County, Miss., on September 25, 1880, and died on August 2, 1948.

He was my devoted personal friend. We were classmates at Mississippi College, Clinton, Miss., where we both graduated in the class of 1898. The following year, we both attended the University of Mississippi, where he took a postgraduate course, and where I was graduated from the law department. After teaching school he was graduated from the law department of Cumberland University at Lebanon, Tenn., in 1905 and began the practice of law at Meridian, Miss. He was successively prosecuting attorney of Lauderdale County, district attorney, and circuit judge. He resigned as judge in December 1916 when he was elected from the fifth district to the Sixty-fourth Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Samuel A. Witherspoon and reelected to the Sixty-fifth and Sixty-sixth Congresses. He served from January 4, 1916, to March 3, 1921. Upon his retirement from Congress, he moved to Clarksdale, Coahoma County, Miss., in the district that I represent, where he practiced law from 1921 until his death.

Judge Venable was well-prepared for the practice of law and unusually well-equipped for service as a Member of Congress. He was well-educated, and as a student of history and government was broadly and liberally informed. He was preeminently a student and well-versed in jurisprudence.

His father, the late Dr. A. A. Venable, was not only president of Mississippi College when he and I enrolled as freshmen in that institution, but was the teacher of Greek and theology. Like his father, he was a Baptist and a great teacher, having taught the Men's Bible class of the First Baptist Church at Clarksdale, Miss., for a quarter of a century.

Webb Venable was a good citizen. He was a patriot. He was devoted to his profession and to his country. No man was more greatly esteemed or highly respected in Mississippi than he.

He was an able lawyer, a capable statesman, and he was devoted to the service of the community in which he lived and the State in which he resided. I counted him among my best friends for more than half a century. His passing is a distinct loss to Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. I too would like to join with my colleague from Mississippi in paying tribute to the memory of Webb Venable. It was not my privilege to know Mr. Venable so well personally but I knew him by reputation, and that reputation was indeed good. He was an outstanding figure in the political history of Mississippi. He was an outstanding lawyer. He was known as one of the most able lawyers ever produced by our State. He was a fair man and like his minister father before him, he was a Christian man. As evidence of his Christian leadership he taught the men's Bible class in the Baptist Church of Clarksdale, Miss., for many, many years.

Mr. Venable was generally recognized throughout Mississippi as a leader, as a good lawyer, and as a Christian character. I deeply mourn the passing of this outstanding Mississippian.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was not my privilege to have known Judge Venable personally, but I will say that I was of course familiar, as every other Mississippian was, with the great work that he has done for the State of Mississippi and for the Nation. I join with my colleagues and friends and with the people of the State of Mississippi in mourning his untimely passing.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve with the distinguished former Member from Mississippi, Mr. Venable. I remember him as a young man. I think his ability as an orator has already been referred to. He made one of the most brilliant speeches during his short term as a Member of the House that I have ever heard on the floor of the House.

Mr. Venable was a fine man and a great American.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the Mississippi Delegation may have the privilege of extending their remarks on this subject at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor may hold hearings this afternoon during sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances and to include a speech by Assistant Secretary of State Allen, a radio address by Mrs. Dorothy Fuldheim, and a telegram from A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Mrs. LUSK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include excerpts from a letter of a constituent.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 738)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, I am reporting to the Congress concerning a labor dispute which recently existed in the bituminous-coal industry.

The significant facts concerning this dispute may be summarized as follows:

The dispute involved the administration of a collective-bargaining agreement known as the National Bituminous Coal Wage Agreement of 1947, which was signed by the United Mine Workers of America and certain coal operators and associations. The dispute grew out of the dissatisfaction of the union with the failure of the trustees of the United Mine Workers of America welfare and retirement fund, established by the agreement, to begin the payment of benefits. In accordance with the terms of the agreement the union had appointed Mr. John L. Lewis as trustee of the fund, the operators had appointed Mr. Ezra Van Horn, and these two had selected Mr. Thomas E. Murray as the third trustee. The trustees were unable to agree upon any plan for the amount of benefits to be paid out of the fund or the eligibility of miners for such benefits. Mr. Murray therefore resigned from his office as trustee. The continued failure to begin payment from the fund resulted in a work stoppage.

On March 23, 1948, I signed Executive Order 9939, creating a Board of Inquiry pursuant to section 206 of the Labor Management Relations Act. I requested the Board to report to me on or before April 5, 1948. The Board held public hearings on March 26, 29, and 30, and filed its first report with me on March 31, 1948. That report advised me fully of the facts of the dispute and indicated that the stoppage had "precipitated a crisis in the industry and in the Nation as a whole." A copy of that report is attached.

I, therefore, requested the Attorney General, in accordance with the provisions of section 208 of the Labor Management Relations Act, to petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for an injunction. An injunction was granted by Justice T. Alan Goldsborough, of that court, on April 3, 1948. It restrained the union from continuing the strike which the court then found was in existence, ordered the union to instruct all members to return to their employment, and further ordered the union and the operators to bargain collectively.

Following the issuance of the injunction on April 3, 1948, there was a gradual return of miners to work. Compliance with the provisions of that injunction and substantially normal production in the bituminous coal mines was obtained on or about April 26, 1948.

Soon after the issuance of the injunction of April 3, 1948, the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES was selected by the two remaining trustees as the new third trustee under the agreement. Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. Lewis, as trustees, approved a plan for beginning payment of benefits under the fund. Mr. Van Horn withheld his approval and challenged the legality of the action of the majority of the trustees in a proceeding instituted in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. On June 23, 1948, Justice Goldsborough dismissed the complaint filed by Mr. Van Horn and held that the plan of Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. Lewis for beginning payment of benefits under the fund was legal.

As a result of the settlement of the dispute over the fund the Attorney General, pursuant to section 210 of the Labor Management Relations Act, requested the court to discharge the injunction. The injunction was discharged on June 23, 1948.

The Board of Inquiry was reconvened subsequent to the issuance of the injunction, pursuant to section 209 of the Labor Management Relations Act, and submitted its final report to me on June 26, 1948. A copy of the report is attached.

It should be noted that this dispute is distinct from that with respect to which I created a Board of Inquiry on June 19, 1948, by Executive Order 9970, and which made its report to me on June 24, 1948. That Board was created because of the imminent expiration of the 1947 contract between the United Mine Workers of America and the bituminous coal operators and the consequent threat of a stoppage of work. A new contract covering most of the industry was agreed upon by the parties prior to the expiration of the old contract and no injunction was sought. A new contract for the remainder of the industry was subsequently negotiated. Since the report of the second Board contains a comprehensive summary of the entire chain of events concerning both disputes, a copy of its report is attached to this message for the convenience of the Congress.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 5, 1948.*

JUNE 26, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Board of Inquiry appointed by you under Executive Order No. 9939 to consider a labor dispute between United Mine Workers of America and the coal operators and associations, pursuant to the national bituminous coal wage agreement of 1947, submitted to you a written report on March 31, 1948.

As reported by us, the dispute grew out of the failure to activate a trust fund for the payment of pensions to miners. This trust fund was created by said wage agreement of 1947, which also provided that three trustees were to operate and administer the fund. The trustees were to be appointed one by the miners, one by the operators, and these two to select a third trustee. The miners selected Mr. John L. Lewis; the operators Mr. Ezra Van Horn; and these two in turn selected Mr. Thomas E. Murray. The trustees were unable to agree upon a plan to activate the fund or any portion thereof for the payment of pensions. Mr. Murray resigned, and with Mr. Lewis and Mr. Van Horn in complete disagreement, the fund, amounting to over $30,000,000 at that time, could not be activated, and out of this situation grew a work stoppage in the mines, as delineated in our report.

Since the filing of our report, Senator STYLES BRIDGES has been designated as a third trustee. Senator BRIDGES thereupon submitted a resolution for the activation of this trust fund for the payment of pension, and Mr. Lewis approved the resolution offered by Senator BRIDGES, but Mr. Van Horn withheld his approval. This led to the filing by Mr. Van Horn of a complaint against his fellow trustees in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, in which complaint he challenged the legality of the action taken by his fellow trustees. On the 22d day of June 1948, the Honorable T. Alan Goldsborough, District judge, before whom said complaint was pending, entered a decree in substance validating the action taken by trustees Lewis and Bridges and entered summary judgment in their favor, dismissing the complaint of Trustee Van Horn.

We are advised that the coal operators signatory to the wage agreement of 1947 have accepted the action of Judge Goldsborough. The dispute over the activation of the trust fund for the payment of pensions has therefore been settled.

We are further informed that a satisfactory wage agreement has been negotiated between the operators and the miners for the year 1948, and all the matters in dispute have been adjudicated or negotiated to a final and satisfactory settlement.

Our final report is therefore concluded upon the settlement of this dispute by the parties.

Respectfully submitted.

SHERMAN MINTON.
MARK ETHRIDGE.
GEORGE W. TAYLOR.

PROTECTING THE NATION'S ECONOMY AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in order to protect the Nation's monetary, banking, and credit structure, and interstate and foreign commerce, against increased inflationary pressures, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are authorized, notwithstanding the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 386, 80th Cong.), to exercise, up to and including March 15, 1949, consumer-credit controls in accordance with and to carry out the purposes of Executive Order No. 8843 (August 9, 1941) insofar as it relates to installment credit.

All the present provisions of sections 21 and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (relating to investigations, injunctions, jurisdictions, and other matters), shall be as fully applicable with respect to the exercise by the Board of Governors of consumer installment credit controls as they

are now applicable with respect to the exercise by the Securities and Exchange Commission of its functions under that act, and the Board shall have the same powers in the exercise of such consumer installment credit controls as the Commission now has under the said sections.

SEC. 2. (a) The third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by changing the first sentence of such paragraph to read as follows:

"Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 35 percent against its deposits and reserves in gold certificates of not less than 40 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation: *Provided, however,* That when the Federal Reserve agent holds gold certificates as collateral for Federal Reserve notes issued to the bank such gold certificates shall be counted as part of the reserve which such bank is required to maintain against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

(b) The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "25 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "40 percent."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To suspend for a period not exceeding 30 days, and from time to time to renew such suspension for periods not exceeding 15 days, any reserve requirements specified in this act: *Provided,* That it shall establish a graduated tax upon the amounts by which the reserve requirements of this act may be permitted to fall below the level hereinafter specified: *And provided further,* That when the reserve held against Federal Reserve notes falls below 40 percent, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall establish a graduated tax of not more than 1 percent per annum upon such deficiency until the reserves fall to 32½ percent, and when said reserve falls below 32½ percent, a tax at the rate increasingly of not less than 1½ percent per annum upon each 2½ percent or fraction thereof that such reserve falls below 32½ percent. The tax shall be paid by the Reserve bank, but the Reserve bank shall add an amount equal to said tax to the rates of interest and discount fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

SEC. 3. Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the sixth paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion, may by regulation change the requirements as to reserves to be maintained pursuant to this section against demand or time deposits or both (1) by Member banks in central Reserve cities, or (2) by member banks in Reserve cities, or (3) by member banks not in Reserve or central Reserve cities, or (4) by all member banks; but no such change shall have the effect of requiring any such member bank to maintain a reserve balance against its time deposits in an amount equal to more than 7 percent thereof, or a reserve balance against its demand deposits in an amount equal to more than 29 percent thereof if such bank is in a central reserve city, 23 percent thereof if in a Reserve city, or 17 percent thereof if not in a Reserve or central Reserve city. No change in reserve requirements made under authority of this paragraph shall continue in effect after March 31, 1949."

Amend the title to read: "Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the tremendous importance of this measure I was wondering if the gentleman from Michigan would agree or ask unanimous consent that the time may be extended somewhat more than 20 minutes on a side. A great many Members on this side, I will say to the gentleman, desire to make some remarks, not only extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the leadership have told me that they have other things to do today. The issues in this resolution are quite simple and are, I think, quite well understood.

There are only three provisions in the resolution, one of which was discussed quite at length on the floor, with respect to the gold-reserve requirement. I do not know that there should be any objection to the reimposition of consumer-credit controls by the minority, because the President stressed the necessity for that in his message. That subject has been before the House on various occasions. The provision in the bill with respect to the increase in the reserves of the banks is a very simple problem which should not be controversial.

I hope the gentleman will not insist upon extending the time because of that situation. As a matter of fact, we have made statements to the Senate leaders that we would try to get this resolution over to them very early in the afternoon in order that they might have a committee meeting and determine what they would do, in the hope that they would be able to dispose of the matter this afternoon.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is not my purpose to make the request myself. I was wondering if the gentleman himself would make the request that we might have an additional 10 or 15 minutes on a side.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am inclined to think at the present time that 40 minutes altogether would probably be ample to cover the whole situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Further reserving the right to object, do I understand that the gentleman refuses to extend the time?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No request has been made to extend the time yet. I am not in a position at the present time to ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the Chair recognize a Member to ask unanimous consent to extend the time?

The SPEAKER. Another request is pending before the House at the present time. The question is, Shall a second be considered as ordered?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will not object to that.

The SPEAKER. Those are the parliamentary rules which the Chair must observe.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that a second be considered as ordered?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the Chair recognize me to submit a unanimous-consent request that the time be extended?

The SPEAKER. The Chair of course dislikes to refuse to put the request, but may he inquire if the gentleman from Massachusetts has consulted the majority leader about this?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. There has been no consultation with me about this matter at all. I say this in no way of criticism of the action of the minority leadership, but it came to me as a complete surprise. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has pointed out, we hope to dispose of this matter and get it over to the Senate so action can be expedited. It has been said all along that this is a great emergency that requires prompt action. In addition, we have the United Nations proposal, in which there is much interest, and which we expect to dispose of today also. As far as I am concerned, I think, as the gentleman from Michigan has pointed out, that this matter has been debated, and the principles involved are known to all of us, and it seems to me that in the interest of expediting the work of the Congress and our work here today the time as allotted under the rules will be sufficient for the discussion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, continuing my parliamentary inquiry, I would never ask anything that I could not entertain myself. That is one policy I attempt to follow through life. Under the rules, 40 minutes of debate are allowed on this proposition. It seems to me that an extension to 1 hour, half an hour on a side, is not going to cause any serious delay, but it will give an opportunity for Members to be heard. It is not that we are thinking in terms of hours of debate, but a reasonable period should be allowed to give some Members the opportunity to express themselves. That is what I had in mind. I recognize that we should have gone to the majority leader, but there are times when the leaders on that side do not come to us, and we just accept that.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why not let the Members extend their remarks in the RECORD, and everybody will read them tomorrow, and it will have the same effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have such a warm regard for my friend from Pennsylvania that I would not undertake to give him the answer his inquiry would properly and from a tolerant angle deserve.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman should not hesitate to express himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, then, if the Chair will recognize me for that purpose——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it having been developed, apparently, that unanimous consent will not be granted, he feels it would be unwise to ask it, when there is no possibility of its being granted.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is why I submitted my parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SABATH. Do I understand the Members are precluded and denied the right——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will submit a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SABATH. Are the Members denied the right to ask unanimous consent to extend the time? Have we not the right at least to ask that, and should that not be considered by the Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has stated that he feels that in view of the fact that it would be impossible to secure that unanimous consent it would be futile for the Chair to present the question.

Mr. SABATH. So the Chair rules on that theory——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not made any ruling.

Mr. McCORMACK. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Chair as a Member of the House himself adopts that position?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not adopting that position, neither is he objecting to the extension to 1 hour. He is not the one who would object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why not let me submit the unanimous-consent request so that the Chair will not be in the position of indirectly objecting?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not recognized the gentleman for that purpose as yet. The Chair will state that he is at all times ready to assume his responsibility for the maintenance of the rules of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that this bill would come up under a rule so that it might be subject to amendment. There are two provisions in the bill: One to change the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks and put them back to their previous level—40 percent gold, so-called backing for Federal Reserve notes, and 35 percent for Federal Reserve bank deposits.

The claim is being made by the opposition that this would so contract the credit and currency as to seriously hamper the ability of the Federal Reserve Board to manage the Federal debt.

I want you to listen to these figures. The Federal Reserve has an excess of gold reserves at the present time amounting to $4,600,000,000. There can be made available from the Treasury an additional $1,300,000,000. The sum of the two is capable of a credit expansion of anywhere between, roundly, seventy-four and eighty-nine billion dollars.

So the claim that is going to be made by the opposition that this would hamper the Federal Reserve authorities in their efforts to maintain the bond market and to control the Federal debt is without foundation.

The other provision in this bill has to do with installment credit. That is the provision which I would have asked to have stricken if the bill had been brought in so that it could have been amended.

What this bill does is to actually limit the purchasing power of those people who buy under the installment plan to about what it was in 1937. In other words, they cannot buy any more goods under this bill than they were able to buy in 1937.

As a matter of fact, per capita, they would be able to buy less, because of the increase in population. I believe that is hitting just a little bit too low below the belt.

I voted against the measure which reduced the gold reserves which were required to be held against Federal Reserve notes and Federal Reserve bank deposits. My position on this matter at the present time is this. The raising of the reserves to their previous level will have no effect on inflation or the ability of the Treasury to manage the Federal debt.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] a statement by the President of the United States as well as copies of several telegrams from various labor organizations in connection with the housing legislation and the high-cost-of-living legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a statement by Hon. Marriner Eccles, for many years Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in regard to the pending bill.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the special session of the Congress has been called by the President for the purpose of enacting legislation that would aid in controlling the dangerous inflationary tendencies that now exist.

In his message he made 10 suggestions for legislation which he thought the Congress should enact in order that this dangerous condition might be controlled. Many of these proposals were incorporated in the bill H. R. 7062, which the Committee on Banking and Currency considered for a few days. But after consideration of that bill, as has been customary in that committee, another and entirely different bill was drawn out of the hat. It was not considered by the committee. It was reported by a partisan vote.

This is the greatest problem for solution that has been submitted to the American people in a decade. It is a question that deserves the deep consideration of the Congress. It deserves their study and their deliberation, and yet it is brought to the House under a suspension of the rules, with 20 minutes' debate on each side, and with no opportunity to amend the bill. This character of consideration violates every democratic process.

This bill is totally inadequate to meet present conditions. The President has asked for bread and the Congress has again given him a stone. I think it is an affront to the intelligence of the Congress and every liberal principle that they only have the opportunity to vote this bill up or down after practically no debate.

I think I can say the Federal Reserve Board is utterly opposed to the bill. I have a devastating statement here from Mr. Eccles, in regard to some of the provisions of the bill, and in this respect he speaks for the Board. It is true the bill continues regulation W that would regulate installment buying and consumer credit. Those who have administered these measures say that that would be totally inadequate unless accompanied by other measures that would have the effect of controlling inflation.

The bill authorizes the increase in reserves against bank deposits by 3 percent. The member banks now have in their possession $65,000,000,000 in Federal securities. They could sell about $3,000,000,000 of those securities and comply with this increase in the reserves and still have $62,000,000,000 in their portfolios. The effect of this increase would be negligible.

The bill provides that gold certificates against Federal Reserve deposits shall be increased from 25 percent to 35 percent, and that gold certificates against Federal Reserve notes shall be increased from 25 percent to 40 percent. This provision will eventually weaken the authority of the Federal Reserve System in supporting the bond market of the United States, which involves its faith and credit. After the last war the public indebtedness of the United States was about $21,000,000,000 and the bonds of United States bore 4½ percent and were nontaxable. There was no support of these bonds by the Federal Reserve and they dropped to 80 percent of par. We can well feel a deep apprehension of what might result at the present time to Government securities yielding 2½ percent which are taxable when the public debt amounts to $250,000,000,000 if the market support were removed.

It is a dangerous measure, one that may be fraught with great peril to the economy of America and one whose ultimate result cannot now be foreseen.

Because of the inadequate consideration of this bill and because of the perils that lurk in it, I shall vote against it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Under the permission granted me, I include the statement of Mr. Eccles:

STATEMENT OF HON. MARRINER ECCLES BEFORE THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE IN REGARD TO THE INCREASE IN THE GOLD RESERVES AGAINST FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES AND FEDERAL RESERVE BANK DEPOSITS

Restoration of the previous ratio of required gold certificate reserves held by Federal Reserve banks of 40 percent against Federal Reserve notes and 35 percent against Federal Reserve bank deposits has been proposed to your committee as an anti-inflationary measure. This proposal would make no contribution whatever to the fight against inflation. It would not sterilize new acquisitions of gold nor would it give the Federal Reserve System any additional powers to curb inflationary expansion of bank credit.

The present reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks stand at a uniform level of 25 percent. Congress established them at this level in consequence of the wartime expansion of currency and Reserve bank credit. The previous requirements of 40 percent against notes and 35 percent against deposits, incorporated in the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, were largely arbitrary.

To restore the prewar levels now would only entail needless operating difficulties for some of the Federal Reserve banks. The combined banks at present hold gold certificates amounting to 50.6 percent of their total note and deposit liabilities, or approximately $6,000,000,000 in excess of the proposed higher requirements. Thus, they would not prohibit Reserve banks from providing member banks with additional funds on which to base a considerable further expansion of bank credit.

If Reserve banks were to be prevented by this device from issuing currency and member banks were thus unable to supply currency to their customers, it would precipitate the kind of money panic which the Federal Reserve System was created to prevent. Likewise, if the Federal Reserve System, because of an artificial limitation, were unable to supply credit to member banks, the results could well be demoralizing in the Government bond market.

Although the Reserve System as a whole has gold certificate reserves in excess of the proposed higher requirement, there is considerable variation among individual Federal Reserve banks. As a practical operating matter, these banks cannot permit the ratios to go down to the vanishing point and hence require a working margin of at least 3 percentage points.

If the higher requirement were restored, some Federal Reserve banks would have a substantial deficiency, others would be below or close to the necessary operating margin, while still others would have a large excess.

Reserve banks with a deficiency would be obliged to sell some of their Government securities to or to borrow from Reserve banks which had an excess. The reserve position of the individual Federal Reserve banks is constantly changing with seasonal and other movements of funds in the economy. Therefore, the proposal would entail operating difficulties and constant inconvenience without accomplishing any useful purpose.

Expansion or contraction of Reserve-bank credit should be determined by the needs of the economy and not by the amount of gold certificates which Reserve banks happen to have, which in turn is contingent upon international movements of gold.

Likewise, inability to supply credit to member banks would compel the System to withdraw support from the Government securities market and perhaps even to sell securities which it now holds at whatever prices or yields they would bring in the market.

The Reserve banks do not control the amount of currency which the public wishes to hold. It is the depositors of the banks and the recipients of checks who determine the volume of outstanding currency. They create the demand and member banks come to their respective Federal Reserve banks to obtain such amounts of currency as their depositors or others presenting checks may desire to have.

If the Reserve System were unable to meet demands for currency it would jeopardize public confidence and might lead to runs on banks and to hoarding of currency, such as occurred in 1931.

It is already within the System's power to invoke such drastic measures. The System has rejected such a course because of the possible disastrous effects on the entire financial situation of the country.

The proposal would appear to be designed to force the Federal Reserve System to abandon support of the Government securities market and thus bring about sharp increases in interest rates. It is inconceivable that Congress or the public desire either to create a run on the currency or collapse of the bond market. If that were the will of the majority, it should be done openly and frankly and not by indirection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted, I include the statement of the President:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

AUGUST 5, 1948.

It now appears that the Eightieth Congress is determined to take no effective action on the proposals which I have submitted to curb high prices and to protect the average American citizen against the certain prospect of increased living costs.

I have been informed that the Republican leadership has decided that the Congress will not be allowed to consider really effective measures to stop high prices. Republican leaders reached this decision without obtaining the full information the administration was prepared to offer in connection with my recommendations. In fact, the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency refused a request for three Cabinet members to be given an opportunity to testify before the committee.

The Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and Interior were and are now prepared to testify. The Secretary of Agriculture was prepared to offer a program directed to the problem of excessive food prices. The Secretary of Commerce was prepared to discuss with the committee the question of shortages of industrial materials and what could be done to correct the situation. The Secretary of the Interior was prepared to submit a program dealing with the proper distribution and prices of coal, heating oil, and other fuels. The committee of the House refused to receive the views of these members of my Cabinet. In the absence of such basic information I do not see how the committee can make an intelligent decision on issues which so gravely affect the welfare of the American people and their standard of living.

Following the same pattern the Ways and Means Committee of the House refused to give any consideration to the recommendation for an excess-profits tax, which is necessary to offset the inflationary effects of the tax bill passed last spring. The chairman of this committee has not even called a meeting of the committee since the Congress reconvened.

It would appear that the Republican leaders are unwilling to extend to the Congress an opportunity to vote on the issues of direct price control, the authority to impose allocations and priorities, and the other elements of a balanced program which I submitted to the Congress, including provisions to strengthen and reinforce rent control.

It now appears that so far the Congress has failed to discharge the tasks for which I called it into special session. It is my hope, therefore, that the Republican leadership will reconsider their present plans for quick adjournment and will take action upon the recommendations I have submitted.

There is still time for the Congress to fulfill its responsibilities to the American people. Our people will not be satisfied with the feeble compromises that apparently are being concocted.

TELEGRAMS FROM THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

AUGUST 4, 1948.

To Senator TOBEY:

Press reports indicate that housing legislation is now being considered which would not include such essential features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as public housing, slum clearance, and rural housing. We strongly urge that your committee hold fast to all of the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. If any housing legislation other than S. 866 should be considered by your committee we respectfully request that we be given an opportunity to state our views on this all-important question.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

AUGUST 4, 1948.

To Congressman JESSE WOLCOTT:

Press reports indicate that housing legislation is now being considered which would not include such essential features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as public housing, slum clearance, and rural housing. This organization is strongly on record as favoring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill as it passed the Senate. If your committee should consider any housing legislation which does not include all of the provisions of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill we respectfully request that we be given an opportunity to state our views on this all-important question.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

TELEGRAMS FROM LABOR ORGANIZATIONS TO CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS REQUESTING OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY BEFORE BILLS ARE REPORTED OUT OF COMMITTEE

1. Telegram from H. W. Fraser, president of Railway Labor Executives Association, to Senators CHARLES W. TOBEY, J. J. SPARKMAN; Congressmen JESSE P. WOLCOTT and BRENT SPENCE:

AUGUST 4, 1948.

Railway labor regards as imperative the passage of adequate housing and anti-inflation measures before the special session adjourns, I urge you and your associates on behalf of a million and a quarter of railroad workers to press for action on these two basic problems. We must have good laws on both if our economy is to avoid increasing difficulties in the months immediately ahead. Our people desire to be heard on any new housing measure or any anti-inflation measure which the special session may consider. Please address reply to 1412 East Pikes Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colo.

H. W. FRASER,
Chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association.

2. Telegram from Alexander F. Whitney, president of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to Senators TAFT, WHERRY, BARKLEY, MCGRATH; Congressmen MARTIN, HALLECK, RAYBURN, and MCCORMACK:

AUGUST 4, 1948.

Due to pyramiding in prices which are forcing a reduction in standards of millions of the common people and a serious housing shortage, it is imperative that adequate laws be enacted to immediately relieve these serious situations and I urge that immediate public hearings be held to permit testimony

from well-informed and interested people. I desire to personally testify before the appropriate committees and will greatly appreciate an early reply advising day and hour I may be heard.

A. F. WHITNEY,
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

AUGUST 4, 1948.

Send the following telegram to: Senator ROBERT TAFT, Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C., and JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

"When the Congress adjourned in June it left behind an unprecedented record of unfinished business. Bills to meet the needs of the American people were ignored, pigeonholed, or amended beyond recognition. The special session of Congress called by President Truman gave Congress an opportunity to rewrite its record. Food that cost $1 in June 1946, now cost $1.47. Other necessities like clothing, which cost $1 in June 1946, now cost $1.25. The doubling up of many American families, due to the housing shortage, is a crime. With both political parties committed to the passage of civil-rights legislation, the effect of Senator VANDENBERG's ruling prevents this issue from coming to a vote.

"The Congress of Industrial Organizations was informed this morning that, due to a decision of the Republican policy committee, the Congress will adjourn Saturday having heard, outside of Government witnesses, only the representatives of the banking fraternity on the all-important question of inflation.

"The phony filibuster successfully conducted by the southern Democrats is a decided contrast to the prompt squelching by the Republican leadership of the recent filibuster led by Senator LANGER to include a civil-rights program in the recently enacted Selective Service Act. Senator VANDENBERG'S ruling, which allowed the filibuster to continue, makes a mockery of the deliberative process and, in view of the arbitrary adjournment date, made it easy for the Republican Party to do nothing effective to control inflation, to do nothing to provide decent homes for the returned veterans, to do nothing to protect and extend the civil rights of all the people.

"Although it would appear that there is no need for long hearings to establish the need for anti-inflation legislation, the meaningless bill now being considered makes it mandatory for organizations representing the public interest to be heard. Senator CAPEHART has publicly stated that the people were not interested in the cost of living. He claimed that there were no requests to testify on the need for legislation to halt the upward inflationary spiral, despite the fact that the CIO and many other groups representing the average American have requested time to be heard on this subject.

"In the interest of the general public, we urge that you as leaders of the Republican Party exercise your influence to hold Congress in session in order to hear the views of President Philip Murray on inflation, Secretary-Treasurer Carey on the civil-rights program, Vice President Rieve on the excess-profits-tax bill introduced by Congressman DINGELL, and the need for enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill by Vice President Reuther. This special session of Congress cannot afford to adjourn without establishing this record on which the American people will vote November 2.

"I would appreciate an early reply so that if Congress is to stay at work and do its job we can inform our membership and arrange for the appearance of our witnesses.

"JAMES B. CAREY,
"Secretary-Treasurer of the CIO."

AUGUST 4, 1948.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We were shocked to be informed today that the CIO has been denied an opportunity to testify during the hearings being conducted by your committee on proposed anti-inflation legislation.

The 6,000,000 members of the CIO and their families are suffering daily what may properly be described in the language of the Republican Party Presidential candidate as "frightful impositions" caused by the high and rising cost of living resulting from uncontrolled inflation that, if continued, is bound to result in bust and depression. We believe our testimony would be of interest and value to your committee. In any event, we feel that we should have an opportunity to present it on its merits and under circumstances that will make it possible for the members of your committee to test its validity by questioning.

More shocking than the abrupt cloture invoked before opportunity had been given to us or to other organizations to present facts, opinions, problems, and criticisms of pending legislation is the reason stated for breaking off hearings, namely, a decision by the Republican policy committee that, rain or shine, inflation or no inflation, the Congress must adjourn next Saturday night.

Most shocking is the statement that only Government witnesses would be heard and the unprecedented classification of private bankers whose banks happen to be members of the Federal Reserve System as "Government witnesses." As we understand it, they are members of the Federal Reserve System purely for regulatory purposes.

The discrimination in favor of the bankers on the one hand and against other citizens and their organizations on the other hand is an unfortunate precedent which, we prefer to believe, you personally would not seriously defend.

We urge you to reconsider and to support our request to Senator TAFT and Speaker MARTIN that Congress be kept in session until effective action has been taken on the emergency items of inflation, housing, and civil rights.

We will appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience.

JAMES B. CAREY,
Secretary-Treasurer, CIO.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, this Congress was called into session to deal with the mounting effects of inflation. While the call was obviously political, the problem of inflation is not political. Indeed, inflation is the most complex economic problem of the age in which we live.

Its solution or nonsolution will determine the future of the people of this country and affect the whole world. So it certainly is a problem that deserves the patient, sober, and careful consideration of the membership of this House.

I should like to vote for a bill that would approach this problem constructively and effectively, but I have been unable to convince myself that the measure before us does more than temporize with this problem.

This bill reminds me of the inflation-control bill before us last December. When that bill was before the House I made this statement:

There is one thing Congress can do about inflation that would be worse than no action at all. That is to pass an anti-inflation bill that does not touch the root cause of inflation.

You know what happened after that bill was passed. The price level kept right on going up and it is going up now. Neither the cause or causes of inflation were at all halted by that measure.

There is a very evil byproduct of this business of temporizing with inflation. I would like to discuss that angle in the very limited time now at my disposal.

There are shrewd people in this country who understand what inflation is doing to the value of money. The longer we postpone coming to grips with this situation the longer the span of time given to speculators and profiteers to outwit the poor and the trusting people of the country and separate them from real property. Here is one of the ugliest payoffs of inflation. All you need to do to see how this evil operates is to recall what happened in Germany during their inflation in the early twenties. There the humble people who relied on government promises found themselves after the inflation with baskets full of worthless currency while the shrewd and unscrupulous came out owning the real wealth of the nation.

Every time we take action that temporizes with inflation the message goes out to the trusting people that Congress has done something toward really halting inflation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Nebraska one additional minute.

Mr. BUFFETT. I think we should tell the people frankly that the present cruel inflation has been created over a 15-year period and its consequences cannot be evaded.

We could go on from there and declare that Congress is going to recover and again carry out its responsibility to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

As the first move we should set up a bipartisan monetary commission to go to work on this complex problem. A monetary commission, to be appointed by the President, Speaker of the House, and President pro tempore of the Senate, could carefully appraise and study the whole range of inflation's ramifications. It could get at the roots of the present inflation and formulate a program to work us out of this fearful situation.

It certainly should be clear to all Members of the House now that little progress can be made on this problem in an atmosphere continually supercharged with political considerations.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that charges and countercharges, plus demogogic appeals of all kinds will continue to muddy the waters and make a cool and dispassionate approach to this problem almost impossible if its consideration is limited to committee hearings and floor debate.

A bipartisan monetary commission could assemble the facts on this matter and work out a pattern for its solution free from the unsettling developments of the political arena. With the commission's program in hand the Congress could enact the legislation necessary to restore stable money to the American people.

America desperately needs a money which will give the producer an assurance that when he saves dollars and tries to provide for his future he holds a repository of value having a reasonably permanent and stable purchasing power.

Mr. Speaker, a monetary commission established now would demonstrate to the country that this Congress was going at the job of ending inflation in a constructive, nonpartisan, and businesslike fashion.

Bills providing for the monetary commission have been introduced. I hope this proposal will get serious consideration before we go home from the special session.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include excerpts.)

GOVERNMENT-BOND PRICES MUST BE SUPPORTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people who own United States Government bonds have a right to expect the Government to make it possible for them to redeem their bonds 100 percent with interest at all times.

If we pass this bill there is one provision that will jeopardize the policy of the open-market committee of the Federal Reserve System in supporting the prices of bonds. That is the second part wherein it is proposed to increase the reserves on the Federal Reserve notes from 25 percent as at present to 40 percent and to increase the reserve requirements behind Federal Reserve bank deposits to 35 percent from the present 25 percent. That is going to lower the amount of gold which is available to support the bond market and will weaken the cushion that is now being used to support the bond market. If that is true to the extent many of us believe it is, it will in all probability cause a flight from Government bonds to dollars and from dollars to tangible property. Then we will be in a real inflation.

That is what I am afraid this bill will bring about. It is the most dangerous provision I have ever seen written into a bill involving our entire economy. The prosperity of the people depends upon a good currency. We cannot have a prosperous country without a good, sound, stable currency. When the people get the idea that their bonds are not going to be supported by the Government as the Government promised them it would support their bonds, I am apprehensive that some serious things might happen, and the inflation we now have is minor as compared to what it will be then.

This is so serious I ask you to consider what the effect might be on the Government-bond market and the bonds that are now owned by millions of people in this country who bought them with the understanding and the promise of the United States Government that they could always get their money back 100 cents on the dollar. It is a dangerous bill and I expect to vote against it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include therein a very remarkable, able, and clear portion of the committee's report headed "General statement."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

HIGH PRICES ARE THE RESULT, NOT THE CAUSE, OF INFLATION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest, clearest statements on the current economic situation in the United States I have come across appears in the report 2455 on this bill by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. With the permission of the House, I insert it in my remarks at this point in the RECORD at this time.

The statement follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

In considering the program presented to Congress in the President's message of July 27, 1946, Congress agrees that one of the basic problems confronting the American people is inflation with its resulting high prices. It recognizes that the Government should take the leadership in stabilizing the value of the American dollar to the end that prices may be adjusted. It considered that a sound economy in the United States is the key to world stability, prosperity, and peace.

High prices are not the cause but the result of inflation. They reflect depreciation in the value of the dollar. Causes for such depreciation of the value of the American dollar are well known. Every effort should be made to remove them. Basically these causes are the easy-money policies of the Government and the unusually heavy demand by foreign countries for American goods.

It may be recalled that almost all the efforts of the Government since 1933 have been to make money and credit easier. The end result of our efforts between 1933 and 1940 were to lick a depression. From 1940 until VJ-day in 1945 the object of Government was to win the war. In order to lick the depression the Government found it necessary to augment the credits which were customarily made available through private sources. It increased the supply of money and credit to restore purchasing power and the demand for both consumer and producer goods. It made available billions of dollars for public and private works as an aid to employment. For years Government expenditures exceeded Government revenue. Deficit financing was taken for granted. Debt increased by billions each year. To make money and credit easier this debt was monetized. The Government provided that this debt could be used as collateral for the issuance of money. Debt and money was brought into such close affiliation that the value of the currency largely depended upon the size of the debt. As debt increased and money became more plentiful, money became less of value. As a consequence prices and purchasing power rose.

As we entered the war it was considered necessary to continue these easy money and credit policies to finance war production. Deficit financing increased daily. National debt increased to an unprecedented $279,000,000,000. Wages rose. Farm income rose. Corporate earnings rose. National income was rising as the national debt increased. Because our farms and factories were producing for war there was a scarcity of consumer goods. Our people could not use their purchasing power, consequently savings per capita rose to all-time highs. The influences created by previous attempts during the depression to make money and credit plentiful were unfortunately continued. On VJ-day we found ourselves with an exceedingly large amount of savings and high earnings. Private debt could be liquidated easily from current income. Following VE-day the administration contemplated a postwar depression which never materialized. To meet this mythical depression they took further steps by reducing gold reserves of the banks to make money and credit easier.

It is difficult for anyone to admit mistakes. When mistakes are made those in responsible positions of the Government should be courageous enough to admit the mistakes and do everything possible to correct them. Instead, Government policies were inaugurated and maintained which inspired inflationary spirals and which in practice have proved that a politically managed economy is the opposite of American principles and can only result in possible economic chaos and disaster.

A strong, sound America is necessary to world stability and peace. There is nothing wrong with the United States that production and sound fiscal policies will not correct. Fiscal policies of the Government since VE-day have not been sound. They have been conducive to economic and financial uncertainty. They have inspired inflationary tendencies which make it necessary now for the Government to take drastic measures. The American form of government is only as effective in meeting crises as the administrators of the Government are courageous in utilizing the powers over which they have control. For years the President and the Federal Reserve System have had the powers to stabilize our economy. Judicious use of these powers would have prevented present high prices. Judicious use of these powers from now on can prevent higher prices and can result in economic and financial stability. Political expediency should not control action in this respect. The measures taken by Government to make money and credit easier, to cheapen the value of the dollar, to raise prices, were altogether too successful in the postwar period.

Almost every one of the acts passed by the Congress to lick a depression and win a war is still on the statute books and is being fully utilized by the administration to maintain a cheapened dollar and higher prices. It naturally follows that a reversal of these processes will bring about an appreciation of the value of the dollar, lower prices, economic and financial stability. The administration has not used the powers to stabilize our economy, which powers have been called repeatedly to the attention of those responsible for the administration of the laws. Instead of reversing the policies which have lead to inflation, the administration has insisted upon maintaining these policies but has consistently tried to offset their evil effects by new and untried controls over our economy. Instead of using the orthodox methods at its disposal to stabilize the American dollar and our economy, the administration asks for price controls, for allocation controls, and priority controls. These proposed panaceas for the ills of our economy should be studied in the light of past pain-

ful experiences. Price controls, allocations, and priorities are a mere palliative to ease the symptoms of inflation. They do not cure. They cannot be administered without serious set-backs to our productive effort. They beget a vast brood of contradictions and uncertainties. They promote black markets and tax evasions. Production and more production is the key to economic stability. We cannot have high production when price, priority, and allocation controls are being maintained. The memories of the people are not so short as not to recall that, with OPA price control, rationing, allocation, and priorities, the economic structure was brought to the brink of chaos. We emphasize the fact that it is impossible to have such restrictions and at the same time have full production. This committee is fearful that, if authorized, such powers would be used as ineffectively and as injudiciously as before. We are fearful that the consequence of their reimposition would be similar chaos and uncertainty.

Our economic equilibrium is balanced on very sensitive scales. Production at the present time is at an all-time high. We cannot afford for political purposes to throw our economy out of balance and possibly destroy the influences which are now at work to balance demand with supply. Marriner S. Eccles, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, testified that "the program—the President's—taken as a whole seems to me to be more of a political program than an economic one because there is in the program action called for which would be very inflationary."

None of the witnesses appearing before the committee on the President's proposed program were able to state specifically how the powers asked for would be used. Some of them testified that the measures requested were in themselves inflationary. None denied that to delegate to the President any of the powers which he asked for would reestablish the police state, the existence of which he deplored when by Executive order he removed price controls in November 1946.

The committee has been of the opinion that if there were deficiencies in the powers which the President and the Federal Reserve had to stabilize the economy, sympathetic consideration would be given to recommendations to correct the situation. The request of the President's message for further credit controls by the Federal Reserve System constituted the first formal proposal submitted by the administration to this committee in respect to primary bank reserve requirements. Although these reserve requirements have been, except in the case of the central reserve city banks, at the legal maximum since November 1, 1941, no formal request has previously been made for an increase in reserve authority. This authority has been granted in this bill. This authority together with the powers which the President and the Federal Reserve have had throughout the years are ample if judiciously used to stabilize prices. They constitute the means by which sound fiscal policies may be effectuated and thereby one of the basic causes for high prices may be removed.

Under the Anti-Inflation Act of 1947 (Public Law 395, 80th Cong.) the President was given specific powers to control our exports. Not an ounce of goods could be exported without a license granted by the Department of Commerce under this authority. At the time this authority was given to the President, this committee in its report (H. Rept. No. 1160, 80th Cong.), stated as follows:

"The committee believes there are two basic reasons for domestic high prices. First: Prevailing money and credit policies, and second the unusually large foreign demand for American goods in short supply. Consistent with this view, the committee provides in the joint resolution for the continuation of export controls. It is their belief that these controls should be exercised by the President in such a manner as to adjust exports to domestic stability."

This committee now is of the opinion that if export controls had been used in such a manner as to minimize the impact of excessively large demands by foreign countries for American goods in short supply prices of consumer goods would be much lower than they are today. In summary, the committee states that since the causes of high prices are recognized the cures can be found. First, the shortage of goods against high purchasing power can be corrected by encouraging maximum production; second, the excessively large costs of Government which might result in further deficit financing must be lowered in every way possible.

The easy-money policies of the administration must come to an end. All segments of our economy must be informed that it henceforth will be the policy of Government to restrict nonproductive credit to the fullest extent practicable. Coordination of effort to this end must be established between the responsible departments of Government and the Federal Reserve System. No legislation in addition to that provided in this bill is needed in the foreseeable future to enable the administration to stabilize our money and our economy but at the next session of Congress a full review of laws now on the statute books having to do with credit and money should be made with a view to encouraging a coordinated program and to further effectuate the purposes of this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this phony bill which does not make any single effective approach to controlling inflation is here in good faith or in expectation that it will pass. It is a political effort, in my opinion, to force the Democrats to vote against the bill so that they may say the Democratic minority failed to give the President authority to control inflation.

This bill does not do anything effective in controlling inflation.

On this bill the great Republican mountain has "labored" for 2 weeks and has brought forth two little tiny mice.

One is to provide for installment credit controls only until March 1949. This would barely give time to print the forms and put the regulations into effect, so it cannot possibly have, standing alone, any effect in bringing down the already skyrocketing cost of living.

The only other affirmative thing that this resolution attempts to do is to increase reserves of members of the Federal Reserve banks by 3 percent on demand deposits and 1 percent on time deposits.

The President asked for 10 percent reserve and they are giving him a third of a loaf. So I say this resolution could not possibly have any real effect whatsoever in stemming or even slowing down the disastrous spiral of inflation that is going on.

You are merely giving the giant of inflation a tiny tap on the wrist to stop this run-away cost of living.

But, this resolution does contain the most dangerous provision that I have ever seen brought in. No single witness testified or advocated it. Yet we find it in the resolution. It is a move, cleverly concealed and camouflaged, to destroy the open-market operations of a Federal Reserve bank in the handling of our $250,000,000,000 debt.

That is the greatest debt that any government in the world's history has ever had to carry. The safe management of it is the cornerstone of our capitalistic system, and yet by this cleverly concealed dagger you destroy the successful open-market operation and the debt management policy of this country at a time when we have this staggering public debt.

The purpose of this, gentlemen, is to force up the interest rate on Government bonds. Already through this country there is a cadre of wealthy men that are demanding more and more return from Government bonds, and it is those that are trying to force the Government to raise its present long-term interest rate from 2½ to perhaps 3½, and probably by the time when the cycle is over to even 6 percent.

By reducing the funds of the Federal Reserve banks to support Government bonds at par, and to maintain the 2½ percent interest rate, this bill will shift from the Government the right to fix the interest rate on its bonds that it will pay—and will put the Government at the mercy of the big investors to demand what interest they wish to receive.

This could be done, as this bill provides, by reducing the funds of the Federal Reserve market operations by over 450 percent in this resolution. You thus cut the supporting Federal Reserve funds for supporting Government bonds from $40,500,000,000 down to $10,000,000,000 or $12,000,000,000.

If you do not think that this 450 percent fund reduction could precipitate a raid on the Federal Reserve by the big holders of Government bonds, cashing their 2½ percent and waiting for the 3½ percent, then you will miss your guess.

You remember the depression of 1893 when the failure of the Jay Gould corporation caused a panic. You remember the stock market crash in the fall of 1929. Gentlemen, you are playing with matches in a powder factory by this action of the Congress which might precipitate the great panic of 1948 or 1949.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being given this opportunity to say a word on this measure before us when the time for debate on the floor is so limited. Yesterday I voted against the provision for suspension of rules during the closing hours of this special session. In fact, I voted about the 17th of June against a similar resolution and for the same reason. I know it is customary to use that procedure toward the end of a session, but there seems to be—from the wording of the resolution yesterday—an unusual reason for that course at this time. The procedure can be used for more than one purpose.

But my objection that day last June and yesterday is this: That in both cases it made it possible for the majority to bring before this House the most tremendously significant bills, giving only a few minutes of debate on measures that require much more consideration, and not permitting the minority to offer any amendments whatsoever. That very thing happened last June, and it is happening today exactly as I feared it would. Now, what do we find before us today. We have before us Senate Joint Resolution 157, and not a single opportunity for any Democrat to offer an amendment, and only 20 minutes of the 40 minutes given to the minority party to debate the bill on the floor of the House. Mr. Speaker, some bills are more significant than others. This is one of the most significant measures affecting our domestic economy for good or bad that I have seen in my 12 years here. It is fraught with greatest power, for benefit or harm, and yet we in the minority are forced to take it or leave it.

And yet it is not a simple question of take it or leave it, for this bill is said to be in answer to the President's request. It is called an anti-inflation bill. It is a composite measure. It contains some things that I would like to vote for. It does make a sort of answer to the President's plea. It does limit consumer credit and bar installment buying, but it counteracts those two Presidential requests by its main features. As a Democrat, opposed to this bill in general, not only because of the limited debate on it but because of its dangerous possibilities, I am forced to vote against it, in spite of the fact that it contains a small portion of what the President asked of this Congress. As the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman SPENCE, implied, "The President asked for bread and Congress has given him a stone."

Some years ago I was very reluctant to see the gold reserves dropped from 40 percent to 25 percent, during the war. I am a believer in sound money, but that does not mean that I think we ought to up the gold reserves as this bill does, at this time and all at once from 25 percent to the original 40 percent. I know we ought to move in the direction of a stable and sound currency, but we ought to move cautiously, with the welfare of the masses of people at heart. This bill, when enacted into law, will undoubtedly help the rich and increase the interest rate generally, including the money that Uncle Sam borrows.

One of the preceding speakers, although he had too little time to develop it, correctly implied that this legislation requires much careful study by the best minds that can give it the whole-hearted and disinterested study which it merits. Are we not rather casually, if not carelessly, tinkering and tampering with that which is at the very basis of our economic structure? I would want a very skillful surgeon to perform an operation on my heart or any other vital part of me if absolutely necessary, and I would want him to know his business. I am told that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board are opposed to the chief provisions of this bill. Are these informed officials wholly wrong?

If my colleagues are correct in the fear expressed, that this measure will shake the United States bond market and prevent the United States Government from maintaining its bonds at par, then we are indeed doing a cruel and very unworthy thing to say in effect to the millions of American citizens owning bonds: "Your Government will be unable to keep your bonds at par, and it is cruel but best policy all around to let things take their course as we follow another policy." I am not enough of an authority on financial matters to know whether it is inevitable and absolutely necessary for America to have to pass through the economic wringer after every great war, as happened after the First World War. I had hoped there might be another way, by which it could be avoided, but I believe that this legislation will make the old way inevitable. Of course, "all that goes up must come down," but there is a lot of difference between plunging down to crash or coming down by parachute.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has now under consideration the legislation to curb inflation and start the high cost of living downward.

Senate Joint Resolution 157 is the answer of the Republican leadership to the demand of millions of Americans that something be done to curb inflation. Senate Joint Resolution 157 was substituted by the Banking and Currency Committee for H. R. 7062, introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman SPENCE, the ranking minority member of that committee. H. R. 7062 contains 40 typewritten pages setting out the primary recommendations of President Truman and his advisers, a practical plan to curb inflation.

The Republican majority of the Banking and Currency Committee have for all practical purposes tossed the President's recommendations in the wastebasket and have submitted the resolution now under consideration which is nothing more than a feeble and ridiculous effort to mislead the American people to the thought that the leadership of this special session is making an effort to reduce the cost of living.

This resolution comes to the floor of the House under a gag rule which limits debate to 40 minutes—20 minutes on each side—and furthermore prohibits any amendments to be offered from the floor of the House which amendments would improve or make this so-called anti-inflation legislation effective.

One hundred and forty million Americans are crying for relief from high prices and today we witnessed the spectacle of the congressional leadership restricting debate on this No. 1 problem of our country to a brief 40 minutes. This special session of Congress should remain in session and thoroughly debate the inflation problem in an effort to produce a practical bill that will adjust our economy and start the cost of living downward. This problem cannot be solved in 40 minutes' debate and possibly not in 4 days' debate, but the time of the Members of this Congress is of minor importance compared to the misery and grief high prices are causing the American people today.

This feeble effort of Senate Joint Resolution 157 compares favorably with the skim-milk misleading housing legislation which was passed at 3 o'clock Sunday morning, June 20, 4 hours before adjournment of the regular session of Congress. It was my hope that when the President called this special session that the majority Members of this Congress would have talked to the people back home and returned to Washington with the intention of doing something about the high cost of living and inadequate housing. Judging from the bill now under consideration, our special session will adjourn with these two urgent problems still calling for solution.

The lack of legislation dealing with these two issues may mean depression and disaster for millions within the next few years. Inadequate anti-inflation legislation may directly affect the people of the world and our national security. Congress must cease drifting on these issues.

Today we do not have price control by Government, but we have price control by big business. The cost of living rises steadily, but corporate profits are rising even more rapidly. Corporate profits in 1947 rose 42 percent above what they were in 1946 when they had reached an all-time high. The income, after taxes, of the 100 largest manufacturing corporations in 1947 was 91 percent greater than in 1946, and during the first 6 months of 1948, the all-time record of 1947 was being broken by new profit highs. It is apparent that the leadership of the Eightieth Congress fears to do anything that will disturb these corporate giants in their march for profits. The propaganda being circulated is to make labor the whipping boy for these unheard-of profits.

One of the first acts of this Congress was to pass the Taft-Hartley Act which provided a cooling-off period for labor. Why does this Congress hesitate in providing a cooling-off period for giant corporations which produce the bulk of our basic commodities from increasing prices?

I wish now to quote from a distinguished Republican United States Senator who has taken issue with his own party on their lack of action to legislate against inflation. Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, has made the following statement:

> There are 140,000,000 people who are dying for one thing and they are tired of waiting for it. I am speaking now of the people who are feeling the tragic burden of high prices and lack of adequate housing. They are wondering whether the Congress of the United States cares about them except to get their votes at election time. This is the cry of a human heart, and we had better accept our obligation. The party which matches up to its trust and its obligation will be the party which God will favor. A word to the wise should be sufficient.

Senate Joint Resolution 157, which this House is now offering to solve inflation, will be a monumental disappointment to the 140,000,000 people whom Senator TOBEY referred to in his above statement.

I shall cast my vote against this resolution because it does not even make a start toward legislation that might reduce the cost of living and save our economy.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not even scratch the surface of the imminent and perilous problems of inflation. It would be impossible to deal with these grave and complex questions in such perfunctory and cursory fashion.

High prices are unconscionably burdening the rank and file of the American people, but I could not possibly fully analyze this measure at this time because its provisions and implications widely affect every segment of the economy.

I have intensively studied money and banking questions with special relation to their impact upon our free-enterprise system for management, labor, and agriculture for many years. There are no questions in the field of economics so complex, so difficult, so intricate, so challenging to correct accurate analysis as monetary questions. Yet this bill seeks in a few paragraphs to tamper and meddle with the delicate mechanism which governs and controls money, credit, commercial paper in its relation to the Federal Reserve System, reserves for gold certificates and outstanding notes and other matters which lie at the heart of our monetary and banking operations and practices.

I believe such action is most unwise and perilous at this or any other time without the most careful and exhaustive study and surely no one will contend that the House has given mature consideration or adequate study and reflection to these vital and difficult questions.

The results can and well may be disastrous—lack of adequate credit, dislocation of the Government bond market, hasty deflation, industrial stagnation, and unemployment. I regard these provisions to be fraught with the possibility of gravest danger to the economy.

The restriction of installment buying at this time cannot be justified economically or morally or socially or in any other way. It will merely impose new and unnecessary checks and perhaps hardship upon our consumers, small-business men, and industry. It will react against our veterans who are seeking installment purchases to furnish their homes and procure essential household appliances and equipment. It will unreasonably and unnecessarily curb and obstruct purchase of essential commodities by every single class of the American people save those who are in a position to pay cash on the line for what they buy, or who can put up in cash a very substantial portion of the purchase price.

Since I do not believe that this bill is a solution, in any respect, for current inflationary conditions, because I believe it is unfair and inequitable to American consumers and purchasers, because I believe it dangerously meddles with extremely delicate monetary and banking mechanisms, afflicts small business and industry with unnecessary and unwarranted restraints, I am constrained to vote against the pending measure.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely unfortunate that the membership of this House has given itself only 40 minutes to debate the tremendously important legislation which is now before this body.

I desire to enter my vigorous protest against not only the time allotted for debate, but against the parliamentary tactics used by the majority leaders who have brought up this important measure under a so-called suspension of the rules. Such parliamentary procedure denies to the minority membership of this great body their right to either amend or to cast their vote for the RECORD upon a motion to recommit. In such perilous times as these, we should put aside partisan politics in an endeavor to legislate proper anti-inflation controls in the national interest.

In the resolution now before us, I should be more than willing to support the measures embodied in sections 1 and 3 without reservation. I should like to point out, however, that sections 1 and 3 of the pending resolution of and by themselves are relatively unimportant devices to curb the present inflationary pressures which are bearing down upon us. However, I cannot and will not vote for this measure in view of the dangerous provisions contained in section 2 of this resolution. This section is clearly designed to deprive and to deny the Government the right to support Government bonds in the open market. The real dangers of section 2 of this resolution cannot be too strongly emphasized. Realistically, psychologically, and actually, the enactment of this type of legislation at this time may send our already tottering economy plunging into the abyss of depression and despair. Many of us remember what happened to the Liberty bonds after World War I. If the procedure is followed as indicated by section 2 of this resolution, there is a strong probability that present Government bonds will soon drop below par and that eventually interest rates on Government bonds will increase materially.

It is well known that the cost of the service of our present public debt at present interest rates exceeds $5,000,000,000 annually. It takes only simple arithmetic to prove that an increase in the interest rate of 1 or 2 percent on outstanding Government bonds will increase this service charge from 50 to 100 percent, or to put it another way, instead of $5,000,000,000, we shall be forced to pay seven and one-half to ten billions of dollars as a service charge for the payment of interest to meet outstanding governmental bond obligations. These are only a few of the factors and of the dangers attendant upon the passage of section 2 of this resolution. Time does not permit further elaboration. It is sufficient to say, however, that this is a most dangerous practice and is not supported by any responsible authority either in the Department of the Treasury or in the Federal Reserve Board.

In addition to the reasons above outlined, there is another reason why I cannot support this resolution. Actually, it does nothing to curb the upward inflationary spiral. In my opinion, it is a makeshift, hurry-up, do-nothing program designed for political purposes to lull the people into a false sense of security. There has been no real effort on the part of the Republican leadership to meet, even to a reasonable degree, the program submitted by the President of the United States to curb inflation. To say the least, the President's program is extremely moderate, and in my opinion represents the very minimum that ought to be done in this fight against inflation.

No, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership will not fool the people of America by the passage of this makeshift legislation. In the months to come they will know that it will not and cannot give them the relief which they need so desperately.

THE MAKESHIFT REPUBLICAN CREDIT CONTROL BILL IS DANGEROUS AND WILL NOT STOP INFLATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday when I opposed the outrageous gag rule I surmised that, under this rule, you would bring in and force through this makeshift bill which is before us today. This, under the pretense that it will arrest the spiral of inflation and might reduce the intolerable increase in the cost of living.

I was not mistaken in your determination to fool the American people. The bill before us was reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee by 16 Members without any hearing and, under the rule, 419 Members are deprived of any opportunity to amend the provisions in any way. You have even refused to extend the debate by 10 minutes. What a high-handed procedure this is.

Personally, I would like to vote for section 1, which tends to temporarily restrict installment buying until March 15, 1949. However, it will take at least several months to put this plan into effect and in this short time I feel it will be ineffective and will not accomplish the recommendations of the President.

At the time you repealed the restriction on so-called installment buying, I warned you that it would have an inflationary effect and would be unjustified from any point of view. I questioned you then that, if people could not buy for cash when they were employed, how would it be possible for them to make payments if conditions and their earnings were not as favorable as they are at the present time?

Other provisions in the bill relative to the restriction of an additional gold reserve are bound to bring about dangerous conditions because it will preclude the Government from protecting the Government securities and bonds. It may create fear and result in dumping of these bonds by the public and especially the bankers. Without the support of the Government, the manipulators would hammer down the prices of these bonds the same as they succeeded in doing after the First World War. This notwithstanding that we have assured the public they would be protected in their investment of Government bonds.

That this legislation will be instrumental in bringing about a reduction in the high cost of living you cannot maintain, because it will not. You have given industry the power to fix prices, which you call stabilizing the prices. However, industry has miserably failed to carry out its pledges and promises. Instead of stabilizing or reducing prices,

they have continuously—even to this day—increased to the point where they are now the highest in the history of our Nation.

You say that high prices are due to the cheap money. No, the high prices are due to the fact that you have authorized all the industries to increase their prices notwithstanding that in 1947 they salted away $17,000,000,000 in profits after all taxation. And for the first 6 months of this year their profits were still soaring and have increased by an additional 18 percent as reported in today's papers. So it is not because of cheap money, but because of avarice on the part of the profiteers whom you protect and to whom you gave the privilege of charging the consuming public not only what it will stand but even what it cannot stand.

I fear that this bill, as explained by the Democratic members of the committee, is a dangerous one and will not stop inflation nor the high cost of living, but may affect the values, as I have stated, of Government bonds that are held by 60,000,000 American people. This bill might increase the interest rate on the future needs of the Government as well as private industry because of the restrictions on the reserve provisions embodied in this bill.

I recollect when President Wilson in 1919 and 1920 urged the Federal Reserve and bankers of our country to restrict the credits to manipulators, hoarders, and gamblers who were outrageously and shamefully boosting the prices of sugar up to 28 cents a pound because they were in control of it and many other commodities. Instead of restricting the loans to these speculators and hoarders, banks started to curtail the credit of legitimate business, but the speculators and hoarders could obtain their loans for months thereafter. Not, however, on the first floor of the bank, but on the second floor where they would be charged a 4- to 6-percent commission, which these speculators could and did pay because of the tremendous profits they were making on their hoarded commodities.

The restriction in your bill will not accomplish the purpose of the President to arrest the inflationary spiral nor the increased cost of living. For this reason, I am constrained to oppose and vote against this bill. If you Republicans would take an interest in the welfare of our country and heed the appeals of the general public you would not bring in this makeshift bill, but would take a few weeks to prepare a bill that would actually relieve conditions, stop the high cost of living, and bring the needed relief to the consuming public so that the women would not feel obliged to organize in every section of our land to stop buying meat and meat products in the hopes of forcing down the prices of meats, butter, milk, and other foodstuffs in order that the American people might obtain enough food to exist at prices their pocketbooks can stand.

We passed a bill to eliminate the unfair tax on oleomargarine which the poorer people are obliged to buy because they cannot afford to pay 90 cents a pound for butter. However, its consideration is being held up in the other body by the dairy trust.

You could easily devote 10 days or 2 weeks to bring in a decent housing bill, but I understand that you are going to bring in another housing bill that again will not aid in the construction of low-priced homes or bring about lower rentals.

You have time enough to pass the bill to increase the minimum wage from 40 to 75 cents an hour which, due to the high cost of living, is necessary in order that the American people of low income may live and exist.

You have time enough to bring in a decent social-security bill which the President has recommended and urged.

You have time to pass a fair-employment-practices bill and a bill to increase old-age pensions.

No, you are deaf to the appeals and needs of the public and are going to adjourn without adopting any of this legislation, because the vested interests that you serve have no regard for the rights and needs of the American people.

We still have 3 months before the election and I am sure that if you would remain here 10 days or 2 weeks longer we could easily pass these relief measures and you would not need as much time at home to campaign. In fact, staying and voting for these bills would do you more good than your 3 months of campaigning, trying to explain to the people—which you cannot—your failure to act and how you are subservient to the vested interests instead of to your constituents.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I believe we who are Members on the minority side in this fight should be permitted to say without question that we are proud of our membership on the Committee on Banking and Currency. I regret the action of the leadership in this instance in forcing us to pass upon a resolution of this importance, touching a problem of this magnitude, in a 40-minute debate. I believe those on the majority side who are not members of this committee and have not been permitted to hear the testimony on such a technical question ought to join us in that regard. When you are asked about it at home you are going to be unprepared as a result of this limitation of debate to answer some of the questions that are raised about this legislation. I regret very much that I cannot go with the majority in this instance, because I would like to cooperate in bringing out an effective piece of legislation, but because I am opposed to this procedure and because I am fearful of the possible results mentioned by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] I shall vote against this resolution.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join my colleagues on the minority side on the House Committee on Banking and Currency. This measure contains 3 sections. Section 1, relating to consumer installment credit, is not the same as the return to regulation W in all of its previous forms. It is rather a watered-down or diluted version of the former regulation W. This section covers consumer installment credit for a 7-month period.

Section 3, as far as the recommendations of the President that the Federal Reserve Board be given greater authority to regulate inflationary bank credit especially pertaining to bank reserves. The proposed amendment increases by three points the requirements as to bank reserves of all member banks but makes no application to any increase in nonmember bank requirements. These apply to demand deposits and merely one point on time deposits. Whether this amount is adequate or not is problematical.

The really controversial section is section 2, the gold-reserve section. In making any change in the present gold reserves base we could be playing with a powder keg. Yesterday afternoon, before the House Banking Committee, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, opposed this section of the measure. He asked for the opportunity for further study of this provision. It was not before us when Mr. McCabe, Mr. Evans, or Mr. Eccles appeared before our committee. It was not in the recommendations by the President before the committee. We on the minority side are asking that, since under the rules debate is rather limited and an insufficient time is provided for a full and adequate discussion of this problem, we vote it down and bring this bill in under a rule and give sufficient time for full and complete analysis of its effects. I think we will live to regret any action we take today that may cause a break in the Government bond market in the months ahead. The squeeze play could be put on, and it can be put on still further. Psychologically all the factors are there. This is a dangerous device. It was not recommended, and there has not been time to have thorough analysis by competent economic analysts. Certainly we reduced the reserves from 40 and 35 to 25 percent in 1945, but to increase the gold reserves at this time is highly questionable and explosive.

I am of the opinion that the members on the minority side of the Banking Committee are following good logic in asking that the Members of the House be given the opportunity to consider a better analysis of the consequences of this section. There is no way under the procedure we are following at this time whereby we can vote for any part of this resolution that we favor. We must either vote for it entirely or against it.

The increase in the gold reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks as now proposed by the House Banking and Currency Committee would make no contribution whatsoever to the fight against inflation, but if adopted, might be of disastrous consequences to the economy as a whole.

Although at the present time all Federal Reserve banks combined are holding gold certificate reserves in excess of the proposed new requirements, these reserves are unevenly distributed among

the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and the reserve of several banks would be insufficient to cover the new requirements.

Furthermore, the new requirements might jeopardize the ability of some Reserve banks to supply credit to their member banks and compel the Federal Reserve System to abandon support of the Government bond market.

The proposal, while completely ineffective in the fight against inflation, might precipitate a run on the currency and the collapse of the bond market.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since I have no opportunity to speak on this measure, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that "the mountain has labored and brought forth a mouse."

Instead of reporting a measure to stabilize the currency and thereby prevent a spiral of runaway inflation, and at the same time protect the American people from the disasters of a precipitate deflation, this measure is brought forth, which I fear may result in plunging this Nation into such a depression as we experienced in 1921, during the Harding administration, or in 1929, during the Hoover regime.

The Committee on Banking and Currency could have easily written provisions into the bill putting a ceiling on the amount of currency, including Federal Reserve notes, and thereby protecting this Nation against runaway inflation; and at the same time it could have put a floor under the volume of the currency by establishing a minimum below which it could not be reduced by providing that if the Federal Reserve banks withdrew a sufficient amount of their notes from circulation to reduce the volume below that point, the Government should issue a sufficient amount of United States notes, with a gold reserve behind them, to hold the currency at the minimum prescribed by the law.

As I have pointed out before, prices in a free economy are governed by the volume of the Nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation. When that volume gets as high as it is today, with the present velocity of circulation, we witness a spiral of inflation. When that volume is reduced below the danger point, even with a medium velocity of circulation, we crash into a depression as we experienced in 1921 and 1929.

Since this bill is being rammed through under the suspension of the rules, we have no opportunity to amend it to protect the American people against the dangers of a disastrous deflation—and I feel very doubtful if it is going to protect them against a further spiral of inflation.

If this motion is voted down, then I hope the bill will be brought in under a rule that will permit amendments, in order that we may adopt such changes as will stabilize the currency within a given range, and protect this country against either a runaway inflation or a disastrous deflation.

The American people are entitled to this protection at the hands of the Congress, in which the Constitution vests the power to "coin money and regulate the value thereof."

Besides there is a grave question whether or not the provisions of this law will not result in unjust discriminations that will be detrimental to our dual banking system, especially in Mississippi and other agricultural States—if not the entire Nation.

I have just received the following telegram from Mr. Frank E. Allen, president of the Mississippi Bankers Association:

JACKSON, MISS., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. JOHN RANKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Mississippi Bankers Association greatly concerned over possibility of requiring increased reserves of banks requirement to include nonmember banks as well as member banks of the Federal Reserve System.

Members of our association are unalterably opposed to any increase in reserve requirements and more particularly to the extension of the authority of Federal Reserve in this regard to nonmember banks.

Such a step would be entering wedge in destruction of dual banking system.

Mississippi bankers have been diligent in control of bank credit to avoid contributing to inflationary trend.

Taking everything into consideration, I think the best thing the House can do is to vote this motion down, and let this bill come before the House under an open rule that will give us ample opportunity for debate and amendments.

The interest of the entire Nation is at stake in this legislation; and I for one cannot vote to ram it through under suspension of the rules in its present form.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority in control of affairs in Congress today arbitrarily and in entire disregard of the people's interest and welfare brings forth a bill to accelerate and inflame the inflationary pressures which already ravage the Nation.

This they do in the face of the President's recommendations personally delivered to the special joint session of Congress, and in defiance of economic law. It is a booby trap, explosive and dangerous, which, if passed on to the President, I hope he will not touch or have anything to do with it. Suspicions are rife that the bill is purposely so worded and planned as to cause the Democrats, under suspension of the rules, to vote against the measure, so that the Republicans can charge the Democrats with killing a bill which, supposedly, the President wanted. The fact of the matter is that this bill does not reflect the President's ideas except in minor detail. Senate Joint Resolution 157 and the report by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] are misnomers. Instead of aiding in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures, there is grave danger of fanning to destructive ferocity the flaming spiral of higher prices, already unbearable to all except the wealthy who can pay the tariff.

The restriction placed upon the Federal Reserve Board by reducing the support authority from $45,000,000,000 to about $10,000,000,000 means but one thing—higher interest rates upon refinanced Government bonds, $50,000,000,000 worth of which will be maturing shortly. This interest burden will be passed on to the average taxpayer. The bond clipper will increase his holdings of the higher-rate certificates with his high-price profits reinforced with the recent income-tax reduction bonus. The average taxpayer will enjoy only the privilege of paying by way of taxation the increased cost of Government financing. Portfolios of big corporations swollen with undistributed excess profits will be disgorged for the purpose of buying up bonds now held by the average citizen at 2½ percent. These and other corporations—banking, insurance, and investment—will follow the lead in absorbing the new issues bearing interest at 2 percent or perhaps 3½ percent.

The gold clause of the bill has aroused the opposition of committee members, because they fear the ultimate effect upon our economy, especially upon those least able to withstand the shock.

It is no concern of mine nor of the Democrats if the so-called sound-money party, the Republicans, want to commit hara-kiri. What I am worried about is that they will drag the entire country down to destruction with themselves.

I must act on the side of safety; therefore I shall have to vote in opposition to this bill.

LET US BE A DELIBERATIVE BODY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we were called back to this special session for the purpose of dealing primarily with two important problems. One of those is to stop the inflationary spiral. We have heard a great deal about who is to blame for it and who is not to blame for it, and what is to blame for it. The people of this country are not interested in talk. The people of this country want us, this Congress, to do something—something positive—something immediate. You cannot do it in 40 minutes of debate. Actually, you will be wasting 40 minutes of time, so far as controlling inflation is concerned, when you devote the time to discussing a bill that obviously makes no attempt to touch upon the real problem that confronts us.

The House Banking and Currency Committee on July 29 opened public hearings with an announcement by the chairman that the hearings were called for the purpose of considering inflation controls.

We heard in our committee three sets of witnesses, Mr. Porter representing the President, the representatives of the Federal Reserve Board, and the Secretary of the Treasury.

Other members of the President's Cabinet asked leave to come before the committee and tell us their views about this

problem and how it should be solved. They were given no opportunity to be heard. Labor organizations asked but could not get permission to come before our committee.

I received a telegram from the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, reading as follows:

I have been directed by A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to appear before your committee in support of real anti-inflation legislation. Have requested many times orally and in writing opportunity to appear for maximum of 10 minutes. Have been denied. Am therefore appealing to each committee member to reconsider and make it possible for labor and other organizations of American citizens to be heard on this vital subject of Nation-wide urgency.

It is hard to believe that on a problem of such great importance any committee of this House would refuse as little as 10 minutes to the representatives of great labor organizations for a presentation of their views.

I understand that this is the only piece of legislation that this House is going to be permitted to vote upon in connection with this all important problem. The President in his message submitted an eight-point program, and on July 29, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] introduced a bill encompassing that program. The bill now before us covers but two of those eight points. The committee has given it no consideration. If you vote for this motion, this House will lose the opportunity to consider it.

There has been a decided effort on the part of some Members of this House to create the impression that restricting bank credit and consumer credit will solve the entire problem. The record is clear, however, that no one can honestly pretend that any such result can come from enactment of this legislation of so limited a scope.

In the last minutes of the public hearings before our committee we were presented with the bill now before this House. It does permit the restoration of consumer credit controls. It also permits the Federal Reserve banks to increase member bank reserves, but not to the extent that the Federal Reserve Board has recommended.

The unfortunate part of it however, is a provision that had not theretofore been considered in any respect by the committee. This new provision requires the Federal Reserve banks to increase gold reserves from 25 to 35 percent for gold certificates and from 25 to 40 percent for Federal Reserve notes. The Treasury Department is opposed to such a provision and the Federal Reserve Board is opposed to such a provision.

The only persons who can favor such a provision are those who desire to compel the Federal Reserve Board to withdraw from the Government bond market its support. In other words, those who support this change in gold reserve requirements, while talking glibly about stabilization are actually by this measure attempting to force the prices of Government negotiable bonds down under par, demoralizing the market and creating lack of confidence on the part of the public in the financial stability of our Government.

The inflationary effects of the measure will be terrific. What is worse, however, is that it will force up the interest rate on future Government securities which must be issued to redeem maturing bonds.

The committee itself had no proper opportunity to consider the consequences that might flow from the enactment of this legislation. No opportunity was afforded to call witnesses who could shed light upon the subject.

Nevertheless, the committee hearings were ended late on the afternoon of August 4, and the committee immediately convened in executive session and this bill sent to the floor by a strictly party vote. It is most regrettable that a problem of such vital importance, to the solution of which both parties are pledged by their platforms, should be made a political football.

Now this House is asked to suspend the rules and pass this bill with only 20 minutes allowed to those opposed to it. Their request for an extension of an additional 10 minutes has been refused on the ground that haste is necessary.

The problems of this country are far too important to be dealt with in any such manner. If the proponents of this bill are sincere, let them give us a bill providing for the consumer credit and the bank credit restrictions. I predict the bill will pass with a minimum of debate and with little opposition.

Let them give us a separate bill covering the gold reserve requirements sought to be imposed by this bill, and give us time to fairly debate it and vote upon it as a separate measure.

The proponents of this bill no doubt are fearful that under such procedure they could never prevail upon this Congress to pass a bill imposing the proposed gold reserve requirements.

If we vote down this motion the proponents of this bill will be compelled to present it under an open rule at which time not only this but all of the other recommendations of the President for control of inflation can be debated, and proper amendments offered, so that this Congress can enact into law measures that may at least stop the inflationary spiral and halt any further rise in the cost of living.

Let us be a deliberative body as intended by our Constitution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to myself.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are all agreed that there are two basic reasons why prices are high. One is a policy of cheap money and credit which has predominated since 1935 anyway, for very laudable purposes, up to perhaps 1945, VE-day. All of our activities from 1935 to VE-day in the field of finance and credit were first to lick a depression and second to win the war.

We were more successful in our attempts to depreciate the value of the dollar and in our attempts to increase the national income, with the attendant high prices caused by such an increase in the national income, than we thought we might be.

These measures which the President and the Government recommended and which the Congress passed during that 10-year period did increase the national income, increase purchasing power and savings. They did increase all of the pressures which we find today contributing to inflation and high prices. The mistake which was made by the Government is that in 1945 following VE-day, it did not hold our economy at that level and announce that from then on the Government would adopt a reversal of policy which would tend not only to stabilize our economy and our prices at the level enjoyed in 1945, because even then it appeared necessary to tighten credit and restrict the volume and velocity of credit and money to a point where we would deflate sufficiently to bring about economic stability. Instead of that, in 1945, some economists in Government guessed that we were going to have a postwar depression. In consequence, a message was sent to Congress asking for a reduction in the gold reserves of the banks.

From 1913, when the Federal Reserve Act was originally passed, until June 1945, Federal Reserve banks were compelled to keep a 40 percent gold reserve behind the issuance of Federal Reserve notes, and a 35 percent gold reserve behind their deposit liability. To broaden the base, in order that the gold base could be expanded, both in the field of money and credit, the Congress at that time reduced those gold reserves from 40 and 35, respectively, to 25 percent. That had a tendency, psychological and otherwise, it had an influence, to continue the inflationary spiral which had started previous to that because of the pent-up savings and high incomes which we were enjoying. When the effects of that were known, we should have restored these gold reserves to 40 and 35 percent, respectively from the statutory 25 percent. That at least would have been an indication that it was the policy of Government to tighten up on credit, stabilize prices, stabilize our economy, strengthen America in her position of world leadership.

We gave study to this question last December, and in a bill which we reported out, which did not pass the House because we could not get the required two-thirds majority, this same provision was included.

I would not discuss this at length were it not for the statements made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN], which might indicate that the action taken by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House and the action which we hope will be taken by the House today, will have a disastrous effect upon Government bonds.

We have said in our report that this economy of ours is being balanced on very sensitive scales. I do not think we want the word to go out to the public, and to those whose obligation it is to manage our debt, that the statements made by the gentlemen I have mentioned reflect the policy of this Congress, and are necessarily reflective of a decline in the Government bond market.

As of this hour, in consequence of what the Committee on Banking and Currency did yesterday in this respect, and in respect to the other limited authority to increase reserve requirements, short-term Government issues today remained steady in price. There was no change in short-term issues; but the long-term bond market reacted to the action taken by the Committee on Banking and Currency, as it should have reacted, and the bond market as of this hour today has gone up from one-eighth to one-quarter of a point. I think that is a complete answer to the statements made by these gentlemen that this is going to be disastrous to the Government bond market. The immediate reaction was to cause the bond market to go up.

Have in mind also that there is now in the aggregate against Federal Reserve deposit liability and Federal Reserve notes not 40 percent but actually a gold reserve of 51 percent. So this disastrous consequence which we hear of today cannot possibly be activated until pressure on gold reserves would bring the actual reserves down to the 40- and 35-percent limitations to which we restored them. We think the net result of the action which we hope to take today will be the psychological effect which it will have upon the stabilization of our money, of our currency, of the dollar, and prices, and that it reflects a reversal of policy. Instead of utilizing the powers which the Government now has to further extend credit, further extend the volume of our currency, and further increase prices, from now on it is going to be the policy of the Government to stabilize our economy, stabilize the value of the American dollar, and stabilize prices. That is the purpose of this bill.

We have authorized the increase of bank reserves by 3 percent against demand deposits. The President's representatives, and the bill which would carry out the President's objectives, would have increased the reserve requirements 10 percent. It was quite generally agreed that if the Federal Reserve were to raise the reserve requirements of the banks by 10 percent it would result in such a sale of Government bonds by the banks, it would result in such a large volume of outstanding loans being called by the banks, that there would be danger that this country would be plunged into the depths of a depression. When we asked the representatives of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury what uses they would put these powers to—would they raise the reserve requirements one-half of 1 percent, 1 percent, 8 percent, or 10 percent—Mr. McCabe, Mr. Evans, Mr. Eccles, Mr. Snyder could give our committee no information whatsoever on the kind of increase that was expected in the foreseeable future.

The highest increase at any one time in Reserve requirements during the past 12 years was when they raised them by 3¼ percentage points.

Have in mind also that the bank reserve authority has been exhausted since 1941 except in the central Reserve city banks, namely, New York and Chicago and these reserves can still be increased by 2 percent to 26 percent. Since 1941 this Congress has never been asked to increase the authority, to increase primary reserve requirements, until the President's message came down to us on the 27th of last month. In the President's message is found the first formal request to the Congress to authorize the Federal Reserve to increase primary reserve requirements. In consequence of the fact that the maximum increase in Reserve requirements at any one time during the past 12 years has been a little over 3 percent, the fact that this program has been static since 1941; the fact that we could not obtain any information as to the amount that the reserve requirements would be raised, we have given them in the bill we hope will pass today what we think is a reasonable and valuable contribution toward making financial stability and the lowering of prices. I am assured that if these powers and the powers which they have are used judiciously we can stabilize our economy and bring prices down.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, due to the short time allowed for debate and my inability to get time in order to debate this measure, I am constrained nevertheless to express my views at this time on this major problem of inflation as it is not by any means gotten on to a solution by this bill. I am in favor of a much broader anti-inflation program of which this bill is only a small part. This bill proposes to enact two of the items of the President's anti-inflation program, those relating to consumer credit and bank credit.

I have shown my own views with respect to the control of the runaway cost of living by introducing a meat rationing bill with Senator FLANDERS as far back as last January, and introducing it again during this special session—H. R. 7070—with added powers to the President for rationing not only at the retail level but also at the wholesaler and producer level.

In addition to controls over key items in the cost of living, such as meat, and other key items of raw or unfabricated materials like steel which affect the cost of living through the products which go into it, I would also favor much broader powers of allocation at the source over such items. I do not feel that these powers will make a police state as the President once said, nor do I share the fears of some of my colleagues about their causing regimentation. I do believe it best to develop and administer controls which will not result in the flight of goods from the markets as was the case with the artlessly administered meat controls in 1946.

In any anti-inflation program there should be a complete review and overhauling of the law providing support prices for agricultural products. In this Congress there was appropriated for the AAA farm-support program alone $265,500,000, and other large sums are being utilized through the Commodity Credit Corporation to support already very high farm prices.

Management-labor cooperation is also essential in order to maintain the coordination between wages and the purchasing power of the dollar.

Those of us who believe that these are among the basic measures needed to curb inflation must not relent in our fight. The issue is not settled by any means.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, Senate Joint Resolution 157, as amended.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 264, nays 97, answered "present" 1, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—264

Abernethy	Gary	Mitchell
Allen, Calif.	Gathings	Morton
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Muhlenberg
Allen, La.	Gearhart	Mundt
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
	Gillie	Nicholson
Anderson, Calif.	Goff	Nixon
Andresen, August H.	Goodwin	Nodar
	Gossett	Norblad
Angell	Graham	O'Hara
Arends	Grant, Ind.	Pace
Arnold	Griffiths	Passman
Auchincloss	Gwynne, Iowa	Patterson
Bakewell	Hale	Peden
Banta	Hall,	Peterson
Barrett	Edwin Arthur	Phillips, Calif.
Bates, Mass.	Hall,	Pickett
Beall	Leonard W.	Ploeser
Bender	Halleck	Plumley
Bennett, Mich.	Hand	Poage
Bennett, Mo.	Hardy	Potter
Bishop	Harness, Ind.	Potts
Blackney	Harrison	Poulson
Boggs, Del.	Harvey	Preston
Bradley	Hébert	Price, Fla.
Bramblett	Herter	Ramey
Brehm	Heselton	Redden
Brooks	Hill	Reed, Ill.
Brophy	Hinshaw	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ga.	Hoeven	Rees
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Reeves
Bryson	Holmes	Rich
Buck	Hope	Richlman
Bulwinkle	Horan	Rivers
Burke	Hull	Rizley
Burleson	Javits	Robertson
Busbey	Jenison	Rockwell
Butler	Jenkins, Ohio	Rogers, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Rohrbough
Camp	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Carson	Johnson, Ill.	Sadlak
Case, N. J.	Jones, N. C.	Sanborn
Case, S. Dak.	Jones, Wash.	Sarbacher
Chadwick	Jonkman	Sasscer
Chelf	Judd	Schwabe, Mo.
Chenoweth	Kean	Schwabe, Okla.
Chiperfield	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Church	Kearns	Scrivner
Clason	Keating	Seeley-Brown
Clevenger	Keefe	Shafer
Coffin	Kersten, Wis.	Sikes
Cole, Kans.	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Kilday	Simpson, Pa.
Colmer	Knutson	Smith, Kans.
Corbett	Kunkel	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Landis	Smith, Va.
Coudert	Lanham	Smith, Wis.
Cox	Latham	Snyder
Crawford	Lea	Stefan
Crow	LeCompte	Stevenson
Cunningham	LeFevre	Stockman
Curtis	Lemke	Stratton
Dague	Lewis, Ky.	Sundstrom
Davis, Wis.	Lewis, Ohio	Taber
Dawson, Utah	Lichtenwalter	Talle
Devitt	Lodge	Taylor
D'Ewart	Love	Tibbott
Dolliver	McConnell	Tollefson
Domengeaux	McCowen	Towe
Dondero	McCulloch	Twyman
Doughton	McDonough	Van Zandt
Durham	McDowell	Vinson
Eaton	McGarvey	Vorys
Ellis	McGregor	Vursell
Ellsworth	McMahon	Wadsworth
Elsaesser	McMillan, S. C.	Weichel
Elston	McMillen, Ill.	Welch
Engel, Mich.	Mack	Wheeler
Fallon	Macy	Whitten
Fellows	Maloney	Whittington
Fenton	Manasco	Wigglesworth
Fernandez	Mansfield	Williams
Fisher	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Ind.
Fletcher	Mason	Winstead
Folger	Mathews	Wolcott
Foote	Merrow	Wolverton
Fuller	Meyer	Woodruff
Fulton	Michener	Youngblood
Gamble	Miller, Md.	
Garmatz	Miller, Nebr.	

NAYS—97

Albert	Grant, Ala.	Miller, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.	Hagen	Mills
Battle	Harless, Ariz.	Monroney
Beckworth	Harris	Morgan
Bell	Hart	Morris
Blatnik	Havenner	Morrison
Bloom	Hays	Multer
Boggs, La.	Hedrick	Murdock
Boykin	Heffernan	O'Brien
Buchanan	Hobbs	O'Toole
Buckley	Holifield	Patman
Buffett	Huber	Pfeifer
Byrne, N. Y.	Isacson	Philbin
Cannon	Jackson, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Carroll	Jarman	Rains
Celler	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin
Combs	Jones, Ala.	Rayburn
Crosser	Karsten, Mo.	Rooney
Davis, Ga.	Kee	Sabath
Dawson, Ill.	Kelley	Sadowski
Deane	Keogh	Sheppard
Delaney	King	Smathers
Dingell	Kirwan	Smith, Ohio
Donohue	Klein	Somers
Douglas	Lane	Spence
Eberharter	Larcade	Teague
Engle, Calif.	Lesinski	Thomas, Tex.
Feighan	Lusk	Thompson
Fogarty	Lynch	Walter
Forand	McCormack	Wilson, Tex.
Gordon	Madden	Worley
Gorski	Mahon	
Granger	Marcantonio	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Miller, Conn.

NOT VOTING—67

Abbitt	Gore	O'Konski
Andrews, N. Y.	Gregory	Phillips, Tenn.
Barden	Gross	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Priest
Bland	Hartley	Regan
Bolton	Hendricks	Richards
Bonner	Hess	Riley
Canfield	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Chapman	Jenkins, Pa.	Ross
Clark	Jennings	St. George
Clippinger	Johnson, Tex.	Scoblick
Cole, N. Y.	Kefauver	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Cooley	Kennedy	Short
Cooper	Kerr	Stanley
Courtney	Lucas	Stigler
Craven	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Trimble
Dirksen	MacKinnon	Vail
Dorn	Meade, Ky.	West
Elliott	Meade, Md.	Whitaker
Evins	Murray, Tenn.	Wood
Flannagan	Norrell	
Gallagher	Norton	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vail and Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr. for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. MacKinnon and Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Stigler against.

Mr. Canfield and Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Cravens and Mr. Clippinger for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Abbitt and Mrs. Bolton for, with Mr. Norrell against.

Mrs. St. George and Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Gross and Mr. Ross for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Short and Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Gregory against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Richards.

Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Riley.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Priest.

Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Cooper.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Chapman.

Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Bonner.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Wood.

Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Kefauver.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the joint resolution was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed, Senate Joint Resolution 157.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two copies of letters written to Mr. HALLECK and to Speaker MARTIN, signed by a number of Members of Congress.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD an article that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of August 4 concerning the new type of education in Poland instituted by the Russian-dominated regime, and also to include an article on the freedom of Poland.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein two articles from the last edition of the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the New Jersey Legislature.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include five separate editorials.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I asked permission to insert in the RECORD an article on the works and spirit of William L. Ward, of Westchester. I am advised by the Public Printer that it exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing and will cost $213. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the excess, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] may have an indefinite leave of absence on account of being in the naval hospital.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances; in one to include remarks on the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 157, and the other to include remarks on the farm program and soil conservation.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE INFLATION CONTROL BILL

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I voted against this bill today which has proceeded from the House Banking and Currency Committee, this bill allegedly to curb inflation. I voted against it because I consider it a fake, by which I mean that in its purpose it will fool the people. God knows they have been fooled long enough by this Congress.

To put forth this piece of legislation to curb inflation is like sending an infant to do the work of a man. I predict that the purpose claimed for it will not be accomplished, that inflation will continue, the people will continue to suffer, and that one day they will rise in their wrath and smite those who are responsible for it. If the leadership of the Congress does not intend to do what is obviously necessary in this special session, we might just as well go home and save the taxpayers' money. I hope the President will veto the bill and will tell the country his reasons for so doing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. HARVEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS LOAN

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. J. Res. 212) to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SMITH of OHIO. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House that this motion has not been formally and specifically authorized by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say, in order to clarify the situation, that it is possible for the chairman of a committee to offer the motion on his own responsibility and if he does the Chair will recognize him.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in House Concurrent Resolution 75, passed unanimously by the House of Representatives December 10, 1945, and agreed to unanimously by the Senate December 11, 1945, invited the United Nations "to locate the seat of the United Nations Organizations within the United States"; and

Whereas the General Assembly on December 14, 1946, resolved "that the permanent headquarters of the United Nations shall be established in New York City in the area bounded by First Avenue, East Forty-eighth Street, the East River, and East Forty-second Street"; and

Whereas, pursuant to authorization of the Congress in Public Law 357 of the Eightieth Congress, the "Agreement Between the United Nations and the United States of America Regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations" was brought into effect November 21, 1947, defining the rights and obligations of the United States and the United Nations with respect to the above-mentioned site; and

Whereas plans have been prepared for construction on said site of permanent headquarters of the United Nations to cost not more than $65,000,000, and the United Nations is ready to proceed with such construction as soon as financing can be provided; and

Whereas the present temporary headquarters of the United Nations are inadequate for the efficient functioning of the Organization and retention of its headquarters in the United States can be assured only by the erection of adequate permanent facilities; and

Whereas owing to the current critical dollar shortage, the other member nations are not able to provide in cash at present their respective shares of the cost of constructing the permanent headquarters; other methods of borrowing the necessary funds have been found impracticable; and the permanent establishment of the headquarters of the United Nations in this country will result directly and indirectly in substantial economic benefits to the United States from the expenditures of the Organization and its member nations; and

Whereas in view of the foregoing considerations, the United States representative at the seat of the United Nations in response to an inquiry of the Secretary-General of the United Nations regarding the possibility of a United States Government loan, informed the Secretary-General, with the authorization of the President, by note dated October 29, 1947, that the President would recommend to the Congress the authorization of a loan from the United States to the United Nations for the construction of the headquarters in an amount not exceeding $65,000,000; and

Whereas the General Assembly of the United Nations, by resolution of November 20, 1947, authorized the Secretary-General to negotiate such a loan with the appropriate officials of the United States Government, expressly recognizing that such loan would require the approval of the Congress; and

Whereas the United States Representative to the United Nations has negotiated and signed, on behalf of the United States an agreement with the United Nations in the form set forth below, providing for an interest-free loan of not more than $65,000,000 from the United States to the United Nations to be repaid in annual installments, and said agreement is, by its terms, to become effective on notification to the United Nations that the Congress, with the approval of the President, has made available the funds necessary to be advanced in accordance with the provisions of the agreement: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, or the making available of funds as provided in section 4 (b) hereof to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement, set forth below, between the United States of America and the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., on March 23, 1948, with such changes therein not contrary to the general tenor thereof and not imposing any additional obligations on the United States or relieving the United Nations of any obligations, as the President may deem necessary and appropriate:

LOAN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

It is hereby agreed by the Government of the United States of America and the United Nations as follows:

(1) Subject to the terms and conditions of this agreement, the Government of the United States will lend to the United Nations a sum not to exceed in the aggregate $65,000,000. Such sum shall be expended only as authorized by the United Nations for the construction and furnishing of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in its headquarters district in the city of New York, as defined in the Agreement Between the United States of America and the United Nations Regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., on June 26, 1947, including the necessary architectural and engineering work, landscaping, underground construction and other appropriate improvements to the land and approaches, and for other related purposes and expenses incident thereto.

(2) Such sum, or parts thereof, will be advanced by the United States through the Secretary of State, to the United Nations upon request of the Secretary-General or other duly authorized officer of the United Nations and upon the certification of the architect or engineer in charge of construction, countersigned by the Secretary-General or other duly authorized officer, that the amount requested is required to cover payments for the purposes set forth in paragraph (1) above which either (a) have been at any time made by the United Nations, or (b) are due and payable, or (c) it is estimated will become due and payable within 60 days from the date of such request. All sums not used by the United Nations for the purposes set forth in paragraph (1) will be returned to the United States through the Secretary of State when no longer required for said purposes. No amounts will be advanced hereunder after July 1, 1951, or such later date, not after July 1, 1955, as may be agreed to by the Secretary of State.

(3) All sums advanced hereunder will be receipted for on behalf of the United Nations by the Secretary-General or other duly authorized officer of the United Nations.

(4) The United Nations will repay, without interest, to the United States the principal amount of all sums advanced hereunder, in annual payments beginning on July 1, 1951, and on the dates and in the amounts indicated, until the entire amount advanced under this agreement has been repaid as follows:

	Amount
July 1, 1951	$1,000,000
July 1, 1952	1,000,000
July 1, 1953	1,500,000
July 1, 1954	1,500,000
July 1, 1955	2,000,000
July 1, 1956	2,000,000
July 1, 1957	2,000,000
July 1, 1958	2,000,000
July 1, 1959	2,000,000
July 1, 1960	2,500,000
July 1, 1961	2,500,000
July 1, 1962	2,500,000
July 1, 1963	2,500,000
July 1, 1964	2,500,000
July 1, 1965	2,500,000
July 1, 1966	2,500,000
July 1, 1967	2,500,000
July 1, 1968	2,500,000
July 1, 1969	2,500,000
July 1, 1970	2,500,000
July 1, 1971	2,500,000
July 1, 1972	2,500,000
July 1, 1973	2,500,000
July 1, 1974	2,500,000
July 1, 1975	2,500,000
July 1, 1976	1,500,000
July 1, 1977	1,500,000
July 1, 1978	1,500,000
July 1, 1979	1,500,000
July 1, 1980	1,500,000
July 1, 1981	1,500,000
July 1, 1982	1,000,000

However, in the event the United Nations does not request the entire sum of $65,000,000 available to it under this agreement, the amount to be repaid under this paragraph will not exceed the aggregate amount advanced by the United States. All amounts payable to the United States under this paragraph will be paid, out of the ordinary budget of the United Nations, to the Secretary of State of the United States in currency of the United States which is legal tender for public debts on the date such payments are made. All sums repaid to the United States will be receipted for on behalf of the United States by the Secretary of State.

(5) The United Nations may at any time make repayments to the United States of funds advanced hereunder in excess of the annual installments as provided in paragraph (4) hereof.

(6) The United Nations agrees that, in order to give full effect to section 22 (a) of the agreement regarding the headquarters of the United Nations referred to in paragraph (1) above (under which the United Nations shall not dispose of all or any part of the land owned by it in the headquarters district without the consent of the United States), it will not, without the consent of the United States, while any of the indebtedness incurred hereunder is outstanding and unpaid, create any mortgage, lien or other encumbrance on or against any of its real property in the headquarters district as defined in said agreement. The United Nations also agrees that the United States, as a condition to giving its consent to any such disposition or encumbrance, may require the simultaneous repayment of the balance of all installments remaining unpaid hereunder.

(7) The effective date of this agreement shall be the date on which the Government of the United States notifies the United Nations that the Congress of the United States, with the approval of the President, has made available the funds necessary to be advanced in accordance with the provisions of this agreement.

In witness whereof, the Government of the United States of America, acting by and

through the United States Representative to the United Nations, and the United Nations, acting by and through the Secretary-General, have respectively caused this agreement to be duly signed in duplicate at Lake Success, N. Y., on this 23d day of March 1948.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WARREN R. AUSTIN,
United States Representative to the United Nations.

For the United Nations:

TRYGVE LIE,
Secretary-General.

SEC. 2. Sums advanced to the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2) of the aforesaid loan agreement shall be disbursed by the United Nations for the purposes for which such sums were advanced within 90 days after their receipt from the United States. Any funds not so disbursed within that period shall be returned to the United States through the Secretary of State within 30 days thereafter.

SEC. 3. So long as the headquarters district is used as the seat of the United Nations, nothing in this resolution shall be deemed to limit the control and authority of the United Nations over such district as exercised pursuant to Public Law 357, Eightieth Congress: *Provided, however,* That in the event such district is, for whatever reason, no longer used as the seat of the United Nations, the United States shall, in addition to any rights it enjoys under paragraph (6) of the aforesaid loan agreement and section 22 of the Headquarters Agreement (Public Law 357, 80th Cong.), be entitled to recover from the land and buildings in the headquarters district, in advance of all other creditors of the United Nations, any indebtedness incurred under the loan agreement which is then outstanding and unpaid.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $65,000,000 to accomplish the purposes of this joint resolution. Amounts received in repayment of such loan shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate $25,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution and of the loan agreement referred to in section 1 in such manner, and in such amounts, as the President shall determine, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this purpose. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest, for advances made by it hereunder from funds made available for the purposes of this joint resolution and of the loan agreement set forth in section 1.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. BLOOM. No.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify. Is anyone on the Democratic side opposed to the resolution? [After a pause.] Is anyone opposed to the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the resolution and I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

INVITATION EXTENDED BY UNANIMOUS ACTION

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on the 5th of September 1945, I introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution which was numbered House Concurrent Resolution 75. The resolution read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United Nations be, and hereby are, invited to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America.

That resolution was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House on the 10th of December, 1945, and on the same day, by unanimous consent, that resolution was considered and passed by the House of Representatives unanimously. On the next day, December 11, 1945, the resolution was considered and passed unanimously by the Senate of the United States.

Accordingly, the concurrent resolution inviting the United Nations to the United States was adopted by the Congress without a dissenting vote after being called up by unaimous consent in both bodies.

The proposal before us today is a further step in implementing this invitation which was extended to the United Nations. The invitation was accepted at the time the resolution was adopted. It was regarded as one of the factors taken into consideration by the United Nations Organization in coming to the United States. It is inconceivable to me that today, at this stage in the history of world affairs, having invited the United Nations to the United States, without objection in either body of the Congress, that we should now hesitate at all in making the loan necessary for the erection of the buildings to house the organization.

The resolution now before us should pass by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, most of us believe in United Nations and pray that it will be successful. But just as its benefits will be shared by all participating nations, so should its cost be shared. By the terms of this measure the cost is not shared. Absence of provision for fair interest means that the United States, over the period of the loan, is actually donating the entire sum.

The dangers of the inflationary cancer are decried on every hand. This afternoon this House, having concocted a salve, approved the enactment of that salve into law. But salves do not cure cancer. The cause is too deep seated.

A principal cause of our inflationary cancer is our foolish belief that we can and should play Santa Claus to the world—dissipating our resources carelessly without regard to the consequences.

We will continue to suffer inflation until we come to our senses as to Government expenditures. Here is a good place to start. Defeat this nonemergency measure now. Then, for the next session, work out a plan whereby, if there must be this gift to United Nations, the giving is shared by such nations as Russia, Argentina, South Africa, and others, all of whom are in better condition financially than we are.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill by which it is proposed that the United States loan to the United Nations $65,000,000 to build a headquarters in New York City. The loan is to be repaid over a period of about 30 years, at the rate of about $2,000,000 a year. It does not provide for interest; in other words, the loan will not carry interest.

Mr. Speaker, on December 17, 1945, I made a speech in which I said this in regard to the United Nations Organization:

> We must not expect too much from this Organization at once. I shall not expect anything but friction in the United Nations Organization for the first 10 years. If they accomplish much of anything, I will be surprised. But if they can hang together for 10 years we may begin to see cooperation.

I said this not in the spirit of pessimism but in the spirit that we must not hope for too much from the United Nations immediately. Consequently, I have not been disappointed. I think they have accomplished much good. We are still hanging together notwithstanding the abuse of the veto by the Soviets and other discouraging features.

I also said at that time that it is high time not that we not stand toe to toe with the Soviets in a threatening attitude but that, sitting across the table from them, we look them straight in the eye and tell them that we mean to uphold our ideals just a little bit more than they mean to propagandize their ideologies. It was more than a year after that that we began to live up to that. We did begin to look them straight in the eye with the Greece-Turkey loan and other measures and tell them that we meant to uphold our ideals. It is true we are just in the beginning of that difficult program but we have made a start. We should not give up because the going is rough.

We are still hanging together. We must consider that this building of the United Nations site is a part of the great world peace movement which, Mr. Speaker, is still our only hope to avoid a catastrophic and annihilating war perhaps sometime in the next generation. I think that only if we carry that point in mind do we have the proper perspective on this loan. It is one of the things that some people may say is not so necessary. I do not say it is vital to the survival of the United Nations but it is one of the things we should do in order to carry out that great plan. Such a

viewpoint will give us a somewhat different concept of it.

I said the loan is to be for $65,000,000. Remember that this year we appropriated over $6,500,000,000 for what was practically the same plan, to achieve world peace, 100 times as much. We should not be penny-wise and pound-foolish. I do not think there will be much quarrel about the loan itself. It seems to me the difficulty, if any, is about the interest. Nevertheless, I think that is a sound financial transaction. The people of New York City in reliance on the congressional invitation of 2 years ago have spent $13,000,000 for a site. Together with the buildings there will be an investment of $78,000,000.

Various estimates have been made of what we can sell the property for if the United Nations should disintegrate. We have something in the nature of a first mortgage. The construction will carry in mind conversion to business use. It is located in the business section with ample transportation facilities. Most of the surrounding properties have already doubled in value. The estimates of salvage value if the United Nations should disintegrate run all the way from $50,000,000 to $60,000,000 to $70,000,000. Suppose we take the $70,000,000, that would mean we would have $5,000,000 more than what we have in there. If the United Nations should disintegrate within a year, that would mean that we would have a profit on it. We would be absolutely safe. We would be absolutely safe without any cost or loss for 10 years. But suppose we discount all of that and take the lower estimates. The point I want to put across is that the interest is going to amount at 1.875 percent to $600,000 a year. Inasmuch as we contribute 40 percent of the United Nations' budget we would have to pay 40 percent of that anyway if they paid interest. That would mean $240,000 that we would have to pay at all events. So, Mr. Speaker, it is costing us $360,000 a year for what? Three hundred and sixty thousand dollars a year to insure that the United Nations survives. Is not that worth that investment? Every year we are out $360,000 and no more than that. I would not like to have my children or my grandchildren say that for such a little sum I have done something that discouraged the United Nations Organization. I hope we are out the $360,000 each year for the whole 30 years. For if the United Nations survives for that length of time it will be an outlay which will not only return a hundred, a thousand, or a millionfold but returns in lives and money beyond calculation.

I have not said a word about the other benefits that will accrue. For instance, the business coming to the United States which they say will amount to between $300,000 and $500,000 a year. The saving that we will make by not having to send our whole delegation to some place in Europe and pay their transportation and expenses wherever they may have to meet which is another $300,000 to $500,000.

I say looking at it in that light it is a sound financial transaction and in view of the fact that it will only cost us $360,000 a year to keep the United Nations alive, we should not hesitate to vote for this measure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is thinking and talking as a hard-working and thrifty individual. He is talking about dollars, when he ought to be talking about lives and the future welfare of our Nation. During the war you will all remember, when Russia was in danger of destruction by Hitler, we began to help her and Stalin, and if it had not been for our help, perhaps that country and that philosophy of communism would not be in the picture today.

During the last few months the Congress of the United States has appropriated billions and billions of dollars to end communism. We have Communists here in the Federal Government, according to the recent press. There have been many of them down here in the executive departments. They moved in with the New Deal, and they have never moved out. Today the President refuses to give a Senate committee the files so that it may check charges of communism, just as earlier he refused to give a House committee the files from FBI so that it might check on known gangsters. So we are trying to overthrow communism with our money and with our voices, and soon perhaps by sending our men to fight again on foreign soil, this time under direction of UN, but we are doing very little to get Communists out of the administration—to actually get them out. They have been here, to my own personal knowledge, something like 10 years. They have been carried along on the Federal pay roll and have been given good jobs, positions, and power. Now, what do we propose to do here at home while we are fighting communism abroad? We are going to buy a piece of real estate in the State of New York. One of the tenants will be Russia, and one of the philosophies that will be taught and advocated and made secure there on American soil will be communism. By this bill, we provide a home for Communists who may be brought here by Russia; we give them sanctuary. As in the days of old, a murderer might flee and find safety in a refuge, so we today, seeking to destroy communism—or at least to hold it in check so it may not destroy us—by this and our previous moves give to Communists a citadel of refuge. With $65,000,000 we erect here on American soil an international safety zone, as it were, over which we will have no jurisdiction, in which Communists may live and thrive and from which top Communists may direct their campaign to destroy us.

If that is not foolish, if that is not downright foolish, silly, and absurd, to give an enemy of our country, the Communists, a home in America, a home over which we will have no jurisdiction at all, then I do not know how to characterize this action.

We are still the simple-minded, gullible Uncle Sam. We build up Russia and communism. Now by this bill we give both a beachhead on American soil.

Do you not realize that when you give this land to the United Nations you are taking it out of the United States and it becomes foreign soil. Russia and the representatives of Russia on it can do what they please. Just a little while ago we learned from the press reports from the State Department itself that there are Communists who are coming here through the United Nations and teaching here their philosophy.

I am frank to say that according to the investigation that the Labor Committee has held, you will find plenty of Communists who have been getting their orders from abroad making trouble for American workers, depriving them of their right to work. So now we give them a foothold in America. We establish a sanctuary for them and we put them in a place where we cannot later touch them. Instead of having them coming from Moscow, we bring them over wholesale as employees of the United Nations and then we let them go out free of any authority and free from any supervision by the State or Federal authorities and carry on their dirty work.

If that is not silly and absurd, I would like to know what it is. I might just as well ask a burglar who intends to rob me to come in and occupy the spare bedroom in my home and say "I cannot touch you as long as you stay there," and then when I go to sleep have him steal all my goods or assault me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 on National Security of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I receive hundreds of letters from all over the country urging that my committee take action to strengthen the United Nations. I therefore was pleased when our distinguished chairman the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] held open hearings by the full committee on this vital subject.

Distinguished men and women from all walks of life gave us their views as to what, in their judgment, could and should be done. After receiving suggestions from Mr. Austin, our United States representative to the United Nations, and after consultation with officials of the State Department, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 202, which is as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) the Congress hereby reaffirms the policy of the United States of endeavoring to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations and the strengthening of its member nations.

(b) The President is hereby respectfully advised that it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Government should take steps to strengthen the United Nations by means of the following:

(1) Continuance of efforts on the part of the United States, by agreed interpretations and procedures or by amendment of the

Charter, to liberalize the voting procedure in the Security Council by such steps as the elimination of the veto in applications of the provisions of chapter VI for the pacific settlement of disputes and in voting on the admission of states to membership in the United Nations;

(2) Promotion of agreements contemplated by article 43 of the Charter to provide armed forces for the purpose of enabling the Security Council to maintain international peace and security, and for the development of international confidence which will permit urgent steps to be taken toward regulation and reduction of armaments, on the basis of effective and enforceable safeguards which will protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions and will develop world security;

(3) Development of the potentialities of the General Assembly for promoting cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security;

(4) Encouragement of the fullest practicable use by every nation of the organs, agencies, and facilities of the United Nations for the fulfillment of the purposes and principles of the Charter;

(5) Continuing consultation with other member nations of the United Nations, as may be desirable and feasible in the light of the progress made in strengthening the effectiveness of the United Nations through the foregoing steps, upon the amendment of the Charter through recommendation of the General Assembly under article 108, or if necessary, review of the Charter at an appropriate time by a general conference called under article 109 or by the General Assembly;

(6) Association of the United States with such regional and other collective arrangements as are based upon self-help and mutual aid and as affect its national security;

(7) Encouragement, support, and assistance, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, of free nations in their firm determination to defend their independence and liberty against aggression under article 51.

I believe this resolution met with the general approval of the State Department and our representative to the United Nations, and the substance of it, in many respects, was adopted by the full Foreign Affairs Committee when we voted out unanimously a statement of policy on this subject.

At the same time we included several other subjects intended to strengthen the United Nations, one of which was the $65,000,000 loan to the United Nations by the United States for headquarters in New York City, which is now before us.

I was one of those who felt that we should at this special session, when passing the loan bill, also pass the statement of policy, adopted by our committee, and took part in consultation with our leadership, urging this be done. However, because of the limited nature of the special session it was thought best to pass only the loan bill at this time. We were given assurance, however, and a statement was issued to the press, to the effect that the other matters contained in our package bill, including the statement of policy, would be given top priority as soon as the Congress reconvenes in January. With that assurance my Foreign Affairs Committee adopted the following resolution which states our position with reference thereto:

More than a year ago the Committee on Foreign Affairs began studying afresh a question which is disturbing millions of Americans, namely, how to strengthen the United Nations so that it can become a mechanism able to settle disputes between nations equitably and effectively on the basis of world law, and with sufficient moral and military force to prevent aggression and maintain peace.

After the most thorough public review of the subject since the San Francisco Conference, including extensive hearings at which many of the most distinguished and thoughtful men of our time presented their views, the committee prepared and on June 9, 1948, reported unanimously H. R. 6802, a bill to strengthen the United Nations and promote international cooperation for peace. It contained a comprehensive statement of policy and provisions for enlarging and strengthening American representation and assistance to the United Nations, adoption of a convention granting necessary privileges and immunities for delegates and staff of the United Nations, and a $65,000,000 loan for facilitating construction of the United Nations headquarters on the selected site in New York City.

Members of the committee believe that the most important part of the bill is the statement of policy with respect to improvements in the practices, procedures, and structure of the United Nations which we should strive for if it is to be made capable of functioning as intended. However, because of the fact that this special session was called by the President to consider only certain limited matters, including the headquarters loan; and because the consideration of H. R. 6802 which in large part is outside the designated scope of the session would make it difficult for the leadership to refuse consideration of many other matters also outside that scope; and in view of the fact that the House leadership has given assurance that the remainder of H. R. 6802 will be brought up for consideration by the House early in the next regular session, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has voted to report favorably Senate Joint Resolution 212, which is essentially the same as sections 8 and 9 of H. R. 6802, approving the United Nations headquarters agreement and authorizing $65,000,000 for the loan.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the unanimous invitation of the Congress for the United Nations to locate its headquarters in this country was accepted in the face of strong opposition. Thereafter Rockefeller donated a site which cost more than $8,000,000, and New York City has expended or will expend upward of $13,000,000 as its contribution. Despite the suggestion of a powerful and obstreperous member of the organization that its headquarters be removed to Europe, and although many delegates were doubtful of the propriety of meeting in Paris in September because of the fear that a serious effort toward this end might occur, I do not believe there is danger of such a change. I do not believe that failure to promptly erect headquarters buildings in New York would create such danger. I am, however, very much afraid that more delay in proceeding with this project after, as has been explained, the ground has been excavated, would create an impression of lack of faith in the United Nations which might prove quite serious.

I have repeatedly expressed the opinion on this floor and elsewhere, even as early as the convening of the Dumbarton Oaks conference, which laid the ground work for the San Francisco conference where the United Nations Charter was signed, that the United Nations or some similar organization must succeed if civilization is to survive. I also expressed it on the day before as well as the day the San Francisco conference convened. In fact, I wrote my friend, Dr. Clanton W. Williams, a history professor at the University of Alabama, on September 15, 1942, as follows:

Some sort of world court, league of nations, international army or international political force will be necessary after this war and we must do whatever is necessary to provide it.

I still believe this very strongly, and since the United Nations is now in being I think it simply must succeed. I believe it behooves us all, every peace-loving person and nation, to contribute everything possible thereto. Certainly the Congress of the greatest Nation in the world cannot run any risk whatever of creating lack of faith that this will occur. There are many other reasons which argue compellingly for the passage of this legislation, but I am impressed that this is probably the strongest one and that it alone justifies its passage.

This loan was referred to a moment ago as a gift. Instead, it is an excellently secured loan from which many benefits will flow, many of which have been discussed. I wish to emphasize, however, that it is not really a loan of $65,000,000. This is true because the United States contribution toward United Nations expense is 39.89 percent. It would be much more if actually based on ability to pay. Incidentally a movement to increase it would have undoubtedly occurred but for the probability of this loan. Therefore if the loan were obtained from another source we would contribute approximately $26,000,000 toward its repayment, and an appropriate comment on the criticism that it is noninterest bearing is that approximately 40 percent of it will be loaned to ourselves. Certainly the advantages which will flow to this country in the enhancement of our leadership in the United Nations, the approximately $20,500,000 which come annually to our shores because of its presence here, and the saving in travel and communications estimated at $300,000 annually will fully compensate us for interest on the remainder, to say nothing of numerous other benefits.

No, we cannot run the risk of either decreasing our prestige in this great organization or contributing toward the loss of faith in it which might cause its failure. This might result should we not implement our invitation and the action of John D. Rockefeller and the city of New York by the passage of this legislation. Therefore I am delighted that it is under consideration and hope and believe the vote against it will be small indeed.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, in adopting the pending measure, the Congress will not only be taking one more step toward carrying out an agreement made in good faith with the United Nations, but it will also be serving the best interests of our Government and our people.

The agreement referred to was made and entered into at Lake Success, New York, on June 26, 1947, between our Secretary of State as the representative of the United States Government and the Secretary-General of the United Nations as the representative of that body. In this agreement, reduced to writing and signed by the respective representatives, it was stipulated that the Government of the United States would lend to the United Nations a sum not to exceed $65,000,000. This sum to be used for the construction and furnishing of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations in the city of New York. The resolution before us today authorizes the appropriation of the amount necessary to carry out the terms of the agreement.

The agreement further provides for the advancement to the United Nations of parts or installments of the fund from time to time as the work of construction progresses. It also stipulates that the loan shall be repaid, without interest, to the United States in annual installments of from $1,000,000 to $2,500,000 each, the dates for such repayments being set forth in the body of the written contract. The writing also contains a provision that all sums not used by the United Nations for the purpose required shall be returned to the United States.

Protecting the interests of the United States is a clause in the agreement providing that the United Nations shall not, without the consent of the United States dispose of, mortgage, create any lien upon nor encumber all or any part of its real property in the United Nations' headquarters district while the debt owing to the United States remains unpaid. The United States may, as a condition to giving its consent to any sale or encumbrance, require the immediate payment of all unpaid installments.

The agreement was evidently carefully drawn, and with the intent to safeguard the United States from any material loss. It may be urged by some people that we will sustain a considerable loss by foregoing interest on the loan. As a matter of fact we lose nothing. The United States is not a lending agency. It is not engaged in the loan business for profit. Making no interest charge is merely foregoing a profit, not losing something the Government already has or owns. The Government is merely accommodating the United Nations and making no charge for the accommodation. The loan is secured and every dollar of it will be repaid.

Why should we not cheerfully and willingly aid in building up, strengthening and giving prestige and dignity to the one great Organization in which the free people of all the world trust for lasting peace and security? Especially is this true since the Organization at our invitation has indicated its intention to make its home and headquarters on American soil.

The United States Government was prompt and diligent in its efforts to induce the United Nations to locate its headquarters in America. On June 26, 1945, the United Nations Charter was adopted at the conference in San Francisco. On December 10, 1945 this House passed House Concurrent Resolution No. 75 inviting the United Nations to locate its headquarters within the United States. This resolution was adopted by the Senate on the following day. The vote in both branches of the Congress was unanimous.

On February 14, 1946, a resolution was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations accepting the invitation of the United States to establish its permanent headquarters in this country. By the same resolution temporary headquarters were established in the New York City area. Later in the year Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., offered to donate funds necessary to purchase a site in New York, and on December 14, 1946, the General Assembly adopted a resolution accepting the offer. A site covering approximately six city blocks in New York City was purchased with the funds so generously provided by a patriotic American.

This Congress by the enactment of Public Law 7, Eightieth Congress, has exempted the gift of Mr. Rockefeller from gift taxes, and by Public Law 357, passed unanimously by both Houses of the same Congress, has authorized the President to bring into effect the United Nation's headquarters agreement to which I have referred.

Financing the construction of the headquarters buildings is now the problem facing the great organization we invited to our shores, and the resolution we have under consideration today offers the logical and certainly commendable solution.

As is clearly set forth in the Foreign Affairs Committee report accompanying the resolution to the floor, it was not only found to be impracticable but impossible to finance construction through contributions from member nations. Thorough investigation also developed the impossibility of negotiating a loan from private sources or banking institutions. The Export-Import Bank lacked authorization, and such a loan was beyond the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

If we should fail to pass the pending resolution the result, in my judgment, would be disastrous. It would mean our repudiation of the solemn agreement made with the United Nations by our Secretary of State. It would mean the disruption and probable abandonment of all plans of the United Nations for construction of headquarters buildings. It means that the American Government will at once be the object of severe criticism by other nations over the world, especially by those other nations that invited and wanted the United Nations headquarters within their borders. It would mean our forfeiture of the trust and confidence of many nations and peoples who have heretofore respected our word as they did our bond. And finally, it might very easily mean that the United Nations, finding itself unable to finance the construction of its headquarters here, will abandon its New York site and start a search for another location in another land.

I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that it is now and will always be to the advantage of the United States to have the headquarters of the United Nations within our borders. By the same token, it would be to our disadvantage to have them elsewhere. This is the one country in the world in which the headquarters should be permanently located. The Organization is now with us. We must keep it with us.

I hope the pending resolution will be adopted without a dissenting vote.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the American people have shown in numerous polls and otherwise that they are overwhelmingly behind the United Nations as the world's best and perhaps last chance for peace.

The majority has just won a great national debate in which the question was, Shall we tell the Russians to take it or leave it on our proposals to amend the United Nations Charter, or get out of the United Nations, or do we want to try to make the United Nations work as originally designed, if possible.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House today is an effort to clothe those words with actions and to redeem the prestige and authority of the United States, especially with reference to the invitation that was extended to the United Nations by giving it a suitable home here.

I invite any Member of the Congress to go out to the United Nations headquarters at Lake Success and see the "salt mine" in which they work—most of the staff, especially the personnel in the lower echelons, work in an abandoned factory building without natural light or air for most of the personnel. Then, to say whether or not we are acting as host to the world's great hope for peace or suitably accommodating the assemblage of nations which by our invitation is located in the United States.

As to the merits of the proposal—first, the city of New York and the State of New York and a private citizen of the United States have undertaken this project together. The site, worth $8,500,000, has been donated. The city and State of New York have put up over $13,000,000 for site improvements and similar items—that is probably going up to $20,000,000 before this project is completed—and the United States here is asked to loan—I emphasize that—loan $65,000,000. If it does not, we will have in New York City what I have called before and I call again "a Black Hole of Calcutta," on which the site has been completely excavated and which is waiting for something to be put on it, and that something will be the United Nations' buildings to be financed by this loan.

As to the merits of the loan itself; the loan will be repaid out of the regular budget of the United Nations. I do not think that has been made clear. The United States contributes not most of the money but only about 40 percent to that budget. The reason for the loan having been made interest free is as a

straight quid pro quo on a business basis. Income from the expenditures in the United States of the United Nations delegations and others who come here to the United Nations is estimated at about $20,500,000 a year. If the question had been: "Shall the United Nations headquarters be paid for outright by a special levy on the United Nations?" would it not have been logical to suppose that the United States would have been asked for a greater proportion of the amount than is shown by its contribution to the normal administrative budget of the United Nations? Let us say the United States would have been asked for at least 60 percent, and with some justice. Instead of paying more than our share of the administrative budget then, into a special building fund, we are making an interest-free loan.

As to the value of the property itself, the Foreign Affairs Committee was very careful on that point and has two appraisals of the property as proposed to be completed. One of these is by the coordinator of construction of New York City, Hon. Robert Moses, who has an enviable reputation. He values the project, on the most conservative estimate, as being worth from 50 to 60 million dollars. Not satisfied with that alone, we also got an appraisal from the head of a leading private real estate firm in New York City, Mr. Charles F. Noyes. He says:

> Furthermore, at this time it is my opinion that all real-estate experts will agree that if anything should happen in the future and the Government finds that it owns the property through foreclosure of the $65,000,000 loan, the loan could be salvaged and probably without loss to the Government.

The loan agreement, which the House is called upon to approve, and the pending bill protect the United States by making this as nearly as may be a first mortgage. If the United Nations ceases to exist, for any reason, the land and the buildings become the property of the United States, so it is a business matter. It is a loan and as well and intelligently secured as practicable.

One final point: Would it not be anomalous for us, as has been said by the gentleman from Michigan, to be spending billions of dollars for armament, and then to bridle at $65,000,000, a loan with adequate security, which we are asked to make in the cause of peace; and in the cause of enabling the institution for peace to have a haven in the one place in the world where we know it will be safe, in the United States? Are we not a generous enough host to extend to the United Nations Organization which is here in response to our own invitation in which the hope for peace of hundreds of millions of people is wrapped up, just that degree of hospitality?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the United Nations and still trust that it may hold the last great hope for peace. The only question in my mind is whether this is the time or the place to construct this building. In my judgment it is neither.

Who is going to occupy this building? Will they be Communists? Will they strive for cooperation or confusion? We are not certain, and I maintain that until we are permitted to inquire, investigate, and know who will occupy this building we should not divert this $65,000,000 worth of critical material and scarce labor to constructing a building of this type when our own American citizens and veterans cannot get the construction they need for ordinary homes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] referred to the excavation of the basement and likened it to the Black Hole of Calcutta. Well that is just too bad. I can think of several things with which the hole could be filled and it is not $65,000,000. I am not willing to use already scarce material and labor to provide a bung for that hole.

The hole never should have been dug until they knew definitely whether or not they were going to secure this money to construct the building.

I think it should also be pointed out that the donation of this site for the United Nations headquarters removes $8,000,000 from real-estate taxes in the city of New York. Who is going to make up this loss in revenue? Furthermore, no provision is made to provide schooling or health protection for the school children who will come into this area under this program. Neither is there provision for fire or police protection. Since this site does not have the protection of the police and fire departments of the city of New York, the question arises, would a fireman or a policeman be covered by insurance if he should be ordered out to fight a fire or pursue a criminal in an area not having fire and police protection as provided for in the metropolitan area.

Another feature is the diversion of steel. Those of us living in less populated areas are not confronted with this vital subject, but it is mandatory that steel be used in the New York area for the construction of apartment buildings. In this program we see the diversion of this critical and high-priced commodity going into the construction of a building which could easily be postponed, at the expense of much-needed houses for our own American citizens. In fact, would it not be the part of wisdom to wait until a building slump might arise, as some seem to fear is inevitable, and then use this public-construction program as a means of providing employment to those engaged in the construction and manufacturing of buildings and materials.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to emphasize that I am not opposed to the United Nations Organization, but on the contrary have tried in every way I know to strengthen its authority by attempting to have the Greek-Turkish situation, as well as the Palestine question, referred to them for action. I am really sorry that the UNO was ever invited to come to America. In my opinion it will bring foreign intrigue along with it. The idea of stating that if we have it here in America we can watch and keep check on it is silly. The present exposé of communistic infiltration into high places of our Government shows how silly such an argument is.

We should also remember that the Brooklyn Navy Yard is directly across the street from the proposed UN headquarters and that with a pair of field glasses practically every operation of this navy yard can be viewed from this proposed building. I am more inclined to believe that foreign agents would be able to keep a much closer check on our navy yard operations than we would be to keep a check on them. I therefore repeat that, in my opinion, this is not the time nor the place to construct this building, especially since they already have a place to meet and are getting along very well in their present quarters.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, all hope and pray that the United Nations may continue to function, gain in power, and to preserve peace; but it is an experiment, and as such it would seem that we should look ahead.

I am going to vote for this appropriation because it is the only way we now have to that end, but I feel that a provision should have been inserted in this resolution to the effect that if the United Nations should unfortunately blow up the buildings could be converted to housing purposes. In order to do that there should be inserted a provision placed in the measure providing that all UN structures should be such as to lend themselves to conversion to housing.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. There is a provision for the United States to repossess this property should the United Nations go out of existence.

Mr. KNUTSON. But it might cost all the buildings were worth to reconvert to living quarters.

Mr. JAVITS. The main building is an office building.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well and good, but let the other buildings be so arranged that they could, without too much cost, be converted to apartments. In that way we could salvage a considerable part of this money and at the same time relieve our housing shortage by that much.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, to propose that we give the United Nations $65,000,000—it is presently dignified by being called a loan—to build a temple in New York is nothing short of ridiculous.

Housing is one of the most important questions now before the American people. Sixty-five million dollars would build 6,500 $10,000 homes for veterans. To go into the material and labor market now for this useless construction will

drive prices up to that extent because it will compete in an already short market.

We are requesting all political subdivisions to withhold all construction, unless it is absolutely imperative, and let a maximum of materials and labor go into housing. That is as it should be. It is unbelievable that we would consider this proposal at this time when inflation and the high cost of living concerns us very much. We do not hear any complaints about their present quarters at Lake Success. From what I have seen around the country, I feel sure there are surplus war buildings; I have in mind abandoned airfields, that could be made suitable for their use at much less cost, if it is determined that we want it permanently in this country.

Marriner S. Eccles, whose judgment all of us respect, advises us in our fight against inflation and high prices, to "encourage States to cut down spending and let the Federal Government set an example;" and further, "Don't let political reasons lead the Government into backing a housing program in excess of materials and labor available."

Now in the face of existing conditions, you propose a $65,000,000 building that in no sense is necessary. And I believe we should delay this $65,000,000 building until we can investigate the charges of communism that have been hurled at the United Nations by responsible people. The State Department has informed committees of Congress in so many words that the United Nations is a hotbed of communism and is being used as a vehicle for entry of thousands of Communists into this country contrary to the laws of the land.

I can think of a hundred reasons why this $65,000,000 should not be spent for building at this time, and I have not heard one good reason in support of the proposal.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on my side.

Mr. Speaker, this bill—Senate Joint Resolution 212—provides for the construction of a building in New York City to house the United Nations Organization. It would divert from the homebuilding industry a huge amount of building material and labor and thus deprive many thousands of families of homes.

Mr. Marriner Eccles, whose qualification to speak on this question cannot be challenged, testified before our committee that the erection of this building in New York City "is something that could be deferred; that the United Nations seem to be housed in a manner in which they can operate and it would seem advisable to defer that until we know a little bit more about the international situation and the United Nations relationship to it and until such time as there are more building materials and labor available, because any construction, of course, competes with all other construction."

Mr. Eccles is so right in this. The venture would intensify competition for material and labor in the building industry. This would be decidedly inflationary.

The proponents of the bill say the amount of inflation that would be created would be small and that the merits of the proposal outweigh its evils. I deny this.

The menace of recognizable actual and potential inflation and the immediate need for constructing a building for housing the United Nations Organization are just about as 1,000,000 is to 0.

But worse than that is the fact the erection of this elaborate United Nations palace in New York City would provide a permanent home in the United States for Stalin's agents. It would provide a solid base for them to carry on their satanic work of destroying our Government and institutions. The International Organizations Immunities Act and the United Nations Headquarters Site Agreement Act would firmly establish this base. Under these acts Stalin's agents cannot be touched.

Mr. Robert C. Alexander, Assistant Chief, Visa Division, Department of State, whose knowledge of the subject upon which he speaks cannot be questioned, testified before the Revercomb committee:

> You can assume that all of the countries behind the iron curtain are going to fill up their missions with Communists or Communist agents. You take that for granted. You do not assume that they will send persons not in sympathy with their governments.

Of course, to expect anything else would be plain asininity. Every person that is now in the United Nations Organization or that will become attached to it in the future coming from behind the iron curtain is, or will be, an agent of Stalin, whose sole task is to overthrow the Government of the United States and bring our people under his heel.

Mr. Alexander in the testimony referred to, said there were approximately several hundred persons of a subversive character brought into the United States by the United Nations.

Would Stalin have nominated, through his representative, Trygve Lie for the position he now holds, Secretary General of the United Nations, had he not been certain beyond peradventure that Trygve Lie is a Communist and amenable to his dictates? I pause to give any Member in the House opportunity to assert that Stalin would recommend the appointment of anybody who is not subservient to his will to any position. No one has risen.

All this is bad enough, but we should not be so naive as to believe that Russia is the only contributor of Communists to the United Nations. Communism is a powerful force in France and other European countries. That it exercises a degree of control over the appointment of persons from those countries to the United Nations, and all other international organizations, will not be denied by anyone who knows the facts. Certain it is that there is a measure of cooperation of the communistic forces from those countries in the United Nations Organization with Stalin's agents. Exactly the same thing is true of the Latin American countries where communism is becoming powerfully entrenched.

I assert that the United Nations is the haven of the world Communist movement with, of course, Joseph Stalin as its head. The United Nations is serving him in good stead in directing his spy network in this country which is at last coming to light. Housed in New York City the United Nations becomes the very ultima ratio for the communistic overthrow of the United States by violence and force.

It is a deception to call this a loan. Every Member of Congress knows, or ought to know, that the United States would in all probability pay practically all of the cost. I was amazed at the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] that the transaction would cost the United States only between three and four hundred thousand dollars a year. The money would have to be raised by a public debt transaction. At 2.107 percent interest, the average rate on all interest-bearing debt, the transaction would cost the United States taxpayers more than $4,000,000 for the first 3 years.

The political authority of our Government has almost continuously for about 30 years pursued a policy of directly or indirectly expropriating the produce of our labors and gratuitously handing it over to political authorities in Europe and other countries. First there were the loans made to foreign countries in connection with World War I.

Then there were the foreign securities sold to private citizens in the 1920's which securities were salable only because the political authority controlling the Government approved them and encouraged their sale. The heavy losses suffered by the investors in those securities must be directly charged to the policy of the political authority of that period.

Then came the gold-purchase program in 1933 and 1934. The pockets of the American people were picked to the tune of many billions of dollars for the payment of enormous premiums on gold purchases. Lend-lease came next. Then postwar II gratuities to foreign countries and finally we have the 5-year projected Marshall plan. The total would greatly exceed $100,000,000,000.

The trend of increasing expropriation of American producers and gratuitously handing the fruit of their labors over to foreign political authorities, which are now practically all collectivist states, is definitely upward and becoming more and more a permanent fixture upon the American economy.

When the above facts are considered in connection with the Federal debt, unconscionable taxes and the deep-seated political corruption in which the United States is now mired, it would be anyone's guess as to what the ultimate money cost of the United Nations' structure would be to our taxpayers. It is reasonably certain that we will pay much more than the principal amount of $65,000,000 and it should surprise no one if it should cost us roundly $100,000,000 in the next 34 years, the alleged life of this euphemistically designated loan.

I am unalterably opposed to this bill because it would rob many families of

needed homes, intensify inflation, and give Stalin's agents a foothold that we might never be able to disestablish.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. I think the gentleman would be interested to hear that there is such competition for building labor in the New York area now that certain building mechanics are demanding overtime which brings their weekly rate of pay to $240.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I have always thought it would have been better for the United Nations and its effectiveness if its headquarters had not been located in the United States or any of the other major powers. It is more easily subject to national pressures, or at least the other strong nations fear that it will be unduly influenced by the host nation. Our forefathers were extremely wise when they set up the United States Government in an area, the District of Columbia, independent of any of the units comprising the new organization.

Or, if the United Nations were to be in America, it would have been better to have it almost anywhere else than New York City, our least American and most European city.

But the headquarters is here and at the invitation of the Congress and the Executive. We have made a commitment. I do not see anything for us to do but to vote the loan, which is a sound loan, and assist the United Nations in getting suitable quarters in which to work. Let us do everything within our power to assist it in becoming the kind of organization that can do the job the war weary and apprehensive peoples of the earth want it to do—establish justice and settle international disputes peacefully.

Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that it did not prove possible to bring before the last session or this session the whole bill, H. R. 6802, of which this resolution today represents only one of five main provisions. They deal with all aspects of the functions of the United Nations and of the United States relations to the United Nations. All of these provisions are necessary. Anything less is piecemeal legislation.

The statement of policy in section 1 of the act was drawn with the greatest care, and commands the support of all the various groups in our country which have been most active in studying and promoting sound proposals for international organization for peace. It is not all that many want, but I believe events will prove it sound and the first real forward step since San Francisco. May I read the statement of policy:

SEC. 1. * * *

(b) It is the policy of the people of the United States through constitutional processes to strive to accomplish the aims and purposes set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and to strengthen the United Nations by—

(1) Confirming the status of the United Nations in its site within the United States with appropriate privileges and immunities, facilitating its headquarters-building program, and increasing the effectiveness of the United States in the work of the United Nations;

(2) Seeking by voluntary agreements, interpretations, and practices to improve the functioning of the United Nations, to liberalize the voting procedures in the Security Council, and to eliminate the veto on all questions involving pacific settlement of international disputes and situations, and the admission of new members;

(3) Pressing for agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter, and for agreements to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction, and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violation and evasion;

(4) Encouraging, and associating the United States with, such regional and other collective arrangements for self-defense as are consistent with the Charter, are based on continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid between free nations, and affect the national security of the United States; and making clear the determination of the United States to exercise the right under the Charter of individual or collective self-defense in the event of any armed attack against a member affecting the national security of the United States; and

(5) Initiating consultations with other members concerning the need for and possibility of so amending the Charter as to enable the United Nations more effectively to prohibit and prevent aggression or other breaches of the peace.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of the committee was reluctant to bring out just the headquarters loan without the remaining sections of H. R. 6802. However, in view of the special circumstances prevailing, the committee agreed to do so, accompanying the bill with the following statement of explanation:

STATEMENT BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS REGARDING SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 212, THE UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS LOAN

More than a year ago the Committee on Foreign Affairs began studying afresh a question which is disturbing millions of Americans, namely, how to strengthen the United Nations so that it can become a mechanism able to settle disputes between nations equitably and effectively on the basis of world law, and with sufficient moral and military force to prevent aggression and maintain peace.

After the most thorough public review of the subject since the San Francisco Conference, including extensive hearings at which many of the most distinguished and thoughtful men and women of our time presented their views, the committee prepared and on June 9, 1948, reported unanimously H. R. 6802, a bill to strengthen the United Nations and promote international cooperation for peace. It contained a comprehensive statement of policy, and provisions for enlarging and strengthening American representation and assistance to the United Nations, adoption of a convention granting necessary privileges and immunities for delegates and staff of the United Nations, and a $65,000,000 loan for facilitating construction of the United Nations headquarters on the selected site in New York City.

Members of the committee believe that the most important part of the bill is the statement of policy with respect to improvements in the practices, procedures, and structure of the United Nations which we should strive for if it is to be made capable of functioning as intended. However, because of the fact that this special session was called by the President to consider only certain specified matters, including the headquarters loan; and because the consideration of H. R. 6802 which in large part is outside the designated scope of the session would make it difficult for the leadership to refuse consideration of many other matters also outside that scope; and in view of the fact that the House leadership has given assurance that the remainder of H. R. 6802 will be brought up for consideration by the House early in the next regular session, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has voted to report favorably Senate Joint Resolution 212, which is essentially the same as sections 8 and 9 of H. R. 6802 approving the United Nations headquarters loan agreement and authorizing $65,000,000 for the loan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on the joint resolution before us.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this bill as I feel that to do otherwise, even under present conditions, might appear to be a direct slap at the United Nations, the success of which is so important to all of us.

I regret that this matter of building a headquarters for the United Nations has come up at the present time due to the large quantities of building material which will be diverted from home building for the purpose of the United Nations headquarters.

The materials likely to be used by the United Nations would construct about 8,000 separate homes for the people of the United States and it would seem preferable in many ways to utilize these materials for such homes and let the United Nations organization continue to function in its temporary quarters at Lake Success. I know that these temporary quarters are not suitable, yet I am inclined to think that housing for our own people right now might well take preference over the provision of an adequate and suitable home for the United Nations.

I favor the United Nations and, under ordinary conditions, would approve of this legislation without a qualm of conscience. Now, however, while voting for it, I wish that it might have been postponed for a year or two.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 212, providing for a $65,000,000 interest-free loan to the United Nations for a permanent headquarters in New York, is a matter of deep concern to both myself and the constituents of the Third District of Connecticut.

During the past few months, I have been the recipient of considerable correspondence from constituents in my district advocating favorable passage of this legislation. These constituents have expressed not only their deep concern for a permanent headquarters for this Organization but their sincere hope

that the ultimate benefits to be gained by such Organization situated within the bounds of these United States, will far overshadow the expense of providing them with adequate housing facilities and headquarters.

Our participation in two major world wars in the past 25 years, and the sacrifices freely made by our people, in the loss of their beloved ones, support of every Government loan drive, and their physical efforts in support of national defense, have brought forcibly to their minds the ray of hope for some peaceful solution of the world's problems. These people, who have given their all, certainly do not wish to again see us embroiled in major conflict, and they are unquestionably sincere in their opinion that such ray of hope lies in the continuation of the United Nations Organization.

The sum of $65,000,000 to be expended for adequately housing this Organization is relatively insignificant compared to the sacrifices that have been made by our people to fight and gain victory in the past two major world wars. Such victory is hollow without having achieved by it a permanent and lasting peace for all the peoples of the world.

I do not feel that this Congress has any intention of diminishing the ray of hope held by our people for some form of enduring peace. To my mind, the nurturing of the present United Nations Organization, and confining such headquarters within the bounds of our United States, will be a proper step in the right direction. The Organization has had a rather stormy career, but we must not lose faith. After the adoption of our own Federal Constitution there were many who were skeptical concerning its future.

It is therefore my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will pass this very worthy legislation, which is of such vital importance to the well-being and morale of our people, without further delay.

The eyes of millions of peace-loving Americans are upon us; in fact, Mr. Speaker, the eyes of peace-loving peoples of the world are upon us. It therefore behooves us to fulfill their earnest hope and desire for a continued and permanent peace.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, it is quite possible even under the most tragic and difficult conditions ever confronting mankind that we approach this problem by piecemeal, but there is only one approach which will finally bring us to anything that is sound in the way of a conclusion and in the way of action, and that is to observe and understand the problem as it is in all its parts.

Our Foreign Affairs Committee some months ago was under great pressure from all parts of the country asking us to do something to strengthen the United Nations as the foundation of a new world civilization. We called for witnesses, and we had a magnificent company of leading men and women from all over this Nation representing great fundamental interests, who gave us a very informative and rational set of remarks and arguments. We prepared then a bill which included, among other important things, this loan for $65,000,000. That bill unfortunately fell down in the pressure of ending up the meeting of the Congress in June. So we are here today face to face with a responsibility from which there is no escape.

If we turn this proposal down, we will announce to the world that this Congress has turned its back on the position which the people, the Congress, and the administration have assumed up to now in the support of and welcome to this great world organization. So, I ask you men and women of this body when you vote here today to bear in mind the tremendous responsibilities that rest upon you in giving housing to this vitally important United Nations organization.

We are not giving away $65,000,000; we are investing it on a mortgage. We have substantial security. We can take charge of the buildings any time we have to. There are at least four great buildings proposed. One of them will be 41 stories high, and obviously it can be converted at short notice if necessary for business purposes.

The State of New York and the city of New York have already spent over $13,000,000 to advance this enterprise. Mr. Rockefeller, who, as you know, is in somewhat straitened circumstances, has contributed over $8,000,000 toward this. If we let the organization build the building, we would have to put up 40 percent of it anyway, and if we loan it we will get it back in time in full, and our mortgage interest will then be canceled.

In closing, I come back to where I started. You stand face to face with the most tremendous challenge to your resources of brains and character and patriotism and understanding that has ever confronted mankind.

I plead with you in the name of human freedom not to drive this institution across the Atlantic and put it under the control and power of the Russian Communist program; as it surely will be if it goes over there. We have them here. Let us keep them here. Let us keep our eye on them. Let us put the force and power and intelligence of our Nation behind this thing. Let us let the world know that we believe in world civilization; that we believe it can be done.

We have the center of a new world civilization here. Let us house it properly. Let us support it properly. We are for it against all comers. In God's name, let us stand up today and face this situation from the world point of view—from the point of view of world humanity and the spiritual challenge which it makes to us whether we shall enthrone slavery or freedom in this Nation and throughout the world.

As for me, I am for this. I am going to vote for it and I hope and believe all Members will be equally intelligent and vote for it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 164; noes 27.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-six Members are present, a quorum.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HOUSING—ANSWERING THE ARG MENTS MADE AGAINST T-E-W BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, all agree that the housing shortage is still acute. The proponents of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill contend it will be the best means for dealing with the housing shortage and for establishing a national housing program for the next 10 years, while its opponents, including those in the House, have made three contentions:

First. All the available men and materials for housing construction are already being utilized; second, private industry is building enough to meet the emergency; and, third, the T-E-W bill will have an inflationary effect. It will be useful to answer these points in turn:

First. That present housing construction is already utilizing all the men and materials available. This contention will not stand examination because while private residential construction in the first 6 months of 1948 totaled $3,100,000,000, nonresidential construction and public construction totaled $3,600,000,000. Of this amount, $1,650,000,000 of commercial construction was not alone for factories but was for stores and offices, many of which we could well do without. Furthermore, social and recreational construction alone—the bowling alleys and the swimming pools and race tracks—reached a volume of $80,000,000 in that period—an increase of 110 percent over the same period in 1947. The materials supply situation has been improving very markedly—for example, at the end of May 1948, stocks of hardwood flooring were two and one-half times what they were in 1947 and stocks of oil burners five and one-half times. There are still shortages of cast-iron soil pipe, nails, cement, and steel, but as to these I have already pointed out the large-scale diversion of men and materials to nonessential construction.

The manpower situation has also improved very markedly, and no effective argument can be made of shortage of manpower in view of the large amount of nonresidential construction still going on. In 1947 the Congress took off the controls on commercial construction, and in 1948 on social and recreational construction as well. Tables bearing out these points follow at the end of these remarks. The uncontrolled building of such structures at a time of great

national emergency in housing can hardly be understood by any veteran who risked his life for his country during the war and who, 3 years after the war, is still living doubled up with relatives.

The T-E-W bill is also criticized because it will put the Government in the housing business to compete for scarce men and materials. But it will do nothing of the kind. It provides for only a maximum of 100,000 units of public housing per annum; this is 10 percent of present housing construction and would be 7½ percent of the construction expected under the T-E-W bill. That is the least which can be done to bring a share of the new housing within reach of those in the lower income brackets who need it most. T-E-W will reduce costs and accelerate private construction; it will not compete with it.

Second. Private industry is doing the job. Even if this were true, it is a fact that the housing produced is not within the price range, either for sale or rental, of those in the middle- and lower-income levels who need it most. The average price of a home around New York City is $13,000, veterans generally cannot pay more than $6,000. Housing starts in June 1948 decreased about 4 percent from those in May 1948. Not less than 30 percent of the housing construction in the country was done prior to March 31, 1948, under mortgage-insurance provided by title VI of the National Housing Act. It is freely predicted even by real-estate interests that 100,000 additional home units will be lost this year because title VI went out March 31, 1948, and it is estimated that total housing completions this year will not be much more than 900,000 units. In the face of an immediate demand from two to four million veterans living doubled up with relatives, an answer from the housing-construction industry is hardly business as usual.

Third. It is said that the T-E-W bill would be inflationary in its effect. This must be premised on the absolute expenditure involved. Commitments under the T-E-W bill are a maximum of $160,000,000 of subsidies per year with a total of $1,610,000,000 to $2,610,000,000 of insurance authorization, and $1,310,000,000 to $1,560,000,000 of revolving loan funds generally considered collectible; there is general agreement on the United States being committed for the insurance authorizations whether or not T-E-W passes. That leaves a maximum of $160,000,000 yearly in subsidies. There is no such outcry, however, as meets this expenditure for housing lower-income families, when it comes to aiding certain special interests. It is, therefore, interesting to compare the expressed fears of inflation due to a housing bill with the following appropriations made by the Eightieth Congress:

Rural electrification	$636,000,000
Soil conservation	203,000,000
AAA farm support program	265,500,000
Reclamation projects	156,000,000
Flood control, rivers and harbors	900,000,000
Federal aid to highway construction	1,147,000,000
Foreign aid and the ERP	7,000,000,000
Total	9,301,500,000

Certainly any expenditure at a time like this is inflationary. Yet any one of the great expenditures I have mentioned could certainly not rate superior to housing. The inflationary effect of the T-E-W bill, such as it is, is not the fault of housing but of our over-all general responsibilities. How can it be said to be inflationary to build permanent assets like homes as against farm support payments that will go in the banks as money where there is already plenty of money. Housing in order to meet a basic emergency is an elementary need of the American people, and certainly should not be discriminated against.

To sum up, first, the T-E-W bill remains the only comprehensive housing bill before the Congress. It is the only bill which to the country will mean a sustained long-range construction program to meet its housing needs, as well as a prompt start on a broad enough scale to really help in the housing emergency. Second, private industry is not doing, and cannot do, the job of meeting the emergency all by itself, and the worst thing which is happening to the private-construction industry in its effort to meet problems greater than its capabilities is the way in which it is earning public disapprobation—the housing industry ought to be out fighting for T-E-W. Finally, in a monetary sense, housing is no more inflationary than rural electrification, soil conservation, flood control, and aid to highway construction. It is at least as important, if not more so, than these activities. Nor can we say that anything is inflationary that adds to the real assets of America with the tangible values which are added by housing. The shortage of men and materials is an excuse, not a reason, for we are diverting a big part of the men and materials available for construction to nonresidential construction, including social and recreational. The T-E-W bill, promising a sustained production program of homes for 10 years at least, will naturally bring in its wake a great broadening of the production of construction materials and the entry of many thousands of additional workers into the industry because of the security and stability which it will afford. There is no substitute for the T-E-W bill and for the acceptance of national responsibility for the people's welfare which it implies.

TABLE 1.—*Value of new construction put in place, by type, first 6 months of 1947 and 1948*

[Millions of dollars]

Type of construction	First 6 months—		Percent change
	1948	1947	
Total new construction	$7,684	$5,677	+35.4
Total private	6,064	4,432	+36.8
Residential building (nonfarm)	3,100	1,935	+60.2
Nonresidential building (nonfarm)	1,651	1,504	+9.8
Social and recreational	80	38	+110.5
Industrial, commercial, and all other	1,571	1,466	+7.2
Farm construction	200	160	+25.0
Public utilities	1,113	833	+33.6
Total public	1,620	1,245	+30.1

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics and U. S. Department of Commerce.

TABLE 2.—*Production of construction materials, composite index, by month for the years 1946, 1947, 1948*

[1939 monthly average=100]

Month	Year		
	1946	1947	1948
January	89.5	124.6	131.5
February	87.2	124.0	121.5
March	109.1	132.7	140.3
April	120.4	138.2	142.9
May	125.3	141.2	145.7
June	129.2	139.7	
July	134.6	142.8	
August	147.9	147.6	
September	142.1	149.1	
October	150.8	159.0	
November	139.5	139.6	
December	125.9	136.5	

NOTE.—This composite index includes 20 materials.
Source: U. S. Department of Commerce.

TABLE 3.—*Building materials in short supply as reported by field offices of the Federal Housing Administration on September 1, 1947, and July 1, 1948*

Materials	Number of offices reporting shortages	
	As of Sept. 1, 1947	As of July 1, 1948
Gypsum products	41	31
Hardwood flooring	21	4
Millwork	32	14
Iron and steel pipe	29	23
Plumbing fixtures and material	32	16
Cast-iron soil pipe	14	+16
Nails	21	+23
Electrical products	10	2
Sheet metal	14	6
Felt	12	2
Wood siding	8	5
Finish lumber	8	3
Plywood	3	0
Hardware	4	1
Plaster and materials	8	2
Heating equipment	4	1
Cement	4	+7
Steel	4	+9
Other	23	21

Source: Federal Housing Administration.

TABLE 4.—*Labor causing construction delays because of short supply as reported by field offices of the Federal Housing Administration on September 1, 1947, and July 1, 1948*

Type of labor	Number of offices reporting shortages	
	As of Sept. 1, 1947	As of July 1, 1948
Bricklayers	39	30
Plasterers	30	23
Carpenters	17	6
Plumbers	15	10
Electricians	6	2
Painters	4	2
Other skilled labor	12	9
Common labor	5	3

Source: Federal Housing Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Changes in proportion of construction workers employed in private residential construction, by month, January through June 1948*

Month (1948)	Estimated number (in thousands)	Percent privately financed new residential construction
January	1,870.9	45.7
February	1,730.7	41.9
March	1,804.9	37.1
April	1,966.4	36.8
May	2,049.0	36.1
June	[1] 2,182.0	36.9

[1] Preliminary.
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. DONDERO]. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE PROBLEM OF RISING PRICES

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the president of the Retail Food Dealers' Association of California, who lives in Los Angeles and whose name is Mr. Fred A. Baughan, talked to me about certain aspects of the problem of rising prices. He made a trip through some 36 of the 48 States, always inquiring on the points I am about to put in the RECORD. He had gathered together, as a result of that trip, certain figures which I now give you in lump form. I thought they were interesting and that I should bring them to the attention of the Congress.

It is a very easy matter for us, or for our constituents, to say that prices have risen and to blame these rises upon one cause or another. It is a common trait that we should overlook one of the principal factors in the rising prices, and one that should not be overlooked. So I rise today to put into the RECORD these figures.

In 1942 the population of the United States was 134,664,924 people; in 1946, the last available date for which I have these figures, the population had risen to 141,228,693 people.

In the first of these 2 years which I am now comparing, the Federal Government collected in taxes $5,948,836,402, but 4 years later the Federal Government alone collected from the taxpayers of the United States $44,238,590,336.

We have a tendency again, in discussing taxes, to think only of the taxes imposed upon the people by the legislative body of which we are a part, the Congress of the United States. State and local taxes are paid by the same people who pay the rising costs of living.

In 1942 the actual amount of local and State taxes collected from the people was $9,665,000,000. In 1946 they had approximately doubled, to $17,500,000,000. This is the only figure in which any estimate has been necessary. The greater part of that figure is actual, but in order to provide it for all the States a very conservative estimate was made of a 75 percent increase, which was proven to be less than the increase in almost all the States available. For example, the increase in my own State is 400 percent. Therefore, when we take only 75 percent for the national average, that is, I think, conservative.

Thus the taxes collected per capita in 1942 were $116 per person; the taxes collected per capita 4 years later, and less than those collected now, were $438 per person, or four times the amount of the first figure.

I come now to consumer sales, which are the purchases by people who speak of their concern over the rising cost of living. That figure has not changed materially. The amount in 1942, exclusive of taxes, was $75,255,163,598, and the amount in 1946 was only $81,931,409,604. Thus, consumer purchases, exclusive of taxes, between the 4 years, increased only from $558.60 to $580.10 per person. I call this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that this is an increase in those 4 years in the actual cost of the things purchased themselves of only $21 per person in the United States. When, however, you include the taxes in the cost of consumer goods, the per capita cost on these consumer items rose from $674.50 to $1,017.20. Now, putting that into the simple language with which I think we must approach all of these problems of inflation and of rising costs, we should not try to provide complicated solutions for what seems to be complicated problems, but to provide the simple solutions which will eventually solve them with courage and cooperation from the people. What this means to us is that 43 percent of the present cost of living represents taxes; State, Federal, and local. We can do something about the expenditures of government.

I desire to add to this only the comment of my friend, Mr. Baughan, who prepared these figures. Turning for the moment to poetry, he says:

The high cost of living is only a joke:
It's the high cost of government which is keeping us broke.

Mr. Speaker, the figures, to which I referred above, are as follows:

	1942	1946
Population, Bureau of the Census	134,664,924	141,228,693
Federal taxes collected	$5,924,836,402.00	$44,238,590,336.00
State and local taxes collected	9,665,000,000.00	17,500,000,000.00
Total taxes collected	15,579,836,402.00	61,738,590,696.00
Tax collected per capita	116.00	438.00
Consumer sales ex tax	75,255,163,598.00	81,931,409,604.00
Consumer sales per capita	558.60	580.10
Consumer sales tax included	90,835,000,000.00	143,670,000,000.00
Per capita cost of Government and living	674.50	1,017.20

NOTE.—It is seen that consumer sales have increased only $21.50 per capita in 1946 over 1942, and is due to higher standards and greater purchasing power. Cost of living on the same standard is actually much lower. Taxes, on the other hand, representing the cost of government, have increased $321.40 per capita, and of course do not represent the increase in bonded debt of the many political subdivisions making up the governmental structure of these United States of America.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 12 minutes.

ONE CENTRAL LOYALTY AGENCY NECESSARY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the recent disclosures made by Congress by the admitted Communist, Mrs. Elizabeth T. Bentley, and the verification of these allegations by the former editor of the Daily Worker, Louis Budenz, and T. Whittaker Chambers, I feel it necessary to again call attention to one of the most shocking examples of the ineffectiveness of our Government security system.

Some time ago, I called attention to the fact that George Shaw Wheeler was employed by the War Department in the Allied military government in Berlin. It is not intended at this time to restate all of the now well-known facts regarding Mr. Wheeler's activities. However, for the benefit of those individuals who are still not entirely clear on Communist techniques and double talk, there are a few points which I should like to make for the record:

First. While George Shaw Wheeler is vigorously denying that he is disloyal, he does not state whether or not he is pro- or anti-Communist, pro- or anti-Soviet, or pro- or anti-American foreign policy with regard to the preservation of American principles in the war against communism. In fact, he does not state just what it is that he is not disloyal to.

Second. Mr. Wheeler states that the "Civil Service Commission held a full hearing on my loyalty and I was cleared." I now call upon the Civil Service Commission to furnish to Congress the complete record of the Wheeler case, showing the basis of that clearance and the names of those who used their influence to clear Mr. Wheeler, as well as the methods by which this was accomplished. As in the Remington case before the Ferguson committee, it will be interesting to determine from the record how these individuals accomplished the task of manipulating the appointments and clearances of their colleagues.

Third. In his letter printed in the Washington Post of July 9, 1948, Mr. Wheeler states that he got his job in Czechoslovakia from the National Socialist administration of the Ministry of Education, and not from the Communists. He states that he is lecturing in English to college students, in the field for which he is trained, "classical, liberal economics." He states, further, that "the Congressman assumes that my living in a country means that I approve of all that happens in it."

Few people doubt the impossibility of an American citizen's teaching American principles in a university which is under the domination of the Communists. Surely these lectures are sanctioned by the Communist leaders in such a country. The known techniques of the Russian police state make Mr. Wheeler's protestations that he is teaching the American viewpoint to students in a Russian-controlled state obviously false. It is apparent that Mr. Wheeler is teaching with the consent and guidance of the Soviet Government. In view of this, I am led to wonder about the nature of the "classical, liberal economics" which Mr. Wheeler disseminates in what he calls the American way.

In regard to Mr. Wheeler's statement that "the Congressman assumes that my living in a country means that I approve of all that happens in it," the best indication of his disapproval would be a condemnation of the Communist overthrow of the legally constituted government of Czechoslovakia. There is certainly no doubt in the minds of any loyal Americans regarding the conditions in Czechoslovakia, and if Mr. Wheeler cannot find strenuous criticism of the Soviet practices there, then there is little likelihood of his finding anything wrong with them anywhere.

More important than any single case of disloyalty to American principles by a Government employee, however, is the whole problem of the security clearance of Federal personnel. At the present time, there are many security and investigative offices, employing thousands of persons, at a cost of countless millions of dollars, all engaged in investigating employees and applicants for employment in the Federal service. In spite of the mountainous sum of money and load of persons engaged in the task, we have the repeated cases of the George Wheelers, the Remingtons, Silvermasters, and all the rest. This blundering overlapping and duplication of ineffectual investigative procedure must be done away with and replaced by a single, effective, speedy, and economical office which will clear all Federal personnel once, and thereafter merely bring the case up to date.

There is at present a constant reinvestigation of persons each time they move from one Government job to another.

A typical example of this "investigation by confusion" would be that of an individual whose chronological record of employment might be as follows: Having received his original appointment with the Treasury Department, his background would be investigated by that agency. Sometime later, upon transferring to the War Production Board, his background would be investigated by the Civil Service Commission. Seeking advancement, a transfer to the War Department would cause his background to be investigated by the Counterintelligence Corps. Pursuant to an Executive order, his position might be reallocated to the State Department where his background would be investigated by that agency. Upon enlistment in the Navy, his background would be investigated by the Office of Naval Intelligence. Resuming civilian employment, he is appointed to the Atomic Energy Commission and his background is investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. At this point, his background has been investigated six times. At no time has the information concerning his date and place of birth, education or former employment varied. Yet, ignoring the records already compiled, or believing them to be inadequate, Federal agents repeatedly criss-cross the entire country verifying facts and interviewing witnesses, which, when once accomplished should eliminate the need of repetitious verification.

I propose that all the existing governmental investigative records be consolidated and placed under the jurisdiction of one agency which will have the sole responsibility for clearing personnel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the spirit moves me, as a result of listening to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], to make a few observations, again—accent on "again"—before the end of this special session, which is very rapidly approaching in response to the wishes of the Republican leadership.

There are certain facts that the Republican Party cannot escape today and will not be able to escape during the next 3 months, and which the people should not be permitted to forget. One is that for 55 months prior to June 30, 1946, under the leadership of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, one of the greatest men of all time, and who will always be one of the greatest men of all time as long as mankind exists, the Democratic Party held the line against inflation. For 3½ years prior to June 30, 1946, during the war period, the over-all increase in the cost of living was 6.6 percent. Today the over-all increase in the cost of living since June 30, 1946, when price controls went off, is 40 percent. In other words, the cost of living during the last 2 years has increased nearly 7 times what it increased during the preceding 3½-year period. That is fact No. 1.

The second fact is that the Democratic Party enacted legislation that held the line. During the war we were shipping abroad more food for nonmilitary purposes than we have shipped abroad during the last 2 years, and we held the line. The argument that Government purchases are the cause of the increase in the cost of living in the light of that is entirely fallacious in itself. We had the courage to pass legislation in the interest of the people, and we held the line. We had great commitments during the war. We had to purchase and send abroad food for nonmilitary purposes during the war. If we include military purchases, and they were taken out of domestic consumption, the drain was many times greater during the war than it has been during the last 2 years. This includes the export of food, meat, and the other things our Government purchased.

Of course, where there are no controls and there are shortages of essential things that the people need, prices are going to increase, but the fact is during the war that there was effective price control and prices were not increased.

We had the illustration of speculation on the grain markets, that happened only after price control was taken off. There was no speculation during the war with price control on, because we kept the prices stationary. We held the line in the interest of the people. The speculator in wheat and in other commodities came in only after price controls were taken off. There was no such speculation while price controls were on. So the indisputable fact is that for 55 months the over-all increase under the Democratic administration under the leadership of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt was 21 percent, of which 6.6 percent during the last 3½ years of that 55 months, from the time the late Franklin D. Roosevelt issued the hold-the-line order, when the little-steel formula was put into operation in February, or about February, of 1943.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has mentioned wheat and speculation in wheat. I take it that he has mentioned it with reference to the price of wheat and the effect on the price of wheat.

I have here the paper from my home town in Indiana. On the front page there is a statement from the county agricultural conservation committee pointing out the support-price program and how the farmers may avail themselves of it.

It goes on to say that the support price in my home county on wheat is $2.14 a bushel.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask the gentleman whether he voted for the support-price program?

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will let me conclude. On the last page of the paper is the market quotation furnished by the Farm Bureau Cooperative on wheat. It is $2.02 a bushel. In other words, as of today, wheat in Indiana is going into the market from the farms at a price 12 cents below the support price, which as the gentleman knows, is 90 percent of parity.

I might say in respect to the support-price program that I voted for it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman's last observation certainly defeats any purpose that he had in making his inquiry of me, so far as the support-price program being put through under a Democratic administration when the gentleman himself voted for it.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Massachusetts apparently completely misinterprets what I have in mind. I simply want to point out that wheat which is one of the basic crops and probably along with corn, the most important factor affecting meat prices, dairy prices, and poultry prices, as well as the cereals that we eat directly, is reaching the point where the supply is catching up with the demand so that the cash price to the farmer is 12 cents below the support price which is 90 percent of parity.

I might point also, because I think it is significant although I am not professing to see the whole high-price situation cleared up by itself overnight, because I know better than that, but I might point out that the support price on oats which is another important factor in the cast-of-living index is 72 cents per bushel, and the farmer is getting 63 cents for oats in Indiana today.

Mr. McCORMACK. The fact remains that the over-all increase in the cost of living during the last 2 years is 40 percent higher than it was on June 30, 1946.

I will yield to anyone on the floor to deny that statement.

So far as the price of meat is concerned, it is 60 percent to 80 percent higher as well as being higher with reference to other foods. But I am taking

the over-all figures, including clothing, rent, and everything else. It is 40 percent higher than it was 2 years ago, or a little over 2 years ago when price controls were on.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], because I happened to refer to him.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I am honored that he should have thought it necessary to say something when I simply pointed out the fact that Government spending amounted to 43 percent of the cost of living.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will come to that. The gentleman himself voted for that Government spending, did he not? You voted for the present budget appropriation?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman probably overlooked the fact that we are now spending less than we are taking in.

Mr. McCORMACK. Are we?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I mean, are we spending less than we did before?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. We are spending less than we are taking in.

Mr. McCORMACK. That may be true, but that is no credit to the gentleman's party. That is due to the increase in income taxes and increase of revenues from all sources.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I do not understand what the gentleman is objecting to. Is the gentleman objecting to the money spent for national governmental expenses? However, I want to say that that is not what I wanted to talk to the gentleman about.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is talking about Government expenses.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. You are talking about Government expenditures.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; you are. I have not come to that, yet.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. All right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had not come to that subject yet. You were talking about it. You voted for the appropriation?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. And you voted for the wartime appropriations, did you not?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Some of them, but not all of them.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman voted for all these Government appropriations which were made, and which are now claimed as one of the main contributing factors in this inflation.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. No.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thought you did. What I wanted to say to the gentleman seriously is that he is perpetuating, I think unintentionally, that incorrect idea that the OPA prices, that is, the prices limited arbitrarily, actually represented the prices at which people were buying the things they had to buy—consumer things; forgetting that the OPA had created the greatest black market this Nation has ever had, and that while the OPA had some very fine and beautiful ideas——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. DONDERO]. There are other special orders, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman be given some extra time, with the consent of the people who have special orders.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be glad to yield and take my time later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman sees my point. There is no use talking about controlled prices when you cannot buy things at that price.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will agree there was a bad black market, but anybody who was caught would be punished and jailed; but what about the gray market that exists now? What about the legalized robbery that is going on? Take automobiles, for instance. Try to buy an automobile, and note the prices of second-hand automobiles.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I never believed that two wrongs made a right.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are people highjacking on steel with their inside connections. We know what the situation is. We have a gray market. I call it a red market, because gray is a nice looking color and we like to look at it. If you and I are gouged in buying an automobile, or we have got to pay two or three hundred dollars a ton for steel in some small business, when we should be able to buy it for $90 or $100, we are not seeing gray. We are seeing red. So I call it a red market.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I agree with the gentleman. I think that kind of gouging is just as bad as for the Government to gouge, or anybody else. But I do wish the gentleman would answer what I said about people being unable to buy for that price, because that is serious. You see, here is the Government subsidizing the people, taking the money out of the taxpayer's pockets to pay for something that other people buy, and then they had to go to the black market to get those things.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I will agree that the subsidy should be included; but, including that, it would be only a minor part of the sharp increase that has taken place during the past 2 years. No one could say that the payment of subsidies which were made should not indirectly be charged up as a part of the cost. To undertake to say that is not so would, in my opinion, be a violation of intellectual honesty. But, including that, it would not be a very important factor. It certainly would not amount to the 40 percent over-all increase in the cost of living. It might amount to about 3 percent on the prices at that time, or 5 percent at the outside.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Regardless of how the Republicans may try to explain this inflationary condition that has occurred, the fact remains that in my district 2 years ago factory workers had bank savings accounts; they had War Savings bonds; they had money in their pockets and money in the bank. Two years later, 2 years after the Republicans took control of Congress, my people have no money in their pockets, no money in the bank, and they have no more war bonds. They have cashed everything. It took all of their savings in addition to their salaries in order to live, since the Republicans took over the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, let me give an illustration of some prices under OPA, lest we forget:

Porterhouse steak: In stores other than chain stores with annual gross sales under $250,000, AA or Choice, 55 cents a pound; A or Good, 51; B grade, 44; C grade, 37 cents a pound; D grade, 33.

Chain stores and all stores with annual gross sales over $250,000; AA or Choice porterhouse steak, 53 cents a pound: A or Good, 49; B grade, 42; C grade, 36; D grade, 32 cents a pound.

Here is a whole book of all the prices that a friend of mine very kindly sent to me, and it brings back fond memories of bygone days that would still exist if it were not for the Republican Party.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very much interested in the very factual recital of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts. I was also interested very much in his plea to the Republican leadership for an extra 20 minutes of the Congress' time to consider this tremendous problem of inflation, which was denied to him by the Speaker of the House himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was denied. Leave it that way.

Mr. MONRONEY. However, the gentleman was denied the right to put the request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Leave it that it was denied. We did not get the extra time.

Mr. MONRONEY. All right, leave it that way. But the fact is that here we are, 12 minutes after 3 p. m., with, I believe, 26 Members on the floor, listening to special orders.

Mr. McCORMACK. In justice to the Speaker, I know he wanted to give it but it was denied, so we did not get the 20 minutes. As a matter of fact we ought to have had a couple of hours.

Mr. MONRONEY. And here at 3 o'clock in the afternoon we have no legislative business before us. So we perhaps could have found some time adequately to discuss the problem of inflation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Plenty of time. And even worse than that, there was no opportunity to offer amendment, and they did not give to the minority even the customary right of offering a motion to recommit to get itself on record.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Wisconsin is a pretty progressive man. I hope the gentleman will ask me no question on which I may have to take issue with him.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am seeking enlightenment from the gentleman from Massachusetts. I listened with great interest to the prices of meat, particularly, and other things back in the days when they were much lower than they are today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Back in the sweet days.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I understand that this year we have prospects of bumper crops not only in this country but things look pretty good in Europe along that line too, comparatively.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us all hope it is there. We know it is here.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. We all know we certainly need everything Providence can give us there. What I understood was——

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not started my speech, you know.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. The Department of Agriculture recommended as a target to aim at for 1949 a cutting of breeding cattle by half a million head and cutting wheat acreage by 8 percent. I am wondering if that is not a reversion to the plowing-under policy, an attempt to keep the supply down and the price up; and I am just wondering what explanation the Secretary of Agriculture may have for it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Assuming the gentleman's premises are correct, I will say frankly I am unable to answer. Certainly the gentleman would not say that this administration is trying to keep prices up. Whatever the reason is it is not that. I assume the gentleman's premises are correct. Of the facts involved in his inquiry I have no knowledge.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am quoting from a release made by the office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly it would not be to keep prices up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 5 minutes allotted me today may be used tomorrow afternoon after any previous special orders, rather than this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, President Truman called Congress back into session to enact a legislative program in the interests of the American people. Two of the most important pieces of legislation the President asked for were legislation to control inflation and passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill to provide homes for the homeless and for slum clearance.

It is now abundantly clear that this Republican Congress has no intention of taking the necessary steps to check inflation and save the consumer and business from the depression toward which we are surely headed.

It is also now abundantly clear that the Republican leadership in Congress will not permit the passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill in this special session of Congress—or in the next Congress if they are again in control.

They spend these precious days trying to justify their failure to act—their refusal to legislate in the interests of the people whom they are privileged to represent.

No amount of phony excuses can obscure the facts for the American people. Inflation is producing higher and higher profits for a few and a steadily lowered standard of living for the many. The high and rising prices that inflation represents has decreased the buying power of the wage earner and all those living on fixed incomes, with the result that millions of families today are not able to balance their budgets. They are using up their savings and going into debt.

People are being priced out of the consumer market.

This is the stuff out of which depressions are made. If this is allowed to continue, and it is in fact accelerating, our entire economy will come tumbling down about our ears.

It is this depression that the President has asked us to prevent. And that is the job of this Congress.

Prices, wages, and profits have gotten hopelessly out of line. We must reestablish a balance or suffer the consequences. Those consequences involve not only the immediate happiness and well-being of the American people but world-wide economic stability and peace.

The American people cannot use Republican excuses to pay their grocery bills.

If indeed the President has, as some Republican Members claim, the power to control prices without Congress having to pass any additional legislation, it is up to this Congress to protect the American people by staying in session and seeing to it that the President uses these powers to which they vaguely refer. If, in fact, he had such power and did not use it, he ought to be impeached.

But this nonsense of claiming that the President has powers to control inflation is a phony excuse for doing nothing, and they know it.

Or if the commodity-support program is the cause of high prices, as some Republican Congressmen claim, why does not the Republican leadership bring in a bill to reduce commodity price supports or to do away with the program altogether?

They do not because they know this is a phony argument—an argument which they are preparing for use in the next few months to corral a few votes in the cities, being careful, of course, not to use it among the farmers.

If foreign aid is the basic cause of high prices as some Republicans in Congress claim, why does not the Republican leadership bring in a bill to cut off all foreign aid—stop all exports?

They don't because they know this is the phoniest argument of all. They will use it all the same to avoid talking about their failure to check inflation.

But I do not today wish to discuss the high cost of living but to answer the speech made by the distinguished Republican from Illinois which was made over the radio July 29, 1948, and in the House of Representatives on July 30. His speech was a series of trumped-up excuses to dish out to the American people in the coming campaign for the Republican's failure to pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

Why is this carefully prepared set of excuses being built up?

Because there are at least 3,000,000 families without homes, many of whose members will vote in November.

How are these people living? They are doubling up with friends and relatives and strangers so that more than 6,000,000 families are living in cramped and demoralizing circumstances. Every year there are at least 400,000 new families with no place to go to establish their homes. They must also double up with other families or live in trailer camps, garages or other make-shift accommodations. They, too, must be told why the Republican leadership is keeping them in these conditions. They too have votes.

The Republican leadership in this special session of Congress does not have the courage to sit down and meet the housing problem squarely, and then—they are so terribly busy working out ways and means to play politics, to flimflam the American people, to get votes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have the spectacle and the country has the spectacle of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill passing the Senate, which bill deals with slum clearance, public housing, low-cost housing, and rural housing. The leadership of this body says that is socialistic, and yet the Republican Party put it into their platform only a few weeks ago in Philadelphia. They come out for slum clearance and low-cost public housing in their platform.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows very well that when the Republicans pass legislation to help the higher-income brackets, that that is free enterprise, but when the Democrats try to help those in the low-income brackets that is socialistic.

The American people are pleading for action on housing, and they are getting speeches instead. No wonder the American people have lost confidence in the Eightieth Congress.

I take it that the speech by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] before this body and on the radio is the last word of the Republican leadership on the T-E-W bill, not only for

this session but in any other session in which they control the majority vote. I am surprised at the stand of the gentleman from Illinois on this matter—after his championship of the people on so many scores, and after his close working relationship with those who believe in the rights of the people.

I find the gentleman's remarks on housing especially unbelievable, but then he is a good soldier and I suppose he is only coming to the rescue of his party.

The gentleman from Illinois seeks to leave the impression that if we will just leave private industry alone, there will be all the houses the American people need and anyway the need isn't very great; a need upon which no two authorities can agree.

The gentleman from Illinois implies that Government does more harm than good when it concerns itself with housing. Was not the biggest housing production in the 20's when the building industry was left alone? In the 30's the Government invested $20,000,000,000 in housing and what did that produce? To show how ineffective the Federal Government is in this field, the gentleman from Illinois makes fun of the Wyatt program and says that it was only after we got rid of it that we got any housing. In other words, he tries to leave the impression that if we pass the T-E-W housing bill, we won't build any houses, and even if the T-E-W bill were desirable—this is not the time to pass it, for it would increase inflation. That is the climax of the argument—the grand climax—and here the gentleman from Illinois seeks to leave the impression that the administration is sadly remiss in even asking for the passage of the T-E-W bill at this time. Therefore, the gentleman from Illinois and the Republican Party are protecting the American people in preventing the passage of the T-E-W bill. And the American people ought to stand up next November and say, "Well done."

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is an intelligent man and a very skillful orator and he is very often right. But he is not serving the American people when he seeks to excuse the Republican Party for blocking the passage of the T-E-W housing bill and no amount of skill can cover up the facts for the American people. Six million families who find themselves living doubled up cannot be satisfied with speeches or excuses. The 5,000,000 families living in slums will not be impressed with his arguments.

IS THE TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL INFLATIONARY?

The gentleman from Illinois claims that he is opposed to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill because it is inflationary. This is the latest argument in a long and devious line of arguments of those who have consistently opposed slum-clearance, low-cost housing, and low-cost public housing.

It ill becomes the party that does not believe in controls—the party that stands by while profits continue to mount and the standard of living of the vast majority of the American people steadily drops—to come up now with this inflation argument.

Remember it is the Republican Party which has cut the taxes of the rich and the profiteers to such a degree that there now appears to be no money to pay off our World War II debt.

The Republican Party does not seem to be concerned over this inflationary pressure or they would reimpose the excess-profits tax as the President has asked them to do. No, they only wring their hands over inflation when it comes to building houses for the homeless.

Not to pass the T-E-W housing bill is the most inflationary action this Congress can take in the field of housing.

Four hundred thousand new families add to the demands for housing every year in a market where 3,000,000 families are already on the waiting list—and 5,000,000 city families are buried in the slums—not to speak of farm families.

The opponents of the T-E-W bill do not want a large production at low prices. They want a limited production at high prices.

We must fight inflation blow by blow where it counts. This aimless milling around must stop. We cannot legislate ourselves back to the good old days even if we could agree on what period we would be willing to call the good old days. We must rather seek out and cure maladjustments in our economy, in prices, in incomes and production, using a scalpel instead of a cleaver. That is the only way we can discharge our responsibility for the security and well-being of our country and the people in it.

Inflation, like its twin, depression, does not mete out even-handed justice to all alike. The burdens these twin dangers impose upon our people are felt more heavily by those who can least afford to bear them. The problem of meeting the needs of those who are suffering from the effects of inflation must be faced as squarely as we face the problems of meeting the needs of depression victims by relief where relief is needed. That means providing price relief to the consumer at the lower levels, building up production of the things needed at those levels and in every other possible way remedying the maladjustments in the price and income level that the current inflationary spiral is intensifying.

High prices alone are not the problem: If wages and income and prices mounted evenly across the board for everybody we would merely be using dollar bills for pennies. The fact is that, relatively, prices for some things, particularly foods, are rising more rapidly than the incomes of the people that need them. And the prices of certain manufactures, such as steel, are rising more rapidly than can be supported by sustained demand. In brief, the maladjustment of wages, prices, and profits, rather than their levels, are the basis of our problem, and these maladjustments are now threatening the security of the vast majority of our people.

The remedy is not to label all consumption inflationary or assume that any production is equally effective as a cure for inflation.

We need not concern ourselves with the price of breast of guinea hen, but we must be concerned with the price of stew meat.

We must not seek to step up production of $30,000 homes to relieve a housing shortage for people who make $3,000 a year.

We need price control where it counts, and we need production of those things that the great majority of the people need. We must not mistake full employment for healthy prosperity if that employment is not productive of the needs of the people. Full employment in the time of the Pharaohs produced coffins for kings but not peace and security for people. And full employment here in America today if it is confined to making luxuries for the few instead of necessities for the many will prove equally meaningless for the people.

Full employment of all construction workers on houses for inflation's profiteers would aggravate, not cure our difficulties. Those workers and materials are needed to solve the housing shortage of our lower-income groups, our veterans and other younger people who have no homes and who cannot get them at present prices. The T-E-W bill, which will put people to work on the housing problem where it will do the most good, is therefore a bill for fighting inflation through production—production where production counts.

The gentleman from Illinois in opposing the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill on the basis that it is inflationary quotes Mr. Marriner Eccles, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the former Chairman of that Board.

It is interesting to note in passing that Mr. Marriner Eccles is a New Deal appointee, and of course we remember that the gentleman from Illinois is a Republican.

In interpreting Mr. Eccles' remarks before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Illinois is about as accurate as Republicans usually are when they try to interpret New Deal Democrats.

Mr. Eccles said:

> Congress is currently considering the continuance of easy mortgage credit for housing. Easy mortgage credit is one of the most inflationary factors in the domestic credit picture. * * *. The housing shortage cannot be overcome by increasing the competitive pressures on scarce supplies of materials and manpower. They are the limiting factors on the volume of construction.

I agree with Mr. Eccles 100 percent but I would point out to the gentleman from Illinois that if Congress would enact the allocations, priorities, and price-control program the President has asked for, competitive pressures on scarce supplies of materials and manpower would be regulated in the widest interests of the American people and would serve those who need to be served most.

In a letter which Mr. Eccles sent to the Banking and Currency Committee on April 5, 1948, on the subject of the

Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, he had this to say:

The Board is particularly concerned about three proposals contained in these bills: First, creation of a Government-financed secondary market for mortgages already underwritten by the Government; second, continuation of the undesirable mortgage-insurance program under title VI of the National Housing Act; and third, addition to title II of the National Housing Act of a permanent program of excessively easy mortgage credit.

The gentleman from Illinois and the Republican majority in the House of Representatives voted for and passed in this session of Congress those very parts of the T-E-W bill to which Mr. Eccles objected. They voted for each and every one of the proposals Mr. Eccles said were inflationary.

The gentleman from Illinois voted for a secondary-market provision which was passed by the Republican House of Representatives in H. R. 6959 and S. 2790. Indeed, the secondary-market plan adopted in the latter bill contains none of the anti-inflationary limitations which were proposed in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

The gentleman from Illinois voted for the continuation of title VI of the National Housing Act, which was passed by the Republican-controlled House of Representatives as a part of H. R. 6959. Apparently he was not afraid of inflation when he voted for title VI a short few weeks ago.

Finally, the Republican House of Representatives, presumably including the gentleman from Illinois, voted for and passed a provision for 95-percent mortgages under title II of the National Housing Act, which Mr. Eccles opposed as inflationary. This was passed by the House as a part of S. 2790. Thus, it appears that each of the provisions which the gentleman from Illinois claims he opposes because they are inflationary have been voted by the gentleman from Illinois and his colleagues.

They have voted for those parts of the housing program that Mr. Eccles opposed as inflationary but are objecting to that part of the program he did not consider to be inflationary—slum clearance and low-cost public housing—as indeed they are not.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System did not oppose slum clearance, and they did not oppose low-rent public housing. Indeed, they could not raise such objections because the public-housing program provides low rents and does not involve inflationary expansion of bank credit.

The facts are that the Republican majority in the House of Representatives has bowed to every demand of the real-estate lobby and the construction industry, but it is unwilling to adopt the noninflationary public-housing program which would provide homes for the homeless and take 5,000,000 families from out of the slums.

Before leaving this subject of inflationary pressures, I would like to point out that a majority of the Senate, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the House Banking and Currency Committee have felt that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill should be adopted.

Inflationary pressures result from an excess of demand over supply. We can never meet the demand for housing unless we increase production of houses people can afford to live in. Only by building houses, more than 1,500,000 houses a year, for a period of years, will we meet the inflationary demand for housing. The longer we defer construction, the longer we continue inflationary pressures. Those who support the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill hold to the view that the best way to meet inflation in the housing field is to increase production and keep housing production at high levels.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield for a suggestion?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would be interested in hearing the gentlewoman discuss the materials out of which the homes will be built. That is one of the points that has been raised about the housing problem, the lack of materials available for building houses.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. We can go into that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield there?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentlewoman will remember that last year the Republicans voted to lift controls off of materials on amusement places. Under the Democrats we were not letting these big firms go out and build every kind of building they wanted whether it was necessary or not. We were channeling materials into the building of homes. The Republicans lifted those controls completely and the result is that there is much more construction in dollar volume of buildings that could very well wait until the future, more dollar volume of such construction than there is in the construction of homes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Exactly. Amusement centers, movie houses, pool rooms, night clubs, office buildings, luxury hotels are all competing with home building for building materials.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield to anyone—I am sorry, but I want to get along. I want now to take up the question of past expenditures for housing.

PAST EXPENDITURES FOR HOUSING

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said that since 1932 we have committed or expended or incurred liabilities in the field of housing activities of more than $20,000,000,000. Now this is certainly an impressive figure when viewed from a distance, but like many pictures painted on a very large canvas, if we stand close to it its defects become obvious to the eye.

If you got the impression, as you probably did, that the Government has spent or contracted to spend $20,000,000,000, you have been misinformed and misled. Let us take a look at some of the items that have been added together to produce this total:

First, money the Government has actually spent;

Second, money which the Government has loaned, which will be repaid with interest;

Third, money which the Government has loaned which has already been repaid;

Fourth, money which private individuals have borrowed from private banks on mortgages to buy or build homes, under the protection of a Government guaranty. This is the FHA—a $9,000,000,000 program under which not 1 penny has been spent.

Fifth, money which private individuals have not yet borrowed for these purposes, but may borrow at some future time and seek to have insured under existing law; and

Sixth, as if these were not enough, a billion dollars of such insurance authorization of which not a single penny has been used or can be used at the present time.

You do not have to be a financial expert to know that a total made up by adding amounts like these is as meaningless as adding up the numbers on a page of your telephone book.

Here are the facts as published by the Special Joint Committee on Housing, in House Document 1564, part 2:

First. The total amount actually spent from money appropriated out of the Treasury for the housing programs from 1932 through June 30, 1947, was about $2,600,000,000, $1,800,000,000 of which was for war housing.

Second. Of all of these programs, not a single one is operating at a net loss or cost to the Government except those which were specifically intended by the Congress to operate in that way—such as the war housing program, which was as much a war expenditure as the purchase of tanks or ammunition.

Third. The various insurance programs—which account for half of this imposing $20,000,000,000 figure—far from operating at a loss, are building up substantial reserves out of their income. For example, FHA has now written more than $12,000,000,000 insurance, and hundreds of thousands of families have benefited from its program. Its net insurance payments have been a small fraction of 1 percent, and out of its income reserves have been built up which total more than $175,000,000.

So much for Mr. DIRKSEN'S $20,000,000,000 bogeyman which he arrived at by adding together all of the contingent liabilities in addition to actual expenditures of the Federal Government in housing. This $20,000,000,000 cost would only have had to have been paid by the taxpayer if the entire economy of the country had collapsed. Thanks to the Democrats it did not.

It is hardly cricket to leave the impression with the American people that housing from 1932 to 1947 has cost them $20,000,000,000.

One of the programs in which the taxpayer invested in the thirties and which bailed out 1,000,000 distressed home owners in America was the home owners' loan program instituted by the Democratic administration in the thirties and

budgeted in Mr. DIRKSEN's $20,000,000,000. The liquidation of the program is being completed without loss to the taxpayer.

THE WYATT PLAN

In 1946 a Democratic Congress created the Office of the Housing Expediter. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] correctly states, Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the former mayor of Louisville, was called to Washington by President Truman to fill this post.

The gentleman from Illinois in his criticism of the Wyatt program, tried to imply that Mr. Wyatt stopped, rather than gave impetus to building activity.

But the record is clearly the opposite.

Mr. Wyatt breathed life into the construction industry. Because of his program we witnessed the greatest short-time expansion of home building in our Nation's history. Because of the stimulus he gave to the production of building materials we were able to build in 1947 the number of homes to which the gentleman from Illinois now points.

The end of World War II found this country facing a housing shortage of unparalleled magnitude. Careful study of the situation after VJ-day indicated that during the next few years, solely to meet the emergency needs of veterans, a minimum of some 3,000,000 homes would be needed. This did not take into account the volume of need for housing, apart from the problems of veterans.

Mr. Wyatt came to Washington early in January 1946. During his first month here he consulted with more than 30 major national groups, including home builders and real estate groups, veterans' organizations, the Chamber of Commerce, National Conference of Mayors, the A. F. of L., the CIO, the Producers Council. The emergency program he recommended early in February was based on his discussions with these groups.

The program as it finally emerged later in 1946 was basically a private enterprise program operating under various Government controls and stimuli. Except for 200,000 units of temporary housing involving reuse of surplus war structures, the program did not involve any powers to build houses as such. Its major objectives were:

First. To stimulate production of building materials.

Second. To assure that housing received a proportionate share of such increased material production.

Third. To insure that veterans got the benefits of these actions.

The accomplishment of these objectives depended on use of various controls of a wartime nature, including priority measures and price control adjustments while demand and supply were brought into balance. Reinstitution of limitations on nonhousing construction was an important part of the program to prevent the gobbling of materials by nonresidential construction. Also, emergency financing measures with liberal Government mortgage aid were included to provide ready sources of credit for the home seeking veteran as well as production credit for private builders.

Mr. Wyatt's plans were based on an awareness of the complicated nature of the emergency problems in housing, and a realization of the fact that drastic and emergency measures would be necessary to overcome them.

The program only remained in existence for a little over 5 months, rather than the 2 years originally proposed. Yet, despite this, the actions taken under it were of major importance in the rapid postwar recovery of the home-building industry.

THE WYATT PROGRAM EXCEEDED PREDICTIONS AS TO HOME-BUILDING PRODUCTION IN THE POSTWAR PERIOD

Despite a general acceptance of the fact that between one and one and a half million new homes would be needed annually for at least 10 years, and despite the emergency needs of the 14,000,000 demobilized veterans, spokesmen for the home-building industry and construction experts were not optimistic in late 1945 regarding the number of units which might be started in the early postwar period.

In November 1945 Joseph E. Merrion, of the National Association of Homebuilders, indicated that the best the industry could hope for during the coming year was to start 500,000 units.

Herbert U. Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards was quoted in the Washington Post on November 5, 1945 to the effect that "Present prospects for production in 1946 do not exceed 400,000 units." At about the same time the F. W. Dodge Corp.'s Bulletin, Construction in 1946, contained a forecast that "total residential building in the entire United States is apt to approximate 325,000 units in 1946."

The Veterans' Emergency Housing Program refused to accept these gloomy forecasts and reflected a much greater confidence in the American productive system. It set a goal of starting 1,200,000 units in 1946, about one-fifth of them to be temporary units and trailers. The idea of establishing goals was similar to the wartime practice of using goals as production incentives. Thus the goal for 1946 was deliberately set at a far higher figure than the then existing estimates of homebuilding industry's productive capacity and the potential building materials supply. The goal for conventionally built housing was not high in comparison with peak output of the twenties. And in the 20 intervening years, the general advance of American technology, of labor productivity and of housing need would not appear to make these housing goals excessive. Actually the homebuilding industry had not made technological changes and improvements in productivity comparable with other industries such as manufacturing or mining. Moreover materials production was at a very low level in 1945. But the program placed major emphasis on measures to increase materials production and it was hoped that the establishment of a high housing goal would in itself act as a powerful stimulant to production.

Results of the Wyatt program:

A. HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

The period during which the VEHP was in existence witnessed the greatest short-time expansion in home building in our Nation's history. The number of new privately financed permanent homes started in 1946—662,500—was the highest for any year since the record years of the 1920's. The last full year before our entry in World War II, 1941, a year of better-than-average home building saw only 619,000 such privately financed units started, as well as 96,000 publicly financed; the year during which World War II ended saw only 207,000 such started. The largest number of units ever started in 1 year was 937,000 in 1925.

In addition to the 662,500 privately financed new permanent homes started in 1946, there were approximately one-third of a million housing units of other types, including temporaries, trailers, and conversions, to bring the total number of starts during the year to about a million units of all types. It should be noted that it took 6 years after the end of World War I to achieve the 1925 record pace, and the 1946 achievement occurred in the first full year after the war ended. This compares with the first full year after World War I—1919—when a total of 405,000 units were started; the next year, 1920, the volume fell sharply to 207,000 as rising costs priced housing out of the market. That is what is going to happen again, let me say to the Republicans, unless this Congress passes legislation to control run-away prices, and passes a long-range, sensible housing program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Despite the low level of construction in early 1946, and the smaller number of homes started in 1945 and completed in 1946, 1946 saw the completion of 642,000 units, two-thirds of them new permanent structures.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] certainly left clearly with me the impression that in 1946 there were only starts in housing. He says you cannot live in starts. Everybody agrees you cannot live in starts, but we see that houses were completed in 1946 and that the record was very acceptable.

Statistics for 1946 reveal that home starts met or came close to meeting the original program goals for each segment of the program except for prefabricated housing, and the extent by which the 1946 starts fell short of the Wyatt goal is a measure of the extent to which industrialized housing did not come up to expectations.

Despite major changes in the program by the end of 1946, the beneficial results of many of the actions taken persisted and will have permanently useful effects. The measures taken to aid in rehabilitating the building materials industries through plant rehabilitation, aiding new factories to open and aiding in reopening closed factories are showing their results

even now in the continued high output of many materials.

Also the construction limitation order continued in effect from March 26, 1946, until June 30, 1947, during which period $2,400,000,000 in commercial construction was denied approval.

Just think how few houses we would have had if the Republicans had had their way and there had been no check on commercial construction. In fact, I think one of the reasons the Republicans attacked the Wyatt program so vigorously, was just that there was a check on commercial construction. If this action had not been taken there is little doubt but that commercial construction during the postwar years would have preempted a much larger share of the available materials and left less for housing, as indeed it was already doing in the period from VJ-day until the construction limitation order was issued 8 months later.

With the aid of the recovery in homebuilding achieved during 1946, and the monumentum achieved by year's end, homebuilding in 1947 proceeded at an even more rapid rate. Of vital assistance to this achievement was the continuing high level of material production, and the continuing availability of liberal Government financial assistance through the FHA title VI as well as the GI home loan program.

In 1947, 835,000 homes were completed; 370,200 of these homes were started in 1946 during the Wyatt program. There were 849,000 starts in 1947—of these only 92,000 were rentals. Anyone who knows what people are looking for realizes what this means.

If it had not been for the Wyatt program we would be building only the small number of houses today the building industry predicted we could or would build.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] left the impression that the money spent in the Wyatt program—$400,000,000, was wasted. This money was used for premium payments to industry to increase the production of building materials. The gentleman from Illinois is not the only one who knows that houses have to be built out of materials.

B. MATERIALS PRODUCTION

A truly significant aspect of the short-lived Wyatt program was the remarkable accomplishment in improving materials production. The Department of Commerce Composite Index of Building Materials Production shows total 1946 production was 40 percent higher than 1945 with production rates in late 1946 at or close to all-time highs for many materials. These unprecedented production increases, achieved under extremely adverse conditions in the reconversion period are a tribute to and an example of the effective cooperation of industry, labor, and the Government in meeting a critical national problem through the leadership of Mr. Wyatt as Housing Expediter.

Most building materials industries emerged after VJ-day as casualties of a war economy. Their normal markets had been cut off many months before by necessary wartime restrictions on nonessential construction; wherever possible their productive capacities had been diverted to war production. Where this had not happened they had lost workers to war industries as well as to the armed forces and had been shorn of raw materials and new equipment as well as their usual markets.

For example: Production of clay brick had averaged 4,200,000,000 brick from 1937 to 1940. Brick was considered of little importance in military and temporary wartime construction. Production fell steadily during the war years; output in 1945 was 2,300,000,000, and stocks had fallen to a fifth of the traditional level of a billion bricks. Many of the plants which had remained open were badly depreciated, needing new equipment; many of the closed plants were obsolete. About 350 out of 800 brick plants were closed.

The problem was chiefly one of bringing back closed plants into production and of accelerating the rehabilitation and mechanization of plants that were operating, expanding their capacity, hiring and training additional workers, and encouraging overtime work.

Aid was given the industry through priorities in obtaining new equipment, aid in recruiting and training labor, price increases under the OPA, and a premium payment plan for extra brick production.

Results were obvious by mid-1946. Some 120 closed plants were reopened in 1946 and a number of new plants brought into production. Total output for 1946 was 4,860,000,000 brick, the best year in the industry since 1930, with the exception of 1941 when production slightly exceeded that for 1946. By year's end production on an over-all basis was believed to be adequate in relation to demand.

There are other equally dramatic stories of production increases, all of them the result of an enormous amount of work and effective cooperation on the part of industry, labor, and government under the leadership provided by the veterans' housing program.

For many materials impressive records were achieved. By late 1946, monthly production rates were at an all-time high for some, such as gypsum board and lath, asphalt roofing, some plumbing fixtures, and housing-type radiation. Others, such as lumber, nails, brick, and structural clay products, were at near record monthly levels by this time.

THE OPA COOPERATED WITH WYATT ON PRICE CHANGES

Between VJ-day and the end of price control in November 1946 OPA made about 500 industry-wide or area-wide price ceiling adjustments with respect to building materials and their components as well as some thousands of individual adjustments for specific producers. In many cases OPA proceeded in accordance with its normal pricing standards, particularly in increases required to meet increased production costs. In many instances, the actions were initiated by Mr. Wyatt's recommendations. Price changes on building materials were necessary for three general purposes:

First. To lift price restrictions imposed during the war as a means of holding production for civilian use to minimum levels—as in the case of gypsum lath and housing grades of plywood. Ceilings on these were set at low levels to prevent diversion of manufacturing facilities needed for producing wartime items.

Second. To absorb increases in production costs as with clay products and millwork.

Third. To make low end items sufficiently profitable to justify unusual increases in output as in the case of nails, builders hardware, and electrical wiring devices.

Mr. Wyatt specifically included authority to recommend such prices as part of his original program in the full knowledge that such adjustments would be necessary in the process of reconverting the building materials industry.

HOUSING DESIGN STANDARDS AND METHODS WERE LOCALLY APPROVED

From the beginning it was required that all applications for permits to build and to use priorities to obtain materials which were being specially set aside for veterans' housing, meet certain minimum standards similar to those used by the FHA. All applications were, however, locally reviewed in local FHA offices and not in Washington. The minimum standards were designed to assure that veterans would not be cheated, and they were standards presumably acceptable to the home-building industry since they were similar to those used by FHA in approving applications for mortgage insurance.

The only new designs and methods that had to be approved in Washington were those relating to industrialized housing, and then only in cases in which manufacturers had requested a guaranteed market or a Government loan. Other than such cases, the requests were handled in local FHA offices.

It is not true that detailed plans had to be submitted. Floor plans and general lay-out were required.

Also, as a result of a complaint that some builders were not following the plans they had submitted, in June 1946 provision was made for FHA inspection of construction to assure that the structure conformed with the plans submitted and upon which a price ceiling had been set at which the house could be sold or rented to a veteran.

LOW-COST HOUSES AND RENTAL HOUSING

Surveys of veterans' needs in 1946 indicated that about half of those seeking housing on the then current market wanted to rent rather than to buy. Moreover, these surveys showed that the median rental they thought they could afford was $43 and the median sales prices of housing they could afford ranged around $5,500.

Thus, the Wyatt program proposed channeling the largest part of materials into low and moderate cost sales and rental housing. It was proposed to do this through price controls over materials, building sites, and housing both new and existing—the Congress refused to enact legislation which would enable controls to be placed on the price of existing housing. Moreover, the program visualized the use of extensive measures to stimu-

late production of materials as well as homes in recognition of the fact that "production is the long-range solution to inflation."

It was also recognized by Mr. Wyatt from the outset, as he reported to the President, that an "inflationary spiral would be fatal to the housing program" not only with respect to achieving low-cost housing, but also in its effect on the size of the housing market. Thus, the hope of achieving volume construction of low-cost homes was necessarily related to the maintenance of a stable price structure and prevention of excessive rises in prices, not only for houses and building materials, but for the economy in general.

The institution of VHP-1 on March 26, 1946, restricted home construction during the remainder of 1946 to homes to sell for not more than $10,000 or to rent for not more than $80 per month. Within these limits every effort was made to obtain as much rental housing as possible and to assure that the majority of homes would be available at prices within the reach of veterans. For many reasons, including the situation in the economy in general, this well-intentioned effort to keep prices down was not overly successful. However, undoubtedly this action did keep sales and rent prices for new homes below the levels they would otherwise have reached in an uncontrolled market.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield at this point with reference to the material matter?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield only for a question, because I really want to get along with this.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I might make the observation that the gentlewoman has asked for the unusual privilege of talking beyond 1 hour and no one on this side objected.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I asked to speak beyond the 40 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In addition to the 40 minutes that the gentlewoman had, she asked for an additional half hour which would make the time much more than the customary hour allowed by the House and no one on this side objected.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentlewoman.

It came to my attention the other day that the export of lumber in the last quarter amounted to 200,000,000 more feet. In other words, on that basis, for a year, we will be exporting 800,000,000 board feet.

In view of the fact that export controls are entirely within the control of the administration and the Department of Commerce, does not the gentlewoman think that the material situation might be improved if some consideration was given to limit the export of this construction lumber?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I think that is a good question. As I remember it, we are exporting lumber, but we are also importing lumber.

The lumber which we are exporting we can afford to export in order to get the lumber which we need so desperately and which we must import. I cannot answer the gentleman right off, but I say if it is wrong, I am not defending it. If it is wrong, then we ought to exercise controls.

But I want to say to the gentleman that my remembrance from studying that particular aspect of the matter is that what we are exporting is not hurting us. In return we are importing many, many times over, lumber which is not readily available here, which we do not grow here, or which we do not have enough of here.

May I ask the gentleman from Colorado if he would prefer for me to talk about the building production record or the housing need?

Mr. CARROLL. I suggest that the gentlewoman from California talk about the need for housing.

THE RECORD ON HOUSING NEED

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois invites the American people to look at the record to find out how much housing we need. He says that Congress set up a joint committee of Senators and Congressmen to survey the housing problem and that this joint committee secured estimates of housing need from at least 15 different sources. The highest estimate was 2,000,000 units per year while the lowest was 300,000.

Now, it is true that the joint committee did obtain these different estimates, as the gentleman from Illinois says. What he failed to tell, however, is that the investigators whose findings he talks about were not all estimating the same thing. Some of them were studying just the urban part of the housing problem, while others were studying not only the urban housing problem but included farm housing in their considerations. Some of them were looking at the problem for a 5-year period while others were trying to determine how much housing we would need over a 10- or 15-year period.

There were bound to be differences in their conclusions as to how many houses were needed in the various periods, and these differences are clearly brought out in the complete record, which the gentleman from Illinois failed to make use of.

The gentleman from Illinois was not even fair to the National Association of Real Estate Boards. The association was responsible for the low estimate of 300,000 units which the gentleman cites but the association was not talking about housing need—they were talking about the number of houses that could be sold and they were probably being very realistic for if we continue to produce housing exclusively at high prices, we will be lucky to sell even that many. However, even Mr. Herbert Nelson, executive vice president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, has admitted that the desired objective to fill our housing needs might equal as many as 1,500,000 new units per year, if we were trying to produce decent housing for all American families.

But the gentleman from Illinois makes his most glaring omission from the facts of the record when he fails to tell the American people what conclusion the joint congressional committee arrived at itself after surveying the findings of all these other investigators. What the joint committee decided is made completely clear in its final majority report dated March 15, 1948. Now this report consists of only 30 printed pages and is written in very simple and straightforward language which leaves no doubt as to the committee's conclusions.

What the gentleman from Illinois did not quote, I would like to quote—from page 8 of this report in which the committee is presenting its findings on our present and prospective housing needs.

They say:

Our present housing problem is of long standing. While developments attributable to World War II have contributed to the intensity of our present problem, the current shortage actually has been accumulating over a long period of years when the volume of new-housing construction was less than the net increase in new families.

In the spring of 1947 there were 2,800,000 families living doubled up with other families. The vast majority of these families have been forced to accept these unsatisfactory living arrangements because of the acute housing shortage. An additional 500,000 families are living in temporary housing, trailers, rooming houses, and other makeshift accommodations. Moreover, during the last year, even with the sharp expansion of home building, the net number of new families formed greatly exceeded the number of new homes provided. Finally, a very substantial proportion of our existing supply of housing falls far below minimum standards of decency.

Where the report refers to a substantial proportion of our existing supply of housing which falls far below minimum standards of decency, they are talking about the 5,000,000 families who are today living in slums.

The report further states:

The most recent information which has been released by the Bureau of the Census as to the status of the housing inventory leads this committee to conclude that we should have a construction program that will produce at least 15,500,000 nonfarm units between now and the end of 1960. This would call for the average annual construction of not less than 1,285,000 nonfarm units. In addition, there is a large need for better housing in farm areas. This makes it clear that for many years at least 1,500,000 houses should be built annually in the United States.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to commend the gentlewoman for her remarks, and to say that her whole statement before this body today is completely corroborated and substantiated by the bipartisan action of the Senate of the United States in the passage of S. 866, in which they said:

The pending bill—

Referring to S. 866—

which was reported favorably by this committee on April 24, 1947, is a bipartisan measure, resulting from several years of intensive study and exhaustive hearings by various committees of the Congress.

With reference to the shortage which you just mentioned, in this report it says:

While the volume of housing construction has increased sharply during the past 2 years, the completions of new housing, even at this expanded rate, continue to lag behind the net increase in number of families—

Of which the gentlewoman has just spoken—

and it is well known that the prices or rents of these new houses have been beyond the means of far too large a proportion of the population.

This bears out what the gentlewoman has said:

As a result, overcrowding and doubling up have continued widespread, and the country has been at a virtual stalemate on the critical problems of slum removal and basic and permanent improvement of the housing conditions of the American people.

May I say to the gentlewoman from California that on a radio debate last night over a national network as we debated this with some of the Republican Members of this body, the polls coming in from the people—and the polls will not be complete for some time yet—showed that over 74 percent of the people were in favor of the program which the gentlewoman from California is presenting here today. I desire to commend her very highly for her interest and activity in this matter.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

I know that the program is bipartisan. We arrived at these findings together. This bill has passed, actually passed the Senate four times. It is blocked today in the House of Representatives by the Republican leadership.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield for one question?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I will. I frankly do not understand the Republicans and I cannot understand why the Republican leadership in the House at this time will not pass it. I do not understand why the distinguished gentleman from Illinois places himself in a position of approving of that blockage, because I have great respect for the gentleman from Illinois; and I hope that nothing I have said today has given any contrary impression. I have respect for his intelligence and for his ability and for his oratory.

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Why is it that the minority party when it controlled the Congress all those years up until January of 1947, did not enact into law the program for which the gentlewoman speaks and the program that the President recommended to the Congress be enacted at this special session?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not excuse that lack of action; I do not excuse it for 1 minute. Just as I compliment the Republicans every time I think they are right I do not excuse them in this instance. I think we should have passed it. The fact is the bill is more needed now than ever. The housing situation has become more acute. Boys returned from the war for 4 years have been living doubled up with relatives, friends or strangers unable to have their own homes. They are resentful and rightfully so. The passage of this bill will not create homes overnight but every day that it fails of passage delays for that much longer the housing that is needed, keeping families that much longer out of their own homes and living that much longer under conditions that are unhealthy.

Mr. CURTIS. I am firmly convinced that the gentlewoman believes in the argument she is making and I am delighted to hear her say that her party in all the years they have controlled Congress should have enacted the legislation that the President requests we now enact in the special session in 15 days.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman from Nebraska is not quite fair when he draws in that 15-days stuff. This is not a new subject that is being discussed now for the first time. Never has there been a bill that has had so many hearings and about which there has been so much discussion and for which there is so much public support.

Mr. CURTIS. No; it has been here since 1930.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. It has been here since 1944. That is when we began hearings on a long-range housing program. Nineteen hundred and forty-four was the year Congress first began those hearings. I believe it was 2 years later, 1946, that the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill was first introduced as a result of those hearings. It passed the Senate. It did not pass the House.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Just a minute.

Mr. CURTIS. It was way back in 1930 that President Roosevelt said that one-third of the people of America were ill-housed.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. That is not the point. The point I am talking about here is the long-range housing program, the permanent housing program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. We put through low-cost public housing under President Roosevelt. We put through slum clearance, too, under President Roosevelt. We have three or four projects in my own district. One of the first ever put through was in my district, so there is no point to the argument that it has not been done, for it has been, even though the Republicans opposed us. We had to do it by legislation on appropriation bills, we had to have the Rules Committee bring in rules permitting it to be in order on appropriation bills.

Then in 1946 when the Wagner-Taft-Ellender bill passed the Senate it got stalled in hearings here in the House even though we were in control because the Republicans insisted on points of order. As soon as 12 o'clock was reached and there was not a quorum present in the committee they would raise points of order; as many as three times they raised them. Once Senator TAFT appeared before the committee and could be given only 10 minutes because a Member of his own party made a point of order against continuing. The bill was passed in the Senate but it was stalled in the House by Members of his own party.

We have this bill here this year. It has passed the Senate. It lay for months in the House committee. Finally it was passed out of the committee by a combination of Democrats and three or four Republicans. Then it got tied up in the Republican-controlled Rules Committee, and they will not let out a rule to bring it up. The only thing they did let out finally was the insignificant bill that eventually was passed in the last session. There is your legislative history.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. That is the legislative history. The gentleman from Massachusetts, as usual, is correct and he recites the legislative record in detail. I was simply trying to be very generous to the other side in not offering all of this detail. Of course, I take it for granted that the other side of the aisle will acknowledge the fact that under President Roosevelt the Democratic administration passed the first low-cost housing in the country.

I am talking about the T-E-W bill—a very important program that affects all of us. It affects the Democrats and Republicans alike. But whatever happened in the past, whoever was responsible, the fact is that today we ought to pass this bill—now—in this session of Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to find out from the Republican leadership if they still think slum clearance, public housing, and low-cost housing as contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is socialistic? That is their objection here, yet the Republican Party put that in its own platform only a few weeks ago. I wonder where the country is going to be if through any great misfortune the Republicans win next fall so far as housing is concerned; never mind anything else.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Maybe one of the Republicans could answer that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wonder if Governor Dewey and Governor Warren agree with the Republican leadership in the House that this type of legislation is socialistic and why they have not spoken out. Why have they not said something while this special session is going on about the high cost of living? They are the Republican candidates and they are both governors.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows that that is the old theory, the pre-McKinley theory, you get more votes if you do not take a stand on very many issues. The fewer issues you take a stand on the more votes you get. That way you can be all things to all people.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentlewoman would like to make a correct

statement. She said that the administration spent $400,000,000 on the Wyatt housing program.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I said that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] quoted a figure of $400,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentlewoman just said a minute ago that after spending $400,000,000 on the Wyatt housing bill the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said that it had fallen flat, as I remember it. The truth of the matter is that before the administration had spent even a small fraction of that $400,000,000 the Wyatt housing program became such a mess and was producing no homes to speak of that they dropped the thing like a hot potato. In other words, it fell of its own weight because it was built on a bad foundation. Now, I want to answer my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman is arguing on my side. The gentleman is saying that Mr. Wyatt accomplished all that he did on very little money. Well, that was marvelous, that was wonderful. The record is here to show what he accomplished. You cannot dispute it.

Mr. JENSEN. It was a complete failure.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman cannot dispute the housing figures for 1946. No amount of argument on the other side of the aisle can dispute the figures on the increased production of building materials. No amount of argument can do that. Let us not argue any more. Now did the gentleman want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentlewoman should ask Mr. Wyatt if it was not a complete flop.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Does the gentleman want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I want to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts knows that the Republicans did not pass and adopt a platform at Philadelphia for the Democrats to administer, because it has been proven that everything they attempt to administer they mess up and it gets into politics and they make a complete flop of the whole thing. When we get into power after next January, we will put in a housing program, I think, that will be administered properly.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not.

Mr. JENSEN. And we will build houses.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman says he thinks they will.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I would like to ask my friend if he believes in slum clearance and if he believes in low-cost public housing.

Mr. JENSEN. As a social measure, I do.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Does the gentleman believe in it?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Will the gentleman vote for it?

Mr. JENSEN. As a social measure, a limited slum clearance, administered by honest people.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Will the gentleman vote for low-cost public housing?

Mr. JENSEN. Properly administered.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Properly administered.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, but not by this gang of fumbling New Dealers that do not know how to administer anything properly. You would have a Silvermaster and a Currie and a few others administer that program.

Mr. MCCORMACK. It is very easy for my friend to deal with the subject in that manner, with the real estate lobby dominating down here for the last 18 months, with the power lobby dominating, with the National Association of Manufacturers and the Meat Institute lobbies. The record is very clear as to whom the gentleman and his party respond to, and that is every nefarious lobby trying to wrest money at the expense of the people.

Mr. JENSEN. I would rather be associated with those boys than with the gang the gentleman is associated with.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to answer the question put by the gentleman from Massachusetts when he said, "Why do not you Republican leaders tell us where you stand? He was referring to Governor Warren and to Governor Dewey. Now, I think the record ought to show where they stand and the country ought to know that the present titular leadership of the Republican Party is not in harmony with the membership of this body. I would like to read just a moment for the RECORD. This is an interview by Joseph A. Loftus, a reporter for the New York Times, on June 21, 1948. He interviewed Governor Warren when he attended the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia.

In this interview Governor Warren said that "Some of the fundamental problems of the American people were left unsolved (by the Eightieth Congress.)." The Times states that Governor Warren specifically deplored the failure of the Eightieth Congress to enact housing legislation.

These statements by Governor Warren should be widely circulated in the halls of Congress, in the RECORD, and in speeches by the Members of Congress who support the President's program on housing.

In conjunction with that, last night, as I mentioned to the gentlewoman from California before, we had a radio debate, and I said to an outstanding Member of this body in the Republican party, "How do you square your philosophy with the statement of your own leadership?" What he said is typical, and this is what we ought to get to the people: "Well, after they are elected, we will change their viewpoints."

I am reminded, when the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, spoke, when we were talking about the power projects in the West, when Governor Dewey was campaigning in Oregon, we said, "How do you square your viewpoint with the Governor's declaration in Oregon?" He said, "The Governor is only a Presidential candidate."—the RECORD will bear me out in this—"and he is not controlling this body." The people have got to know that the leadership believes one way and the membership acts another within the Halls of this Congress.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

And now if I may get on with the facts in reply to the speech of the gentleman from Illinois. The Special Joint Committee on Housing makes it clear that at least 1,500,000 houses should be built annually in the United States for at least the next 10 years.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] makes the usual Republican slur at the Federal Government. This is the usual all-inclusive indictment in which the Republicans indulge and to which we are now accustomed. The gentleman from Illinois says that the houses that are being built now are not paper houses—made from Federal red tape but they are real houses. People live in them, he says.

Now, I do not know exactly to what the gentleman from Illinois is referring. I suppose he means by "real houses" the houses that were built by private industry in 1947. I would like to remind the gentleman that houses in 1946 were also built by private industry. I would also like to remind him that the building industry was helped by the Government in 1946 and 1947 and 1948, and to inform him, if he already does not know it, that in this special session the Republicans will bring in a bill which will propose further aid to the building industry.

So I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that the building industry does need aid. The whole question is where and how the aid is given; is it given in such a way that it helps all the people or just a segment of the people?

I would also like to remind the gentleman from Illinois that people not only live in the houses to which he refers—people have to pay for them, too, and they are paying three or four times more than what they are worth; that the prices prevent the vast majority of veterans and other families who are in the greatest need from obtaining their own homes.

Furthermore, some of these "real homes to which the gentleman from Illinois refers, which have been built with Government assistance because of Federal loans to private builders, are so badly built that to all intents and purposes they are not real homes. And to prove what I say, I refer the gentleman to the number of grand-jury investigations and indictments against builders for defrauding their customers.

I would like to also remind the gentleman from Illinois that the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Michigan, in opposing a limited secondary market for GI loans, said that many of the houses built

under these loans without the benefit of FHA inspection were practically shacks, and I agree with the gentleman from Michigan in this statement 100 percent.

The United Industrial Associates tells us that a typical home cost $4,599 between 1935 and 1939; cost $9,745 in June 1947; and $11,094 in June 1948.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois how he intends to continue this totally uneconomic market.

I would also like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he thinks the refusal of the Republican leadership to control inflation protects the taxpayers' money.

THE BUILDING-PRODUCTION RECORD

The gentleman from Illinois seeks to get over the thought to the American people that if Congress would just leave the building industry completely alone, the American people will have all the housing they need, and he implies they will have homes, of course, at a price they can afford to pay. To try to prove he is correct, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] points to the record of the building industry during the twenties. He says that builders of the country, without any Government interference, built a lot more houses then than they did in any similar period.

This is supposed to be the clinching argument as to why the Republicans should not pass the T-E-W bill. Of course, the building program in the twenties in no way touched the slums of America and in no way provided housing that the low-income groups could afford. But the gentleman from Illinois does not go into that.

I want to make it clear that I am not attacking the building industry but I think we ought to face facts. We cannot solve the housing problem or indeed any of our problems unless we do face facts. Now it is arrant nonsense to talk about Government keeping out of the housing field. The Government is in the housing field now up to its neck.

The Republican leadership in this Congress has brought in bill after bill which have provided Federal aid for the building industry. Who are they kidding when they say the Government ought to keep out of the housing business? The whole question, I repeat, is what to do in order to accomplish what goals.

But to get back to the speech of the gentleman from Illinois where he refers to the accomplishments of the private builders in the 7-year period from 1922 to 1929.

The private builders of that day did build 5,632,000 dwelling units from the end of 1922 to the end of 1929, or an average of more than 800,000 units a year.

Of course, the gentleman from Illinois fails to note that in the 7 years that immediately followed from 1930 to 1936, this same industry put up only 1,457,000 units or an average of only a little more than 200,000 units per year. It was able to produce only 93,000 units in the year 1933 or only one-tenth as much as in the peak year of the bygone period the gentleman from Illinois likes to talk about. And, in fact, the building industry did not begin to recover from this pitifully low point of production until 1936 and 1937 when the much-despised Federal Government aid began to pull them out of their doldrums.

I have another point or two that I would like to make as long as we are talking about what the building industry has done in the past and is now doing. The first is that whenever we talk about the present rate of construction of houses in this year 1938, which will be around 900,000 units, we certainly are entitled to make the point that this record will be as good as the peak record made back in 1925. But I am not as complacent about the point as is the gentleman from Illinois. During the 23 years since 1925 most American industries have shown vast increases in productivity. Look at the record of agriculture, of automobiles, refrigerators, radios and nearly everything else you can think of. Can you imagine Detroit setting its 1925 production as its goal for the future? Why do we have to be satisfied that housing is as good as it was 23 years ago? I say it isn't good enough. The gentleman from Illinois has lost sight of the fact that our population has greatly increased since 1925, increased some 25,000,000 and today we have an average of 400,000 new families a year seeking homes.

Another point that I would like to bring out in this same connection is that the very production record of the private building industry in this country is an argument for the kind of long-range approach to the housing problem that we find in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. As I have said, the building industry produced 937,000 dwelling units in 1925, whereas 8 years later in 1933, production was down to only 93,000 units. It is that boom-or-bust pattern, that cycle of violent ups and downs that characterizes the building industry and it is that behavior that needs to be studied and corrected.

When we have found out what causes these violent swings and can take remedial steps, we will be able to stabilize the building industry so that its production can be a steady stream of dwelling units designed to meet the needs and pocketbooks of the American people. The T-E-W bill would set up the means for conducting research into the economic behavior of the building industry and would set into motion some of the long-range planning that is so obviously needed to correct our housing troubles.

The gentleman from Illinois says, and I quote:

> We shall gradually go over the million mark each year and that is so far beyond the dreams of any Government agency that it's not even funny.

Now when he said that, the gentleman from Illinois must have been napping because just a few moments before he got through criticizing Mr. Wyatt and what the gentleman likes to call Mr. Wyatt's grandiose plan for building houses faster. The gentleman from Illinois reminds us that Mr. Wyatt's ambition was to build 2,750,000 dwelling units in 2 years. The gentleman from Illinois says we will gradually go over the million mark. Mr. Wyatt said we could get 1,500,000 in the second year.

If it had not been for the Wyatt program under this administration which so greatly stimulated the production of building materials, the record of home construction in 1947 to which the gentleman from Illinois now points could never have been achieved.

The building industry cannot afford to build low-cost rental houses for those who are now living in the slums.

It is no economy to refuse to clean out the slums. Slums corrupt the mind and spirit, breed divorce, delinquency and disease and the taxpayer pays for these slums when he is required to pay higher taxes in support of bigger jails, increased court expenses because of the higher divorce rate, reform schools for children and bigger county hospital wards and mental institutions.

The slums will never be cleaned out if we leave it all to the building industry. The Republicans ought to know that private industry must make a profit.

The Bureau of Census shows that in 1946, two out of every three city families had total family incomes of less than $3,500 a year, and more than two out of every five less than $2,500 a year.

I challenge the Republicans to show us where the building industry is today constructing houses to meet the needs of those seeking homes in these income brackets.

COST OF THE TAFT-ELLENDER-WAGNER BILL

And lastly, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] seeks to alarm us by charging that the cost of the long-range housing bill will reach the astronomical figure of $9,000,000,000. In this case, although it seems to me too high, I will not quarrel with his figure so much as with his reasoning. What he has done is to represent the cost of the program as the sum of the maximum possible amounts that could be expended over a period of almost half a century. If this line of reasoning had been applied to other programs to which the Government is committed, which of them would ever have been adopted? In the whole host of good things that the Federal Government does and properly should do for the general welfare of its citizens and the country, there must be an eventual total cost. But we never consider that ultimate total cost as a present financial obligation of the Government. The maximum expenditure will be in the year 1953—$265,000,000—thereafter there will be a drop of one hundred and sixty-five million a year—after another 5 years there will be another drop.

Representatives of both parties have sponsored and supported many kinds of legislation for the benefit of the veterans. Yet I have never heard it charged that since most of the 15,000,000 veterans will be with us for 40 years, and expenditures for veterans' benefits already approximate $7,000,000,000 annually, we should reckon the cost of these benefit programs at $280,000,000,000. No one would vote for a program of that magnitude, I am sure. Heaven knows what it may cost to maintain the Department of Agriculture for the next 40 years, but I hear no one demanding that it be abolished. To me this demonstrates the absurdity of applying such a total cost theory to the long-range housing program. That is not the way to figure Government expenses. In-

stead it is the way to conjure up hobgoblins to frighten and mislead the uninformed.

To save ourselves a lot of arithmetic—even if the gentleman from Illinois' figure of $9,000,000,000 were correct, that would average out to $225,000,000 a year over the 40-year period. That does not seem to me excessive. I do not think it would seem excessive to the millions of families who need housing today, or to those who will need it next year, or 10 or 20 years from now. Surely it would not seem excessive to Mr. TAFT, the chairman of the Republican policy committee, who has said in the Senate, that if we had to spend $500,000,000 a year to solve the housing problem, the cost would not be too great in proportion to the total expenditures of the Government. Indeed, it did not appear excessive to the Senate, which has twice passed the bill with these facts in mind. I think it would not seem excessive to the House, if the Republican leadership would permit us to vote on it.

The $9,000,000,000 figure cited by the gentleman from Illinois as the cost of the T-E-W bill cannot be proved out. It may include among other things:

First. Six billion four hundred million dollars as the maximum possible total annual contributions over a 40-year period for extension of the low-rent housing program at a maximum rate of $160,000,000 per year.

Second. One billion six hundred million dollars additional FHA title VI insurance authorization for the insurance of home-mortgage loans made by private lending institutions to private individuals. No estimated annual cost.

Third. One billion dollar FHA insurance authorization for yield insurance of large-scale rental-housing projects. No estimated annual cost.

Fourth. One billion dollar authorization for loans to cities for slum clearance and urban redevelopment. These loans are repayable with interest.

Fifth. Five hundred million dollars for a 5-year program of non-recurring lump-sum capital grants for slum clearance. One hundred million dollars per year for 5 years.

Sixth. Five hundred million dollar authorization for purchase by National Home Mortgage Corporation or mortgage loans already insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government. No estimated cost.

Mr. Speaker, I plead again to the Members of this House to bring the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill to the floor for a vote, by signing the discharge petition.

The American people want the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. They want to clear out the slums and make it possible for every family to have a decent home.

This Congress will regain the confidence of the American people if it passes the T-E-W bill which has the official endorsement of both parties.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE WEST

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of my reasons for asking for this time is to speak the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] if she informed the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that she was going to make the speech she has just concluded.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I did.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to use the balance of my time to speak about the observation made concerning the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department.

As a Representative from the West, may I say that the gentleman from Iowa and his committee have done more for western development than any committee in the history of the Republic. Twice as much money was appropriated for rural electrification by the Eightieth Congress than was appropriated by any other Congress in the history of REA. Forty-two percent of all the money they have ever received, and they have been in existence 14 years, has been appropriated by this Republican Congress. The farm wife who has been waiting a long time for electricity to light her home, run the washing machine and the radio, and provide her household with refrigeration is grateful for this splendid record on REA made by the Eightieth Congress.

The committee headed by the gentleman from Iowa has done more and furnished more funds for western development, both irrigation and power, than any committee in any other Congress. The appropriations made by his committee for reclamation and power development are twice as large as those made in any other Congress. I resent these insinuations made in political speeches on this floor to the effect that the gentleman from Iowa and the Republican leadership in this Congress are trying to choke off this very worth-while program.

The figures speak for themselves. The West has had a better break under this Republican Congress than under the administration-controlled Congresses.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON (at the request of Mr. CURTIS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the address of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL POWER POLICY

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONDERO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, in response to the remarks of the preceding speaker, I should like to say that whatever I said with reference to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] was not in the spirit of any individual criticism, because it is true that under his chairmanship of that important committee there is no question that the appropriations for the West have increased over the last fiscal year.

The point I was making is that we are now more and more getting into the question of changing the power policy of this Nation. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa would agree with me that he is not in agreement with my position nor with some of the things which Governor Dewey advocated in Oregon.

May I say to explain this point further that actually in the great power projects of the West, there has been a reduction of appropriations for power lines for the transmission of power and there is developing within the Halls of the Congress a movement in favor of the private power utilities who want to purchase power at the bus bar of the great multiple-purpose dams of the West.

I think the gentleman from Iowa would agree with me that there is contemplated a change in that program. Therefore, we ought to understand what the issue is—not that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has been cutting appropriations for the completion of these dams heretofore instituted, but a change in the power policy of this Nation which I think is of fundamental importance for this reason. The money to build these great multiple-purpose projects came from the people and the Treasury of the United States. We did not build them to create monopolies. We did not build them to turn them over to private power utilities for their private gain.

We built them for the benefit of the people; in order to provide ample electricity at low cost.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman referred to appropriations to complete power projects. That is not a fair inference. The Congress has provided money to start new dams and reservoirs. A great many new dams and reservoirs have been started, and they will benefit the territory that the gentleman is interested in.

Mr. CARROLL. I think if the gentleman were a little bit more familiar with the record he would know that what I had reference to and of course the gentleman from Iowa will corroborate my

statement, is, for one example, the Great Coulee Dam. I also had reference to the Central Valley Authority and the Colorado Big Thompson and other great projects either completed or now under construction.

All of those dams have had appropriations made for them in years past. There is nothing new about this. There is nothing new about the power policy at all.

Mr. CURTIS. But there have been a great many new dams started.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman is condemning me and any Member of the House of Representatives or anybody in America who is bound and determined to defend private enterprise, free and honest private enterprise, then I certainly am willing to accept his condemnation.

I am going to defend free enterprise from the peanut vendor on the corner to the biggest corporation in the United States against Government encroachment.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman has stated the case completely insofar as his viewpoint and mine differ on the sale of public power generated by the great dams of the West. That statement emphasizes our differences and I think we understand one another.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, I will stand on that statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), for the week of August 2 to 7, on account of official business.

To Mr. CRAVENS (at the request of Mr. GATHINGS), for an indefinite period, on account of death in the family.

WHAT WILL YOU BUILD HOUSES WITH?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the question of materials which I discussed with the gentlewoman from California, one point should be clarified. Contrary to the gentlewoman's impression, the 800,000,000 board feet of lumber which it is estimated will be exported from this country during the current year at the current rate of export, is not being exported as a barter proposition in return for other lumber we need. Most of it is being exported to the ECA countries of Europe, particularly England, and much of it is not a matter of barter but a matter of gift.

It so happens that I am one of those who believe Congress should do everything it can that will actually get sound results in the way of housing. One of the questions which must be answered is how and where we will get the materials and labor for building the houses. You cannot build houses with words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has expired.

DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIAL POWER

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the discussions this afternoon have been extremely interesting to every Member of this House. I want particularly to discuss the question of the steam-power plant that has been proposed for the Tennessee Valley, and the taking advantage of the natural resources of this country. However, I certainly do disagree with those who feel that this Government should build in any part of this country new generating steam plants which have nothing in common whatever with the original purpose of either flood control, irrigation, or reclamation. We know the original purpose of the Tennessee Valley Authority was flood control, yet we find, through the medium of legislation that has been filed here only in recent days, and the great effort to have it enacted into law, for an authorization for a steam-generating plant. Who for? For the great industries located somewhere down in the Tennessee Valley.

Those of us who come from the New England area are somewhat familiar with the history of the past, and the migration of industry from our part of the country to other parts of the country because we could not compete with them in the production of goods or the employment of labor at their low wages and other conditions that were favorable to them. As far as I am concerned, I shall oppose to the utmost the appropriation of any public money that will be for the benefit of great industrial plants in this country at the expense of the rest of the public. This is an attempt to spend public money to build a steam generating plant at a total estimated cost of over $80,000,000. Such a plant will come in direct competition with the industries in my part of the country who not only have to pay the costs of building their own generating plants themselves and maintaining them, but also their share of the cost in taxes of these publicly built plants with the taxpayers' money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Peter Campbell Brown, executive assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, delivered before the New York Bar Association at Lake Placid on July 1. The extra cost of this matter will be $159.75. Notwithstanding that, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. Garet Van Antwerp III.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 6, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 7119. A bill to grant increased retired pay to certain disabled enlisted men of the Regular Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 7120. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7121. A bill to provide nonquota immigration status for the alien parents of American citizens and to expedite admission of certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7122. A bill to amend the Hawaiian organic act to prevent the loss of nationality, by reason of continuous residence for 5 years in a foreign state, of certain persons declared to be citizens of the United States under such act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 7123. A bill to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 7124. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 7125. A bill appropriating funds to initiate construction of flood-protection works at Rutland, Vt.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 7126. A bill for the establishment of the National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana (by request):

H. R. 7127. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor to report periodically on labor conditions in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 7128. A bill for the relief of the alien Gheorge Ion Dimian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 7129. A bill for the relief of Gaspare Vallone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 7130. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cardella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2141. Mr. HART presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, requesting the Congress of the United States to adopt necessary legislation to encourage and make adequately effectual a comprehensive program of merchant shipbuilding in the shipyards of this country and of expanding our merchant marine, which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 6, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, August 5, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who wert the God of our fathers, we rejoice that Thou art also the God of their succeeding generations. When we go up and down the courts of memory, there comes to us the glorious testimony that Thou hast placed at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace.

We humbly confess that again and again we put all of our trust and reliance in human ingenuity, only to find that our efforts are futile and fruitless. Grant that we may yield ourselves unreservedly to Thy spirit in order that our lives may be transformed and touched to finer issues.

May that day speedily dawn when truth and righteousness shall be triumphant and men and nations everywhere shall give themselves in a glad and willing obedience to the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords in whose name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 5, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Chair state the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is operating this morning under a unanimous-consent agreement which the Chair will read:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, That on the calendar day of Friday, August 6, 1948, at the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending and upon any amendment that may be proposed to the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and upon the final passage of the said bill: *Provided,* That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on said calendar day of August 6, the time between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 1 o'clock shall be equally divided between the proponents of the committee amendment and the opponents thereof, and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The immediately pending amendment is that offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] to the so-called McCarthy substitute for the committee substitute.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who is in charge of the time of the proponents of the measure, and also of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, who is in charge of the time for the opponents of the measure, if it will meet with their approval for me to suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be charged equally to each side. I think it will not take more than about 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I am very reluctant to assent. We are short of time anyway.

Mr. WHERRY. It is immaterial to me, but I thought that, in the interest of saving time, it would be well to have as many Senators as possible present so as to avoid the duplication of questions later.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire agree?

Mr. TOBEY. I agree.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Feazel	Lucas
Baldwin	Ferguson	McCarthy
Ball	Flanders	McClellan
Barkley	Fulbright	McFarland
Brewster	Green	McGrath
Bricker	Gurney	McKellar
Bridges	Hatch	McMahon
Brooks	Hawkes	Magnuson
Buck	Hayden	Malone
Butler	Hickenlooper	Martin
Byrd	Hill	Millikin
Cain	Hoey	Moore
Capehart	Holland	Morse
Capper	Ives	Murray
Connally	Jenner	Myers
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Kem	Pepper
Dworshak	Kilgore	Reed
Eastland	Knowland	Revercomb
Ecton	Langer	Robertson, Va.
Ellender	Lodge	Robertson, Wyo.
Russell	Thomas, Okla.	Watkins
Saltonstall	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Smith	Thye	Wiley
Sparkman	Tobey	Williams
Stennis	Tydings	Wilson
Taft	Umstead	Young
Taylor	Vandenberg	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is absent on important public business in the State of Tennessee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

To whom does the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin and I have conferred, and I yield to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Five minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, at the outset, I desire to clear up two misapprehensions which were developed in the debate of yesterday. The first grew out of the impression of the distinguished Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] that I planned to object to the consideration of the bill. What I said, or intended to say, in the committee, had to do with the proposal that we would try to agree to a bill that might be passed by unanimous consent, and I said that if the bill carried the public-housing feature I would have to object; that I could not see that bill adopted by unanimous consent without voicing my objection to it.

The other had to do with the statement I made when the Senator from Wisconsin yielded to me, about what the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] had told our committee. The words I used created the impression that the distinguished Senator from Ohio had told us that a bill without public housing and without slum clearance was better than a bill with it. That was not what I meant. What I meant to say, and all I meant to say was that with respect to comparable features of the bill which is now the McCarthy amendment, and similar features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which is the committee amendment, I understood the Senator from Ohio to say that, in his opinion, the revision of the language in the McCarthy substitute improved the same and similar provisions of his original bill,

Mr. President, as I indicated yesterday, there are some very good features in the McCarthy substitute. In my opinion, there is more benefit in that substitute for veterans than in the original bill the Senate passed at the regular session. We carry in this bill the same provision concerning veteran cooperatives that was in the other bill, but the McCarthy substitute places the emphasis upon cheaper houses, and in that respect it is in the interest of a veteran who might be able to finance a $5,000 or a $6,000 house but could not finance one costing $10,000 or more.

Under the McCarthy amendment our farmers can share equally with their urban friends in this program and the farmer who wants to build a house can get the same type of aid under this bill as any city man can get.

I admit that any Government guaranty of home mortgages is to some extent inflationary. I suggested to our committee that we include in our report—I have not yet seen it, but I hope it is contained in it—a statement to the effect that construction is now at an all-time high; that homes built under these high costs may not be worth as much 5 years from now as they are now, and that no one who does not urgently need a house should take advantage of this Government financing plan to get one, because, after all, there is nothing in the bill that gives someone something for nothing. He assumes the obligation of paying for what he gets, and eventually he will either pay for the house or, when the foreclosure comes, he will lose his equity in it.

I favor the McCarthy amendment because it does not include the public housing feature of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, nor does it include the slum-clearance feature. I would have no objection to including the slum-clearance feature, but under the original bill that program was not going to be started until next year, and if we want to start it next year there will be ample time next year to provide the authorization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I know of no subject that has ever been presented to the Senate which has received more earnest consideration from the committees of both branches of the Congress. For more than 4 years committees have been at work upon this problem. In 1944 and in 1945 there was appointed a Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development, of the Senate Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, the subcommittee being headed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. That committee held hearings for many months. From the hearings thus held the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill was formulated, which was later submitted to this body and passed by it almost unanimously. That bill, Senate 1592, was then sent to the House, where it was pigeonholed by the same forces that are now objecting to the passage of a measure similar to the one which is presently before the Senate. The report accompanying the introduction of S. 1592 recommended the improvement and extension of the FHA mortgage programs; a yield insurance program; a housing research program; a program of Federal loans and contributions to communities for urban redevelopment; an extension of the present low-rent housing program; and a clear statement of our national housing policy. While not making any recommendations as to the form of farm housing legislation, it emphasized the need thereof.

At about the same time the Taft committee was holding hearings, a Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning held hearings on postwar housing. That committee, which was known as the Colmer committee, came to the same conclusion as did the Taft committee, that dwelling units of a character that could be built under the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill should be built. Then the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency considered the subject as presented to it when S. 1592 was introduced by its three authors. That committee not only relied upon the evidence which was adduced before the special Taft committee, but it held hearings of its own, and as a result of those hearings they recommended the provisions which were incorporated in S. 1592.

Let me refer to the exact language used in the report made by the so-called Colmer committee of the House:

> This committee on July 3, 1945, issued a special report on the subject of Postwar Public Works and Construction, and in the report recommended that the Government extend its facilities on research and information; that it make efforts to improve the building code situation; that it provide assistance in the technical development and financing of housing; that it improve and extend the FHA mortgage insurance programs; that a yield insurance program be considered to attract new equity investment into housing; and that the Federal Government extend the present low-rent housing program.

I read further from that report with particular reference to the low-cost housing program:

> While the committee still believes, as stated in its seventh report, that public works should be held to a minimum now, it noted one exception to this principle. That exception is the provision of housing for low-income families, including veterans' families. In the normal course of events, industry has built housing for upper-income families and relied upon a filtering-down process to provide housing for the lower-income families. Despite all the efforts of the Housing Expediter, he has not been able to get enough low-rent housing for the low-income families of veterans, or other low-income families, for that matter. The long hearings and the detailed report of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing point up the need, developed in some detail in this committee's seventh report, of public housing to meet this immediate problem of housing for veterans in the lower-income brackets. It is recommended that renewed attention be paid to this problem as soon as Congress reconvenes.

As I indicated a few minutes ago, S. 1592, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, was passed by the Senate and failed to pass the House of Representatives during the Seventy-ninth Congress. When the Eightieth Congress convened, it was necessary to introduce a new housing bill. Accordingly S. 866, more commonly known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, was introduced. Hearings were again held by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and in its report accompanying S. 866 the following recommendations were made: A declaration of national housing policy; a housing research program; improvement of the FHA mortgage-insurance programs and their extension to meet the needs of lower-income families; a yield-insurance program; a program of Federal loan and annual contributions aid to localities for urban redevelopment; an extension of the public low-rent housing program; and a farm housing program.

Senators will recall that a joint committee on housing consisting of Members from both the Senate and the House was created. Let me read a summary of the findings and recommendations which that commfttee made after holding hearings over a period of many weeks in Washington and in many parts of the United States:

> This committee was set up as a joint committee of both the Senate and the House at the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress in July 1947 to make a thorough study and investigation of all phases of the housing problem. This committee, beginning with September 10, 1947, and continuing through January 28, 1948, held 51 days of hearings in 33 cities and heard 1,286 witnesses. The testimony alone takes up 6,100 printed pages. In addition, various members as subcommittees of the committee conducted special investigations on basic housing problems, and made detailed reports on such topics as the high cost of housing, slum clearance, building materials, and the effects of taxation upon housing. The final report of the committee filed March 15, 1948, essentially represented an endorsement of the basic programs contained in S. 866. More specifically, the report recommended the prompt enactment of comprehensive housing legislation, including a program providing a direct attack upon the basic problem of high housing cost through a program of housing research, and special FHA and RFC insurance and loan aids for modernized methods of construction both on site and through the prefabrication process; a secondary market for FHA and GI loans; revision and improvement of FHA's insurance programs to meet the needs of lower-income families and veterans; a yield insurance program; a program of Federal loan and subsidy assistance to urban redevelopment; a program to extend public low-rent housing; and a program of Federal loans and subsidy aids for farm housing. Following this report, a series of amendments to S. 866 were introduced by Senator FLANDERS, one of the members of the committee, to carry out such recommendations of the joint committee as called for modification and improvement of the S. 866 provisions as previously reported by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Senators will remember that when S. 866 was considered by this body the so-called Flanders amendments were presented to that bill by way of a substitute and extensive debate ensued on the issue of the over-all housing bill. The Flanders substitute was really and truly the

same as S. 866 with the exception of a few minor and technical amendments to make the bill conform to some of the recommendations of the joint Senate-House committee heretofore referred to. Efforts were then made to amend the bill, striking out the title dealing with public housing. I am sure that all of us will recall that the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who sits at my right at the moment, led the fight to have public housing eliminated from that bill.

The bill which is now under consideration is a very important measure. It contains most of the provisions of S. 866 as amended by the so-called Flanders substitute. It provides facilities to assist every segment of our society, not only those able to help themselves but also people in the lower-income groups. We passed similar legislation on two occasions. The first measure, as I indicated a moment ago, was pigeonholed by the House. During the last session the Senate passed Senate bill 866. What happened to it? It went to the House. Hearings were held, and the Committee on Banking and Currency of that body, by a vote of 14 to 13, as I recall, reported the bill favorably for consideration by the House. What is its status before the Rules Committee of the House? There it rests with an ultimatum that it shall not be reported to the House for consideration.

Mr. President, I read in some of yesterday's newspapers that the same obstructionists who have been keeping Senate bill 866 pigeonholed in the Rules Committee made the statement that unless a bill is sent to the House of Representatives by the Senate without public housing, no housing legislation will be adopted.

I say that that is an insulting ultimatum. We have passed the bill twice. Let us pass it thrice and put the responsibility where it belongs—at the doorstep of the House Republican leadership now in control.

Mr. President, I did not intend to go into too many details on a subject that has been so extensively debated on this floor, but I would like for a few minutes to discuss the housing problem in the terms in which the American people think of it—in terms of their need for homes in which to live as Americans should, in which children can get a fair start in life, and which will provide the aspirations which all of us must have to make life worth living. I am thinking of the needs of nearly 3,000,000 families who do not have any homes at all, but are crowded in, most of them involuntarily, with their in-laws and other families, and of the 500,000 families living in trailers, rooming houses, temporary housing, and other makeshift accommodations. I am thinking of the needs of more than 5,000,000 families in cities and surrounding areas, whose homes fall below decent standards for living. I am thinking also of the families on the farms whose homes are shacks which should be replaced or, at a minimum, need major repairs in order to imake them livable. I am not even counting the great majority of farm homes which do not have the sanitary facilities which have become so essential for safe living in our cities, even though I deplore the lower housing standards we seem to accept for farm people.

Not even the best housing legislation we could enact is going to solve the housing problem for 10,000,000 families overnight. That is why we must consider legislation that looks ahead into the future and not try to solve a long-range problem with short-run, emergency measures. It is obvious that when you extend the solution of present problems into the future, you are also going to have to take into account the future increase in demand, losses in supply, and the deterioration of additional housing to the point where it should be replaced; and, finally, in order to bring about a normal relationship between need and supply, it is important that there is a sufficient amount of housing available for rent or sale to give American families some flexibility within their price range and to make it possible for them to move about without having to be plagued with the difficulties of obtaining housing or being separated for long intervals.

Now, what are the facts about housing needs? I know of no better place to turn to than the majority report filed just last March by the Joint Committee on Housing, which was created by this Congress to study the housing problem. I should add that these findings corroborated earlier conclusions reached by other committees, particularly the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Redevelopment in 1945 and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in 1946 and 1947, and that its estimates of need were determined after careful consideration of other estimates from a variety of sources. Data obtained from the Bureau of the Census reports as to population and housing inventory provide the basis of these estimates of need.

Putting aside farm needs for the moment, America will need 15,441,000 new homes by 1960 to provide decent homes for the 39,500,000 families which the Bureau of the Census estimates we will have by that time. That means 1,285,000 homes a year. Discounting the considerable number of farm dwellings that can be rehabilitated, we shall need 200,000 farm homes a year—bringing the total up to 1,500,000 new homes annually.

It will take over 7,000,000 nonfarm homes, or more than 600,000 units a year, just to bring the present supply up to the shelter requirements of American families and to provide a 4-percent effective vacancy rate. Before the war, real-estate people used to think the supply was normal when 5 percent vacancies existed. That is about all we have been doing in this country for the last quarter of a century. Over the long pull, housing construction has just been keeping ahead of the increase in number of families. We have done practically nothing to replace the slums—to replace the losses from fire, demolition, and floods. That is all we will do during the coming years if we do not make a comprehensive attack on the housing problem through effective legislation. If that is all we do, we will have more, instead of fewer, slums, for houses wear out every year.

If we really meet America's housing needs, if we really want to eliminate the slums that imperil the health and morale of several million of our people, we are going to need another 8,000,000 homes during the next 12 years, or nearly 700,000 homes a year, to provide replacements for urban and suburban slum dwellings which are presently or will become substandard, for dwellings lost by fire, demolition, and floods, and for temporary dwellings, most of them built during the war for only short-time use.

Despite the findings of the joint committee and of other congressional committees, there are still those who say we can solve this housing problem without enacting comprehensive housing legislation. Despite the record of festering urban slums and dreary rural shacks, there are those who say that if Government will just let things alone (except provide a little credit assistance), everything will work out all right.

I am conscious of the record that the private building industry has built up since the war. I hope that private builders will start a record-breaking million homes this year, as everything seems to indicate. I am in favor of the credit aids from the Federal Government which are contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which will help them achieve and maintain that record.

But I see nothing in the present situation that offers the hope that even with these credit aids, the private building industry will be able to achieve and maintain the production necessary to fill the enlarged goals that have been envisioned by the Joint Committee on Housing. Neither does the joint committee.

Let us take a look at the record. The previous peak in home building was reached 23 years ago, away back in 1925, when 937,000 dwelling units were started. Then construction began to slide down, helping to take the whole economy with it, until, in 1933, 93,000 homes, only 10 percent of the peak volume, were produced. Conditions in 1925 were very similar to what they are today. Homes were being built at prices and rents which only a small portion of American families could afford to pay. When that limited demand was filled, and when people who had over-extended themselves in a desperate search for homes became unable to meet mortgage payments, home building started down the toboggan slide. The result was that average housing production during the two decades before the war was only 500,000 homes a year, just enough to keep up with the increase in families and not enough to take worn-out and other bad houses out of use and send them to the junk yard.

This example which all of us remember characterizes the history of home construction, and this history will not change until one fundamental characteristic of the industry as it existed then and exists today is changed. That characteristic is that not enough people can afford new housing at the prices and rents at which it is made available to permit a sustained production sufficient to meet American needs. There are two ways of assuring enough housing for the

American people—one is through a public-housing program; the other is to bring the costs of private housing down, in relation to incomes, so that there will be enough demand to sustain the high rate of production which America needs. I think our emphasis should be on the latter. I think the Government should utilize its resources fully to help private enterprise get its costs down. I would like to see this filtration theory we hear about work, but it will work only if you pour in enough new houses to crowd out the slums at the bottom.

It is hardly germane to say that the costs of housing have not increased any more than other prices, although there is good evidence that building costs, and the selling prices of both new and used houses, have exceeded the general rise in the costs of living and income. What is important is that new houses cost too much today to sustain production at the levels needed, just as they did in the thirties and twenties.

What is needed is for the home-building industry to catch up with the modern industrial parade. It needs to develop mass-production methods to serve the mass markets awaiting for it. It needs to have the shackles of outmoded building codes and restrictive practices removed. The Federal Government can help in two principal ways. It can adapt its credit aids to the needs of builders using modern production methods. This is done in S. 866. And it can inaugurate a program of research into new methods, materials, and techniques, and to encourage their adoption. This is done in S. 866. The authority would be, and should be, broad enough to permit the Government to cooperate with home building in all aspects of housing, from the improvement of production methods in the factory down to the modernization of building codes. Congress will have ample opportunity to control the extent of these activities from year to year through the appropriations procedure.

I am hopeful that with the improved credit aids to private industry and a broad program of research, private enterprise will, in time, be able to take care of the housing needs of most of the American people. But I do not believe that with these aids private enterprise will be able to assume the burdens unaided of clearing out the festering slums in our cities. The changes in methods of production and distribution which we hope to see accomplished will not be sweeping or rapid enough to permit any early solution, by private enterprise, of the problems of low-income families living in urban slums or in the bad housing in our rural areas. Any comprehensive housing program must deal with these problems, too, if it is to accomplish decent homes for all American families. So the modest programs in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill of Federal assistance for slum clearance and public housing and of direct credit and subsidies for the improvement of farm homes are essential parts of that bill.

I have heard it said that the way to clear slums is to get rid of them, but nobody has ever explained to me how private builders are going to be able to buy up slumland at its present costs, remove the old houses, and then replan and redevelop the areas with homes which people can afford to buy. Private builders will do as they always have done, and do their building on raw, inexpensive land. The essence of the urban redevelopment program contained in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is for the Government to share with local communities the excessive costs of acquiring and clearing slum areas so that the cleared land can be made available, primarily to private builders, at prices which represent a fair value at its new use.

Neither has anybody ever explained to me how private builders are going to provide decent homes at prices and rents which present slum dwellers, or other low-income families can afford to pay. The people who have talked so glibly about the fine workings of the filtration theory have recently come along with some figures which, assuming certain things happened, purported to show that private enterprise was building for low-income families. I am sure those figures are small comfort to the low-income veteran looking for a place in which to live, or to the low-income family huddled together in a decaying tenement. They certainly are not believed by 90 percent of governors, mayors, and prominent individuals, including a majority of those connected with the home-building industry, who, according to a report issued by the Joint Committee on Housing, said that private enterprise would not be able to provide decent homes for all low-income families within the foreseeable future.

If, as opponents of this bill attempt to prove, 20 percent of the houses built last year finally were priced at $4,500 or less, they are not in localities of greatest housing need or else they are shacks which are substandard to begin with, or soon will be. There are certainly no such numbers of decent homes in Washington or in my home city at that price. A recent census survey indicates that the average prices at which new homes are being sold today in Washington is $13,000 to $15,000. This is beyond the means of four-fifths of the families in Washington.

There is only one way I know of at the present time to hope that these families will have decent homes in which to live, and that is through public assistance.

The only other argument against public assistance for slum clearance and public housing programs that deserves serious consideration is that these are problems that the local communities can and should solve. The fact is that most cities cannot afford to take on the additional burden and that the few cities which can will be able to handle only a part of the problem. The governors and mayors who replied to the joint committee questionnaire sent out by Senator WAGNER agreed that the cities and States could not take care of all the needs of low-income families, and only a few thought they could go beyond local tax exemption for public housing projects. Their judgment is sustained by the report, Coordination of Federal and State Taxes, filed by Senator BRICKER. This report describes the financial strains being imposed upon the cities and States by higher costs of services, by the necessity for making up for wartime postponement of replacements, maintenance work, and new construction, and by the inflexibility of their principal source of revenue—real-estate taxes. It is sustained by the heavy bond flotations of municipalities and by the increase in interest rates on such issues. It is obvious that if we leave the problem of slums and bad housing exclusively to the local communities, it will not be solved. I believe that the Federal Government, together with the local communities, has a responsibility for the people's housing needs. I think it needs to be concerned with the health and character of its people. I think it has some responsibility of seeing that children start out in life with the equality of opportunity that only decent homes can provide.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise on time generously furnished by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, not to discuss the pending legislation, but to give a short explanation of an amendment intended to be proposed jointly by the Senators from Oregon and Washington. At the time of the disastrous Columbia River floods, the Congress most generously acted to furnish emergency stopgap housing for those who were flooded from their homes and who lost even all personal belongings. Local groups have worked feverishly since that time to see that all sufferers had some sort of accommodations.

It is now the consensus that local housing authorities in Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., can, if certain federally owned housing projects and demountable housing units in the area be transferred to the local housing authorities, furnish reasonably permanent housing for the flood sufferers as rapidly as present stopgap facilities must be vacated. The plan proposed will effect a savings in funds provided for stopgap housing which will, in my opinion, be several times the value of the properties sought to be transferred under this amendment. The amendment simply provides for the transfer to the Vancouver local housing authority of two public housing projects together with 500 demountable units located in the area, all having a value of approximately $450,000; and for the transfer to the Portland local housing authority of two public housing units having an estimated value of $275,000.

This amendment has been drafted after consultation with the Housing and Home Finance Agency and local housing groups, both public and private. Any additional financing can be worked out within the fabric of existing law and at a saving to the Government of several times the value of the property sought to be transferred and utilized.

I hope my colleagues will support us in this effort.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield. I have only 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I shall take only 1 minute, Mr. President.

I wish to say that I join in everything the senior Senator from Oregon has said, and I add the point that the amendment we are offering makes possible an effective implementation of legislation which the Congress has already passed. This amendment will make it possible to carry out the aims and objectives which we have already sanctioned and approved in the legislation passed in the closing hours of the last session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Either the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Wisconsin will now be recognized.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire yields to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] to whom he allots 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, from the Midyear Economic Report of the President, which was transmitted to us the other day, I read at the bottom of page 14 the following statement:

The unusually high level of current demand for houses has combined with the unique character of the building industry to push home buyers' costs far more above those prevailing after World War I than consumer incomes have risen in the same time span. During the past year, the average price of new houses has risen about 20 percent, while average family income after taxes was only about 8 percent higher during the first half of 1948 than during the same period in 1947.

So, Mr. President, inflation is becoming more pronounced in the housing field, as in every other field; but all we are attempting to do here this morning, all we shall do if we adopt the McCarthy substitute, is to reduce the total demand for housing.

What is the real meaning of that statement? Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, vice chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, when testifying before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on August 4, 1948, had this to say:

A good example of the demand problem is in the field of housing. The point has been made that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is inconsistent with an anti-inflation program because it would add to demand.

This point is not well-founded. If there is a shortage of housing, and if this is contributing to excessive housing costs in the same way that a shortage of food would contribute to excessive food costs, then the production of more housing is anti-inflationary in the same sense that the production of more food would be anti-inflationary. It may well be that, for a time, we cannot divert much more labor and materials to the total production of housing in view of other competing national needs. But let us make sure that they are competing national needs, and not competing nonessentials. And even then, there would still remain the question of the composition of the housing that is being produced. It would still be sound and desirable to produce relatively more low-rent housing for veterans and others of modest means, and relatively less high-priced housing for families who can get along very nicely for a while with what they already have. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is designed basically for this purpose, although this is not true of the "Title VI" provisions contained in the bill. Thus, under present circumstances, talk about damping down the demand for housing is discriminating and mistaken until one breaks the demand down into various types. Some types of housing should be expanded, other types should be contracted.

So, Mr. President, the country is demanding low-rental housing because the country needs it.

The Senate on three separate occasions, I believe, voted for public housing and for low-cost rental housing. The public officials of Pennsylvania, Republican and Democrat, in State government and in municipal government, have favored, and still recommend, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The newspapers of Pennsylvania make the same demand.

Let me read now an editorial appearing in the Republican Philadelphia Inquirer on August 3:

CONGRESS SHOULD PASS HOUSING BILL

It would be folly to expect Congress, in the short space of the present special session, to give consideration to all the problems touched upon by President Truman's hodgepodge program. There is simply no time for the study that would be required.

One subject, however, is an outstanding exception. That is housing.

This problem has been already exhaustively investigated by both Houses of Congress. At least three congressional committees have conducted full-scale hearings on housing relief, and one committee traveled all over the country studying the subject.

There is surely not one aspect of housing needs that has not been examined in Washington. The conclusions reached by various experts in the field have gone into the makeup of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to promote low-cost housing.

The Senate has already passed the bill. It is locked up in the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and there are many indications that the House would promptly approve it if the committee would only release it.

There is no excuse for adjourning the present session without favorable action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner law. On many other proposals before Congress the Members can find reason for doing nothing at this time.

But they will not be able to convince the people that they are doing the right thing by killing off housing relief.

Too many persons have suffered acutely by reason of the housing shortage and the high prices of available houses and apartments to shrug away this subject.

One of the greatest double-crosses of our times has been perpetrated upon the American people in the matter of housing relief.

There is hardly a politician, from President on down, who has not promised to do something, since the day the war ended, to solve the housing problem. The problem is as unsolved as ever.

The Truman administration has mangled the subject of housing relief. It has periodically promised the construction of millions of homes and has gone through the motions of appointing housing commissions and expediters, but those millions of homes remain unbuilt.

Unable to work out anything on its own, the administration has all but washed its hands of the problem and turned it over to Congress. That body has had an exceptional opportunity to demonstrate its determination to accomplish something where the President failed, by pushing to passage the Taft-Ellender-Wagner law.

Opponents of Government-stimulated low-cost housing, however, spearheaded by an indefatigable real-estate lobby, have managed thus far to keep that law from passage.

The results are visible on all sides, in the continuing scarcity of homes, particularly in the low-cost field. Veterans who returned to the accompaniment of promises that homes would be found for them are still living doubled up in houses other than their own. Rental dwellings are almost impossible to locate in many sections and homeseekers are frequently compelled to buy houses priced above their means, simply because they have no other choice.

Favorite argument of the real-estate lobby in opposing the T-E-W bill was to the effect that the housing problem would solve itself, without Government aid. But it has not worked out that way.

So it is now objected that the housing bill would be inflationary, which is a fashionable term for almost anything that is disliked. If this objection is valid it would hold against virtually every public improvement, too, and we might find highway and sewer construction labeled inflationary.

The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill would help thousands of families to obtain decent homes at moderate cost. It is urgently needed. It could be passed quickly, without any further debate. The Republican majority in the House will be making a grave mistake—a political mistake—if it permits this bill to die.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate should pass this bill. I believe the Senate overwhelmingly favors the bill; but one or two Members of the other House say to the Senate of the United States, "Unless you bow to us, unless you strike out the provisions we oppose, we will not even appoint conferees. You, the Senate of the United States, must accept dictation from us, from one or two men. Housing legislation is dead for 1948 unless you accept our dictation."

So, Mr. President, the issue is much deeper than the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; it is deeper than the McCarthy substitute; yes, it is deeper than the housing legislation. The issue before the Senate of the United States is whether a few men in one House of the legislative branch of government can stymie and throttle the legislative processes. The issue is the preservation of constitutional government. The issue is the integrity of the Senate of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope and trust that the McCarthy substitute will be defeated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks an address I made nearly 2 years ago, on December 12, 1946, before a regional convention of the National Association of Housing Officials. In that address I predicted—quite accurately, it now turns out—how dark the prospect was for decent housing legislation in this Eightieth Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DARK OUTLOOK FOR HOUSING

(Speech by United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, at regional convention of National Association of Housing Officials, Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, December 12, 1946)

It should be a source of satisfaction to you men and women of NAHO to know that

the entire country is now painfully conscious of a problem you have been concerned over for these past many years, the problem of providing homes for our people at prices they can afford.

You are in the position today of the prophet who foresaw the doom, of the meteorologist who had predicted the deluge, of the courier who had brought the warning, only to be ignored until the catastrope had struck.

Having told the Nation for these past many years that our housing situation was becoming alarming, that firm, bold, imaginative steps should be taken to meet a need which was sure to come, you can sit back now, if you like, and point to your record of warning and say "I told you so." There is always some satisfaction in that.

But there's not satisfaction enough—not, I am sure, when considered in relation to your sincere concern over the problem and your sincere desire to see the job of housing our people met with forthright vigor. Patting yourselves on the back for how right you were will not solve the ills you warned against.

There is danger in it, too. By reminding people that you had tried to tell them years ago of a catastrophe which is now upon them, you risk their ire for not having told them in more emphatic terms. The insurance agent who reminds you the day after your fortune is lost in a fire that he had tried unsuccessfully to sell you fire insurance is likely to earn your undying antagonism for not having knocked you down, sat on your chest, and made you buy his product.

I'll have a little bit more to say later about this phase of your history—this business about having foreseen the danger and of having pointed to some of the solutions. First, however, I want to touch on the subject on which I have been asked specifically to speak: The legislative phase of the housing problem.

I wish today I could be a bearer of glad tidings; I wish I could start my speech with a direct promise to you that in the field of housing legislation—and, thus, in housing generally—everything is going to be all right.

But wishes do not build houses and wishes do not pass legislation, and any note of cheer which may creep into my remarks is, I am afraid, largely coincidental.

The cold, hard facts, from the legislative standpoint, are pretty cheerless. There will undoubtedly be legislation in Washington soon bearing on housing, but, speaking for myself, I am afraid it will be the wrong kind.

First, I see little prospect, at this present moment, for any legislation soon to resume the type of low-rent slum-clearance housing programs which were so successful before the war. Second, I see little if any prospect for legislation such as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft long-range national housing bill to stimulate private-enterprise capital in the housing field into the all-out efforts we know are necessary.

I may be overly pessimistic; I hope I am wrong. But I want to speak what is on my mind and speak it freely, and it is this: that the Congress now beginning to assemble in Washington, flushed with an astounding political victory at the polls, seems to be convinced it was elected for only one purpose—to end governmental "interference," that's the term they use, in almost every field of endeavor in which the Government became interested in the past 14 years.

That includes housing.

The outlook for legislation involving housing includes, as I see it now from signs which are pretty evident in Washington, the removal of all construction controls yet remaining on the books, letting industrial and commercial builders grab the materials, and the end or virtual end of rent control through substantial increases or perhaps the abdication of Federal control in favor of State control. There may be, too, some liberalization of FHA mortgage-insurance coverage designed to maintain present inflationary real estate trends yet a little longer. These are the wrong types of legislation. For the rest, I think Congress, as it is now talking and thinking, means to let housing find its own way out of the morass. It will undoubtedly seek to starve out Federal agencies now concerned with housing and give the real estate industry the program that industry so long has espoused—laissez faire and the devil take the hindmost.

The fellow the devil is going to take—used to be known as GI Joe. He'll get the worst deal, because his needs are the worst. But the public generally is going to suffer with him.

To understand why I consider the immediate future for progressive housing legislation so very dark, I want to take you back only six short months or so. To my mind, our rosy postwar future collapsed just about then, with the collapse of effective inflation control. And our housing outlook, I fear, started on its way to what also begins to look like a collapse—one, I hope which might be avoided even yet.

You all know the history of the OPA debates in Congress, the results of them, and the start we made then toward our present crisis.

But something happened then that you may not have watched very closely. You may not have noticed. Perhaps only politicians paid it very much attention.

When the House of Representatives passed the first price-control renewal bill back before Easter, it was a very worried collection of Congressmen who saw that bill go to the Senate. The men who put through the amendments designed to cripple OPA were scared. They knew those amendments if upheld, meant the end of effective price control. They had a big spree on the House floor while voting through those amendments but when the bill went to the Senate they began to worry over the effects of their action come election day.

Then they went home for Easter vacation, and when they got back, they weren't nearly so scared any more. No one back home seemed to be too upset by these OPA votes. Very few constituents ganged up on their Congressmen to demand an explanation for killing—or trying to kill—effective inflation control.

That was significant. It gave those Congressmen willing to see inflation let loose upon us the courage they needed to stay in the fight. When the first bill was vetoed, they took a chance on voting the same amendments a second time. Prices began to rise, of course, inflation came upon us creepingly at first, then with giant steps, and still the resentment was slow in rising back home. Then began the producer strikes, as more and more industries looked to the end of price and inflation control completely. The meat crisis burst upon us. The people, so slow to rise in anger as their savings and their earnings began to shrink under the inflationary pressures, suddenly became aroused—

Meat—they must have meat.

Well, they got meat, and the pattern which up to then had been emerging gradually, suddenly traced itself out in indelible ink.

Those Congressmen who had voted so gleefully for the crippling of controls, who had thereupon suffered untold anguish over the political repercussions they feared from their OPA votes, found themselves being reelected overwhelmingly.

Now every Member of Congress, and you can take my word on this, is acutely conscious of his record, particularly his voting record which is down in black and white and easily consulted. When reelected, therefore, he assumes his record has been approved by the voters in his district. He likes to assume that every vote in his record has been approved.

Consequently, among a majority of those Congressmen coming back next month there is an inclination to believe that their voters have resoundingly approved, among other things, the murder of price control, and with it the hobbling of housing; the refusal to put price ceilings on existing homes and thus head off the disgraceful real-estate inflation we have since experienced; the critical attitude they displayed toward the housing program generally and their general antipathy to controls of any kind.

It is my personal belief, and I think you agree with me, that these men were reelected in spite of rather than because of their votes on those particular issues. But these Congressmen don't seem to think so. They point to the election returns as their mandate to pursue similar policies for two more years.

I admit the motivation is strong. For the people have done little if anything to convince their individual Congressmen—those who were reelected—of the errors of some of their ways.

And that's why I consider the future of housing legislation so dark. Meeting the housing crisis requires planning, direction, channeling of materials—Government interference, if you will. And this doesn't fit in with the talk we are hearing around Washington of complete decontrol of everything, including housing.

In view of this feeling, how, I ask, if we couldn't get the national housing bill out of the House Banking and Currency Committee last session, are we going to get it out this time? If the people showed such little concern over things as fundamental as the price of food and the loss of their savings and earnings, what incentive is there for conservative-minded anti-Government-interference Congressmen—Government interference, meaning affirmative Government action of any kind—what incentive do they have now to vote for something as communistic as this bill was supposed to have been?

No incentive at all, that I can see, unless you and others like you get a whole lot busier than you have been up to now in seeing to it that the people know what this bill is all about.

It would be presumptuous for me here today to tell you men and women of NAHO the facts about housing—you know them backward and forward.

You know that long before the war made the problem so acute, so visible, so personal even to families in the middle and high income brackets, that we had a frightful deficit of necessary livable housing for our people in this country. You know that about 40 percent of all our homes are 30 years or more old; and 20 percent are at least 40 years old; that more than 30 percent of all homes lack either toilets and baths or inside plumbing of any kind or need major repairs—that about 6,000,000 dwelling units are needed today to meet the barest minimum standards of health and decency for families now living in disgraceful slums, and that millions of new families are being formed with no immediate prospect for housing they can afford; that the 116,667 slum clearance units in public housing programs of the past and the 360,000 or so permanent war housing units were but a drop in the bucket from the standpoint of need and that little if any progress has been made by private enterprise up to the war toward meeting the needs of those above the public housing income level. In 1940, for instance, less than 500,000 homes were built privately.

And you know, too, that even the record-breaking construction era we are now passing through is not even beginning to meet the

problem. One million two hundred thousand units—that was the goal for residential construction in 1946. Of these 700,000 were to be of conventional construction—and we are just about meeting that goal, getting that many under way. It's a real achievement. But it is far from enough. The goal of 250,000 temporary units which was set for this year will also probably be met. There again, we have achievement, real achievement. The industrial housing goal is not being met this year, apparently, and I'm afraid the next Congress will see to it that this program gets even less encouragement next year than it has received this year.

I think it's too bad that industry itself has shown such a great reluctance to go into this field without overwhelming governmental guarantees against loss. I think, too, that the Government itself, as represented by RFC, has been unnecessarily cautious.

But RFC's caution is merely a reflection of the apparent feeling of the new Congress. And Congress considers itself a reflection of the feeling of the people.

In these days of Gallup polls, it is not enough just to try to convince your Congressman; you've first got to convince the voters.

I said earlier that I was going to refer again to your organization and others like it, and the efforts you made over the years to warn of the coming crisis in housing, warnings which fell largely on deaf ears.

Please forgive me for being perhaps an unmannerly guest, but I don't think you did as good a job as you should have done, as good a job as you can do.

For instance, let's look at this Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, which died so ignobly in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Is there anyone here who thinks it communistic? Is there anything in it which has not already become an accepted part of American housing tradition? Is there anything communistic about building Government-financed low-rent housing for those in the very lowest income bracket? Senator TAFT didn't think so. He spoke for the bill, he sponsored the bill, he particularly endorsed this small phase of the bill calling for Government action in a field where private enterprise cannot possibly make money.

But when the cry arose in the House and in the House Banking and Currency Committee over the communism of this phase of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, how many of you men and women—known in your own communities, respected there, recognized as persons who know a whole lot more than the general public about the problem of housing—how many of you, I ask, wrote to your newspapers disputing the irresponsible criticisms emanating out of Washington, and which those newspapers published, calling the national housing bill communistic because of its very small portion devoted to public housing? Did you appoint yourselves committees of one each to nail the lies and defend the truth?

How many veterans—then, as now, bitterly disillusioned in their search for living quarters—did you personally talk to and explain this bill, its provisions, for instance, for very long term, high percentage, FHA loans on new housing; its provisions for urban redevelopment encouraging insurance companies and others to build modern rental housing on land now useless to housing because it is so high in price, even though covered now with slums costing your cities thousands and millions in municipal services, policing, health, and other costs?

Did any of you members here today from Pittsburgh tell your newspapers and business interests there, as they watch the slow deterioration of your golden triangle, how this bill could make into an overnight reality the ambitious program of Mayor Lawrence for redevelopment of the lower downtown area, with the Federal Government investing in Pittsburgh's future? In New York, in my city of Philadelphia, elsewhere in this region, you men and women of NAHO know what this bill could do to restore our blighted areas with modern rental housing which would be privately built, privately operated, and profitable. Have you told your town of these possibilities?

If that is communism, Senator TAFT never thought so. Has Senator TAFT suddenly turned Bolshevist?

Senator TAFT is a recognized leader of the Republican Party in the Senate and, too, in the whole Congress. He has real influence. Yet it is significant to me that his influence was not sufficient to get this bill through the House, where it was held up largely by Members of his own party.

As long as your own Congressmen think the real-estate interests opposing any and all types of progressive housing legislation speak for all, or even a majority, of the people in their districts, then there is no chance for the new Eightieth Congress to do a thing about housing but do what real estate asks—turn it loose completely to find its own way.

I am reminded of what happened a year ago when housing construction was, in effect, turned loose. Controls were lifted. Ceilings were off. The housing built during that period from September 1945 to January 1946, is now on the market—much of it, that is—and it is still waiting buyers. Why? Because the builders, as if by magic, all began concentrating on the lush, high-profit, high-priced field.

About 28 percent of all homes begun then, during the free market period, were designed to sell at more than $10,000. Yet, it is significant, that after controls were reestablished last January, only 2 percent of new homes were priced at more than $10,000.

In Washington, today, there is home after home begun during the free market period and still for sale at prices ranging from $23,000 to $29,000. They are nice houses. They have not just one or one and a half bathrooms—they have two and three baths. The baths are all tile. They have copper plumbing, slate roofs, screened porches, perhaps electric dishwashers and air-conditioning. They have everything.

These, incidentally, appear typical of the houses for veterans put up in Washington during the free market period. The same was largely true in other cities.

Most of the veterans I know are looking for places a little less pretentious. I think they believe they could get along with only one bathroom and could perhaps tolerate asbestos or asphalt roofing. Conceivably they could manage with only galvanized plumbing and get along without the electric dishwasher, at least for a while. I think they would put up with many such hardships in order to obtain homes they could afford. During the free market period, they weren't getting such houses. And now, with relaxed controls, many are finding they still cannot get them. A $10,000 ceiling is helpful, but most veterans, I think, want homes at $4,000, $6,000, and $8,000.

They'll get them, too—if they can hold out long enough. I think it's a sorry shame, though, that they—who have already waited so long—must wait now for a collapse in real estate in order to buy such homes—and it is altogether possible that if a collapse comes, the veteran may not have the money to buy any kind of a home.

Yes, as I said, the legislative outlook for housing is dark. But it does not have to remain so. There is nothing in the Constitution which says that once you elect a Congressman for 2 years you are powerless to influence his votes. Lobbying is still legal; in fact, we've set up official rules and regulations for it now. Everybody can have a lobby and everyone can be his own lobby.

I believe we can still have progressive housing legislation in the next Congress only if the people, first, are thoroughly convinced they want it, and if they then convince their Congressmen they want it. It's up to people who know the facts to see to it that the people get those facts.

In other words, it's a job for you.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

To whom does the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in his recent speech to the Congress, the President of the United States said he had called us into emergency session for two fundamental reasons. The first was that he wanted the Congress to consider the question of inflation; and, second, and most importantly, he wanted the Congress to pass legislation which would accelerate the building of residential houses in this country at this time. I think it reasonable and proper to quote from the President's speech a few sentences of his on the subject of housing. The President said:

> The second reason why I have called the Congress back is that our people need legislation now to help meet the national housing shortage.
>
> We desperately need more housing at lower prices—prices which families of moderate income, particularly veterans' families, can afford to pay. We are not getting it.
>
> Even more urgently, we need more rental housing, especially low-rent housing. We are not getting it.
>
> Most of the housing now being built is for sale, or for rent, at prices far above the reach of the average American family.

Up to that point in his declaration of purpose on the subject of housing the President had not referred to either slum clearance or public low-rent housing. The reason for his failure to do so up to that point in his speech is obvious because the President and the Congress and the public want more houses at lower prices, and they want them immediately. The President knows, as does every thinking Member of the Congress, that the passage of comprehensive legislation to provide for public low-rent housing and slum clearance would not result in the construction of additional units of housing in this country during the period of time ending more than several years from now.

This Congress, in dealing with the housing situation—and let us not forget that we came back to try to do something about it—is faced with a very practical situation. On the 22d day of April the Senate passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and sent it to the House of Representatives. The Senate was obviously in support of that legislation, and would have liked to have it enacted. That measure remains before the House of Representatives, where, for reasons sufficient to its membership and leadership, the bill has not as yet been passed.

Today we are being asked, in the face of a declared emergency by the President, to send to the House of Representatives this committee bill, a piece of proposed legislation which the House has already had before it, on which it has taken no action, and on which we have reason to believe the House will take no action at this session.

Therefore, it is obvious that to adopt the committee recommendation is to take an unwarranted risk that we shall come out of this special emergency session of the Congress with no housing legislation at all.

I know that the chairman of our Banking and Currency Committee, who takes an opposing view, will agree that the McCarthy amendment, which will stimulate more housing at lower costs, is an improved version of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in every single, solitary respect, except that it does not include the social and welfare provisions affecting public housing and slum clearance.

Mr. TOBEY. And rural housing?

Mr. CAIN. And rural housing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired. To whom does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter, dated last July 30, and addressed to me by Rear Adm. J. E. Maher, United States Navy, Chief of Base Maintenance, Navy Department, regarding the effect of the housing situation on the morale and reenlistment of Navy personnel. This letter from Admiral Maher is in reply to an inquiry I addressed to the Navy Department regarding housing, especially as to its effect on Navy personnel in the Newport, R. I., area. The letter is a long one and the time allotted me prevents me from reading it all. I shall read a few sentences, however.

The housing shortage is considered one of the more important factors presently affecting morale and reenlistments of Navy personnel. Other factors such as pay, separation of families during sea duty, nonadaptability to service life, etc., enter into the picture but it is believed that unfavorable living conditions, occasioned by the housing shortage, have the greatest adverse effect. This is borne out in a letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel, dated September 23, 1947, to the Chief of Naval Operations which is quoted in part as follows:

"The housing problem both as it affects officers and enlisted personnel is a matter of vital importance to the entire Navy. Inadequate or nonexistent housing is an immediate cause of generally low morale, expediency transfers, prospective lowered reenlistments, hardship discharges, changing of orders, high rate of emergency leaves, and other administrative problems requiring expenditure of time, money, and loss of manhours.

He then proceeds to give various examples and illustrations.

"This bureau has estimated that 75 percent of all transfer requests received from petty officers (approximately 200 per month) stem from the lack of adequate housing. It has become almost 'routine' to receive requests for transfer back to sea after a few months of shore duty and the reason is always 'no housing.' Examples of men receiving their first tour of shore duty since before the war and not being able to live with their families are legion. Obviously, such men are neither contented nor efficient.

"The unrest prevalent throughout the Navy because of the housing shortage is vividly portrayed in the stream of correspondence received daily in the Bureau of Naval Personnel. All bureaus, departments, and branches of the Navy are being affected now. The expected decline in personnel strength in the near future will make the full utilization of every available man a matter of concern to every member of the Navy. Improvement of the critical housing situation will stretch the Navy's dollars farther and will make available thousands of man-hours of work now being lost.

"From congressional sources, from fathers and mothers and from wives, this Bureau receives a continuing flow of letters pointing out the need for housing, charging lack of interest in the welfare and morale of our men and asking what we intend to do about the situation. Such feeling has a positive and definite effect upon morale. * * *

"Since VJ-day, because of the Nation-wide housing shortage, dependent housing has become one of the greatest morale factors in the Navy."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GREEN. In view of that fact, I ask unanimous consent to have the whole letter printed in the RECORD immediately following these brief remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C., July 30, 1948.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: In response to your inquiry, I submit herewith information on the effects of the housing shortage on morale and reenlistments of Navy personnel.

The housing shortage is considered one of the more important factors presently affecting morale and reenlistments of Navy personnel. Other factors such as pay, separation of families during sea duty, nonadaptability to service life, etc., enter into the picture but it is believed that unfavorable living conditions, occasioned by the housing shortage, have the greatest adverse effect. This is borne out in a letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel, dated September 23, 1947, to the Chief of Naval Operations which is quoted in part as follows:

"The housing problem both as it affects officers and enlisted personnel is a matter of vital importance to the entire Navy. Inadequate or nonexistent housing is an immediate cause of generally low morale, expediency transfers, prospective lowered reenlistments, hardship discharges, changing of orders, high rate of emergency leaves, and other administrative problems requiring expenditure of time, money, and loss of manhours. As an example the enlisted discharge section receives approximately 800 requests for hardship or dependency discharges per month. Of this number some 20 percent of the requests are based on inadequate housing, and unsatisfactory housing conditions, undoubtedly, are a contributing factor in many others. In addition, many personal visits, telephone calls, and personal letters are received daily in the Bureau of Naval Personnel with requests for discharge or change of duty because of housing conditions. No figures are available on the number of personnel who fail to reenlist because of unsatisfactory accommodations. However, the problem is one of constant concern to major commands ashore and afloat as is evidenced by reports, queries, and suggestions received in the Bureau, and it is a known fact that reenlistments are curtailed by lack of a place for families to live. Requests for transfers from one duty station to another so that the man concerned could be near his family have reached a new high.

"This bureau has estimated that 75 percent of all transfer requests received from petty officers (approximately 200 per month) stem from the lack of adequate housing. It has become almost routine to receive requests for transfer back to sea after a few months of shore duty and the reason is always 'no housing.' Examples of men receiving their first tour of shore duty since before the war and not being able to live with their families are legion. Obviously, such men are neither contented nor efficient.

"The unrest prevalent throughout the Navy because of the housing shortage is vividly portrayed in the stream of correspondence received daily in the Bureau of Naval Personnel. All bureaus, departments, and branches of the Navy are being affected now. The expected decline in personnel strength in the near future will make the full utilization of every available man a matter of concern to every member of the Navy. Improvement of the critical housing situation will stretch the Navy's dollars further and will make available thousands of man-hours of work now being lost.

"From congressional sources, from fathers and mothers, and from wives, this Bureau receives a continuing flow of letters pointing out the need for housing, charging lack of interest in the welfare and morale of our men and asking what we intend to do about the situation. Such feeling has a positive and definite effect upon morale."

The Chief of Naval Operations in endorsing this letter to the Secretary of the Navy on October 3, 1947 commented in part, as follows:

"The Chief of Naval Operations is acutely aware of the need for large-scale recruiting and reenlistments if the enlisted strength of the Navy is to be maintained. The effectiveness of the Navy in the years ahead will depend largely on the numbers and caliber of the men enlisted during the next 12 months.

"The Chief of Naval Operations feels that in peacetime, when the total number of personnel is limited by appropriations, we cannot afford to pursue policies which induce our best men to return to civilian life. It is incumbent upon the Navy, particularly in view of the present international situation, to insure that the limited funds provided for national defense are used most efficiently. It is considered that this calls for taking all possible steps to attract and retain high caliber enlisted personnel. An extraordinary effort toward removing factors causing the lowered morale described in the basic letter appears to be mandatory.

"Since VJ-day, because of the Nation-wide housing shortage, dependent housing has become one of the greatest moral factors in the Navy. Despite the fact that considerable funds have been expended in providing dependent housing, the need continues to be urgent and its effect upon morale extremely critical. The Chief of Naval Operations feels that it would be unrealistic to expect that future appropriations for housing construction, a gradual lessening of the civilian housing shortage, or possibly a less favorable civilian labor market will solve the personnel problem. This problem must be dealt with much sooner than any of these factors can operate. The improved morale sought here must be brought to bear on the reen-

listment and recruiting programs of the present fiscal year. Further, it is considered that with their present pay, our enlisted personnel will, as was the case before the war, be unable to compete in the civilian market for adequate accommodations, even when housing is not in short supply."

The above-quoted matter has been determined to be inapplicable as of the present date.

Naval personnel are seldom able to remain in one locality long enough to compete for housing with permanently located civilians. Most Naval personnel coming to an area where there is a housing shortage find that rental housing within their means does not become available to them, because of the prior interest of permanently located civilians, until a large portion of their tour of duty in the area has expired. This type of experience is particularly unfortunate in its effect on the morale of enlisted personnel coming from extended tours of sea duty to shore duty with the expectation of at least a short period of normal family life. Their expectation is seldom realized and their reaction all too often is to want to give up the Navy as a career.

In most instances, naval personnel, both officers and men, veterans of World War II, have no choice but to report for duty where ordered and are forced to be separated from their families because suitable housing cannot be found. Many others are occupying accommodations far below acceptable standards such as trailers, tourist cabins, etc. These men cannot exercise an option available to former servicemen—that of moving to another locality—without leaving the Navy.

The housing problem described above has the maximum impact upon the most valuable and highly trained personnel. It is a fact that most experienced enlisted men in the Navy are married. Percentages of men in the various pay grades, who are married, as computed by the Bureau of Naval Personnel, are as follows: Chief petty officers, 81 percent; petty officers, second class, 31 percent; petty officers, first class, 61 percent; petty officers, third class and below, 8 percent.

Although enlisted personnel in the chief petty officer and petty officer, first class categories are those most affected by the housing shortages, it does not follow that these men are the ones who fail to reenlist. Most of these men are now accepting unsatisfactory living conditions because of their seniority in and loyalty to the service and the large equity which most of them have in retirement income. The present rating structure of the Navy is markedly unbalanced showing shortages in the lower petty-officer ratings and excesses in the higher ratings and nonrated men. The Navy's most serious problem in enlisted personnel acquisition is that of inducing its first enlistees to reenlist. These men, although not directly affected by the housing shortage, since most of them are not married are nonetheless affected by the state of morale of the senior petty officers. The man considering a first reenlistment takes into account his probability of satisfactory living conditions, etc., in the future. He expects to marry and have a family. If he sees that the Navy's senior petty officers are not able to have a satisfactory family life, he is not likely to commit himself to a Navy career. However, the attracting of Navy career men in large numbers is a most important factor in the national defense—particularly when we consider the possible rating structure of the Navy about 10 to 15 years hence when present senior petty officers have retired.

For every man who can be induced to reenlist, the Government saves the thousands of dollars required to train a recruit, and the Navy gains the services of a trained man. Once a man has reenlisted the chances of his making the Navy his career are quite high. His each subsequent reenlistment saves the cost of training a recruit. In short, if we can have a Navy of career men, we shall be able to make the maximum contribution to the national defense at a minimum cost. Conversely, if most of our personnel fail to reenlist, we shall be able to make only a minimum contribution at high cost.

The policy of the Navy with regard to the providing of housing accommodations for its personnel is determined by the Navy's responsibility for the national defense. The Navy endeavors to provide housing for its personnel in all cases where the lack of such housing is found to be detrimental to naval efficiency. In accordance with this concept, before World War II, when no critical housing shortage existed, the Navy felt justified in expending public funds only for construction of such housing as was necessary to provide for the residence on-station of certain key personnel required, in the public interest, to be available at all times, and for personnel attached to isolated stations.

During and subsequent to World War II, the housing situation became acute. During the war the housing shortage was alleviated to a considerable extent by the construction of numerous Government housing projects in the vicinity of the principal military installations. Since the war, the Navy has made extraordinary efforts to provide such housing for its personnel as can be justified in the interest of national defense within the limits of funds available. As of January 1, 1948, these efforts resulted in the creating of 2,711 family units by construction (mostly at isolated stations, which have highest Navy housing priority) and 1,638 units by conversion of suitable existing buildings on stations in localities having high Navy housing priority. In addition, a total of 7,054 units of all types have been built overseas.

In order to provide a maximum number of quarters with available funds, suitable existing buildings in localities where the need has been greatest have been converted into apartments whenever the unit cost was found to be less than new construction.

It is realized that it is impossible to secure funds in an amount sufficient to provide new or converted housing for all naval personnel during a period of Nation-wide housing shortage. However, it is desired to point out that new construction of public quarters would result in a substantial saving of public funds when observed from a long-range viewpoint. Service personnel occupying public quarters forfeit their rental allowances. Public quarters are therefore self-amortizing by savings effected in the appropriation "Pay and subsistence" from which rental allowances are paid to those personnel who must seek housing accommodations other than public quarters.

In March 1947 the Navy completed a survey of defense housing needs within the continental limits. At that time it was determined that 21,237 units were required to meet Navy needs in the most congested defense areas. For various reasons, principal of which was the limit of funds available in the appropriation specifically designated for maintenance of rental housing, the total was reduced to 10,385 units. These were requested from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency by letters dated March 28, 1947, and October 13, 1947. As of this date, approximately 7,000 of these units have been transferred to the Navy; the remainder, approximately 3,200 units, are the subject of dispute between the Navy and local interests.

In the absence of appropriations for new construction, it was considered that acquisition of defense housing projects was the only practicable and the most economical means of providing housing for married naval personnel attached to permanent naval shore establishments. Present law requires the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to dispose of defense housing as expeditiously as possible. Transfer to the Navy is effected without exchange of funds. It is therefore considered imperative that the Navy should make every effort to acquire those projects presently in dispute.

In this connection, the Navy has requested transfer of the Tonomy Hill project at Newport, R. I. The transfer of this project is being delayed because of conflict with local interests. The Navy has an urgent need for housing in the Newport area. A recent survey reveals that there is a 196-unit deficiency for shore-based officer personnel and an 823 unit deficiency for shore-based enlisted personnel. Consideration of only the number of shore-based personnel does not give a realistic picture of the number of Navy families dependent on the Newport-Quonset area for housing as there are 20,000 fleet personnel attached to ships and carrier squadrons based in this area for whom no provision for housing has been taken into account. It is estimated that 7,500 of these fleet personnel desire family housing.

A market analyst from the Federal Housing Administration is presently conducting a housing survey of the Newport area in conjunction with the Navy. The survey is being undertaken with special reference to the housing requirements in this community, both Navy and civilian broken down into appropriate categories, with some conclusion as to the portion of the need that can be met by private industry and recommendations as to how the balance of the need might be met. Consultations will be held with local business and civic interests as well as representatives of the municipal government. It is hoped that this survey will present a solution to the housing problem in the Newport area.

I shall be very happy to furnish you with any additional information you may require.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. MAHER,
Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
Chief of Base Maintenance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Wisconsin yields 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from New Hampshire also yields 2 minutes, making 4 minutes in all, to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment submitted by the Senators from Oregon [Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE] and the Senators from Washington [Mr. CAIN and Mr. MAGNUSON]. The subject matter of the amendment has not been considered by the committee. We have had no report from the Federal agencies involved, and we have had no estimates, so far as I know, of the amount of property that will be turned over to the housing authorities in the States of Washington and Oregon by Federal agencies. It is not a relief measure; it is not a charitable grant. We are turning this property over to local housing authorities. They will get title to the property without any cost whatever, and they will be permitted to charge rent to the flood victims. They will not have to remain

on the property nor comply with the terms of the bill more than a day, a week, or a month.

It is a proposal which should be given some study. We should not start to give away Federal property amounting probably to millions of dollars without any more consideration than can now be given to it on the floor of the Senate. I have 4 minutes in which to discuss and to oppose an amendment which was submitted last night. It was not even printed until this morning. In all fairness, if the amendment had merit, I would favor it. I have no lack of sympathy for the flood victims. We have voted millions for their relief. This is not that kind of a measure. It is a measure granting to municipal housing authorities, without cost, valuable property of the United States, including 2,005 dwellings in one project alone, the university homes project. It may be the right thing to do, but it should not be done in the last moments of the session under the existing circumstances. I am opposed to the amendment.

I may say that if we are to enter into a field of this kind in the Congress we have projects in Utah running into millions of dollars. There would be just as much justification for turning those projects over to the municipalities of Utah, Salt Lake City, Ogden, and other municipalities so as to give preference to veterans who are now without homes and transfer the properties to them without cost.

Under this amendment, rentals would be collected. It would be a money proposition for the municipal housing authorities in the two States of Washington and Oregon. I think, in common justice and fairness, the Senate ought to give the matter adequate consideration before agreeing to such an amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is my understanding that during the recent regular session of the Congress, many bills were blocked because, as contended by many Members of this body, we should formulate a long-range program which would treat equitably all comparable cases. In the instant case, is it not questionable whether we are showing a preference with respect to this particular transfer in comparison with other proposals which have been shelved in the past?

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator is entirely correct. There were proposals from Idaho and from my own State of Utah relating to measures of this kind. They were opposed on the ground that no general policy had been adopted by the United States with reference to the disposal of property.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired. To whom does the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from New Hampshire have combined to yield a total of 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], to submit an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon does not seem to be present at the moment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then the Senator from Wisconsin yields 30 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio for 30 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we have before us one of the two important measures to be considered at this session of the Congress. This is a peculiar session. It is a session called in the midst of a political campaign. It is not subject to ordinary rules. We cannot treat legislation in the ordinary way. When we returned we had the choice of opening the session to all legislation, of treating it as a regular session, of getting the committees going and putting all the machinery into action. If that were done, there was no hope that we could finish probably short of 2 months, at least.

Furthermore, the President then submitted a program which, if we had undertaken to consider it in detail, would easily have required 6 months before we could have taken up all the important measures, which involved many differences of opinion and which, after all, had not been neglected by Congress, but which in most cases simply involved disagreements between the Congress and the President. In that situation we were in the same position as were those who were in charge of the machinery of Congress in making a decision, and we made it in the statement which we issued at that time. I read from that statement, in part:

> In the President's program there is very little of an emergency nature. Most of the social welfare legislation proposed is of a permanent character—

And that applies to public housing—

> which can be considered more thoroughly next winter. The Democrats controlled Congress for 14 years, professing the greatest interest in social welfare legislation. Now they say that they failed to deal adequately with social security, education, health, and housing and blame the Republicans for not enacting the program they failed to enact during 14 years.
>
> We believe, therefore, that this session should be limited to a short period as suggested by the President himself, and our efforts will be devoted to completing the session as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I notice that yesterday the President referred to the fact that the House committee had refused to hear some of the Cabinet Members. We asked the Government to present all the witnesses they had, last Wednesday, but in many cases they were not ready. Mr. Bremer testified before our committee publicly, and was given the right to and has filed, I think, a statement with the House committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry, but I have no time, under the rule, to yield.

Continuing the statement:

> We will carefully examine all of the President's recommendations to determine whether there are any matters which can be dealt with promptly on an emergency basis.

On the particular question of housing we said:

> During the first week also, committees of both Houses will give further consideration to the housing problem and any proposals in respect thereto. Much already has been done to solve that problem. Stimulated by the legislation adopted by the Eightieth Congress, a million new dwelling units are being constructed this year, and their construction practically exhausts the materials and labor available for the purpose. This is more than twice the number of dwelling units constructed when the Truman administration, with every emergency power and millions of subsidy funds, was fumbling with the situation.

We may well remember that we gave the President every power to act. He established an administration under Mr. Wyatt which turned out to be such a complete failure that the President canceled the whole business and turned back four-fifths of the money which we had appropriated.

> We are deeply concerned with a long-range program increasing still further the number of homes to be constructed, but such a program involves serious complications and differences of opinion which cannot be dealt with adequately at this special session.

Mr. President, before signing that statement, I canvassed as thoroughly as I could the position of the House leaders who had opposed public housing, and I found that their position was still the same. It became clear to me that if that controversy were precipitated we would be here for several months. It was a permanent, long-range program, and, like many of the other things proposed by the President, it could be more adequately dealt with at the regular session.

So far as I myself am concerned, I propose to introduce at the next session a bill reinstating the general program of public housing and slum clearance, including rural housing, which is practically the same as the subsidized system which I am proposing for the cities.

So, Mr. President, the truth is that if we want the session to finish, we have substantially to agree with the House. It may be that the House is justified in its position, but the Constitution provides that no bill can pass unless the House, as well as the Senate, agrees to it. Both Houses have a veto on legislation. Doing the best I can, and with a sincere desire to put through a public-housing program, I recognize that it cannot be done at this time. Therefore we sought to develop a bill which would do everything that could be done without becoming involved in an extremely controversial long-term question of public housing.

We have probably built as many homes this year as we could have hoped to build if we had a public-housing program. The President's report, from which I read a few days ago, shows very clearly his own view that we have had a very successful housing program. He said:

> Residential construction is expected to increase the total supply of dwelling units by

more than a million during 1948. This high output has been accompanied by an increase in costs that is outrunning consumers' ability to pay for the housing they need.

His advisers further say:

This volume of residential construction is already straining the capacities of the construction industry in many areas and of producers of some construction materials, and is unquestionably competing with other primary national needs. This situation highlights what has become the chronic necessity of developing and applying new methods and substitute materials to the housebuilding industry.

On the demand side, a distinction needs to be drawn between essential need and capacity to pay current costs. The basic housing needs of a growing population in the face of a serious and cumulative shortage would be sufficient to sustain the present level or even a higher level of home building for many years to come. But only a few years at most would be required to saturate the demand of those who can acquire houses at current costs, and that saturation would portend a serious downswing in residential construction.

What we have in this bill attempted to do is to develop and assist all private construction possible of as cheap houses as can be built under private construction. We have eliminated the main feature of the proposal which was made last year by the House and which, in fact, was in both bills at that time, to continue section 603 under which builders could borrow 90 percent of the value of one-, two-, and three-family houses and could build on a shoestring without having to put up any capital. That was the most inflationary feature of the program, and we eliminated it from this particular bill. While, according to the figures of the Department of Commerce, there have been built many more cheap houses than I thought would be possible, houses which, I assume, are mostly in rural areas and suburban districts, costing less than $3,250, exclusive of land, yet in general there have been too many houses built of the $10,000 to $12,000 class under section 603. We have eliminated that section so as not to encourage further the building of such homes.

The bill contains amendments to title I providing for a limited type of insurance for houses costing $4,500. The figure was $3,000, but we raised it to $4,500. Such houses can be built in the South and in rural districts. To a considerable extent we may hope that it will encourage the building of very cheap homes. A $4,500 home can be bought or rented by a man with a family, receiving an income of approximately $2,250. That gets down to a point which will cover today most of the 14,000,000 industrial workers and a great many others.

The amended title II provides special inducements for builders to construct homes costing not less than $6,000, which certainly is the very lowest price at which houses can be built in any urban community in the North. There is a special inducement offered by giving to the builders of such homes mortgages up to 85 percent. That is not the same as section 603, which provides for 90 percent, but it will require builders to put up some capital. It will require them to put up a much smaller percentage of the capital than if they built $10,000 or $12,000 homes. In other words, the effort is to stimulate the building of two $6,000 homes instead of one $12,000 home. Obviously it is no more inflationary to build two of $6,000 value than one of $12,000 value, and twice as many people will be taken care of. The general tenor of the bill is designed to encourage the construction of the cheaper homes.

The other main defect in the housing program has been the difficulty of getting anyone to build houses for rental; that is, larger scale projects on which the houses can be rented to a number of families. There was practically no success under title II of FHA in getting such rental houses built. The only sign of some kind of rental housing occurred under section 608, title VI, which is, I think, perhaps somewhat too liberal for builders, but under that some building of house rental projects was undertaken. So we have decided to continue section 608, hoping it may encourage the building of rental housing rather than the building of houses for sale, the sale of which is forced on many veterans who should not have to buy them, and who would prefer to live in rental housing.

In accordance with the general recommendation of the President regarding the need of developing new methods of building, cheaper methods of building, we also continued section 609, which encourages the construction of prefabricated homes, and section 611, which encourages the construction of a vast number of homes under prefabrication plans on the site, a special method which is hopefully adopted, although we reduce the mortgage which could be given on such homes to about $6,000, or limit the total cost of the house to about $7,500, as compared with $9,000 or $10,000 as the section formerly provided.

There are other provisions, for instance, the yield-insurance provision, proposing to insure insurance companies on equity investments, which was contained in both bills. It is an experiment. I do not think it is inflationary, because I do not believe any insurance companies are going ahead on that line for a year, probably, anyway. It will take a long time for them to get the State laws in shape, and make all their plans, and for the Government to work out the details. Yet I think it is an experiment worth adopting. Incidentally, it is not inflationary, because it merely takes the savings of people which have been paid in insurance policies, and invests them in this undertaking, instead of their being invested in some other form of construction program.

Mr. President, leaving out the public housing subsidies feature, which I think is necessary in dealing with the very lowest-income groups, the purpose of the bill is to exhaust, without inflationary effect, every means of accomplishing the desired objective on a private basis, through the insurance principle, turning the whole intention to the construction of cheap houses, and encouraging no longer the building of the more expensive houses.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the secondary market provision. Last year the Senate passed the Jenner bill, which provided for the use of "Fanny May," the Federal National Mortgage Association, set up by the RFC, which has been used before for the handling of secondary mortgages, to provide a secondary market for FHA mortgages. We passed the bill last year to give them more money for that purpose, up to $840,000,000.

There was a limitation in the bill, however, which provided that banks could sell to "Fanny May" only about 25 percent of the mortgages they had made since last April. That has proved to be a very considerable limitation. The current bill increases that to 50 percent of the mortgages made since last April. We are of course more interested in future mortgages than in past, and it happens that there are some seven billion dollars of these mortgages outstanding in the hands of the banks today, and the interest rate is going up. These mortgages bring in as a rule only 4 percent interest, and there is a danger that they will dump the whole amount on the Government if they use up the $840,000,000 at once on older mortgages. We are interested in providing a secondary market so that new mortgages can be made.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is offering as an amendment his bill, S. 2927. I think it would be unfortunate to adopt that bill. In effect it sets up a new secondary market in the hands of the Veterans' Administrator, who would be authorized to buy mortgages in any amount. I do not think there is any limit on the amount of money which the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to give him. I believe there is not any limit on the total dollar value of what a veteran may buy, so that the Veterans' Administrator is likely to be swamped with demands for billions of dollars of these mortgages. The Senator is somewhat more liberal, in providing 66⅔ percent instead of 50 percent so far as the mortgages which may be made by any bank are concerned.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will yield on that point, I am perfecting the bill by making the percentage 50 percent.

Mr. TAFT. On that point, then, the figure is the same, and under the Morse amendment the Administrator could buy mortgages which had been made for the last 5 years. I think it would be dangerous. We have tried to work out the best and most liberal provision consistent with not involving the Government with more than $840,000,000, and I think it would be unfortunate if this particular amendment were agreed to.

Mr. President, I have one amendment to the McCarthy amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, at the end of line 21, before the quotation

marks, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a comma, and the words "or not to exceed such percent per annum, not in excess of 5 percent, as the Administrator finds necessary to meet the mortgage market."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the $6,000 house to which I referred, under title II, was limited to a 4-percent interest rate. I am afraid it would be difficult to fix the limit at 4 percent, since the rate has gone up, and the bill authorizes the Administrator to raise the rate from 4½ to 5 if he finds it necessary. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will not accept the amendment as a part of his amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. The amendment is acceptable to the other members of the committee, and therefore I accept it.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. How much more time have I, Mr. President?

Mr. FLANDERS. I am rising for necessary information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 9 minutes more.

The Chair understands the Senator from Wisconsin accepts the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio, and it becomes a part of the amendment now pending.

Mr. FLANDERS. I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio to the fact that there is no page 66 in the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry. I was using the committee print we had yesterday.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator's amendment was drafted in accordance with the committee print of yesterday. Page 66 refers to the committee print.

Mr. TAFT. It is on page 13, at the end of line 21, instead of on page 66, as I previously stated.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I say to the Senate in all sincerity that, because of the position of the House, no matter how we handle this matter, if we want a housing bill, I think the conferees, if there should be a conference, would, in the end, have to agree to a bill which did not include subsidized public housing in country and city. That is my conclusion, although I have done everything to persuade the gentlemen who are opposed to it in the House to the contrary. Under the circumstances, the House, being a coordinate body with the Senate, I think we gain nothing by being insistent. We could prolong this battle and stay here for some time, but the result, I believe, would be the same. In the interest of accomplishing what we want to accomplish, in the interest of obtaining the things which I believe are necessary, aside from the subsidized housing programs, I think the Senate would be wise to adopt the McCarthy amendment, and I urge very strongly that the Senate do so.

I shall be very glad to yield now to the Senator from Kentucky, if he wishes to ask any questions.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Ohio was talking about the Secretary of Agriculture not appearing before the committee. He was scheduled to appear before the committee on a day when the consideration of the wheat agreement in the Committee on Foreign Relations remained unfinished, and he had to go back before that committee to appear on that subject, which prevented him from appearing before the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. TAFT. He has appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes; he has appeared before us.

Mr. BARKLEY. He has appeared before that committee?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Ohio intimated that he had not appeared.

Mr. TAFT. The Secretary said in a public statement yesterday that he had been refused opportunity to appear before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator said the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. He did appear before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and testified, and was cross-examined by the committee.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to refer to an amendment which the Senator from Ohio agreed to last spring when we had the housing bill before us, and which was then adopted. It is noncontroversial in character. It makes it possible for States such as Massachusetts and, I believe, New York, who have their own State housing programs, to come under the benefit of this proposed law. The amendment is to be found on page 129 of the committee bill, section 607. I think the Senator from Ohio is familiar with the language. I have already spoken to the Senator from Wisconsin about it. He has agreed to accept it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the page?

Mr. LODGE. Page 129 of the committee bill, section 607. It is a principle to which the Senator from Ohio gave his approval last spring when we had the housing bill before us.

Mr. TAFT. I certainly have no objection to it.

Mr. LODGE. Then, will the Senator from Wisconsin accept the amendment, which is the language contained on page 129 of the committee bill, section 607?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have discussed the amendment with the other two members of the subcommittee, and it is acceptable.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. The amendment begins in line 5, on page 129, and runs over to line 4 on page 130. My request, Mr. President, is that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin be modified so as to include that language.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] will be modified as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and as agreed to by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to offer Senate bill 2927 as a substitute for title II of the McCarthy substitute bill, beginning on page 21.

Mr. President, if we really want to do the job that needs to be done for the veterans on secondary markets for their loans, this amendment will do the job. I think the veterans of the country have the right to expect us to keep faith with our promise to make loans available to them for housing. This amendment will do just that.

With regard to the argument of the Senator from Ohio as to whether or not this amendment will result in dumping of existing paper, my answer is it will not. In the first place, these institutions need to make loans, and could not continue as lending institutions if they dumped their portfolios on the Federal Government.

Secondly, when the Federal Government created a secondary market through the RFC there was no evidence of dumping. This point is further borne out by the fact that only when it was reliably rumored that the secondary market in the RFC would be abolished, the lending institutions rushed to sell their loans to the Government. What the lending institutions need is assurance that there will be a market for the loans. My amendment gives them that assurance and that market.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks at this point my answers to a series of questions bearing upon my amendment. Two minutes does not give me the time to present a detailed discussion of the subject.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS REGARDING FEDERAL SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI LOANS

1. Question. What is needed to back up the veterans' home-ownership program established in the GI Act?

Answer. A full secondary market in the Federal Government whereby original lenders will be afforded an opportunity, when necessary, to sell loans made to GI's.

2. Question. Should this secondary market be established in the RFC or in the Veterans' Administration?

Answer. It does not matter where the market is pieced, provided it is an open and full market. The Veterans' Administration would be preferable because it guarantees the loans.

3. Question. Should the authority to purchase GI loans include those heretofore made as well as those hereafter made?

Answer. Yes. Institutions already having large portfolios of these loans must have an outlet for such loans in order to make new GI loans.

4. Question. What is the main advantage of a Federal secondary market?

Answer. The primary advantage is the psychological value of a Government-sponsored secondary market. When supported by a secondary market in the Federal Government, a primary market is induced, by the aforesaid, among the large aggregations of capital, such as the large life insurance companies and other trustees.

5. Question. What volume of loans has already been made?

Answer. Approximately $7,000,000,000.

6. Question. Would lending institutions dump all of these loans on the Federal Government?

Answer. No. In the first place, these institutions need loans and could not continue as lending institutions if they dumped their portfolios on the Federal Government.

Secondly, when the Federal Government afforded a secondary market, through the RFC, there was no evidence of dumping during that period. This point is further borne out by the fact that only when it was reliably rumored that the secondary market in the RFC would be abolished did lending institutions rush to sell such loans to the Government.

7. Question. Would a full, free open market in the Federal Government for GI loans cost the Government any money?

Answer. No. The Government pays approximately 2.09 percent for its money, and these loans return 4 percent. Even if the lending institution were allowed a 1-percent service charge, the Government would still get a return on its funds invested in the purchase of GI loans in excess of that which it has to pay for money. Historically, it has been shown that the Government's mortgage operations have been profitable to the Government, instead of a loss.

8. Question. Can the Home Loan Bank System or the Federal Reserve System purchase GI loans?

Answer. No. The Federal Reserve System is set up for short-term credit and therefore cannot take such loans. The Home Loan Bank Board System only lends on such loans put up by the lending institutions as collateral, and then only in a very limited amount, not to exceed 25 percent of the paid-in capital of the lending institution.

9. Question. What is a reasonable servicing fee?

Answer. The agency providing the secondary market should be authorized to pay up to a maximum of 1 percent for servicing of the loans, i. e., collecting payments of principal and interest, paying taxes, etc. This is a usually accepted rate, and the average institution would not be able to service such loans without a loss at a rate lower than this.

10. Question. In creating a secondary market in the Federal Government, should additional safeguards be prescribed with regard to the character of the loan, the value of the home, or protection of the veteran in general?

Answer. This would not be necessary. The GI Act, as amended, now provides that any loan guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration should be secured by property of reasonable value, and should be appraised by an appraiser appointed by the Veterans' Administration. If the loan is sound as originally made, then it would be sound for purchase by the Federal Government under the secondary market set-up.

11. Question. Should the provision for a secondary market cover any loans regardless of the amount of the mortgage, if heretofore made?

Answer. Yes. Only with such an open market as that could lending institutions in many sections have a liquidity in their portfolios sufficient to warrant their making GI loans in the future. However, under S. 2927 we limit the amount of loans heretofore guaranteed to $12,000, as a reasonable limitation.

12. Question. Should there be any limit on the amount of the mortgage which could be purchased, if hereafter made?

Answer. Yes. It would be well to encourage lending on houses of limited cost in the future. It is therefore suggested that the purchase of loans hereafter be limited to those not exceeding $7,500, in order to bring to the veteran low-priced homes in the future.

13. Question. Is it true that the GI has been gypped on his home-loan purchases through faulty construction or otherwise?

Answer. No. The Veterans' Administration records show that they have received complaints on less than one-half of 1 percent of the total loans made. Even this amount could have been materially reduced if the Veterans' Administration had functioned in accordance with the provisions of the GI Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the question addressed to me by the Senator from Wisconsin inquired yesterday as to the total amount of loans which would be covered by the bill being considered and as to the amount of authorization which would be required.

The total amount of loans which would be covered are the aggregate of $7,000,000,000 loans so far guaranteed by the Administrator and the dollar aggregate of loans so guaranteed over the months to come. The current monthly aggregate approximates $150,000,000.

As to the total authorization which will be necessary, I presume the Senator means how many of these loans will be offered to the Government for purchase from time to time. The Senator must know that no accurate estimate in that regard is possible. The aggregate to be offered will be dependent from time to time chiefly upon the alternative income yield which the institutions holding eligible loans can realize in the event they sell the allowed portion of their loans for recommitment in other obligations which would afford them more attractive media of investment. The Senator will recognize further that we have deliberately framed the bill along lines which encourage retention of outstanding loans, rather than along lines which would impel lenders to rush to the Government with their portfolios, as is the case in the alternative measures proposed or enacted along this line.

The best example and parallel which can be afforded the Senator is that experienced during the period from September 1946, through June 30, 1947, when an entirely open market, not even limited by the percentage of 50 percent proposed in the bill under consideration, was available to lenders. Up to May 1947, after some 8 months of operation, and with a total of around $4,000,000,000 outstanding over that period, less than $50,000,000 in such loans had been offered to RFC, despite the fact that its commitment arrangement encouraged and even compelled the offering of these loans to the Government. It is true that during the period from May 1 through the close of the market on June 30 an approximate additional $100,000,000 was purchased or committed for by RFC but that rush eventuated from the rumor that the action taken on June 30, 1947, by the Congress to eliminate the market, was in prospect. I think that we can, therefore, view with some confidence that so long as lenders are assured the assistance of such a market along the lines framed by this bill the tendencies they have demonstrated in the past to retain these loans in their portfolios will be the controlling factor and the Government need not fear that the offerings of lending institutions will in any way near approximate the maximum permitted by the bill.

It must be borne in mind further that even were the Government to be obligated to purchase a considerable dollar volume of these loans the result will be a greater profit rather than a greater loss to the Government. This stems first from the fact that the Government is already committed on its guaranty to nearly 50 percent of the amount of each individual loan and such guaranty will undoubtedly exceed any loss likely to eventuate due to the purchase of these loans under any foreseeable conditions, and secondly, from the fact the Government will net a yield of about 1 percent per annum on the aggregate amount of its purchases because of the spread between outlay and income.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks a table showing the total outstanding FHA and GI mortgages, showing very clearly the need for my amendment.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total outstanding FHA and GI mortgages

FHA insured mortgages (1934 to date)	$9,795,000,000
GI home loans approved (face value of mortgages)	[1] 7,601,000,000
Total	17,396,000,000

RFC OPERATIONS (FIGURES COVER LAST 10 YEARS)

FHA mortgage purchases:	
Purchased to date (June 30, 1948) (of which all except $44,563,000 repaid or sold)	$318,999,000
Outstanding commitments to purchase	241,998,000
GI home-loan-mortgage purchases (of which $133,644,000 are still held)	148,880,000

[1] About $3,400,000,000 of this total is guaranteed by VA.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask to have printed at this point in my remarks a statement headed "GI loans down 43 percent."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GI LOANS DOWN 43 PERCENT

In June 1947, 52,695 veterans applied for GI home loans; this June only 30,199 applied, a decrease of 43 percent. The unbroken downward trend in applications began last October, after applications had reached a peak of 52,700 loans in September. Here is convincing evidence of the failure of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act home-loan provisions to meet the needs of veterans at

this time. The 4-percent rate and the lack of an adequate secondary market have combined to block the original intent and assurances of Congress when this act was passed.

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks statistics showing mortgages insured or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mortgages insured or guaranteed by Veterans' Administration—Purchase and commitment contracts combined

MONTHLY DATA

[In thousands of dollars]

Month	Authorized		Canceled, amount	Undisbursed, amount (net change) [1]	Disbursed amount	Repaid or credited, amount	Unpaid balance, amount (net change) [1]
	Number	Amount					
1946:							
October [2]	3	13			13		13
November	99	557		138	419		419
December	387	2,114		299	1,815	2	1,813
1947:							
January	954	5,313	10	574	4,729	11	4,718
February	1,194	6,629	82	−151	6,698	38	6,660
March	1,852	10,535	41	1,609	8,885	67	8,818
April	2,784	16,065	346	3,252	12,467	107	12,360
May	3,652	21,801	79	7,188	14,534	157	14,377
June	14,223	86,707	235	68,353	18,119	221	17,898
July [3]	14	[4]−806	9	−17,311	16,496	237	16,259
August	0	[4]−42	718	−15,817	15,057	370	14,687
September	[4]−12	[4]−8	657	−13,808	13,143	417	12,726
October			670	−9,513	8,843	383	8,460
November			335	−6,004	5,669	467	5,202
December		1	407	−4,921	4,515	396	4,119
1948:							
January		[4]−308	754	−3,116	2,054	612	
February			570	−2,640	2,070	480	
March		8	207	−1,690	1,491	638	
April			222	−1,427	1,205	672	
May			201	−1,130	929	619	
June			1,485	−2,641	1,156		

CUMULATIVE DATA (END OF MONTH)

1946:							
October	3	13			13		13
November	102	570		138	432		432
December	489	2,685		437	2,248	3	2,245
1947:							
January	1,443	7,998	10	1,011	6,977	13	6,964
February	2,637	14,627	92	859	13,676	52	13,624
March	4,489	25,162	133	2,468	22,561	119	22,442
April	7,273	41,227	478	5,721	35,028	226	34,802
May	10,925	63,028	557	12,909	49,562	383	49,179
June	25,148	149,735	792	81,262	67,681	604	67,077
July	25,162	148,929	801	63,951	84,177	841	83,336
August	25,162	148,887	1,519	48,134	99,234	1,211	98,023
September	25,150	148,879	2,176	34,326	112,377	1,628	110,749
October	25,150	148,879	2,846	24,813	121,220	2,011	119,209
November	25,150	148,879	3,181	18,809	126,889	2,478	124,411
December	25,150	148,880	3,588	13,888	131,404	2,874	128,530
1948: June	25,150	148,880	7,027	1,244	140,309		133,644

[1] Net change applies to monthly data.
[2] Authority created.
[3] Authority ended.
[4] Decreases due to adjustments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me one more minute?

Mr. TOBEY. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the McCarthy substitute I must announce that I will have to vote against it, not only because of its demerits but also because of the parliamentary procedure which is being used in connection with it. Some of us on this side of the aisle are being asked to eat political crow filled with political poison. We are being asked to swallow our convictions and reverse the vote we cast just a few months ago in support of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I say the place to work out any compromise on this legislation is in conference. Under the statesmanship of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] we passed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill last spring. It was a sound bill then. It is a sound bill now. The Senator has safeguarded it with all the conditions and checks necessary to prevent socialization of housing in this country.

Mr. President, I will not go back on the vote previously cast in the Senate, because one thing I stand on as a constitutional liberal is a record of consistency in the Senate of the United States. The place for the Republican side of the aisle to adjust differences on this issue of housing is in conference, and then let the conferees give us their last best compromise on the issue. We should stand on our rights and our convictions in the Senate and not let leaders in the House dictate to us the form in which our legislation must be sent to the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the deep sincerity with which the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] have approached this matter. However, when the T-E-W bill was before the Senate in the first instance I voted in favor of it. I believe that the provisions in it for low-cost housing and slum clearance will be extremely helpful to the people of the State of Connecticut. Therefore I support that bill again.

In the second place, Mr. President, had the entire membership of the House had an opportunity to pass upon this question and to express their legislative will and had voted against it, I would feel entirey different than I do. But since the entire membership of the House has never had an opportunity to vote upon the T-E-W bill, I feel that an opportunity should be presented to them.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall support the T-E-W bill again, and vote against the minority amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I inquire how much time the Senator from Wisconsin has left.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. And how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Twenty-eight minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the two Senators from Oregon [Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and myself have an amendment pending to the bill. It is in the nature of an emergency amendment. It involves the housing of the so-called disaster-relief families, victims of the Columbia River flood catastrophe of some weeks ago. Inasmuch as my time is limited I cannot discuss the amendment, but I want the RECORD to show my argument on the matter which contains several figures and statistics showing the absolute necessity of doing something for the housing of those families at this time. We all regret that we have to place the amendment on the bill, but it seems vital and necessary that we do so.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I have prepared on this subject be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the statement referred to will be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The statement prepared by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

ARGUMENT FOR TRANSFER OF HOUSING TO PORTLAND-VANCOUVER AUTHORITIES

About 5,300 families were made homeless by the Columbia River June floods in the Vancouver-Portland area. Most of these flood victims were living in Vanport—a Federal war housing project.

In both Portland and Vancouver an extremely tight housing situation prevailed even before the flood. These 5,300 families—over 20,000 people—therefore, confront an impossible situation. Winter is coming on, stop-gap housing is inadequate, and the prospect of permanent home construction, at prices they can afford, is dark, indeed.

Too, Vancouver and Portland face a serious community problem. Flood victims are now housed in war-constructed temporary housing, in trailers, and in homes where the private owners have rented rooms to help meet the emergency. Unless plans are developed now for rehousing these people in permanent construction, what is presently called temporary or emergency housing will become permanent. Both communities then will find themselves saddled with highly undesirable slum areas.

Both Portland and Vancouver have recognized the problem and want to do something about it. Through their Housing Authorities they want to meet this problem themselves. They are merely asking us to give them the opportunity to do so.

The amendment I have offered will give Vancouver and Portland an opportunity to devise a permanent solution to the housing emergency created by the Columbia River flood. It provides that title to certain federally owned temporary housing units and land be transferred to these housing authorities. Two thousand nine hundred and ninety-three units constructed during the war and 457 acres are affected.

These units were erected to house war workers. The law requires they be dismantled and disposed of by January 1, 1950. All houses involved are now fully occupied. Unless a plan for replacing them with permanent construction at reasonable cost is devised, the units will probably still be occupied in 1950.

During the war the land involved was the site of temporary housing for war workers. The housing situated there has been torn down and removed. Streets, sewers, and other utilities have already been dedicated to the city of Vancouver. On this site the Vancouver Housing Authority proposes to build permanent houses. As these permanent structures are completed families now housed in temporary quarters will be given an opportunity to occupy new homes—either by purchase or rental.

We have a precedent for transferring title to these local public agencies. All Senators will recall that on June 18 of this year we passed the so-called McGregor bill, H. R. 5710. This bill gave colleges and universities title to temporary war housing located on property owned or leased by them. The total number of housing units involved was approximately 129,000—far greater than the number affected by the amendment we are discussing.

The junior Senator from Washington, the senior Senator from Indiana, Mr. CAPEHART, and the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. REVERCOMB, among others participated in the discussion advocating passage of the McGregor bill. They emphasized the fact that transfer of temporary housing to colleges and universities would actually save the Federal Government money—in the long run. As the junior Senator from Washington stated on that occasion, and I quote from page 8717 of the RECORD:

"I may say to the Senator from West Virginia that if this property is conveyed to American educational institutions, the institutions will assume the burden of maintenance and repair; and the Senator from West Virginia is conclusively correct when he understands that a great deal of money will be spent by the Federal Government for the maintenance of the property."

The property we now propose conveying to Portland and Vancouver Housing Authorities will likewise entail outlays for maintenance and repair by the Federal Government. The communities in the flood area will assume these costs. To the extent of the transfer, the Federal Government will be out of the housing picture in the area. The communities themselves will be given a workable opportunity to solve their own problems.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope this amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, because of the exigencies of the situation, a situation which is very tense, and because of the fact that time is so extremely precious due to the great demand on the part of Senators for time to speak, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and I have agreed to ask the Senate to give us eight more minutes.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement heretofore entered into with respect to the time of voting at 1 o'clock be modified, so that instead of at 1 o'clock the vote be taken at 1:08, and that the rule requiring the call of the roll to establish the presence of a quorum be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and the order heretofore made is amended accordingly.

Mr. TOBEY. It is understood that the time will be divided equally between the Senator from Wisconsin and myself.

I now yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the able chairman.

About all any of us can do in the brief time allotted to us is to record our views and convictions relative to the issue involved here today. If there is anything that means a better America, it is to put the families of America in better homes and in decent environment. If there is anything that will aid in curtailing juvenile delinquency in America, it is the creation of more wholesome home and community conditions under which the children of America may grow to adulthood.

It seems to me that a fundamental issue has been presented here. Do we favor the more liberal point of view? Do we favor the more democratic governmental policy? Do we favor a program of greater assistance in affording adequate, decent rural and urban homes to the people of the country? Or do we favor a policy that will minimize, curtail, and limit the assistance which the Government of the United States may afford to the people of the country in getting decent homes or housing? Indecent housing is a public shame today.

Mr. President, slum clearance, rural housing, and the expansion of the housing program would be aided, progressed, and forwarded by the committee amendment. By the McCarthy amendment that program would be curtailed and restricted. It seems to me that when the simple issue is presented to the Senate of the United States, if we really appreciate what it means to America, her present and her future, we will give our unqualified support to that program and that bill which will give the greatest housing assistance to the people of the country.

For that reason I shall support the committee bill and oppose the amendments.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I think it is well for the Senate to keep in mind, first, what heretofore has been done with reference to this legislation. The Seventy-ninth Congress passed this same legislation. The House failed to act on it. In the first session of the Eightieth Congress the Senate passed it again, and the House failed to act on it. Then there was appointed a joint committee between the two Houses to make a study of the housing situation. That committee held hearings all over the country, and then issued a report. That report was agreed to unanimously, with the exception of two items, and, as I recall, on those two items only two Members dissented. They were the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER], who dissented on the public housing and rural housing sections of the report.

Following that, amendments were prepared and offered in the Senate to Senate bill 866, in keeping with the recommendations of the joint committee, which consisted of 7 Members of both Houses, 4 Republicans from each House and 3 Democrats from each House. Those amendments were agreed to in the Senate.

Then there was prepared and offered to the Senate the rural housing substitute for the recommendation of the committee. That was prepared and offered by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The Senate agreed to that rural housing provision as a substitute for the recommendation of the joint committee.

All those provisions are carried today in the bill which is before the Senate. Four provisions are not carried in the McCarthy substitute, namely, public housing, slum clearance, research, and rural housing. There is not a single provision in the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin which would give any help whatsoever to any of the farmers of the country in building houses. That is one of the crying needs of any housing program. We cannot hope to have an adequate over-all building program unless we include something for the farm population.

I agree that the provisions of the McCarthy amendment are good so far as they go. I think every member of our committee agrees that they are good so far as they go. But I should like to call attention to this point: If we pass the bill as the committee has recommended it, and get the conference to which we are entitled between the House and the

Senate, every single clause, every single provision, every single word in the McCarthy substitute will be available at the conference table, to be placed in the bill if the conferees see fit to do so.

We are entitled to a conference. That is all we are asking for. The legislative procedures which have been established give us the right to expect a conference between the two Houses on this legislation. No person has the right to set himself up as an absolute dictator over legislation and say that no conference will be granted. We are entitled to a conference, and that is all we are asking for. Regardless of the threats which have been made, as reported on the floor of the Senate, I believe that we shall get a conference if we pass this bill as the committee has recommended it.

We have been threatened before. For example, we were told, when the Senate passed a bill for consumer credit controls, that the House would never accept it, that we would never get an agreement to it, that we would never get a conference. But there was sent back here a few days ago—only yesterday, in fact—a bill from the House agreeing to consumer credit controls; and this morning our committee accepted those consumer credit controls, and we are going to send the bill back to the House, where the House will accept our amendments or ask for a conference.

We were told at the end of the last session that unless we agreed to the House housing bill, without change, there would be no housing legislation. But in the very last minutes of that session we saw a housing bill come back, regardless of how inadequate it was.

I believe that we will get the conference to which we are entitled if we stick by the committee and by the former action of the Senate, and pass the bill that has been reported.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I do not plan to argue at this time the complete question of the advisability of public housing or some of the other things which are left out of the proposed substitute. However, I do wish, for the benefit of Senators on this side of the aisle—those on the other side can engage themselves as they please—to read the section on public housing in the Republican Party platform:

> Housing can best be supplied and financed by private enterprise; but government can and should encourage the building of better homes at less cost. We recommend Federal aid to the States for local slum clearance and low-rental housing programs only where there is a need that cannot be met either by private enterprise or by the States and localities.

I briefly call the attention of my Republican confreres to the fact that our platform provides for subsidies. The bill provides that there shall be no interference or competition with any private-for-profit construction; and certain guaranties are made to local housing authorities set up under the laws of the States involved.

I wish now to address myself briefly to a more serious problem. Yesterday the Presiding Officer of the Senate read from page 324 of Jefferson's Manual. This is not a binding rule of the Senate. It is good advice from a Democratic statesman whom we all respect, whether we be Democrats or Republicans. I should like to read that paragraph again:

> It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House, or the particular votes or majorities on it there—

This is the part which I wish to emphasize—

> because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independency, not to be influenced by the proceedings of the other.

I am aware that there are practical problems involved in our sending our own bill to the House of Representatives in spite of the fact that there have been repeated statements that no bill containing public-housing provisions will be considered by the House. However, I wish to say that I have no doubt in my own mind that, nevertheless, the House of Representatives would permit any bill we might pass to go to conference. It is inconceivable that the House would not allow any bill we might pass to go to conference. The implications of such action on the part of the House would be so serious that the House would not wish to face them.

I simply ask the Senate to follow the recommendations of that great statesman, Thomas Jefferson, and make up its own mind, and send the bill to conference. I have every confidence in the established conference procedure, and that we can bring out of the conference legislation which will be appropriate to the situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. TOBEY. I inquire, how much time have I remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire has 15 minutes, plus an additional 4 minutes, or a total of 19 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I might suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that in view of the fact that he has 19 minutes and I have 14 minutes, I wish he would use up 4 minutes of his time, so as to equalize the amount of time remaining to each side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin also has 19 minutes, under the extension of the time limitation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, before going into any discussion of the over-all matter before us, I desire to offer a modifying amendment to the substitute bill which now is under consideration.

This amendment would substitute for the Administrator's estimate of the value of these veterans' projects, when completed, his estimate of December 31, 1947, replacement costs. The latter basis is the one used in the new section 608 and all present bills on the subject, and is, I am informed, recommended by the FHA as a more practical noninflationary basis of valuation. This will make it possible for veterans' projects already planned under December 1947 estimates to be expeditiously developed under FHA assured mortgages under section 207 (c).

So, Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment, which is in line with the description I have just given. The amendment has been agreed to by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, in line 4, it is proposed to strike out "will be the value of the project"; in line 5 it is proposed to strike out "when the proposed improvements are completed" and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "as the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I accept that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New York then becomes a part of the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, now to get down to the over-all proposition which is facing us, let me say that I yield to no one, either in or out of the Congress of the United States, in my advocacy of and in my desire for slum clearance and public housing. It is the only way I know of by which the slums can be cleared and decent, livable dwellings can be provided for those in the lowest-income groups. In line with this attitude, during the last session of this Congress I supported the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; and I opposed, so far as I was able to do so, all other housing legislation which appeared now and then and which was calculated, in my opinion, to defeat the purposes of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. My record on this matter is definite and indisputable.

But, Mr. President, in this special session we are not faced with that situation. Today we are faced with quite a different situation. W are now faced with a situation in which this Congress must pass some kind of workable, effective housing legislation. As I see it, Mr. President, for us of the Senate at this time to stand on our constitutional rights—and I do not deny them—and, in our position as an independent legislative body, to insist upon what we may believe to be our prerogative to pass legislation very similar to or identical with the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, would be a grave mistake. All of us know what happened to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in the House of Representatives. All of us know that even if this matter were to go to conference, as it easily might, the chances are that there would be no public housing and no slum clearance legislation enacted by both Houses of the Congress at this session. Moreover, if we pursue such a course, which I have indicated, and pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill with those provisions in it, we shall jeopardize the chance of obtaining any housing legislation whatever.

We know what happened at the last session; we know that we got no housing legislation worthy of the name out of that session; and we can well recognize, if we are realists at all in legislative matters, that, with the same kind of Senate action now, the very same result can reasonably be expected to occur now.

Mr. President, may I have a little more time allotted to me? I should like to complete what I have to say.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from New York as much more time as he may need, although I hope he will make his remarks brief.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as I understand it, the provisions of the substitute amendment are even better than those of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, aside from matters pertaining to slum clearance and public housing. The substance of the substitute bill in its present form is absolutely indispensable.

So I am going to be realistic; and in order to help insure that we get some housing legislation, which is vitally needed and which we must have at this time, I propose to vote and intend to vote for this substitute bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Am I to understand that the junior Senator from New York speaks to this subject not only for himself but also for the Governor of New York?

Mr. IVES. No; the Senator from New York wishes to make very clear that he is speaking only for himself. The Senator from New York has not discussed this question with the Governor of New York, either lately or at any other time.

However, the Senator from New York would point out that the record of the Governor of New York on public housing and veterans' legislation speaks for itself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from Wisconsin yielding any further time?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. TOBEY. I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on former occasions I have expressed my deep convictions with reference to this legislation. Obviously within the time limitation under which we now work, it is impossible to go into further detail regarding the matter at this time.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] seems obsessed with the idea that the President of the United States has asked Congress to pass adequate housing legislation for political reasons and with political motives. If the Congress of the United States, which adjourned in June, or at least a coordinate branch of the Congress, the Senate of the United States, had given the House of Representatives an opportunity to vote on what the Senate passed, the President of the United States in all likelihood would not have been compelled to call Congress back in order to pass adequate legislation. The Senator from Ohio apparently has surrendered his position on the question; whether out of conviction or of expediency I do not know, and I am not concerned; but it seems to me unfortunate, to say the least, that the Congress as a whole without regard to any political implications, without regard to any issues which may be drawn from its action or its falure to act, is denied the opportunity to vote on the sort of housing bill it might easily vote to enact if given an opportunity.

The Senator from Ohio may surrender his position, either through conviction or expediency or at the point of a shotgun, but I do not myself propose to surrender my convictions upon the housing situation. It seems to me it is a denial of the democratic process of legislation for any man or any group of men in any legislative body to deny their own members the right to pass upon a bill the Senate has passed and sent to them, by saying they will not even allow it to go to conference if we pass it again.

The Senator from Ohio referred the other day to a report the President sent to the Congress. He had the privilege, which none of the rest of us enjoy, of seeing that report 24 hours before it was made available to the rest of us, through the courtesy of one of the members of the committee. But the housing referred to in that report and the housing the Senator from Ohio now uses as an alibi, so to speak, for not supporting the pending bill as reported by the committee, do no good to the low-income groups of the country. Under that program no veteran can build or buy a house. The veterans of the country have asked us to provide them houses, or to provide them the possibility of building or buying houses. Instead of giving them a house, we do not even give them a dugout or a pillbox. The low-income people of the country have asked Congress to make it possible for them to buy or build houses or to acquire them. We not only do not give them a house or the opportunity to have a house; we do not even allow them a trailer or a tent or a shed in which they may house themselves and their families.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, there is no politics in this. I voted for public housing in the bill that passed the Senate in June. I shall vote for it today. I voted for slum clearance then, and I am for it now. We know that those who own the slums will never remove them. They will not tear them down and build new houses for those who are compelled to occupy them because they cannot obtain better houses in the communities and cities in which they live. The only way by which they will ever be removed and decent housing conditions provided for millions of our people who cannot help themselves now because of their economic inability will be for the Government of the United States to help in the process of their removal and their replacement with decent houses.

I could go into a great deal of detail about the desirability of that, but I do not have the time to do it. When this question was before the Senate at the last session, the McCarthy amendment or substitute was defeated by a vote of 49 to 35. Surely a majority of the Senate is not now to be intimidated by a threat from any source as an excuse for reversing its position taken only a few weeks ago.

Does the Chair indicate that my time has expired?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Chair for giving me that admonition. I shall vote against the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, and with great pleasure and deep conviction vote for the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces that the Senator from New Hampshire has 11 minutes at his disposal, the Senator from Wisconsin 10 minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, when the pending bill was before the Congress in the latter days of the regular session, I was more than happy to follow the leadership of the Senator from Ohio in promoting what was known as the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. I am amazed at this particular time to find the distinguished Senator from Ohio reversing himself, primarily as he says upon the theory that it is an inflationary bill. If it is an inflationary bill today, it was an inflationary bill when we passed it only a few weeks ago. What has happened here is not economic inflation but political inflation that has taken hold of some of the Members who are ready to reverse the position they took a few weeks ago. I am amazed to find my friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], saying that the Republican candidate for President has said nothing to him or apparently to anyone else on the floor of the Senate about the great controversial question of housing that exists in this country today.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not have the time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, has telegraphed Governor Dewey as to where he stands upon this, and asked him whether he will not say something. That telegram has been unanswered. A. F. Whitney, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, sent a similar message. His telegram remains unanswered. Walter Reuther, a leader in the Congress of Industrial Organizations, has also telegraphed Governor Dewey. His telegram remains unanswered by the nervous man in Albany, N. Y.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has told the country time and time again where he stands upon housing legislation, and with all the sincerity I possess, I believe the great Governor of New York owed it to the Congress and to the people of the country to make a statement upon this controversial issue which is before the Senate.

He is the leader of the Republican Party at the present time. He is the candidate for President upon the Republican ticket. When an issue so vital, so important to millions of people in the low-income groups of the Nation, is before us as it is today, I seriously contend that the gentleman representing the Republicans in the great campaign to come should have spoken out as clearly and as definitely and as bravely as the President of the United States has spoken upon the issue. As I said before, it is not a question of inflation, it is a question of political expediency or political inflation at this moment, when we find Senators who have acted with courage in the past reversing their position now. I have never known a man more courageous than the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Everyone knows where he stands on every question. It probably was a great detriment to him in the Republican convention at Philadelphia that he has always been courageous in discussing and voting on measures, regardless of what they were, and regardless of the outcome but today I confess I am somewhat puzzled at this sudden change of heart. Today we find him reversing his position on a bill which he sponsored and which caused many of us to follow him in the fight we had upon the question of housing.

I shall not retreat, Mr. President, upon this important question. My convictions were with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and those who voted in the majority at that time, and I shall maintain that position by the vote which I shall cast today.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as one who supported every part of the housing bill which was passed by the Senate at the last session, which included public housing and slum clearance, I rise today to support the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. If I believed for a moment that this Congress, before it adjourns, could pass the bill reported by the committee today, I would support the committee's position. However, I am thoroughly convinced that as a practical matter, if we send back to the House of Representatives the bill upon which it has refused to act up to this time, a bill similar to this committee bill, that it will not act upon the bill, and we will adjourn without any helpful legislation upon this subject.

I am in favor of slum clearance and public housing at this time. Ordinarily, I would not be in favor of the Government's going into the business of building houses, but I know there are many families without homes, and, therefore, a situation is presented requiring Government help.

I have always taken the position that private endeavor, so far as it can meet the needs of our people and a growing country, should be left alone if it can in fact meet the situation and the needs of the people. But when the national requirements extend beyond the ability of private investment to proceed and beyond private means to build, then I think the Government should step in and help to quickly solve a widespread and pressing problem.

We face here a very practical question on this bill, and that is, Shall we take half a loaf or none? Shall we get a bill passed, a law enacted, with some good in it, though not all that we want, or shall we so act as to get no bill and consequently no help whatsoever?

Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield me another minute?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield one more minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much additional time does the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. One minute.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have before me a telegram which I desire to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I do not have time to read it. It deals with the need of financing housing for veterans in my State. I hope sincerely that the bill which will be passed by the Senate today will be passed also by the House and that it will meet the needs of the veterans and other persons.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *August 6, 1948.*

Senator CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

An announcement has been made today by the Public Housing Administration re offering for sale the homes comprising the Ordnance Park project, in compliance with the provisions of the Revercomb bill, S. 2288. In connection with this announcement we have learned that these homes can be financed only to the extent of 80 percent. We, the veterans of Ordnance Park, request your assistance in securing the benefits that Congress has plainly indicated it thinks veterans should have, that is, combination FHA and GI financing of veterans' homes so that younger veterans who have not had time to accumulate the required down payment, but who, nevertheless, are good credit risks, can provide themselves and their families with adequate homes. We find in an extensive survey, comprising all of the local FHA approved mortgagors, that there is not a single one of these institutions that will write a combination GI-FHA loan. The only thing they offer is straight title II, 80-percent loans at 4½-percent interest. We feel that the intent of Congress in this matter is perfectly clear—that veterans should be permitted to buy homes on a combination FHA-GI loan or section 610 (90 percent at 4 percent) and we feel that the lower interest rate for the GI loan of 4 percent is the determining factor for these financial institutions refusing to make these loans and we feel that while they are enjoying the benefits of the FHA financing that they should not be permitted to ignore some of the FHA plans and concentrate on the ones which provide them with the most advantageous returns. We respectfully and urgently request you to try with every means in your power to have Congress clearly indicate that any financial institution who is writing FHA loans must write section 610 and GI loans or not write any FHA loans at all Unless action is taken to make these lending institutions comply with all the FHA financing plans, the greater majority of the people of Ordnance Park will be unable to buy the homes that they now occupy because, to speak plainly, they do not have the necessary $1,200 to $1,500 in cash which is required under title II and is not required under a GI-FHA combination loan. Upon contact with several of the national veterans' organizations, we find that this is a condition that is not confined to the Kanawha Valley. To further substantiate the survey that we have made on the lending institutions we quote the following excerpts from an article in the Charleston Gazette Thursday morning, August 5. "The houses also are eligible for financing under the GI-loan plan which originally would have permitted a veteran to borrow almost 100 percent value on the house. While this combination FHA and GI financing plan is still approved by the Government, it is doubtful if any of the veterans will be able to find a lending institution to accept a combined loan according to a survey yesterday of a dozen different companies—not a single company official interviewed said they would be willing to go along with this plan. FHA loans to purchasers of houses in Ordnance Park will be insured under a 4½-percent interest rate. To qualify for buying one of the properties, a veteran must have available a down payment of about $1,200 to $1,500."

Under the terms of the Revercomb bill, these houses are being sold at the 1941 construction cost. In 1941 title VI financing was available to anyone purchasing a home provided he met the required credit qualifications and in one instance, here in St. Albans, in 1941 homes were sold under title VI with no down payment, the down payment being amortized over a 3-year period. This was known as the Belvil Park project of St. Albans. We feel that in spite of the considerable advance in construction costs which makes these houses a preferred mortgage risk at these prices, that the certified FHA mortgagors are discriminating against the veterans and are attempting to obtain higher interest rates than Congress contemplated the veteran paying for homes in this price bracket, and again, we urge you to help us secure our lawful rights and benefits. We feel that we are a part of the citizens of the United States whose credit is pledged to guarantee all FHA loans and we feel that financial institutions who are enjoying the security afforded to them by Government guaranties of their loans should be forced to follow the will of Congress and make loans under all plans that are authorized. Your record of splendid cooperation with us on veterans' housing assures us that effective action will be taken on this appeal.

Respectfully,

VETERANS' TENANTS ORGANIZATION,
Ordnance Park, St. Albans, W. Va.
FRANK D. BARKALOW, *President.*
J. E. SHIPP, *Secretary.*
FRANK LOHNSTEIN.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly. As previous speakers have pointed out, I have supported all the measures which heretofore have been presented for slum clearance and public housing. I twice supported the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, and I propose to support hereafter all legislation containing the purpose of that bill. But I recognize that, as has been brought out in the debate, we are facing a condition, not a theory. I feel that it is vitally important that we pass housing legislation at this session, going as far as we can go in agreement with the House. It is positive progress to pass the pending amendment even without the slum-clearance and public-housing features, which I am

convinced would never pass the House at this emergency session.

It is a very difficult vote for me, but I shall support the McCarthy amendment which is supported by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who I know has made every possible effort to bring about an agreement between the House and the Senate. I think it is a sound approach, and I shall support it from that standpoint. I do not feel for 1 minute that I am surrendering my allegiance to slum clearance and public housing, but even if such legislation were passed at this session we would not have time to get it working before the next Congress. So I shall support the McCarthy amendment, because I think it is the right choice of alternatives in this emergency session.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield a half minute to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, during the recent session no long-term program has been outlined for real-estate needs. In view of the fact that an amendment is now pending to this measure which would perhaps change drastically the situation in that respect, I am impelled to offer an amendment to the McCarthy substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. His amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time remains?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin has 5 minutes and the Senator from New Hampshire has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to myself 4 minutes.

Let me, first, compliment the statesmanlike approach to the problem by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. He has for years been fighting for slum clearance and public housing. At this time he recognizes that we must adopt the McCarthy amendment or have no housing legislation at all.

I want also to compliment the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the other Senators who have felt so strongly in favor of public housing and who now are voting for the substitute bill prepared by Senators BRICKER, BUCK, and McCARTHY because they also recognize that a vote against the McCarthy amendment is a vote against any and all housing legislation, regardless of how they personally feel about public housing.

I point out—and if I am incorrect, I hope the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] will correct me in the 8 minutes which remain to him—that there is not a single objection by either the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] or the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] or any other Senators to anything in the McCarthy amendment. It is a poor man's housing bill. It liberalizes loans for low-cost housing; it liberalizes loans for veterans' cooperatives; it increases the secondary market. Unless these things are done, a year from now the housing situation will be much more acute than it is today. Unless we adopt the McCarthy amendment we shall have no housing legislation. After all, it is extremely ridiculous for this body to say that our solution of the housing problem is again to send to the House the identical bill which we sent it 4 months ago. A majority of the House Rules Committee has decided that that bill is not wanted. There has been an attempt in the House to have more than half of the House membership sign a petition to compel the Committee on Rules to report the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill in its present form, so that it may be acted on by the House. Despite tremendous pressure, the House has fallen far short of getting that number, which indicates that a majority of the House itself does not at this time want public housing.

I spent months drafting a slum-clearance provision. After we perfected by amendment the public-housing section I supported the public-housing section. However, I am not voting for it today because we all know that is the most effective way to prevent any housing legislation at this session. I am sure that the Senator from New Hampshire recognizes that unless we adopt the subcommittee amendment which is known as the McCarthy amendment, just as certainly as we are here today there will be no housing legislation. Let me cite one example of what will happen. In the State of New York, there are presently under construction 800 units in one veterans' cooperative project. The Commissioner of Housing in New York has told us, through the office of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], that unless we pass this legislation they cannot complete construction of that project. We can multiply that example by 200 or 300 or 500 in other sections of the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. TOBEY. For how long?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For 8 minutes.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, first I wish to say that I welcome sincerely to the Senate the goodly group of the Members of the House of Representatives who are in the rear of the Chamber, who have come over for edification and understanding.

Mr. President, I rise today in earnest opposition to the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. He has waved the bogey of no housing. I cannot for a minute agree. The only question before the Senate is as to whether or not it will reopen or reject its long-held position in favor of housing legislation under the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

The Senator from Wisconsin has done a good job in polishing up a few sections of—guess what, Mr. President—the T-E-W bill. Yes; all that the Senator from Wisconsin has done is propose a substitute that will benefit the builders and those wealthy and moderately well-to-do people who can afford to buy their own homes. But what is done about those many fellow Americans who, through no fault of their own, are in no position at this time to enter into loan contracts, no matter how liberal the terms may be? The answer is, absolutely nothing.

The Senator from Wisconsin said, with a quaver in his voice and pathetic pseudo sympathy, "This is a poor man's housing bill." What a distorted understanding he represents. The poor would be denied under the McCarthy substitute. There would be no public housing, no slum clearance, for long-range purposes. I deplore this omission. But more important, Mr. President, the Senate itself shares my attitude, for three times the Senate of the United States has recorded itself for the inclusion of public housing and slum clearance.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin makes a pseudo effort on the Senate floor, but there is the RECORD of last April. He voted "No" on public housing. Trust the friends of public housing, and not its enemies.

Mr. President, the McCarthy substitute expressly omits any aid to rural housing. The Russell-Young amendment, adopted on the floor of the Senate, provides for long-term loans and subsidies, in some cases, to aid the farmers of the Nation. I regret this omission also.

Briefly, I have told the Senate what the McCarthy substitute does not contain. Let me say, conversely, that with a few technical variations, House bill 6959, as the committee amended it to conform to the T-E-W bill as passed by the Senate, contains all that the McCarthy amendment does, and much more. The Senator rose and said that I would doubtless agree that the bill he brought before us has all the good qualities of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. All the Senator has done has been to gut the bill, to take the guts out of the bill, cut the heart out of it, and there is only the skeleton left. The heart of the bill is public housing and slum clearance for the little people of this country.

Now let us show up this inconsistency here today. I wish slowly to list what the committee bill provides, which the Senate will undoubtedly adopt, after rejecting the inadequate McCarthy substitute, will do for the homeseekers of America. It will provide:

First. Public housing: Authorizing up to 500,000 units of public low-rent housing to be undertaken over a 5-year period.

Second. Slum clearance: A 5-year program with loans to cities and some Federal subsidies.

Third. Farm housing: Providing long-term loans at low interest and subsidies where needed to bring increased building of homes on farms; originated and carried through by the true friends of the farmers of outstanding merit, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Fourth. Provide a secondary market for GI home loans and Federal Housing Administration—insured mortages.

Fifth. Extends FHA mortgage operations in varying degrees for different types of housing.

Sixth. Provide aids in connection with equity and mortgage financing, and

for cooperative ownership housing, particularly veterans' cooperatives.

Seventh. Provide for a special $1,000,000,000 (B) program of yield insurance, to be administered by FHA, and designed to encourage direct investment by institutional and other large-scale investors in rental housing for families of moderate income.

The issue is crystal clear. A vote for the McCarthy substitute is a complete reversal of the long-held Senate position as to housing.

I cannot believe that this, the so-called greatest deliberative body in the world, will permit this to happen. Reject the McCarthy substitute and let the T-E-W bill as amended go into fair and competitive conference with the House. Let the democratic processes prevail.

Mr. President, in the back of this Chamber, around the walls, is a great group of distinguished Members of the House of Representatives. Let me say to these gentlemen that I am talking to them. They have been denied by their House leadership the right to vote on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Their Rules Committee chairman would not let them vote on it. They know that beyond peradventure. Let the democratic processes prevail.

Mr. President, a just and comprehensive housing program will result if we follow this procedure. Then that great bipartisan coalition which has consistently labored for adequate housing will be upheld. Remember, Senators, your previous votes, when by 49 to 37 you sustained public housing.

The Senator from Ohio, for whom I have a deep affection, said, "I am going to wait until next year and then we will bring the bill in." Let me say to my colleagues, why wait until next year? Eventually, why not now?

We are here today, this is our day, this is our duty and privilege. God grant that we may measure up to it. What about next year? Some of us will not be here. I urge my colleagues to use their prerogatives while they have the opportunity.

Mr. President, down in Mobile Bay, during the Civil War, or I may say during the War Between the States, Admiral Farragut was told that he could not run through the bay, that it was full of torpedoes. His reply was one that has stood for all time as a classic American utterance, "Damn the torpedoes. Full speed ahead."

Mr. President, I, a Senator from New Hampshire, say to the Senate of the United States, "Damn the torpedoes." We said we were for public housing and slum clearance, and voted that way three times. Now let us do it again and give new hope to troubled people.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired on the side of the Senator from New Hampshire. The Senator from Wisconsin has 1 minute.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to postpone vote on public housing until January, because we must recognize facts. The House is opposed to public housing. The only result of our voting it again and having it go to conference would be to keep the Congress in session indefinitely. I have made an examination which in my opinion shows that we will accomplish nothing if we send the bill to conference. Our conferees would finally yield, and we would have exactly what we have now. Under present conditions the only possibility of getting housing legislation, as I see it, is to pass the bill as proposed to be amended.

I have not reversed my position, as the Senator from Illinois said, on farm housing, because we provide for farm housing in the title I amendment. The one thing that is postponed is decision on the question, which is a vital and very controversial question, whether we shall have federalized, subsidized housing. I am for it, but I say what is proposed is the only way possible by which we can enact legislation now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired on both sides of the question under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOBEY. Will not the timekeeper look and see if he has not made a mistake of 15 seconds in the time coming to me? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has also kept the time and all time has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Myers
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Taft
Connally	Lodge	Taylor
Cooper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tobey
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair asks the Senate please to be in order, and asks the Senate's guests please to be in order.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, on all amendments that may be called up either to the committee substitute or to the McCarthy substitute.

The immediate question pending is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] to the so-called McCarthy substitute for the committee substitute. The question is on the adoption of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am authorized to announce that that amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. MALONE. I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator from Nevada has withdrawn the amendment.

Mr. MALONE. I withdraw the proposed amendment relieving the 7-percent tax on trailer housing at the request of the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], with the understanding that the matter will be considered next year with a general reorganized tax bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No debate is in order. The amendment is withdrawn.

Any further amendment can be called up which any Senator wishes to call up, which may be pending.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I call up amendment lettered "A," offered by myself for my colleague [Mr. MORSE] and the two Senators from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. CAIN], which I have already explained.

Mr. WATKINS. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment called up by the senior Senator from Oregon, on which the Senator from Utah asks for the yeas and nays. Is there a sufficient second? The request not being sufficiently seconded, the yeas and nays are not ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be called up?

Mr. MORSE. I call up Senate bill 2927 as an amendment, and ask that the clerk be directed to call attention to the perfections within the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon calls up his amendment, which is Senate bill 2927, as modified. The clerk will state the modifications.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 18, after the word "if", the amendment is modified by inserting the word "guaranteed"; on the same page, line 22, after the word "prescribed", the words "for insurance of mortgages on the same class of housing under the National Housing Act, as amended:" are stricken and in lieu thereof the words "by the Administrator:" are inserted; on page 3, line 1, after the word "par", the words "with the primary right of repurchase re-

served to the original mortgagee;" are stricken, and on the same page, line 9, after the word "exceeds", the figure "66⅔" is stricken and the figure "50" is inserted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as perfected, to the McCarthy substitute. The Senator from Oregon asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be called up? If not, the question is on the substitute offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TYDINGS (when Mr. GEORGE's name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is unavoidably detained. If he were present he would vote "nay" on this measure. If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea."

Mr. MCFARLAND (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is absent by leave of the Senate. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is absent on important public business in the State of Tennessee.

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—48

Ball	Gurney	Reed
Brewster	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Holland	Smith
Butler	Ives	Stennis
Byrd	Jenner	Taft
Cain	Kem	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	McCarthy	Thye
Capper	McClellan	Umstead
Cordon	McKellar	Vandenberg
Donnell	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin	Wherry
Eastland	Millikin	Wiley
Ecton	Moore	Williams
Ferguson	O'Conor	Wilson

NAYS—36

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Baldwin	Hill	Murray
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kilgore	Pepper
Cooper	Knowland	Russell
Ellender	Langer	Saltonstall
Feazel	Lodge	Sparkman
Flanders	Lucas	Taylor
Fulbright	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Green	McMahon	Tobey
Hatch	Magnuson	Young

NOT VOTING—12

Bushfield	McCarran	Stewart
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Wagner
George	O'Daniel	White

So Mr. MCCARTHY's substitute for the committee substitute was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6959) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized and directed to make all necessary clerical and technical changes, including changes in section numbers and cross references in the engrossed amendment to the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the National Housing Act (H. R. 6959), today passed by the Senate, be printed as passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee which drafted the amendments to House bill 6959 be authorized to file a report at some time before the session ends, and that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 239) to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 212) to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the Pacific War Memorial, New York City, N. Y., signed by Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., praying that VJ-day and VE-day be set apart, not as holidays, but as days of work and prayerful remembrance for those who had a part in achieving victory in World War II, and so forth, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THIRTY-THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION OF KIWANIS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the thirty-third annual convention of Kiwanis International at Los Angeles, Calif., in convention in Los Angeles, Calif., June 6–10, 1948.

These resolutions cover a series of subjects which are fundamental to the continuing growth and expansion of the Nation. It is a very human, very forthright, very able set of resolutions, so I am asking that they be printed in the RECORD.

HAWAIIAN AND ALASKAN STATEHOOD

Whereas Hawaii and Alaska are now territories of the United States of America, and steps have been taken to secure statehood for each of these territories: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in view of present world conditions, and because such statehood would be mutually beneficial, we petition the Congress of the United States to give prompt consideration to the admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States of the Union.

UNITED NATIONS

Whereas the nations of the world are still confronted with the fundamental problems affecting world stability, programs for peace, improvement of health, educational and cultural conditions throughout the world, all of which brought into being the United Nations Organization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International assembled in its thirty-third annual convention in Los Angeles, Calif., reaffirms its confidence in the purposes and its wholehearted support of the United Nations and of the constructive work which it is endeavoring to do; and be it further

Resolved, That Kiwanis clubs throughout our two nations be urged to continue to study the organization and workings of the United Nations and the world problems with which it is dealing, and that definite expressions of opinion on such matters be forwarded by clubs and districts to the Board of Trustees

of Kiwanis International for submission when proper to our United Nations representatives and to our national law-making bodies to the end that an early, equitable and lasting solution of the colossal problems of a chaotic world may be found.

COMMUNISM

Whereas upon the North American Continent two great English speaking nations, the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada, have been blessed by Divine Providence and have prospered spiritually and materially; and

Whereas the ideology of communism is being pressed upon the people of both of our nations and has, through deceit and misrepresentation, operated in such a manner as to threaten the overthrow of representative government; and

Whereas the condition of world affairs, especially between the United States of America and Russia, has drawn us into an organized cold war, which is being prosecuted by Russia in an endeavor to foster among our people the ideology of communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International in convention assembled in Los Angeles does hereby denounce and condemn communism, and be it further

Resolved, That by precept and action we exert ourselves to do all that is possible to eradicate communism, and if those who claim to be or are known to be Communists, refuse to be amenable to our free advances, that then by legislative enactment they be refused employment in national, State, municipal or county government; and be it further

Resolved, That Kiwanis International call upon all member clubs to request their respective legislative bodies to enact adequate laws to protect the citizens of each respective State and province from subversive communistic activities and influences; and be it further

Resolved, That every Kiwanis club be called upon to conduct a vigorous campaign to inform the citizens of their respective communities that the price of our continued freedom is eternal vigilance against the menace of communism; and that every Kiwanis club call upon our citizens to exercise their right of ballot; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, to the Governors of all States of the United States and its Territories, to the Premiers of all the Provinces of Canada, and to all the members of the various legislative bodies.

NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS

Whereas Kiwanis International at its thirty-second annual convention held in Chicago, Ill., in 1947, expressed itself as favoring the adoption without delay by the Congress of the United States of a plan of universal military training; and

Whereas the conditions which prompted the taking of that position are not only still present but the situation has become more serious: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International reaffirm its stand favoring the early adoption of a plan insuring successful military defense of all democratic principles; and be it further

Resolved, That Kiwanis International continue its efforts to develop an informed public opinion supporting every national action essential to the complete defense of this country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the secretary of Kiwanis International to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives.

CITIZENSHIP

Whereas there is throughout Canada and the United States a general apathy toward the fundamentals and the democratic principles of our constitutions and an alarming tendency to draw from our democratic depositories without replenishment; and

Whereas the various elements of our nations are not as yet united in understanding and the support of our democratic processes and way of life and many of our citizens are misled by false ideologies seeking to undermine and destroy not only our governments but all other governments opposing their philosophies; and

Whereas the focal point of this fight for the preservation of our freedoms and way of life against these encroachments is in the minds of our youth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the thirty-third annual convention of Kiwanis International assembled at Los Angeles do recommend and urge that renewed emphasis be laid upon the inculcation in the minds of our youth of an intelligent understanding and appreciation of our constitutional principles and procedure throughout our entire educational system as a source and safeguard of our freedoms and way of life.

CONSERVATION

Whereas Kiwanis International has long appreciated that conservation of our natural resources is fundamental to the welfare of our national economies, and mindful of the many practical programs now being carried on by various agencies looking toward further and better conservation and fertility measures: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That we commend these agencies for their work and we urge our clubs to cooperate with them to the end that perpetuation and replenishment of our natural resources may be maintained.

UNDERPRIVILEGED CHILD

Whereas one of the earliest activities of the clubs of Kiwanis International was in the aid and assistance rendered to children who, because of conditions beyond their control, were deprived of those things which are normal and expected in the life of the average child; and

Whereas the efforts of our clubs in the field of underprivileged child work have contributed not only to the betterment of our communities but to the development of unselfish character in Kiwanians; and

Whereas the need for underprivileged child work is as great today as in the early days of our organization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International reaffirm its interest in work for underprivileged children and that the over 2,815 clubs of Kiwanis International and the nearly 190,000 members be urged, not only to continue, but to expand their efforts in behalf of underprivileged children in our two countries to the end that these children may enjoy the attributes of normal childhood and grow into strong, healthy, loyal, and useful citizens.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Whereas one of the very serious problems facing the people of these two great nations is that of traffic control, in that fatalities, casualties, and property damage are on the increase; and

Whereas this problem is complicated by archaic, complex, conflicting, and often misunderstood traffic regulations; and

Whereas there are available through interested agencies, basic, uniform, model traffic ordinances: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend that Kiwanis clubs in each State and Province use their influence with local legislative bodies to bring about the adoption of uniform traffic ordinances for the protection of life and property within their jurisdictional areas; and be it further

Resolved, That while commending the introduction of driver education courses into the curricula of thousands of secondary schools within the service area of Kiwanis International, we recognize the necessity of providing more opportunities for the training of prospective drivers of motor vehicles and we urge on local Kiwanis clubs the desirability of sponsoring such courses in communities which have not offered this service in their local high schools; and be it further

Resolved, That in view of the seriousness of this problem throughout the area covered by Kiwanis International, we urge that each Kiwanis club make the general problem of traffic regulations and safety an important part of its program, and that appropriate committees be appointed to implement this resolution.

SUPPORT OF CHURCHES

Whereas the first object of Kiwanis International is to give primacy to the human and spiritual rather than to the material values of life; and

Whereas the second object of Kiwanis International is to encourage the daily living of the Golden Rule in all human relationships; and

Whereas communism is atheistic and materialistic in its concepts and is committed to the destruction of the human and spiritual foundations upon which our civilization is based: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International, in convention assembled, rededicates itself to the encouragement and support of our churches in their spiritual aims.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 2919) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, with respect to mortgages of certain veterans' housing corporations, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1774) thereon.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 6, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 212) to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILSON:

S. 2931. A bill for the relief of Kostas Kallinikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2932. A bill for the relief of Francesco Alvino; and

S. 2933. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cardella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2934. A bill for the relief of Virgil L. Hesterly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. McKELLAR) introduced the following bills, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and appear under a separate heading:

S. 2935. A bill to provide for the compensation of civilian employees within the Federal Government, and for other purposes; and

S. 2936. A bill to provide for the classification of all nonpostal civilian positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.)

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2937. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL COMPENSATION AND POSITION CLASSIFICATION ACTS OF 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference two bills, one to provide for the compensation of civilian employees within the Federal Government, and for other purposes; the other, to provide for the classification of all nonpostal civilian positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes. I request that they be printed in full in the RECORD, together with a statement I have prepared explaining and analyzing them. I might add that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service intends to have a hearing on the bills, and I invite any Senator desiring to testify to be ready next week and the weeks following, in order that we may have the bills ready when the Congress reconvenes in January.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred, and the bills, together with the statement presented by the Senator from North Dakota will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills (S. 2935) to provide for the compensation of civilian employees within the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and (S. 2936) to provide for the classification of all nonpostal civilian positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, were each read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2935

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as "The Federal Compensation Act of 1949."

SEC. 101. Compensation for all classes of positions of the Federal Government except the postal field service will be determined on the basis of the compensation being paid in the competitive area.

SEC. 102. The area to be included in determining the compensation will be that area from which the personnel supply is drawn, and which forms the competition for the Federal Government in that area.

SEC. 103. It is the policy of the Federal Government to administer compensation so as to compensate employees as close to the competitive rate for their level of difficulty within their occupation as is compatible with the requirements of a compensation trend line, and the internal alinement of classes of positions. To effectuate this policy, compensation rates will be determined on the basis of a competitive trend line. The trend line will be fitted to the competitive area sampling so as to pay the greatest number of employees as close to the competitive rate for their level within their occupation as is possible in the light of administrative requirements, and the nonmonetary benefits and detriments affecting competition.

SEC. 104. In drawing the competitive trend line, the factors to be considered in addition to the rate data will be those advantages and disadvantages of working for the Federal Government as compared to those advantages and disadvantages of working for other organizations in the competitive area. The trend line drawn on the basis of the data alone will be adjusted upward or downward, to the extent that advantages and disadvantages of working for the Federal Government differ from those in the competitive area. This adjustment will be computed insofar as practicable in terms of actual monetary advantage, but will also include such "judgment" factors as tenure of position, steadiness of employment, attractiveness of the work, and any other factors which directly affect the competition in the area.

SEC. 105. It is the policy of the Federal Government that it should have neither a competitive advantage nor disadvantage with private organizations in the area, when all factors affecting competition are considered.

DUTIES OF ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 106. (a) There is hereby established an organization in the executive branch to be known as the Federal Compensation Administration headed by an Administrator, who will establish compensation rates for all positions in the Federal service consistent with the provisions of this act. These rates will be adjusted from time to time, not less frequently than in 12-month intervals, to reflect changes in the competitive rates. The heads of the departments and agencies shall detail to the Federal Compensation Administration, at its request for temporary service under its direction, officers or employees possessed of special knowledges and skills required in the collection of compensation data in the various competitive areas.

(b) The Administrator shall have the power to prescribe rules, regulations, and methods of procedure to effectuate the purposes of this act. Administration shall be vested in two boards composed of five members each, appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Two members of each board are to be appointed from recommendations submitted by recognized national employee organizations.

BOARD TO ESTABLISH RATES

SEC. 107. (a) There is hereby created within the Federal Compensation Administration two boards. One board shall have authority to set up methods of procedure to establish fair and equitable salary and wage rates for all Government employees except those in the postal service. This board shall have power to request assistance from all governmental agencies in the proper discharge of its duties.

(b) The second board shall have authority to establish a research division and an appeals method and such board shall hear appeals and make final determinations, and it shall be charged with investigating inequities and inequalities due to geographic locations, climatic conditions, industrial occupations and hazards, and accessibility, with decisions to be rendered employees not later than 90 days after hearings have been held.

SEC. 108. The compensation schedule for the various competitive areas and occupational groupings shall be developed on the basis of surveys conducted. These compensation schedules will consist of 19 grades, each carrying a range of 5 steps. The third or middle step will be set as the prevailing trend of rates in the competitive area, as determined by the analysis of the survey data. The first, second, fourth, and fifth step rates will be established by the Administrator, but in no case shall the fifth step exceed the third of the next highest grade. These step rates will recognize differences in individual performance. The step rate assigned to an individual will reflect his performance in the position he holds.

SEC. 109. Compensation for night-shift work, overtime, and holiday work shall be established in accordance with the prevailing practice in the competitive area.

SEC. 110. Within 1 year of the enactment of the Position Classification Act, surveys shall have been conducted for all competitive areas and compensation schedules established and applied.

SEC. 111. Any individual whose compensation at the time of the initial installation of this act is above the range of pay established for the new appropriate grade for his position and class will retain such compensation, providing he remains in the same position.

SEC. 112. The various hazards existing in the Federal Government shall be defined and grouped into hazard levels, and a differential established for each hazard level. When an individual performs duties under hazardous conditions, he shall be paid a differential for actual work time under such hazard.

SEC. 113. (a) Upon installation of this act, all existing compensation and pay legislation for Federal employees in conflict with this act shall be superseded: *Provided*, That the following salary table shall be used as an intermediate salary medium until such time as the new grades shall have been established: *Provided further, however*, That all present grades in the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, first shall have added to each step the sum of $270 above the amount of the basic salary steps within each grade established under Public Law 900 of the Eightieth Congress: *Provided further, however*, That in each case where the salary and grade are translated into the following table, the salary shall be, after adding the $270, an amount nearest equal to the appropriate salary contained in this table:

	Per annum salary				
Grade 1	$2,000	$2,075	$2,150	$2,225	$2,300
Grade 2	2,375	2,450	2,525	2,600	2,675
Grade 3	2,750	2,825	2,900	2,975	3,050
Grade 4	3,125	3,200	3,275	3,350	3,425
Grade 5	3,500	3,600	3,700	3,800	3,900
Grade 6	4,000	4,100	4,200	4,300	4,400
Grade 7	4,500	4,600	4,700	4,800	4,900
Grade 8	5,000	5,100	5,200	5,300	5,400
Grade 9	5,500	5,600	5,700	5,800	5,900
Grade 10	6,000	6,100	6,200	6,300	6,400
Grade 11	6,500	6,600	6,700	6,800	6,900
Grade 12	7,000	7,100	7,200	7,300	7,400
Grade 13	7,500	7,600	7,700	7,800	7,900
Grade 14	8,000	8,100	8,200	8,300	8,400
Grade 15	8,500	8,600	8,700	8,800	8,900
Grade 16	9,000	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800
Grade 17	10,000	10,200	10,400	10,600	10,800
Grade 18	11,000	12,000	13,000	14,000	15,000
Grade 19	16,000	17,000	18,000	19,000	20,000

(b) In all cases where the rates of compensation are on an hourly or per diem basis the sum of $270 additional shall be prorated on a percentage basis to conform to the general design and provisions of this act.

AUTOMATIC PROMOTIONS

SEC. 114. Employees allocated to grades 1 through 4, inclusive, shall receive automatic within-grade salary accretions, one step at a time, each 9 months until they have attained the top step within the grade. Employees in grades 5 to 15, inclusive, shall receive automatic within-grade salary accretions, one step at a time, each 12 months until they have attained the top step within the grade. Employees in grades 16 and 17 shall receive automatic within-grade salary accretions, one step at a time, each 18 months until they have attained the top step within the grade. Employees in grades 18 and 19 shall receive automatic within-grade salary accretions, one step at a time, each 24 months, until they have attained the top step within the grade.

Two years after having attained the top of the grade, employees shall be given opportunity for advancement to the next higher grade through the medium of a noncompetitive examination, vacancies to be filled from resulting promotional registers and vacancies shall not be otherwise filled until such registers have been depleted down to grade 85. The Civil Service Commission or its successor agency is hereby delegated authority and direction for conducting such examinations. Due consideration shall be given to longevity, effective job performance, and other factors which will serve to develop initiative, leadership, and related qualities. All other factors being equal, seniority shall govern the decision.

COMPENSATORY TIME

SEC. 115. When emergency needs of the service require employees to perform service in excess of regular workday or on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays, they shall be allowed compensatory time to be paid at the rate of 90 minutes for each hour of service for such service on 1 day within 5 working days next succeeding the Saturday or Sunday and within 30 days next succeeding the holiday: *Provided*, That the head of the agency may, if the exigencies of the service require, authorize payment of overtime to employees for services performed overtime on Saturdays and Sundays in lieu of compensatory time: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees on special duty or work assignment. Emergency compensatory time shall not exceed 1 week.

OVERTIME

SEC. 116. If the needs of the service require, employees may be employed in excess of 7 hours per day and for such overtime service they shall be paid on the basis of 150 percent of the annual rate of pay received by such employees. In computing compensation for such overtime employment, the annual salary of compensation for such employees shall be divided by 1,771, the number of working hours in a year. The quotient thus obtained will be the base hourly compensation, and one and one-half times that amount will be the hourly rate of overtime pay: *Provided*, That employees paid on an hourly basis shall be paid at the rate of 150 percent of that hourly rate for all services in excess of 7 hours per day: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to employees who are on special duty or work assignment: *Provided further*, That in case the compensatory time earned exceeds 7 hours, the balance of such compensatory time shall be granted on the following day.

NIGHT DIFFERENTIAL

SEC. 117. Employees who are required to perform night work shall be paid extra for each hour of such work at the rate of 20 percent of their base hourly compensation, computed by dividing the base annual salary by 1,771. Night work shall be defined as any work performed between the hours of 6 o'clock p. m. and 6 o'clock a. m.: *Provided*, That such differential for night duty shall not be included in computing any overtime compensation to which the officer or employee may be entitled.

SEC. 118. This act shall supersede all provisions of existing laws in conflict with the provisions herein contained but in no event shall any of the benefits including the right to appeal an efficiency rating, as provided in Public Law 880, approved November 26, 1940, and the right to receive within-grade periodic accretions, as provided in Public Law 200, approved August 1, 1941, be contravened.

SEC. 119. This act shall become effective July 1, 1949.

SEC. 120. This act shall apply to all positions and persons employed in the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government except those in the postal field service.

S. 2936

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be cited as the "Position Classification Act of 1949."

SEC. 101. There shall be a uniform position classification system for all personnel and management purposes in the Federal Government, except in the Post Office Department field service. To accomplish this objective, positions shall be grouped into classes on the basis of actual duties performed, as determined by periodic inventories. The heads of departments and agencies are directed to determine the duties of the positions and allocate such positions to established classes.

SEC. 102. Position classification shall provide a comprehensive and orderly system of grouping positions into classes on the basis of actual duties performed. These classes shall serve as a basis for personnel and management functions, including recruitment, placement, skills utilization, promotion, pay, training, organizational planning, budget, and in maintaining records and controls, such grouping of positions into classes to achieve uniformity in classification and in personnel management among the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

SEC. 103. Definitions:

(a) The term "position" means a combination of duties capable of being performed by one person and may be either occupied or vacant.

(b) The term "class of positions" means a group of all positions sufficiently similar with respect to actual duties performed that they can be treated alike for all personnel and management purposes.

(c) The term "class specifications" means a complete, written record concerning the facts with relation to a class of positions, and includes all information necessary in the use of such class for all personnel and management purposes.

(d) The term "class title" means a short, systematic, and descriptive phrase identifying the class and is as indicative as possible of the kind and level of the work performed.

(e) The term "series of classes" means a group of classes which differ only in the level of difficulty of the work performed, and do not vary in kind of work performed.

(f) The term "duties description" means a description of the actual duties performed in the various positions assigned to the class.

(g) The term "required knowledges and skills" means knowledges and skills which are minimum requirements that an incumbent must possess for the successful accomplishment for the duties in the position allocated to this class.

(h) The term "objective evidence of the possession of the required knowledges and skills" means the primary or secondary evidences that indicate the possession of the knowledges and skills required.

(i) The term "internal alinement" means the arrangement of classes of positions into a series of grades on the basis of the difficulty of the duties performed in each class.

(j) The term "evaluation of a class to a difficulty level" means the assignment of classes of positions to a series of levels based upon difficulty. It is the measurement of difference in degrees of difficulty of duties of classes and is expressed in "grades."

SEC. 104. It shall be the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency to:

(a) Establish policies, regulations, procedures, techniques, and practices in connection with position classification in the Federal Government, departments and agencies consistent with the provisions of this act.

(b) Approve and maintain manuals of approved class specifications to assure comparability of classification standards among all Federal Government departments and agencies.

(c) Make final determination of the classes to be recognized, the titles to be used, the duties description, knowledges and skills required, objective evidence of possession of such knowledges and skills, and the valuation of each class to a difficulty level.

(d) Provide for the staffing, training, and technical assistance to be given to Federal Government departments and agencies on position classification matters.

(e) Periodically inspect the allocation of individual positions to approved classes in the departments and agencies to assure consistency in the application of position classification standards, principles, techniques and procedures, and direct nonretroactive revision of misallocated positions.

SEC. 105. It shall be the responsibility of the head of each Federal Government department and agency within the provisions of this act to:

(a) Periodically collect information concerning the duties actually performed in each individual position in the activity.

(b) On the basis of the duties performed, group positions into approved classes as established in the Federal Government Manual of Class Specifications. The allocation of positions to existing approved classes will be made by the departments and agencies and do not require the prior approval of the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency.

(c) On the basis of the duties performed, prepare class duties descriptions and other sections of the class specifications for proposed classes of positions. The proposed classes of positions will be submitted to the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency for approval and inclusion in the Federal Government Manual of Approved Class Specifications. (Under ordinary circumstances, the proposed class specifications will not be used by departments and agencies as a basis for any personnel action until the class has been (1) written and evaluated by the department or agency, and (2) approved by the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency. In emergency situations, the proposed class specification may be used as a basis for personnel action, provided the class specification is submitted to the Civil Service Commission within 1 month after the first use of the proposed class specification. Such actions will be subject to nonretroactive revision, based on the final determination by the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency.)

(d) Maintain a current inventory of the allocation of positions to classes by periodic review and resurvey in accordance with prescribed procedures and practices.

SEC. 106. To assure uniform classification nomenclature throughout the Federal Government, the class title designations, as indicated in the approved class specifications, will be used for all personnel and management purposes. Organization titles, where they differ from the title on the class specification, may be used unofficially within the department or agency, but should not appear on official instruments.

SEC. 107. The range of work in the Federal Government is herein divided into 20 levels of difficulty. All classes of positions will be evaluated on the basis of the duties performed in the class and will be assigned to 1 of these 20 levels of difficulty.

SEC. 108. (a) Upon approval of this act, the departments and agencies of the Federal Government will prepare duties descriptions for proposed classes of positions at the earliest date for submission to and approval by the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency. The Civil Service Commission shall establish dates for the submission of classes by each department and agency.

(b) At expiration of 1 year following approval of this act, all classes of positions not then approved by the Civil Service Commission or its successor agency under the terms of this act will be evaluated by the department or agency into one of the 19 levels of difficulty.

SEC. 109. This act supersedes all conflicting provisions of existing laws pertaining to classification of positions in the Federal Government.

SEC. 110. This act shall take effect July 1, 1949.

SEC. 111. This act shall apply to all positions in the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government except those in the postal field service.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LANGER UPON INTRODUCING CLASSIFICATION AND COMPENSATION BILLS

Today I have introduced two bills. One establishes a realistic and modern classification system for the entire Government nonpostal service, and the other devises methods for payment of salaries and wages in Government service.

The classification bill calls for 19 grades, instead of the more than 40 grades being used today, and provides sufficient flexibility for any purpose. It removes all consideration of pay from the Classification Act and clarifies the basic principle of position classification and its uses in the light of recent experience gained during the war period and even more recently. Of importance, it prescribes the functions of the departments and agencies as against the functions of the central controlling agency.

Position classification and pay are in separate bills because they are two distinct subjects. Combination of the two has had the effect of reducing position classification only to terms of pay when in reality it must serve multiple uses if efficient personnel management is to be accomplished. Because of this past close association of classification and pay, the classification system has obviously failed to fulfill all of its rightful uses, such as in recruitment, training, budget planning, efficiency determination, reduction in force processes, and others of its multiple uses.

The present Classification Act, while sound in principle, has been used to reduce its function to a personalized pay control. Evidences of this practice become apparent when one views the use of the present classification system, as it is practiced, for reductions in force, recruiting, displaced career employee program, efficiency determination, budget planning and control, organization planning, promotions, and even pay. The present titles and descriptions have only haphazard relationships with the duties as they are performed, and there is, for the most part, no attempt to classify positions into classes.

The bill also places the various functions of the position classification process where experience has demonstrated they must be placed if performed correctly. The Civil Service Commission is now in the process of writing classification standards for the entire Federal Government. This is obviously an impossible task to attempt, since the Civil Service Commission has neither the staff nor can it possibly obtain complete information to make these classification standards sufficiently objective to be useful. Departments and agencies have the large majority of the classification analysts and also have, or could obtain, the detailed information necessary to produce meaningful and objective descriptions of classes of positions. As it is now practiced by the Commission, the "class standards" are of necessity so broad they serve no useful purpose. These standards can best be described as "generalized descriptions of grade levels" and serve no useful purpose in the grouping of positions.

The proposed classification bill provides legislation whereby positions can be grouped into classes so that they will furnish a "cornerstone" for accomplishment of all personnel and management actions. The Federal Government is by far the most complex organization in the Nation. It is imperative that current facts be known concerning duties of each of the millions of positions in the Federal Government. To obtain this information, these positions must be grouped on the basis of the duties of each position. The positions whose duties are sufficiently similar that they can be treated alike for all personnel and management purposes are grouped together into a class of positions. With this class, it is then possible to perform the various personnel and management functions on a large scale, objectively and effectively. This grouping enables technicians to determine the knowledges and skills required for each position, pay can be determined, transfers can be made, efficiency determined, training be given with directness, budgets be controlled, and all the personnel and management functions performed efficiently. Such a grouping of positions into true classes is a necessary first step in the solution of the many problems we experience today.

Such bill to be effective must eliminate the "classification jargon" and substitute the objective description of duties of each class. The large majority of the present classification staffs must be retrained from the position gradification approach to "true class" approach. The personnel management functions, now practically impossible to perform under the present system, thereupon will become possible.

The difficulties of the displaced career employees' program rested primarily in the fact that the titles carried by DCE's and the people they were to replace were meaningless. The DCE regulations then forced replacement of individuals by DCE's who, though they might carry the same title, could not perform the duties. Because of this, the agencies balked and evaded and even seriously retarded the process.

Reductions in force based on present titles proved that titles, for the most part, are meaningless and cannot be used in reduction-in-force process. Many an agency stayed up at night classifying positions quickly, though crudely, into homogeneous classes so that reductions in force could be accomplished without ruining the efficiency of their operation.

Recruitment in terms of broad generalities instead of homogeneous classes has reduced the recruitment process of the Federal Government to a game of "selective certification" or legalistic evasions and subterfuge on the part of Government agencies to keep their agencies operating in spite of the unrealistic recruiting process.

An adequate determination of efficiency in the Federal service has been made impossible by the lack of homogeneous classes. Efficiency determination must be on the basis of specific duties and not generalities. This can be done only by being based on the homogeneous classes which objectively define the duties of positions by means of class specifications.

Effective budget control is impossible when the facts cannot be determined concerning the duties of each individual position. In such an organization, these facts cannot be known without a classification process of grouping positions into homogeneous classes.

The Federal Government will be pared to a minimum efficient working force mainly by cutting a few positions here and a few positions there. The fat lady must be reduced all over and amputation of the arm or leg in large segments will cripple instead of make more healthy. With meaningful classification, it then becomes possible to perform budget planning and control on a realistic basis. This is impossible without a uniform position classification process which groups positions into homogeneous classes and objectively describes them.

Effective training cannot be accomplished on a wide scale unless each individual can be trained for the specific duties he is to perform. In the Federal Government, this can only be done on a wide scale if the duties of each position can be determined by a position classification system.

And so on, throughout all other personnel and management functions, it is clear that the duties must be known concerning the positions and in such a large organization they can only be known through a position classification system which groups those positions into homogeneous classes and objectively describes them.

EVALUATION OF CLASSES INTO DIFFICULTY LEVELS

These classes once determined must be evaluated into levels of difficulty so that they may be used effectively for various purposes, among which is compensation.

This bill proposes 19 levels of difficulty expressed in terms of grades.

It should be observed that all positions in the Federal service are evaluated into the same 19 grades. This aids in Government-wide comparability of evaluation and eliminates the variety of services which have served no useful purposes and have even had harmful effects on the management of personnel.

The number of difficulty levels depends upon the range of difficulty encountered in the organization and the number of distinguishable and useful levels that exist. A system having an excessive number of difficulty levels forces meaningless slight differentiations. A system having too few levels causes classes of easily distinguishable levels of difficulty to be forced into the same grade, causing inequities.

Experience has shown that there exists in the Federal service about 19 distinguishable levels of difficulty from the least difficult class to the most difficult class.

It should be observed that the bill proposes one system of position classification for all classes of positions in the Federal service. This includes the trades and crafts, the military, the foreign service, and many others, including the various organizations which in the past for various reasons have accomplished exemption from the Classification Act.

The most controversial inclusion will probably be the inclusion of all military positions under the Classification Act. At first thought, this seems rather unusual, but study reveals compelling reasons why it should be done.

Military positions account for roughly one-third of all Federal positions at the present time. It has been generally accepted that, in modern warfare, seven out of eight of the military never engage in combat. These seven are engaged, for the most part, in civilian-like pursuits, such as supply, transportation, communication, and other supporting functions in which the duties are all duplicated or closely resemble the civilian pursuits.

The grouping of positions into homogenous classes is just as imperative for good management in the military as in the civilian organizations. The necessity of war waste in manpower management no longer is meaningful when large military establishments seem to have become permanent parts of our Federal service. In addition, the line between military and civilian duties has shifted so markedly until the true military make up only a small percentage of even those in uniform.

The passage of the provisions of this position-classification bill will not, in itself, assure adequate position classification in the Federal service. It is believed that its provisions will go far in promoting good position classification. There must be a parallel change in the philosophy and the motives of those who take part in the process. Good position classification was easily possible under the terms of the Classification Act of 1923, as has been evidenced in a few Government agencies. In practice, however, the position-classification process in the Federal service became one of position gradification and personalized control. The new bill, by separating pay and making realistic placement of classification functions, provides the basis and encouragement for improvement. A parallel change in the administration of position classification must be made in both the Civil Service Commission and the majority of the departments and agencies. It has been demonstrated that such a change is technically possible and even quickly and efficiently accomplished in large-scaled agencies and departments.

The Federal Government is today the largest single employer in this country. The compensation program has to be designed to provide uniformity of position pricing, for a gigantic sprawling organization engaged in everything from research on nuclear energy to selling cigarettes to soldiers.

The objectives of this act are to provide for pricing of the Federal Government positions in such a way that the general rate level in each labor market conforms to the general level of rates prevailing in the labor market area.

The general level of rates paid in the Federal Government should be kept in satisfactory relation to the rates paid by private industry in the same labor market from which the employees are drawn, thus eliminating the contention that the Government pays less for the same class of work and responsibility.

Informal estimates indicate that, if Federal Government workers were paid on the basis of prevailing trends of the community, an eventual saving of approximately one billion dollars a year would result. At present, approximately 40 percent of the civilian Federal employees are paid on the basis of prevailing wages in their labor market. These employees are primarily in recognized trades and crafts and have been exempted from the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, by section 5 of the act.

Furthermore, this bill will establish Federal employees on an equitable basis and provide a uniform and systematic treatment of their compensation.

This act will establish the Federal Government compensation scales on a competitive basis in all areas. It will offer no undue competition to small-business men by increasing labor cost to them. It provides for a flexible system which may be adjusted rapidly when need arises.

A range of steps is established for each of the 19 pay levels to permit recognition of differences in individual performance. The step rate assigned to an individual will reflect his performance in the position he holds rather than his length of service or his state of need.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution establishing a legislative program for each session of Congress to be drafted by the majority leaders of the House and Senate after consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the various standing committees of the two Houses, the legislative program to contain a definite but flexible schedule of dates for the completion of committee and floor action by each House upon all appropriation bills and upon other major legislation. I have had this concurrent resolution prepared for submission now in the hope that between now and the start of the regular session in January it may be studied by individual Members of Congress and by individuals and organizations interested in the improvement of congressional machinery. Then next year I intend to resubmit the concurrent resolution, at which time I hope to have available the comments and the suggestions of all such students of congressional procedure.

I request that a statement I have prepared outlining the purposes of the concurrent resolution and the need for it, together with editorials from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Philadelphia Bulletin, Philadelphia Inquirer, Lock Haven Express, and the American Butter Review commenting on the original proposal I made in a speech in Stroudsburg, Pa., which led to the submission of this concurrent resolution, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement together with the editorials presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That as soon as may be practicable after the beginning of each regular and special session of the Congress, the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the standing committees of their respective Houses, shall jointly—

(a) conduct a study to ascertain the nature and extent of pending proposals for legislation of major public importance (other than appropriation bills);

(b) prepare a program (referred to hereinafter as the legislative program) for the orderly and expeditious completion of legislative action upon such proposed legislation and upon all regular appropriation bills for all agencies of the Federal Government, which legislative program shall include a proposed schedule of dates for the completion of committee and floor action by each House upon each such measure; and

(c) transmit to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, for publication, printing, and distribution to all committee chairmen, a report which shall contain a review of the major business for consideration by the Congress during such session, and a statement of the legislative program proposed for the completion of action thereon.

SEC. 2. At least once in each period of 30 calendar days during each such session, the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the standing committees of their respective Houses, shall jointly—

(a) conduct a study to ascertain what, if any, changes in the legislative program in their opinion are necessary;

(b) prepare such revisions in such program as they may deem necessary; and

(c) transmit to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, for publication, printing, and distribution to all committee chairmen, a report which shall contain a review of the progress made toward the completion of the legislative program, a description of changes in such program deemed necessary, and such revisions in the time schedule originally fixed as they may consider to be necessary and proper, together with a statement of their reasons for such revisions.

SEC. 3. Upon transmittal as provided in sections 1 and 2, the legislative program, and each revision thereof, shall be printed as a document of the House to which it was transmitted. The Public Printer shall print additional copies of each such document in such number as may be required for sale by the Superintendent of Documents to the public.

The statement and editorials presented by Mr. MYERS were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, UPON INTRODUCING SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH AN ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE IN ORDER TO AVOID AN ADJOURNMENT JAM ON MAJOR LEGISLATION

I have today submitted a Senate concurrent resolution to put Congress on a legislative timetable.

Those of us who have served in the Congress over a period of years have all been appalled, I think, at the last-minute rush which faces us at the end of every session. This bill is an attempt to do something about it.

The resolution provides that the majority leaders of the Senate and House, as soon as practicable after the beginning of each regular and special session, and after consultation with the chairmen and ranking members of the standing committees of their respective Houses, shall come forward with a definite time schedule of proposed action on each appropriation bill and on other legislation of major importance.

Obviously, such a schedule could not be final and inflexible. The resolution, therefore, provides that the majority leaders of the two Houses and the chairmen and ranking members of the standing committees whom they consult, are to review this schedule—known as the legislative program—every

30 calendar days and to revise it in the light of developments.

The legislative program established under this resolution would be published, as would any changes or revisions made in it from time to time, and this schedule would then stand as a goal for the Congress to achieve in acting on major legislation. With this goal before us, we may—and I certainly hope we can—avoid, to a large extent, the utter chaos which has marked the adjournment of the last few regular sessions of the Congress, particularly, and which has also been rather typical of adjournment over the years.

This idea germinated from the spectacle we had here in the week before the Republican National Convention opened in Philadelphia when the Congress was trying to do in a few continuous day-and-night sessions work which had piled up over a period of 18 months.

Not long after we adjourned, I made a speech before the Kiwanis Club at Stroudsburg, Pa., where I first proposed this method of putting Congress on a schedule so that as many of the appropriation bills and as much other major legislation as possible could be enacted early in a session, rather than allow them to pile up for the adjournment rush.

In that speech, I described how we sat here day and night with conference committees trying desperately to reach agreement at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning of Sunday, June 20, on such important issues as the long-range farm bill; how we were debating for 4 hours in that all-night session a bill affecting the mineral-mining industry, and how Members were awakened from their catnaps in the cloakrooms to come in and vote on highly controversial and vitally important bills, one after another.

I described the scene as one of weary, exhausted, sleepless, punch-drunk, confused, overworked Congressmen and Senators required to make snap judgments or surrender deep-seated convictions in order to allow Congress to adjourn and still enable the Government to function.

I added, "It is unfair, it is cruel, it is inhuman, and it is certainly against the public interest to require exhausted men to act on legislation vitally affecting every business and industry, every segment of the population, and the very safety and security of the Nation and its people under such circumstances. This Congress has been in session off and on for a year and a half and many important bills introduced early in the first session went into conference 18 months later, at 2, 3, or 4 o'clock in the morning of the last day of the last session. In conference, weary and exhausted men, one eye on the clock, had to make far-reaching decisions, sometimes on the basis of snap judgment, sometimes by surrendering on basic principles and convictions."

The reaction to that speech and to the proposal I made in it for the establishment of a flexible, but definite, schedule of staggered action on appropriation bills and other major legislation was gratifying. Many newspapers picked up the proposal and commented on it approvingly in editorials. I have received so many such endorsements of the plan that I have had this concurrent resolution prepared for introduction now in the hopes that between now and the start of the regular session in January it can be studied by individual Members of Congress and by those individuals and organizations interested in the improvement of congressional machinery. Then next year I intend to reintroduce the bill and hope to have available the comments and the suggestions of all such students of congressional procedure.

The resolution, as now drawn, places upon the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House the primary responsibility for drafting a schedule of action. That is where the responsibility belongs. However, they are to be guided by the chairmen of the various standing committees and the ranking members of those committees from both parties. No formal committee, such as we have set up on the legislative budget, is necessary in this instance, since it is the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House who jointly share the responsibility for drafting the legislative program. The program would include a proposed schedule of dates for the completion of committee and floor action by each House upon each measure considered of sufficient importance to be included in the legislative program.

If this were done, all the Members of Congress and the public would know soon after a session of Congress convenes what the over-all program of the majority includes in the way of major legislation. I might say in passing that this would be one way for whichever party is in the majority next year to prove the sincerity with which it regards the party platform on which its members had campaigned. That is a matter of secondary consideration, however.

Most important, this resolution would require a definite scheduling of action on each of the appropriation bills. We have seen, in the last two sessions, particularly, the piling up of appropriation bills and their final enactment at the very last moment of the session. The entire executive branch of the Government was thrown into a state of indecision last year by virtue of the fact that departments could not plan ahead until their appropriations were passed.

In July 1947, as we entered the 1948 fiscal year, the Congress required the executive agencies to function for nearly a full month in the new fiscal year without knowing how much money they were going to have for their work or what functions were to be eliminated entirely. Thousands of employees were furloughed, and many career technical experts took other jobs as a result of this procrastination by Congress. If we had had, at that time, a definite legislative program before us from the start of the year in January, I doubt very much that the Appropriations Committees would have found themselves with so many bills still in committee long after the fiscal year had begun.

I am not speaking now in criticism of individuals; I am criticizing the outmoded system of operation. We all know how really hard the Members of both Appropriations Committees work. Yet, the Senate Appropriations Committee, for example, could hardly complete action on an appropriation bill and report it out for Senate action until it has received the bill from the House, and if the House waits until July 11 to act on an appropriation bill which was supposed to go into effect July 1, obviously the Senate committee cannot do its jobs as it would like to do it.

Now if we knew soon after the start of the session that the majority leadership of the House and Senate, after consultation with the heads of the standing committees, believed that the Treasury-Post Office bill, for instance, could be completed in the House committee by February 15 and in the House by February 25 and in the Senate committee by March 20 and in the Senate by April 1 and in conference by April 15—and these are just dates pulled out of the air—then I am almost sure that we would adhere to such a schedule. The same would be true of the other appropriation bills. And if the majority leadership, after consultation with the leaders of the standing committees involved, had decided early in 1947 or early in 1948 that the long-range farm bill could be acted upon by a certain definite date, then I am positive we would not have had the long-range farm bill come out of conference at 4 o'clock Sunday morning, June 20, in the dying moments of the second regular, and presumably last, session of the Eightieth Congress.

Housing legislation was high up on the "must" list throughout the Eightieth Congress, and there again matters dragged until the morning of Sunday, June 20, and then we ended up with no housing bill anyway. If a time schedule had been in effect for housing legislation from the start of the Eightieth Congress nearly 2 years ago, I don't think the House committee would have ignored the problem until sometime in June of this year when it first began holding hearings.

It was my original intention to include in this resolution a provision that if any specific aspect of a bill, particularly an appropriation bill, is so controversial that the committee handling it cannot resolve the issue in time to have the bill reported out on schedule, that the controversial feature be stricken from the bill with the intention of taking it up later in a supplemental bill. Thus, an entire appropriation bill would not be held up by discussion and debate and controversy over one small part of it. Something like that was done this year in regard to some of the defense appropriation items. I had contemplated making such a policy the rule in this resolution, but in trying to reduce it to language in the resolution, found that there was no easy and practical formula. For instance, if we were to require that the chairman of the committee offer a motion to strike the disputed portion from the bill without prejudice pending its later inclusion in a supplemental bill, we might find the Senate Appropriations Committee disagreeing over an item in one of the big appropriations measures, striking out that item for later consideration and then never receiving back from the House a supplemental appropriation bill to which this item could be properly attached. And, of course, the Senate cannot initiate appropriation bills.

It is my thought that instead of reducing to language any specific formula for dealing with this particular problem, that we leave up to the majority leaders of the two Houses and the chairman and ranking members of the two appropriations committees the responsibility for agreeing, perhaps only informally, that there should be a "catch-all" supplemental appropriation bill near the end of each session which would contain these various disputed items. Then there would be no hesitancy in dropping them from the regular bills so that these bills could be passed early in the session.

One very important contribution to our lawmaking procedure to follow from the orderly passage of appropriation bills under a flexible schedule would be the achievement of a practical means for eliminating what we have frequently agreed was an undesirable practice, and that is the placing of legislative riders on appropriation bills. The Legislative Reorganization Act disallows them, but we have them nevertheless. We have them only because of the urgency surrounding the enactment of most appropriation bills, which usually come to the White House at or near the last minute. It is a rare instance in which a President feels safe in vetoing such a bill. If the bill were enacted early in the session and contained a rider objectionable to the President, he could veto the bill in the safe knowledge that there was plenty of time for the reenactment of a proper bill. Faced with this situation, few Members of Congress would press for the inclusion of riders on appropriation bills.

I sincerely hope the Members of Congress will give serious study to the proposals outlined in this resolution and will come back

here in January with constructive suggestions on the methods by which these proposals could be carried out. I will welcome suggestions from Members of Congress and from all students of our governmental machinery for improving the resolution. I don't think there could be any opposition to its basic purposes.

Although I have not previously made any particular effort to promote this plan, there have, as I said, been numerous editorial comments in the newspapers approving it in basic outline as described in news stories of the address I made before the Stroudsburg Kiwanis Club on June 23.

The Philadelphia Bulletin thinks the idea a good one, but fears that even if Congress adopted such a plan it might not follow it. It points to the difficulties we experienced here the past 2 years on the legislative budget. I think the situation is somewhat different in that we do know rather accurately what vital long-range legislation faces us as we start a session of Congress, but we cannot possibly know all the details of a $40,000,000,000 budget thrown at us early in a session and therefore cannot—or have not been able to—come up immediately with a sensible and informed legislative budget.

The Philadelphia Inquirer, in commenting editorially on the suggestion for a legislative program, said the establishment of such a policy "would avert the harm to the public that comes from hasty, ill-considered action—or lack of action—in the final frenzied sessions."

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette said that the present policy of the Congress in allowing major legislation to lie untouched for as long as 18 months and then coming to grips with it at the very last minute is "evidence of archaic procedure which a Congressman would not tolerate in his own business." It believes this proposal could spare the Nation "snap judgments and the surrender of principle which are all too often associated with the exhausting closing hours in which Congress seeks to make up for months of procrastination."

Other comments have been along similar vein.

I certainly hope we can arrange the tremendous work load of Congress, a load which grows annually and often seems impossible for the Congress to carry, so as to allow us at least to legislate in calm and sensible fashion. Letting all major bills coast along until the last minute and then having them thrown at us in staccato tempo does not contribute to such a goal.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of July 6, 1948]

GUN-POINT LEGISLATION

Whatever else may be said of the Eightieth Congress, it wasn't lazy. It enacted about 895 public laws. The trouble was that this Congress, like its predecessors, tried to enact too much of its legislation at one time—just before adjournment.

Perhaps there is no way to avoid a legislative log jam in a session's final hours, since Congress always has at hand far more bills than it can expect to consider. But by setting up a definite schedule of staggered action on its most important items, Congress could spare itself a lot of grief and the Nation a lot of half-baked legislation.

Pennsylvania's Senator MYERS has made such a proposal. In a recent address in Stroudsburg, Pa., he declared that the last-minute log jam could be avoided if Congress set approximate dead lines for action on each of the major appropriation bills and on such important measures as those concerning housing and a farm program.

The Senator cites a good precedent—the definite time limitation set upon a legislative budget in the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946. There is no reason why other bills shouldn't also be scheduled on a definite timetable.

In that way, the Nation might be spared snap judgments and the surrender of principle which are all too often associated with the exhausting closing hours in which Congress seeks to make up for months of procrastination.

The Eightieth Congress was in session off and on for 18 months. Yet many of the items with which it came to grips in the closing hours had been pending since early in the session. That is evidence of archaic procedure which a Congressman would not tolerate in his own business.

If our system of government is to command the respect and emulation of other peoples, we must stop what Senator MYERS calls "legislation at gun point." As a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator is advantageously situated to advance this excellent idea.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin]

REFORMING CONGRESS

Senator MYERS' description of the last hours of the Eightieth Congress fits that of most legislative bodies that have preceded it. Vital legislation is allowed to pile up, and then there follows an unseemly scramble in the last hours to get it through. As the Pennsylvania Senator says, "Weary, sleepless, and exhausted Congressmen and Senators make snap judgments in order to enable Congress to adjourn."

The Senator suggests the spectacle could be avoided if Congress set up a flexible and staggered schedule for action on regular appropriation bills. It is the piling up of these appropriation bills, which must be passed if the Government is to function, that causes the jam at the close of the session.

The only trouble is that Congress might not keep such good rules if it made them. The Reorganization Act passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress called for a budget to be made by Congress by February 15 of the session which begins in January. The Eightieth Congress didn't keep the rule.

On paper it is easy enough to adopt the sensible reforms the Senator wants, and which are needed. It is another matter to get Congress to follow them.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

FOR ORDERLY LAWMAKING

The hectic confusion in which Congress jammed through legislation in the last days of the session just ended has made it clearly evident that there is still a great need for perfecting the legislative machinery.

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS did not exaggerate when he recently described the process as "utter chaos." He joined a long list of other students of government in urging steps to avoid a repetition in future Congresses.

The Pennsylvania Senator proposed that a schedule of action on appropriation bills should be adopted, to remove them from the last-minute jam.

Much of the responsibility for delays and frantic eleventh-hour action on bills lies with committee chairmen, who keep measures buried for months, and then let them out to compete with other legislation in the last few weeks of the session.

Establishment of a firm policy of early and orderly disposal of legislation of all kinds would go far toward preventing a pile-up in the closing weeks. More important, it would avert the harm to the public that comes from hasty, ill-considered action—or lack of action—in the final frenzied sessions.

[From the Lock Haven (Pa.) Express of June 24, 1948]

JAM SESSIONS

Senator MYERS makes good sense with his suggestion that Congress should never again put on such a last-minute show of beating a deadline as was given with the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress last week.

Pennsylvania's senior Senator thinks Congress could set up a flexible, staggered schedule for regular appropriation bills and thus avoid the last-minute legislative jams which have become a regular feature of our lawmaking.

Round-the-clock sessions, in which Congressmen strain to get through their required work before the hour of adjournment certainly do not promote sound, well-considered legislation. Senator MYERS, who knows more about it than we do, says "weary, exhausted, sleepless, punch-drunk, confused, overworked Congressmen and Senators are required to make snap judgments or surrender deep-seated convictions in order to allow Congress to adjourn and still enable the Government to function."

We agree with his thought that it is not in the public interest to let exhausted men act on legislation which vitally affects every business and industry, every part of the population, and the safety and security of the Nation.

We hope his remedy can be applied and that it will be effective. Certainly it should not be too difficult for Congress and the Government departments to set up a tentative schedule of early-session deadlines for acting on all routine and regular appropriations. The scheme won't work if the schedule is too tentative and too flexible, however. That old dodge of turning the clock back might be started in midsession instead of on the last day.

[From the American Butter Review for July 1948]

CHANGE CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURE

Closing days of the recent session of the Eightieth Congress presented a picture which in one direction at least strikingly reflects the crying need for procedural change—and change entirely without regard to which political party holds the balance of power. This is in the spectacle, many times before seen, of a mass of legislation—much of vital importance in both the national and world-wide scene—caught in a chaotic jam before a scheduled adjournment date.

Crowded into this latest last-minute rush, some imperative measures emerged only at the expense of fully adequate consideration and in less than satisfactory form, while others failed to emerge at all. Altogether, a far from orderly example of the processes of democratic government.

Among those legislators moved loudly to rebel against this situation was Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who has called for adoption by the Congress of a flexible and staggered schedule for action on regular appropriation bills and the putting into practice of all other means to avoid disruptive bottlenecks.

Says Senator MYERS, referring to the closing June session:

"While we are trying to convince the rest of the civilized world that the American political system is a good one to emulate, we had this spectacle of legislation at gun point.

"Weary, exhausted, sleepless, punch-drunk, confused, overworked Congressmen and Senators were required to make snap judgments or surrender deep-seated convictions in order to allow Congress to adjourn and still enable the Government to function.

"It is unfair, it is cruel, it is inhuman, and it is certainly against the public interest to require exhausted men to act on legislation vitally affecting every business and industry, every segment of the population, and the very safety and security of the Nation and its people under the circumstances.

"This Congress had been in session off and on for a year and a half and many important bills introduced early in the first session went into conference 18 months later at 2, 3, or 4 o'clock in the morning of the last day of the last session."

Who in his right mind could, with means of correction so readily at hand, permit such condition to continue? Surely it is long past time for new procedures.

FAILURES OF THE REPUBLICANS IN THE SPECIAL SESSION OF CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Failures of the Republicans in the Special Session of Congress," delivered by Senator LUCAS on August 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EQUITY FOR LABOR AND CAPITAL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWKES

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Equity for Labor and Capital, delivered by him before the Congress of American Industry, at New York City on December 9, 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CAPPER BY HARRY W. COLMERY

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the occasion of the birthday celebration of Senator CAPPER, by Harry W. Colmery, at Topeka, Kans., July 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COL. EDWARD RICKENBACKER

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD remarks by George E. Stringfellow at the commencement exercises at the College of South Jersey, at Camden, N. J., on June 11, 1948, in presenting Col. Edward V. Rickenbacker for the degree of doctor of laws, the address delivered by Colonel Rickenbacker in accepting the degree, and also the citation by Dr. Arthur E. Armitage on the same occasion, which appear in the Appendix.]

LT. GEN. ROBERT L. EICHELBERGER—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Japanese Voice Sincere Regrets as One of Conquerors Departs," published in the New York Times of August 5, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL RIGHTS—EDITORIAL BY MAYNARD KNISKERN

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Issue of Civil Rights Today Has Lost Its Essential and Primary Meaning," written by Maynard Kniskern for the Springfield (Ohio) Sun, and reprinted in the Atlanta Journal of August 2, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWS OF THE DAIRY INDUSTRY COMMITTEE ON REGIMENTATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter opposing regimentation, written by the Dairy Industry Committee, dated July 29, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEMASONRY AND COMMUNISM

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled Freemasonry and Communism printed in a special committee report adopted by the Grand Lodge of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Maryland, which appears in the Appendix.]

TVA STEAM PLANT—LETTER FROM S. R. FINLEY

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated August 2, 1948, from Mr. S. R. Finley, general superintendent of the power board of the city of Chattanooga, Tenn., addressed to Hon. JOHN TABER, a Member of the House of Representatives, with reference to power needs in the TVA area, which appears in the Appendix.]

A NEGRO LOOKS AT CIVIL RIGHTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE DANVILLE (VA.) REGISTER

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Negro Looks at Civil Rights," published in the Danville (Va.) Register of August 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURING A HANG-OVER—EDITORIAL FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Curing a Hang-Over" from the Wall Street Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SPECIAL SESSION

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by a constituent relating to the Republican record in the special session of the Eightieth Congress, as well as an editorial entitled "Speaking of 'Cheap Politics,'" from the Miami News of July 29, 1948, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR GREEN, OF ILLINOIS, AT ANNUAL ENCAMPMENT OF ONE HUNDRED AND NINTH ANTIAIRCRAFT ARTILLERY BRIGADE

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Gov. Dwight H. Green, of Illinois, at Governor's Day officers' luncheon for the One Hundred and Ninth Antiaircraft Artillery Brigade, Illinois National Guard, on August 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE WATER RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, because of the great interest in the flood-control policy of the United States—its extent, cost, and benefits—I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me containing the tentative plans for conservation and development of the water resources of the United States.

I am submitting this statement as chairman of the Flood Control Rivers and Harbors, Dams and Electric Power Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee. This statement is of particular interest at this time because of the public interest in conservation and development through flood control, rivers and harbors, and dams and electric power as a source of revenue to repay the Government costs.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE WATER RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Conservation and development of our water resources is of paramount importance. Included in this statement are the surveys and estimates of cost made by the Chief of Army Engineers, Department of the Army, as a tentative long-range objective to be carried out in accordance with economic feasibility and the judgment of the Congress of the United States.

Few realize that we do have a broad foundation for our water resources development and that comprehensive plans have been initiated for such development. In 1927 Congress recognized the importance to our growing Nation, of coordinated data covering the still undeveloped wealth of national resources in our river basins. It authorized the Corps of Engineers to undertake such studies of all of our principal river basins to determine the needs and possibilities of developing basins for flood control, navigation, irrigation and related water uses. The majority of these river basin surveys were completed by the Corps of Engineers during the ensuing 10-year period. These surveys have formed the factual basis for most of the Federal flood control legislation which has been adopted during recent years; they have served as the basic engineering plan for control and use of the waters of the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and they have been utilized as the major source of factual data and specific plans for river basin improvement by the former National Resources Board and by many State and local agencies.

Modern students of water resources development also frequently overlook the parts played by the long-established Federal departments, such as the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, and the Corps of Engineers. The first Act of Congress recognizing Federal responsibility and jurisdiction in water resources development was passed in 1824 and provided for improvements in the interest of navigation on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. This work was assigned to the Corps of Engineers and subsequently over the years Congress has expanded the functions and responsibilities of the engineers to include improvements on a broad scale for the development of river basins for the primary purposes of navigation and flood control with corollary beneficial water uses.

The Bureau of Reclamation has likewise been engaged since 1902 in the development of our water resources in the primary interest of irrigation and reclamation with other corollary purposes such as flood control and power development to repay the cost of such development. The Department of Agriculture has been making steady progress in the conservation of water resources on the land by means of proper land use and conservation practices and other water retardation measures. The Federal Power Commission has added to this coordinated approach to water resources development by investigating and furnishing advisory assistance in the field of hydroelectric power as an integral part of the most beneficial utilization of our water resources.

These Federal agencies, in carrying out their parts of the over-all Federal program for conservation and use of our water resources in response to authorizations by Congress, have been engaged in almost continuous review of the river basin studies to keep them in phase with changing conditions. As a result of these continued studies, we now have available up to date, general comprehensive plans of improvement for essentially all of the rivers of the United States.

I have requested the Chief of Engineers to furnish me a report summarizing the status of and the plans for conservation and development of our Nation-wide water resources. This report summarizes the growth of the Federal interest in the development of our water resources, sets forth the legislative basis under which Federal planning and execution of water resources improvements is proceeding, and indicates the responsibilities of the various existing Federal agencies for this work. It also summarizes in concise form the problems and potentialities of all of the rivers of the United States; the type, status, and cost of the plans of improvement as well as the specific advantages which would accrue to the Nation from accomplishment of the plans.

Briefly, the estimates of cost are summarized as follows:

	Cost
1 Works already completed	$4,779,700,000
2. Projects under construction	4,593,000,000
3. Projects definitely planned	18,980,900,000
4. Projects planned for the long-range future	29,152,600,000
Total	57,506,200,000

Item No. 1, works already complete, consists of useful elements of all phases of water resources development projects which have been completed throughout the United States and are now in operation. To provide a comparison of work accomplished with that remaining to be done, the cost of completed parts of the over-all plan of improvement is estimated at $4,779,700,000. Item No. 2, projects under construction, consists of works which are now actually under construction by the Federal Departments in cooperation with local agencies in all parts of the country, at an estimated total cost of $4,593,000,000.

Item No. 3, projects definitely planned, consists of improvements required at this time or to meet the needs of the immediate future which have been planned to the extent that some have been authorized by Congress, some are included in reports now before Congress, and the plans for others are now in course of preparation. The cost of these definitely planned improvements is estimated at $18,980,900,000. Item No. 4, projects planned for the long-range future, consists of plans which have been prepared looking toward ultimate development of water resources which may prove justified over the long-range future. These plans may serve as a guide to proper long-range development and are set forth to give approximation of the probable cost of full water resources development at about $29,152,600,000.

This summary shows in brief that the plans for development of the water resources of the United States will be about 16 percent complete with the completion of work now under way. Definite plans for development which are now ready in the form of authorized projects, reports to Congress, or plans in course of preparation, will include projects with a total cost of about $18,981,000,000. These projects and plans represent a measure in monetary terms of most of the works that would be justified at present or in the prospective future—say in the next 20 to 25 years; and they form a part of longer range plans that point the way to ultimate river-basin development.

With respect to the benefits which will be obtained from this development it is interesting to note that the projects which have already been completed afford average annual savings in flood damages prevented totaling about $343,000,000, according to the Corps of Army Engineers. These plans are estimated to produce transportation savings totaling $475,000,000 annually, and they will permit the development of nearly 60,000,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power, in the interest of repayment of costs to the Government. About 17,000,000 acres of land may be irrigated under these plans and about 15,000,000 acres of potential farm land will be furnished adequate drainage.

The problem of accomplishing the development of our water resources, although of tremendous size, is not an insurmountable problem because very substantial progress is shown by the magnitude of work completed and under way. It should be borne in mind that most of this work has been accomplished in the last 20 years, during which the Nation has also participated in a world war when all civil works activities were practically at a standstill. The benefits and advantages which will accrue from a long-range program of water-resource development as estimated will far exceed the cost. In fact prosecution of a sound program of river basin development may ultimately be essential to our survival as a nation. Ancient civilizations, such as that of the Incas of the Andes, found it necessary to build great public works, such as terraces and aqueducts to conserve meager resources of mountain water and soil, in order to maintain themselves. The cost of those ancient works would be enormous by present-day standards in man-hours of labor, but they were essential to the needs of their time. This Nation with its abundance of resources of soil and water can insure its future by continuing with a far-sighted program for the conservation and use of these resources in accordance with economic feasibility.

The summary presented by the Chief of Engineers furnishes for the first time to my knowledge a picture of the full scope and magnitude of the problem of conserving and developing the water resources of the United States. I believe that it is of such importance and general interest that I present it in full at this time for the particular benefit of those of us who recognize that only by a sound fully integrated approach can we hope to secure the optimum use of the natural wealth with which our country has been endowed.

SUMMARY OF PLANS FOR CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE WATER RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

I. THE RIVERS

1. The continental area of the United States comprises the basins of over 160 separate rivers, and the valleys of innumerable small streams, which flow east and west to the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, southward to the Gulf of Mexico, and north to pass through Canada and reach Hudson Bay and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. These rivers and their basins range in magnitude from coastal estuaries draining a few square miles to the great Mississippi-Missouri, the longest river system in the world, which, with its tributaries, drains the entire inland basin lying between the Rockies and Appalachians, including over 40 percent of the area of the United States.

2. The fact that the greater part of the present area of the United States lies within fertile river valleys is responsible in large measure for the rapid settlement of this country and for its present national development. Other parts of the New World were explored and occupied by white men 100 years before the first permanent settlements in North America, but most of these other areas lacked the fertile soils and abundant waters to be found in this part of North America and were soon outstripped in settlement and development.

3. Beginning with the first settlement at the mouth of the James, and continuing with the westward movement of population across the Great Plains and Rocky Mountains and down the valley of the Columbia to the Pacific, the rivers of the country have afforded pathways through the continental wilderness and have given direction to its conquest. In time of war the rivers have been routes of invasion leading into the heart of the country, and in more recent times have been secure harbors for the building of ships of war for use in distant seas. Small settlements established at strategic river junctions in colonial days have grown to be the greatest industrial centers in the world, and river basins which less than a century ago were almost uninhabited now support populations which run into the millions. These same rivers, whose flow over long periods of geologic time has actually formed the land of America, are still the most important resources of this Nation.

II. GROWTH OF FEDERAL INTEREST

4. With the increasing growth of the Nation, the need for controlling, conserving, and using wisely the resources afforded by the rivers has become more and more evident. Problems and potentialities of the river basins which were relatively minor considerations or nonexistent in a sparsely settled agricultural country have become of foremost importance to a growing industrial nation.

5. These problems and potentialities and their national character have been recognized progressively by the Congress of the United States. As early as the First Congress, an act was passed for the marking of harbors and waterways by the Federal Government to improve the safety of navigation, and the power of Congress to legislate with reference to navigable waters of the United States was definitely established in 1824 by the Supreme Court in the case of *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*. The first definite River and Harbor Act for the improvement of rivers was passed in 1824, and that work was placed under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers of the Army, and has been performed by that Federal agency continuously since that time—for almost a century and a quarter. The Swamp and Overflowed Land Grant Acts of 1850 were an initial effort of the Federal Government toward river-basin development, as they turned over to the various States large areas of public lands subject to the requirement that they would be improved by drainage and flood protection. Initial cognizance of flood control as a problem of national interest occurred in 1879, when the Mississippi River Commission was created by act of Congress, and the Federal Government has participated in flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River since that time.

6. In 1888 Congress appropriated funds for surveys for determining the extent to which the arid regions of the United States could be reclaimed by irrigation and for selection of reservoir sites for the storage of water, and directed that this work be performed under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. The initial Reclamation Act under which Federal reclamation activities are being prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation in that part of the United States west of the ninety-seventh meridian was passed by Congress in 1902.

7. The Federal Power Act was originally enacted in 1920 in an initial effort to establish a degree of Federal regulation over the development and distribution of hydroelectric power, and functions of the Federal Power Commission established thereby have been clarified and expanded by subsequent acts of Congress.

8. Severe floods in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi in 1927 resulted in the passage of the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, which adopted the present comprehensive plan for flood control in the alluvial valley which had been prepared by the Corps of Engineers in accordance with a Presidential directive.

9. Meanwhile, in 1925 the Congress had authorized the Secretary of War, through the Corps of Engineers, and the Federal Power Commission to prepare an estimate of cost of surveys of rivers of the United States "with a view to formulation of general plans for the most effective improvement of such streams for the purposes of navigation and the prosecution of such improvement in combination with the most efficient development of the potential water power, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation." An estimate of surveys required and their cost was submitted to Congress in 1926 and was published as House Document No. 308, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session. The River and Harbor Acts of 1927 and 1928 adopted and authorized surveys of essentially all of the rivers of the United States in accordance with House Document No. 308.

10. The great majority of these comprehensive "308" river-basin surveys were completed by the Corps of Engineers during the ensuing 10-year period. Consequently when, after a series of destructive floods in various parts of the country, Congress began considering the Nation-wide scope of the flood problem, published reports were available to congressional committees which contained definite plans for flood control in most of the major river basins of the United States. With this mass of factual information available Congress was able to draft and pass the Flood Control Act of 1936 which established flood control generally throughout the Nation as a Federal activity and authorized a large number of specific flood-control projects to be prosecuted by the Corps of Engineers at an estimated cost of $310,000,000. This act also recognized the need for works in river basins for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil erosion prevention and made the Secretary of Agriculture responsible for such improvements. This act, therefore, with subsequent flood-control acts in 1937, 1938, 1939, 1941, 1944, and 1946, provides the basic legislative authority under which flood control and related river-basin improvements are being accomplished by these Federal agencies all over the United States.

11. The comprehensive river-basin surveys prepared by the Corps of Engineers pursuant to House Document No. 308 not only formed the factual basis for general Federal flood-control legislation, but were of basic value to the Congress in 1933 when the Tennessee Valley Authority was established by legislative action; as the engineering plan for control and use of the waters of the Tennessee River and its tributaries, which has been developed by TVA, is essentially that set forth by the Chief of Engineers in his report published in House Document No. 328, Seventy-first Congress, second session. The "308 Surveys" were also utilized, as the major source of factual data and specific plans for river-basin improvement, by the National Resources Board established by the President in 1934 and by its successor, the National Resources Committee. Extensive use has been made of these surveys by many State and local agencies concerned with water-resources planning.

12. In the Flood Control Act of 1944 programs of watershed improvement were authorized in 11 river basins for prosecution under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. In carrying out this work the Department of Agriculture utilizes its agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; and actual works of improvement are accomplished by local soil-conservation districts located in the river basins under consideration. In the same Flood Control Act of 1944 Congress recognized the close interrelation of flood control and drainage by providing that the term "flood control" should include channel and major drainage improvements. This act of 1944 also provided for coordination of plans for water-resource development between the various Federal agencies concerned with such improvements; and for more positive coordination and cooperation with affected States. The Flood Control Act of 1944 set up the procedure by which coordination with the States would be accomplished.

13. The acts of Congress which have been summarized briefly in the foregoing paragraphs afford an adequate legislative basis for planning for development and use of the water resources of the Nation; and prescribe the Federal agencies by which such plans may be accomplished to any extent desired by the Congress and the people of the United States.

14. In carrying out its part of the over-all Federal program for conservation and use of the water resources of the United States the Corps of Engineers in accordance with congressional authority has been engaged in continuous review of its river-basin studies to keep them up to date and in phase with changing conditions. In addition, surveys of other specific rivers for flood control and related purposes have been authorized by the Congress. In carrying out these studies close coordination is maintained with other Federal agencies with respect to river-basin problems which are under their jurisdiction, and with the States and local agencies of the respective river basins. As a result of these continuing studies the Corps of Engineers now has available up-to-date comprehensive plans of improvement for essentially all of the rivers of the United States.

III. RIVER PROBLEMS AND POTENTIALITIES

15. The great natural resources represented by the water and land of the river basins is not a permanent asset which will renew itself. When these resources are expended or lost they are in most cases lost forever. Arid and eroded lands of China and the Middle East, which once were well watered and fertile, point to the long-range future that may be anticipated if resources of land and water are not preserved. While such conditions are not imminent in the basins of most of our rivers there are too many instances where the destructive natural forces of flood, wind, and erosion, speeded up by rapid and often unwise development and exploitation, have created serious conditions which can be rectified only at great cost and over a long period of time. In most instances, however, great resources remain which can be controlled and conserved at reasonable cost for the benefit of present and future generations.

16. Because of the wide diversity of the rivers of the United States it is difficult to summarize the water problems and potentialities of the Nation. These vary according to geographic regions and even differ widely in separate parts of a single large river basin. Each river basin requires separate study. However, as a result of a review of studies of the Corps of Engineers covering the rivers of the entire country, the major water problems are summarized in the following paragraphs to give a general picture of the objectives of water-resource development.

17. Floods: (a) Floods occur on all the major rivers of the United States, and are among the most destructive of the forces of nature. They may also be the source of great benefit if their water can be controlled and put to beneficial use. Flood problems on the rivers of the United States range from the slowly rising inundations, which formerly covered thousands of square miles of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River, to the flash type of floods from the bare hillsides of western basins, such as that of the Los Angeles River, which are heavily laden with rocks and debris. Floods on the rivers of the United States are not a new phenomenon; the records of DeSoto's expedition reveal widespread flooding in the Mississippi Valley at a time when the primeval forests and native prairie grasses covered the entire Mississippi River Basin. However, the inevitable settlement and development of river valleys has brought a new realization of their destructiveness, and improper land use has contributed to the intensity of floods.

(b) Flood control works have been constructed by the Federal Government in most of the major river basins and on a number of smaller streams. In view of the spectacular nature and destructiveness of floods which still occur, the effectiveness of existing flood-control works in preventing flood damages is often overlooked. For example, the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River has not suffered severe flooding since 1927 and the system of levees and floodways passed safely to the Gulf of Mexico the great flood of 1937 which devastated the Ohio Valley. The system of Federal levees around Lake Okeechobee in Florida withstood hurricane-driven floods on that lake in 1947 and prevented repetition of a disaster like that of 1928, when over 2,000 people were drowned in the Everglades area adjacent to Lake Okeechobee. Reservoirs constructed in the Allegheny Basin above Pittsburgh have, on a number of occasions, greatly reduced flood damages in that area, although the system is not yet complete. It is estimated that existing flood-control works all over the country now operate to prevent an average annual flood loss of over $343,000,000 on the basis of present price levels and the present degree of river-basin development.

(c) The flood problem is not solved, however, and destructive floods continue to occur in most of the river valleys. On the basis of actual flood occurrences, flood damage surveys, and flood magnitudes and frequencies, it is estimated that the remaining average annual flood damage to be anticipated throughout the country under present conditions is about $466,000,000. This toll of damage will vary from year to year. For example, thus far in 1948 flood damages, including the destructive flood in the Columbia River Basin, have been below normal; while in 1947 damages in the upper Mississippi, Missouri, and South Florida areas alone greatly exceeded the long-term average for the entire country.

(d) The geographical distribution of the national flood problem, expressed in average annual flood damage, is shown in table No. 2, herewith.

18. Navigation: Navigation has been an important use of the rivers of the United States since the Colonial period; and many of the rivers such as the Hudson, the Mississippi, and the Sacramento in their natural states afforded useful waterways for the commerce of the time. As industry grew in the river valleys and agricultural development expanded in the river basins, public demand for low-cost water-borne transportation resulted in the provision by the Federal Government of modern navigable channels on the major rivers suitable for such improvement. At this time navigable channels with a depth of 9 feet extend from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes via the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers; and channels with similar depths extend up many other rivers. The Ohio-Mississippi River system, developed for 9-foot navigation by canalization, is surpassed in tonnage moved only by the Panama Canal and the channels connecting the Great Lakes. Federal navigation projects have been obtained by open channel improvements such as dredging, channel construction works, and snagging; and by canalization by means of locks and dams. These inland waterways transported

9,000,000,000 ton-miles of cargo in 1929, and this movement has increased to 28,000,000,000 ton-miles in 1946. This vast water transportation system results in large annual savings to the public through reduction in transportation costs to shippers and receivers of cargo. At this time there is an increasing demand for deepening parts of the inland waterways to 12 feet to obtain the benefits of heavier tows and modern equipment. The Corps of Engineers is also charged with the improvement of harbors on the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts, and on the Great Lakes, which are the terminals of these waterways. These deep-water harbors and connecting intracoastal waterways are not being considered as a part of this report.

19. Hydroelectric power: Development of hydroelectric power has become an increasingly important potentiality of the rivers of the United States. Hydroelectric power developments which have been constructed by private interests, and by the Federal Government in connection with projects for flood control, irrigation, and navigation, have an aggregate installed capacity of 17,127,000 kilowatts. In its studies of possible river basin development, the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with the Federal Power Commission, gives consideration to the possibilities for concurrent and future development of the rivers' remaining waterpower potential. These studies show that the feasible water power which remains undeveloped on all rivers of the United States, except the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes connecting channels, would permit the installation of an aggregate capacity of 79,965,000 kilowatts. Much of this potential power would not be economical for development at the present time; and for physical and economic reasons it may never be practicable to develop all power potentialities. At present when power development at a reservoir being constructed by the Corps of Engineers is found feasible and economical, a power installation is provided when authorized by Congress. In cases where power development at a project is not justified at present but may in the opinion of the Department of the Army and Federal Power Commission be needed in the future, provisions for future power development are incorporated in flood-control dams. The general distribution of hydroelectric power potentialities according to geographical regions of the United States is shown in table No. 2 herewith.

20. Irrigation: (a) Water for irrigation of agricultural land is one of the most important uses of the rivers of the United States which lie west of the ninety-seventh meridian. Federal activities in connection with this important water use in the West are under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. The Bureau has made comprehensive studies of this problem and is now actively engaged in the prosecution of many Federal irrigation projects. The work of the Corps of Engineers for flood control and other purposes is coordinated with the reclamation work of the Bureau of Reclamation in a number of western river basins; and comprehensive river basin studies of the Corps of Engineers consider irrigation in its relation to other river improvements.

(b) It has been estimated that there are about 23,300,000 acres of land in the western part of the United States which have been reclaimed for agricultural use by irrigation. Of this amount some 5,000,000 acres are included in existing Federal irrigation projects while the remainder has been reclaimed by local interests and agencies. It is difficult to state the definite extent of irrigable land that remains as its suitability for development depends upon water-supply limitations and land characteristics. However, studies of the Corps of Engineers, made in connection with its flood-control surveys, and reports of the Bureau of Reclamation show that there are some 22,700,000 acres of potentially irrigable land remaining to be developed in the western part of the United States.

(c) In addition to the irrigable potentialities in the West, there are large areas in southeastern Texas and in Louisiana and Arkansas where supplemental water for rice land is practical. These rice lands, usually in coastal or alluvial areas, aggregate about 1,600,000 acres; and it appears that some 2,200,000 acres of additional rice lands could be brought into production by a combination of flood protection, drainage, and water supply. Supplemental water supplies are needed in many localities to improve the production of existing lands.

(d) The geographical distribution of irrigation and watering of rice land potentialities is shown in table No. 2 herewith.

21. Drainage and water control: (a) Drainage improvements are an essential part of flood control in many instances, and in accordance with congressional authority the Corps of Engineers includes major drainage improvements in its flood-control programs. Since the Department of Agriculture is responsible for land conservation and watershed improvement measures, an interdepartmental cooperative procedure has been devised to define the responsibilities and extent of activities of the Corps of Engineers and of the Department of Agriculture in planning and execution of complete drainage improvements. In general, the Corps of Engineers is responsible for major drainage outlets and the Department of Agriculture for drainage on watershed lands. Thus the two agencies can proceed in coordination to cover the entire field of drainage and flood control, except in cases where drainage is part of the Federal irrigation projects, where it is prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation.

(b) The magnitude of the drainage problem throughout the United States has been summarized in general terms by the Department of Agriculture as follows:

	Acres
(1) Lands on farms of the Nation that are too wet for full production or for any production at all	29,000,000
(2) Irrigated lands in the West needing drainage to control the water table and prevent damage from alkali salts	8,000,000
(3) Wet lands never cleared for farming or opened for cultivation of crops that are suitable for bringing into agricultural production	20,000,000
Total	57,000,000

The improvement by drainage of lands of existing farms is largely within the province of the watershed improvement programs of the Department of Agriculture and local agencies; but the Corps of Engineers is involved to the extent of improving or providing major drainage outlets. In its studies for flood-control programs, the Corps of Engineers has found that there are about 24,000,000 acres of lands which can be reclaimed for agricultural use by a combination of flood protection, drainage, and control of water levels. This includes most of the nonproducing wet lands included in the Department of Agriculture summary given above. The geographical distribution of the land suitable for improvement by drainage is shown in table No. 2 herewith.

(c) Since much of this land susceptible of improvement by flood protection and drainage is of a highly productive type, when properly developed and used, it represents a valuable national resource for development as the need arises. The lands of this type are to be found largely in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi, and in the Atlantic southeast and Gulf coastal areas; although scattered areas occur in almost all parts of the country. In its approach to the problem of land improvement and reclamation by drainage and water control the Corps of Engineers recognizes that it is neither possible nor desirable to drain all swamp and marshland. Large areas should remain and be preserved in their natural state for the preservation of important fish and wildlife resources. And in all cases the dangers of over-drainage, which have in some instances resulted in unwise development and in loss of land, should be avoided.

22. Watershed improvement: The Department of Agriculture has completed preliminary examinations of 154 river basins or parts of basins, and 18 detailed surveys for watershed treatment programs. It has watershed treatment programs under way in 11 river basins in accordance with congressional authorizations, extending from the upper Potomac in the East to the Trinity River in Texas, and surveys of over 40 watersheds are under way at the present time. These include comprehensive surveys of the Missouri River Basin, and of such diverse watersheds as those of the Merrimack in New England, and of the Rio Grande in New Mexico and Colorado. The importance of this phase of river-basin improvement is fully recognized in comprehensive river-basin plans being prepared by the Corps of Engineers, and works proposed by the Department of Agriculture in watersheds will effectively complement the works proposed by the Corps of Engineers for control of rivers and major tributaries. Watershed treatment programs include measures for conservation of soil, improved land use, reforestation and establishment of vegetative cover, check dams and farm ponds; and other means to conserve the soil and water on the lands of the river basins.

23. Other problems: There are numerous other problems and potentialities associated with the development of the water resources of the United States, which vary in magnitude and importance between the various sections of the country and in the separate river basins. These include the provisions of water supply for municipal and industrial use; pollution control and abatement; preservation of fish and wildlife; improvement of public health and sanitation; development of recreational areas and facilities. Consideration is being given to these matters in preparation of all comprehensive plans for water-resource development; and agencies of the Federal Government such as the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Public Health Service, as well as State and local agencies, are proceeding with specific plans of improvement, and are cooperating with the Corps of Engineers in the development of comprehensive river-basin plans.

IV. PLANS OF IMPROVEMENT

24. The Corps of Engineers has prepared comprehensive plans for the conservation and development of the water resources of most of the major rivers of the United States. Other Federal agencies such as the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Public Health Service have also prepared comprehensive plans in their particular fields of water-resource development and improvement. In addition many State and local agencies throughout the United States have developed local plans of improvement and have completed or initiated projects which fit in with the over-all plans of the Federal agencies. This review of plans for conservation and use of water resources takes into consideration as completely as possible the works under way and contemplated by all Federal and local agencies.

25. The comprehensive plans for water-resource conservation and use which are summarized in this study include works of the following general types:

(a) For flood control: Storage reservoirs, levees, floodwalls, flood channel improvements, floodways, spillways and pumping stations.

(b) For navigation: Open channel improvements by dredging, jetties, bank revetment and contraction works; and canalization by means of lock and dam structures.

(c) Power development: Dams, penstocks, generators, and transmission lines in some cases.

(d) Irrigation: Storage reservoirs; major canal systems; pumping plants, headgates, water-distribution systems, and land leveling and improvement.

(e) Drainage: Canals, levees, pumping stations, control structures and water conservation areas.

(f) Watershed treatment: Check dams, farm ponds, establishment of vegetative cover, reforestation, contour plowing, and improved land-use practices.

(g) Pollution abatement: Reservoir storage to increase low water flow; sewage treatment plants; facilities for treatment of industrial waste; mine-sealing operations.

(h) Other features: Wildlife refuges; recreational facilities; and measures for control of malaria and other diseases and for improvement of public health.

(i) Multiple-use projects: In many cases single project features serve a number of uses, such as a reservoir which stores water for flood control, irrigation and development of power.

26. In a brief discussion of plans for conservation and use of water resources of the United States it is impracticable to list the hundreds of specific projects that would be involved, and it is possible only to summarize and show the status and magnitude of the plan, as follows:

(a) Completed works: Useful elements of all phases of water-resource development projects have been completed throughout the United States and are now in operation. To provide a comparison of work accomplished with that remaining to be done the cost of completed parts of the over-all plan of improvement is estimated at $4,779,700,000.

(b) Projects under construction: Projects are now under construction by the Federal Government in cooperation with local agencies in all parts of the country, with an estimated cost of $4,593,000,000.

(c) Projects definitely planned: Improvements required at this time or to meet the needs of the immediate future have been planned to the extent that some have been authorized by Congress; some are included in reports now before Congress, and plans for some are now in course of preparation. The cost of these definitely planned improvements is estimated at $18,980,900,000.

(d) Future plans: In addition to the foregoing, plans have been prepared looking toward ultimate development of water resources which may prove justified over the long-range future. These plans which may serve as a guide to proper long-range development, are set forth herein merely to give an approximation of the probable cost of full water-resource development at $29,152,600,000. A break-down of the status and cost of the comprehensive plan according to major geographical divisions of the United States is given herewith as table No. 1.

27. Since the full scope of certain future plans such as those of the Department of Agriculture for watershed improvement and those of the Public Health Service for pollution control and abatement, which are to be accomplished jointly with local interests, is not fully defined at this time, the ultimate program for complete river basin development will probably include additional measures not covered by this summary. The program as shown, however, is believed adequate to serve as a general measure of the long-range requirements for sound river-basin development.

28. Accomplishment of the complete program of development represents a task of great magnitude. Nevertheless, over a period of time it is entirely practicable and within the range of demonstrated capabilities of the Nation. For example the appropriations by the Congress for the fiscal year 1949 for public works of the type summarized in this study will aggregate more than a billion dollars. On this basis the program could be accomplished within the lives of present generations. The grand total cost shown above should also be considered in relation to work completed and under way; which will indicate that, with completion of work now under construction, about 16 percent of the total job will be complete. When one considers that practically all of the work completed has been accomplished in the past 40 years and that all of the work under construction was initiated during the past 10 years, a proper time perspective for the over-all plan of improvement may be obtained.

29. The part of the over-all plan of improvement set forth in the summary as "projects definitely planned" with a total estimated cost of $18,981,000,000, including work which has been authorized by Congress to date for all types of river-basin improvement, affords a reservoir of projects which can be undertaken to the extent deemed advisable by Congress to meet the most urgent needs of the present and prospective future. Many of these projects have present economic justification and information on them is available to the Congress in reports submitted by the Corps of Engineers and other Federal agencies. This part of the over-all plan includes most of the projects necessary to provide a well-rounded program of river-basin development for the next 20 or 25 years. Any plan of this magnitude can be accomplished in an effective manner only if the planning and constructing agencies of the Federal Government can proceed under an orderly program, which continues at a fairly uniform rate over a period of years.

30. The grand total cost of comprehensive plans for conservation and use of the water resources of the United States, including work completed and under way, may be divided among the various functions of the plan approximately as follows:

Flood control	$12,295,200,000
Navigation	6,233,100,000
Hydroelectric power	24,086,900,000
Irrigation	8,681,600,000
Drainage	375,400,000
Watershed treatment	4,012,000,000
Pollution control	1,365,800,000
Preservation of fish and wildlife and recreation	456,200,000
Total	57,506,200,000

Table No. 3 herewith gives a break-down of costs by geographical regions of the United States.

31. The foregoing break-down has been estimated to show an approximate division of total cost among the various functions of river-basin development. It should be borne in mind, however, that in many instances the same works perform several functions and the project features and functions are so closely interrelated, as is the case of navigation and flood control on the lower Mississippi River, that an actual separation of project costs is not practicable. The division of cost assigned to flood control includes most major drainage improvements as the two functions are so closely related; and the part of the cost assigned separately to drainage is that of works purely for local drainage and water control necessary to take advantage of major drainage outlets. The division of cost assigned to hydroelectric power development is large in this case because of the greater facility of assigning definite monetary values to power developed, than to certain other phases of water-resource development, and because of the large amount of hydroelectric power available for ultimate development on the rivers of the country.

V. ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PLANS

32. The comprehensive plans for river basin development which are summarized in this study provide a basis for conservation and use of practically the entire water resources of the United States. The accomplishments of the over-all plan with respect to five of its major functions are summarized in table No. 2 herewith by geographical regions of the United States. These may be summarized briefly for the entire United States as follows:

(a) Flood control: Floods which can occur under existing conditions on the rivers of the United States will produce average annual flood damages, estimated at present price levels and at present degrees of river valley development, of over $466,000,000 annually. It is seldom possible, within the realm of practical engineering and economics, to prevent all of the flood damages that will occur on any river; and this is equally true for the flood damage remaining on a Nation-wide scale. The planned flood-control works, however, together with those under construction and not yet effective, would, when ultimately completed, prevent 75 percent of this remaining flood damage. This degree of protection, if it could be obtained at the present time or near future, would result in savings from flood damages prevented, of $356,000,000 annually on the average. In addition to the effect of the planned improvements in preventing flood damage, they would produce large benefits by eliminating hazards to human life, and by preventing the indirect losses to business and agriculture and to the general economy which accompany floods. These indirect losses include disruption of business, transportation delays and detours, interruption of public services and utilities, dangers to public health, and general dislocations in the economy which extend far beyond the actual flooded areas. With the growth and development of population and industry in the river basins, flood damages will undoubtedly increase, and benefits of adequate flood protection will likewise increase.

(b) Navigation: The over-all plan would result in the ultimate improvement of all navigable rivers, and would extend the benefits of economical water-borne transportation to the principal agricultural and industrial areas of the Nation. It is difficult to estimate the benefits that will result from such improvements that will extend far into the future, but on the basis of present development and requirements it is estimated that all waterway improvements existing and contemplated in the over-all plan of development would produce transportation savings of about $475,500,000, annually, when ultimate development is reached. These savings are based on detailed estimates for completed works and on preliminary data for planned future improvements for which it is not practicable to make detailed estimates at this time. The greater part of this commerce that would be carried by the inland waterways would be bulk commodities, for which rapid transit is not essential, such as coal, ore, grain, bulk petroleum products, and fertilizer. For example, the extension of efficient barge navigation along the Missouri and other western rivers would provide a means for economical shipment of fertilizers and fuels into a vast agricultural region.

(c) Hydroelectric power: As indicated previously in this study there remains in the

river basins of the country a feasible potentiality for the development of 79,965,000 kilowatts of power, over and above that now installed. The river basin plans summarized in this study contemplate the development of about 75 percent of this undeveloped resources, or about 56,540,000 kilowatts. Such a large development of power would of course take place over a long period of time in phase with the developing power requirements of industry and population generally and as other aspects of water resource development are carried out. This power potentiality of the Nation is one of its most valuable resources, on which much of its future industrial development will depend. The amount of hydroelectric power that can be developed in connection with other projects for water resource development is an essential part of any summary of this problem; and is given here to complete the survey of river potentialities. Procedures are now in effect for development of hydroelectric power by both public and private agencies and continuing procedures for development and disposal of this resource are matters for determination by the Congress.

(d) Irrigation: The plans of the Bureau of Reclamation for irrigation of western lands, which are related to water resource plans of the Corps of Engineers and which have been included in this summary, contemplate that some 16,200,000 acres of new land will be brought into production by irrigation, and that supplemental water will be provided for a large part of the area now under irrigation. The new land to be reclaimed by irrigation is about 70 percent of the land suitable for this purpose. The benefits of irrigation are well illustrated by present areas in the West where green agricultural valleys contrast with vast dry areas usable only for range land, or with no agricultural value, when dependent upon inadequate annual rainfall. In such areas irrigation water means the difference between rich farming land and desert. In addition water would be provided for about 70 percent of the 2,200,000 acres of potential ricelands.

(e) Drainage: As indicated in table No. 2 with this report there are nearly 24,000,000 acres of wet land which appear suitable for agricultural purposes. This does not include all of the swamp, marsh, and overflowed land in the United States as much of that land is not suitable for agricultural use, or could be developed only at a prohibitive cost. In addition much of the wet land should remain in its natural state to serve its natural purposes of providing areas for storage of flood waters, natural reservoirs for replenishment of ground water tables, and as areas for the preservation of fish and wildlife and natural vegetation. Plans included as a part of the over-all plan of river basin improvement contemplate drainage of about 15,300,000 acres of land, or about 60 percent of that wet land which appears suitable for agriculture. This large acreage would be improved and developed gradually over a period of time as the growth of requirements for additional land evolves.

(f) Watershed treatment: Works for improvement of watersheds, which are completed, being provided, and contemplated, include such measures as improvement of existing vegetative cover, the establishment of vegetation on denuded areas, the protection of forests and grasslands from fire, reduction of grazing, adoption of logging and forest management practices that maintain good ground cover, the proper use of close-growing and cover crops on tilled lands, changes in use of land and kinds of plant cover that will result in reduction of run-off and erosion, all of which help increase infiltration of water into the soil and its retention in the soil and help prevent erosion. Also included are installations of mechanical measures and conservation practices such as terraces, diversion ditches, stabilization of roadside ditches, check dams, small detention dams, debris basins, contour cultivation, and strip cropping to help retard run-off and reduce erosion and movement of sediment. Although it is not possible at this time to assign any over-all monetary or other unit to indicate the benefits which will result from the diverse measures and structures which make up a watershed treatment program, it is obvious that they will produce large returns on a Nation-wide basis by conserving land and improving existing farm and land production. They will complement flood control works on major streams by reducing the number of small floods, and the damages of large floods, and by preventing the flow of sediment into major streams.

33. There are a number of other features of comprehensive plans for conservation of water resources and improvement of river basins. These include:

(a) Pollution control and abatement: In 1939 the Water Resources Committee of the National Resources Committee indicated that there was no quick and easy solution of the problem of river pollution; and estimated that an expenditure of about two billion dollars would be required to abate the more objectionable pollution. Since that time a large amount of work has been accomplished by local and State agencies, under agreements between various States in a river basin, and in accordance with plans and programs supervised by the Public Health Service. In addition legislation is in process of final consideration by the present Congress which will provide for continuation of Federal assistance in pollution control under the general supervision of the Public Health Service. The comprehensive plans for the various river basins, which are summarized in this study, give consideration to this problem; and in many cases reservoirs for flood control and other purposes will have substantial values in controlling pollution by increasing low-water flows. Complete or essentially complete solution of the problem, however, will require treatment plants for municipal sewage and industrial waste. Since such works are largely a responsibility of local governments and private industry; and since proposed plans and their cost were not available it was not practicable to include all of these works in this summary.

(b) Preservation of fish and wildlife: The plans for river-basin improvement include features and costs for preservation of fish and wildlife. In carrying out such plans every effort is made to avoid disturbing the natural habitat of fish and game. This is not always possible as development of the potentialities of the rivers usually results in change in natural regimen and conditions; but in such cases an effort is made to restore favorable conditions as nearly as possible. In other cases it is possible to conserve natural areas and improve their suitability for propagation of fish and game. This aspect of conservation is considered by the Corps of Engineers in all of its plans for river-basin development.

(c) Recreation: With the growth of population in the country there has arisen a growing need for recreational facilities, particularly near centers of population. The navigation channels afforded by the inland waterways in the over-all plan of improvement will serve one phase of this need by offering facilities for recreational boating. Reservoirs built for various purposes are often suitable for recreational use. At this time the Corps of Engineers prepares a master recreational plan for each of the reservoirs placed under construction, and this plan is followed in the development of recreational facilities in conjunction with State and local agencies. The National Park Service of the Department of the Interior cooperates with the Corps of Engineers in the analysis and planning of recreational facilities. The plans of river-basin development summarized in this study will, when accomplished, produce substantial recreational values.

(d) Water supply: The upstream reservoir storage contemplated as a large part of plans of development will greatly improve the streams as a source of water for municipal and industrial use by the regulation of flow and particularly by increasing low-water flow. In addition, in many instances it is possible to reserve storage in the reservoirs themselves for water supply, and the plan contemplates such reservations. This aspect of water conservation will become more important with the development of population and urban areas.

(e) Salinity control: In some coastal areas the encroachment of salt water into the tidal portions of rivers and canals, and into underground water tables, has created a problem which is becoming increasingly serious as these areas are settled and developed. This problem is considered in affected areas and improvement of this condition will be obtained by means of barrier structures, increased low water flows, and by fresh water storage areas.

VI. CONCLUSION

34. This review of plans for conservation and use of the water resources of the United States presents the full scope and magnitude of this national problem. The summarization of the diverse elements of this problem has been made possible by the availability of the "308" river-basin surveys which were authorized by Congress; by the ability of field organizations of the Corps of Engineers in 10 divisions and 41 districts covering the entire United States to keep the plans up to date and coordinated with the plans and activities of other Federal and local agencies.

35. This summary shows in brief that the plans for development of the water resources of the United States will be about 16 percent complete with the completion of work now under way. Definite plans for development which are now ready in the form of authorized projects, reports to Congress, or plans in course of preparation, will include projects with a total cost of about $18,981,000,000. These projects and plans represent a measure in monetary terms of most of the work that would be justified at present or in the prospective future—say in the next 20 to 25 years; and they form a part of longer-range plans that point the way to ultimate river-basin development.

36. It is recognized that this summary presents in brief a tremendous problem, and it is believed that it is factual and correct within the limitations involved in estimating future improvements of great size. The problem is not insurmountable because very substantial progress is shown by the magnitude of work completed and under way. It should be borne in mind that most of this work has been accomplished in the last 20 years, during which the Nation has also participated in a world war when all civil-works activities were practically at a standstill. While the total cost of complete development of our national water resources will be large, it will be only a fraction of the expenditure which this Nation was forced to make to preserve itself during the recent world war. The benefits and advantages which will accrue from a long-range program of water-resource development will far exceed the cost. In fact prosecution of a sound program of river-basin development may be essential to our survival as a Nation. Ancient civilizations, such as that of the Incas of the Andes found it necessary to build great public works, such as terraces and aqueducts to conserve meager resources

of mountain water and soil, in order to maintain themselves. The cost of those ancient works would be enormous by present-day standards but they were essential to the needs of their time. This Nation, with its abundance of resources of soil and water, can insure its future by continuing with a far-sighted program for the conservation and use of these resources.

TABLE 1.—*Status and estimated cost of plans for conservation and use of the water resources of the United States*

	Projects completed	Projects under construction	Projects definitely planned	Future plans for ultimate use	Total
Atlantic Northeast	$267,200,000	$175,700,000	$1,447,300,000	$1,422,300,000	$3,312,500,000
Atlantic Southeast	163,100,000	143,400,000	2,058,700,000	1,443,200,000	3,808,400,000
Alluvial valley of the Mississippi	677,500,000	142,700,000	744,200,000	485,800,000	2,050,200,000
Ohio River Basin	1,192,700,000	433,300,000	3,092,100,000	2,130,600,000	6,758,700,000
Great Lakes Basin	28,700,000	42,400,000	47,800,000	403,700,000	522,600,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin	410,600,000	127,300,000	764,400,000	847,800,000	2,150,100,000
Red River of the North Basin	3,500,000	8,300,000	14,000,000	12,400,000	38,200,000
Missouri River Basin	149,600,000	1,635,700,000	2,681,700,000	1,656,000,000	6,123,000,000
Southwestern tributaries of the Mississippi River	270,000,000	352,500,000	1,631,100,000	2,611,200,000	4,864,800,000
Gulf Southwest	261,700,000	208,800,000	912,500,000	1,921,500,000	3,304,500,000
Pacific Southwest	804,100,000	332,100,000	2,269,200,000	5,880,700,000	9,226,100,000
Pacific Northwest	551,000,000	990,800,000	3,467,900,000	10,337,400,000	15,347,100,000
Total	4,779,700,000	4,593,000,000	18,980,900,000	29,152,600,000	57,506,200,000

STATES INCLUDED WITHIN DELINEATIONS OF GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS

Region	States wholly within region	States partially within region
Atlantic Northeast	Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland	New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, West Virginia.
Atlantic Southeast	South Carolina, Florida	North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi.
Alluvial valley of the Mississippi	None	Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee, Missouri, Illinois, Kentucky.
Ohio River Basin	do	New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois.
Great Lakes Basin	Michigan	New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota.
Upper Mississippi River Basin	None	Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Indiana.
Red River of the North Basin	do	North Dakota, Minnesota, South Dakota.
Missouri River Basin	Nebraska	Minnesota, Missouri, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Kansas.
Southwestern tributaries of Mississippi River.	Oklahoma	Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas Colorado, New Mexico, Texas.
Gulf Southwest	None	Texas, New Mexico. Colorado.
Pacific Southwest	California, Arizona, Utah	Nevada, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Oregon.
Pacific Northwest	Washington	Montana, Idaho, Oregon, Wyoming, Nevada.

TABLE 2.—*Accomplishments of the plans for conservation and use of the water resources of the United States*

	Flood control average annual flood damage			Inland navigation transportation savings [1]	Hydroelectric power (in kilowatts)			Irrigation (in acres of land)			Drainage (in acres of land)	
	Prevented by existing projects	Remaining under present conditions	To be prevented by planned works		Present installed capacity	Remaining undeveloped potential	To be developed planned projects	Now under irrigation	Irrigable land not yet developed	To be irrigated under plan	Potential farm land not drained	To be improved under plan [2]
Atlantic Northeast	$10,934,000	$42,088,000	$26,648,000	$100,000,000	1,810,000	6,826,000	5,674,000	0	0	0	164,000	25,000
Atlantic Southeast	13,062,000	19,162,000	13,503,000	25,000,000	1,873,000	5,565,000	5,487,000	0	0	0	5,815,000	3,787,000
Alluvial valley of Mississippi River	212,847,000	34,899,000	31,019,000	60,000,000	0	4,000	4,000	[3] 1,039,000	[3] 1,275,000	[3] 1,000,000	3,505,000	2,632,000
Ohio River Basin	36,786,000	60,535,000	[4] 47,844,000	150,000,000	2,934,000	4,980,000	4,760,000	0	0	0	902,000	752,000
Great Lakes Basin	310,000	6,103,000	3,993,000	500,000	2,089,000	3,828,000	584,000	0	0	0	163,000	49,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin	10,140,000	52,756,000	[4] 41,684,000	50,000,000	573,000	1,053,000	217,000	0	0	0	553,000	286,000
Red River of the North Basin	45,000	2,391,000	1,851,000	0	10,000	0	0	0	1,166,000	1,166,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Missouri River Basin	4,550,000	50,100,000	[4] 43,000,000	15,000,000	800,000	4,200,000	[5] 2,023,000	5,027,000	4,995,000	4,995,000	0	0
Southwestern tributaries of Mississippi River	12,099,000	47,612,000	[4] 27,406,000	20,000,000	168,000	3,006,000	3,006,000	907,000	1,648,000	895,000	2,579,000	425,000
Gulf Southwest	7,014,000	52,935,000	33,630,000	25,000,000	199,000	1,096,000	795,000	[3] 4,457,000	[3] 2,888,000	[3] 990,000	7,707,000	5,420,000
Pacific Southwest	31,550,000	70,197,000	62,850,000	5,000,000	3,840,000	10,195,000	7,487,000	9,399,000	7,378,000	5,334,000	331,000	184,000
Pacific Northwest	4,194,000	27,331,000	23,103,000	25,000,000	2,831,000	39,212,000	29,503,000	4,093,000	5,523,000	3,311,000	1,268,000	799,000
Total	343,531,000	466,109,000	356,531,000	475,500,000	17,127,000	79,965,000	59,540,000	[3] 24,922,000	[3] 24,873,000	[3] 17,691,000	23,987,000	15,359,000

[1] Based on detailed estimates for completed works and preliminary data for planned works.
[2] Includes lands that will be improved by a combination of drainage, flood protection, and water control.
[3] Includes furnishing water for rice lands.
[4] Exclusive of damages prevented in alluvial valley of the Mississippi River.
[5] Present plans for Missouri Basin contemplate 2,023,000 kilowatts in prospective future; and larger ultimate development as required.

TABLE 3.—*Division of cost of plans for conservation and use of the water resources of the United States*

[In thousands of dollars]

	Flood control	Navigation	Hydro power	Irrigation	Drainage	Watershed treatment	Pollution abatement	Fish and wildlife and recreation	Total
Atlantic Northeast	763,300	475,100	1,809,200	----------	3,000	168,000	93,900	----------	3,312,500
Atlantic Southeast	445,900	565,800	2,648,800	----------	56,100	91,800	----------	----------	3,808,400
Alluvial valley of Mississippi River	1,294,900	579,200	----------	18,000	----------	155,400	----------	2,700	2,050,200
Ohio River Basin	1,951,300	1,756,700	1,832,600	----------	23,000	550,000	645,100	----------	6,758,700
Great Lakes Basin	105,800	7,400	348,700	----------	3,300	3,000	53,300	1,100	522,600
Upper Mississippi River Basin	794,600	920,000	171,300	----------	13,000	142,700	69,900	38,600	2,150,100
Red River of the North Basin	26,400	----------	2,000	----------	300	1,000	5,700	2,800	38,200
Missouri River Basin	1,530,800	306,100	918,400	1,530,800	----------	1,530,800	30,600	275,500	6,123,000
Southwestern tributaries of Mississippi River	1,883,600	653,400	1,198,200	306,500	28,700	766,000	24,500	3,900	4,864,800
Gulf Southwest	878,500	490,000	342,700	706,400	99,000	477,900	282,100	27,500	3,304,500
Pacific Southwest	1,631,700	51,500	3,235,400	4,148,800	400	11,400	125,000	21,900	9,226,100
Pacific Northwest	988,000	427,900	11,579,600	1,971,100	148,600	114,000	35,700	82,200	15,347,100
Total	12,295,200	6,233,100	24,086,900	8,681,600	375,400	4,012,000	1,365,800	456,200	57,506,200

STATUS OF IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the United States Reclamation Act was passed by the Congress of the United States in 1902, 46 years ago. Hon. Francis G. Newlands, then United States Senator from the State of Nevada, was the father of the act. The act was passed under a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, and has been responsible for the conservation and development of approximately 20,000,000 acres of land and 2,500,000 kilowatts of electric energy.

Mr. President, as chairman of the National Resources Economic Committee, a special committee created by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I ask unanimous consent there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement and report by that committee.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUS OF IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—17 WESTERN STATES, JUNE 30, 1948

The people of the 17 far western States which make up the vast arid and semiarid areas are deeply concerned with the Federal reclamation program for complete conservation of water resources for the development of irrigated lands, with the development of hydroelectric power, to assist in repayment of costs and to assure maximum use of the water and land resources. The country at large was likewise concerned with this great reclamation conservation program which was initiated under President Theodore Roosevelt when the Congress adopted the reclamation law of 1902; and it has continued its interest and concern for furthering the reclamation program during the 46 years since the national irrigation policy was written into the Federal Statutes.

Along with the Federal reclamation program, of course, is the companion program of the Army Corps of Engineers, particularly in relation to flood control and navigation concern on the major streams of the West, as well as the country at large. The Corps of Engineers' program obviously looks also to hydroelectric power development as an incident to flood control and navigation projects just as power production is incidental to reclamation irrigation water conservation.

The Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, Dams and Electric Power Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of the United States Senate, of which I have the honor of being chairman, is thoroughly alive to the importance and vital necessity for coordination, in a real sense, of the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers' plans for river-basin developments in the West. The predecessor of this committee, the Interstate Commerce Committee, took an important forward step in this direction in 1944 when it recommended and Congress adopted the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (ch. 665, 50 Stat. 887). That act made a number of progressive moves for the development of western water resources. Among these were the following:

1. The declared power of Congress to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders, and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control, to preserve and protect to the fullest possible extent, and establish potential uses for all purposes of the waters of the Nation's rivers.

2. The requirement that plans, proposals, or reports of the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, and the Secretary of the Interior relating to works of improvement for navigation or flood control by the Army or for irrigation and purposes incidental thereto by the Bureau of Reclamation, shall be submitted to the States affected for their comment and recommendations. The reports are also to be reviewed and commented upon by the Federal agencies concerned—that is—the Corps of Engineers reviews the Bureau's plans in the West and the Bureau does likewise with the Army plans in that area.

3. The requirement that navigation projects operated in States lying wholly or partly west of the ninety-eighth meridian, shall not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, of the waters of these States for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes. This provision was intended not only to protect the rights of the States but to give priority to irrigation and other purposes mentioned where navigation requirements might conflict with the irrigation requirements of the States.

4. Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to supervise the disposal of hydroelectric power produced at Army-constructed dams. Section 5 of the Flood Control Act requires that the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit and dispose of such power in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers, consistent with sound business principles. Preference in wholesale quantities of this power is given to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, States, cooperatives, and private-owned companies, presumably in the order named. The same authority for transmission of power developed in this manner is given the Bureau as in respect to Reclamation dams.

5. Approve the comprehensive plans of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for the full development of the Missouri River Basin, for flood control and navigation by the Corps of Engineers and for irrigation by the Bureau of Reclamation. Both agencies were authorized to produce power as a byproduct in connection with their respective developments. Initial appropriations were authorized to begin construction under the respective plans.

Under the comprehensive plan for the Missouri Basin, the Corps of Engineers is devoting its energies primarily toward the construction of dams, on the main stem of the Missouri for flood control and navigation purposes with power facilities to be installed where economically feasible.

The Bureau of Reclamation is directing its energies toward the construction of storage dams on the western tributaries of the Missouri, which are primarily for irrigation and flood-control purposes with power facilities where feasible. The Bureau is also planning and constructing transmission facilities to carry power, not only from its own dams but from the power plants of the Army dams to the points where it can be sold for distribution. The Bureau of Reclamation is also planning and constructing irrigation-distribution facilities for irrigation of four or five million acres of land in the Missouri Basin that over the years have been subject to serious drought hazards.

The comprehensive plan for the Missouri Basin sets the stage for what the Congress undoubtedly believed to be the proper procedure for coordinating the highly vital work of the Corps of Engineers having to do with flood control and navigation, and the work of the Bureau of Reclamation, which is concerned primarily with irrigation and incidental flood control. As in the new Missouri Basin project, where dams constructed by the Army can conserve water for irrigation, provision is or should be made in connection with other areas for this important conservation measure, for it is important that waters should be conserved for irrigation where operating plans can be developed which give adequate flood-control protection, and, at the same time, conserve water for irrigation.

Such coordination is sometimes difficult but is not impossible of achievement. Recently in the Public Works flood-control bill H. R. 6419, enacted in the closing days of the Eightieth Congress, the approval was given to the comprehensive plans of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for the middle Rio Grande development in New Mexico. This is another step toward the coordinated development of western rivers by these two outstanding agencies of the Federal Government.

There is yet much to be done in this direction by these two agencies in presenting coordinated comprehensive plans for the development of other river basins in the West. Among these where both agencies have been working, I hope in a cooperative way, are the Central Valley of California, the Columbia River Basin affecting western Montana, Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Wyoming, and the Colorado River Basin which affects the States of Nevada, Arizona, and California in the lower basin, and Utah, Wyoming and New Mexico in the upper basin. These are the major river basins remaining where coordinated programs should be forthcoming, and there are also a number of subbasins which would be subject to the same process.

For the information of the Congress and the people of the West and the country generally, I am herewith submitting a few facts on the long-range possibilities of irrigation and power development by the Bureau of Reclamation.

These figures are, in the main, taken from a booklet on Reclamation—A National Development prepared by the National Reclamation Association from data in the Reclamation files and printed beginning on page 2193 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on the Interior appropriation bill for fiscal year 1949. The first tabulation given below is an inventory of irrigable acreage in the 17 Western States.

As is well known, the limiting factor on irrigation in the West is the availability of water that can be economically delivered to land that can be made productive through the artificial application of irrigation water. Generally speaking, the limit of irrigation in the West has been placed at approximately 40,000,000 acres out of a total of areas in the 17 Western States of 1,162,000,000 acres.

Approximately 20,000,000 acres are now under irrigation principally through private enterprise, but including about 3,000,000 acres which have been brought under irrigation by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Office of Indian Affairs.

In addition to providing a full supply of water to approximately 2,500,000 acres, the Bureau of Reclamation now provides supplemental water for an additional 2,390,000 acres that faced water shortages due to inadequate supplies provided by the enterprises that originally developed these areas. I mention the supplemental water problem because it is of continuing importance to the West that established communities built on irrigation developments shall not pass out of existence due to diminishing irrigation water supplies.

In this connection it will bear repeating that the economy of the 11 States of the Mountain and Pacific regions is almost wholly dependent on the irrigation develop-

ments that have led to the tremendous growth in population since the turn of the century. It will be irrigation expansion as well as the hydroelectric power developments in multiple-purpose reclamation projects that will enable the West to continue to grow and to continue to be a major factor in the future development and security of the entire country.

The first tabulation below also shows by States the areas that will be served by irrigation under the Federal reclamation projects now under construction or authorized for construction. These projects when completed will irrigate a little more than 7,000,000 acres of new land and provide supplemental water for slightly more than 3,600,000 acres of land now inadequately irrigated.

Under investigation or proposed for investigation by the Bureau are projects or developments which indicate the possibility of serving a total of 10,250,000 additional acres. Of this 10,250,000, 6,112,000 would be newly irrigated lands and 4,143,000 acres would be provided supplemental water. Thus the Federal reclamation program, as shown by this tabulation contemplates full irrigation supply to 13,200,000 acres of additional new land and supplemental water for 7,750,000 acres now inadequately irrigated. This would leave about 7,000,000 additional acres which might be irrigated in the future.

The table which is a tentative inventory of irrigable acreage in the 17 Western States with details by States on the reclamation program is as follows:

Inventory of irrigable acreage in 17 Western States

State	Area of State	Area works were capable of supplying with water, 1940	Irrigated in 1939 other than Federal	Area irrigated in 1946 on Indian reservations	Federal reclamation projects						
					Irrigable, 1943		Under construction or authorized		Under investigation or proposed [1]		Total project acreage
					Full supply	Supplemental	New lands	Supplemental	New lands	Supplemental	
Arizona	72,691,200	844,212	245,537	89,935	93,195	92,012	109,285	0	145,250	607,660	1,257,402
California	100,353,920	7,398,576	5,127,254	8,465	60,281	560,431	800,500	1,220,000	963,000	890,000	4,494,212
Colorado	66,538,880	3,913,542	3,117,599	8,656	132,661	51,125	3,300	1,100,700	718,745	781,615	2,788,146
Idaho	52,997,120	2,593,534	1,051,631	31,643	445,800	933,280	62,270	742,320	730,120	236,110	3,149,500
Kansas	52,552,320	142,409	99,980	0	0	0	237,020	830	0	0	237,850
Montana	93,642,240	2,344,590	1,285,040	148,822	358,701	0	903,860	265,600	133,300	77,300	1,718,761
Nebraska	49,057,920	992,957	352,978	0	195,958	92,398	1,137,840	20,960	0	0	1,447,156
Nevada	70,273,280	841,304	745,301	26,359	68,402	68,265	0	0	97,800	99,780	334,247
New Mexico	77,767,040	731,990	428,597	17,488	119,668	0	38,387	0	171,900	146,250	476,205
North Dakota	44,834,560	36,522	7,337	7	26,637	0	1,222,810	0	0	0	1,249,447
Oklahoma	44,341,120	8,624	3,826	0	451	0	50,792	0	180,800	600	232,643
Oregon	61,664,000	1,261,081	827,463	3,863	178,545	93,849	47,005	0	1,018,575	211,700	1,549,674
South Dakota	48,983,040	121,847	25,161	298	72,431	0	1,013,110	23,300	0	0	1,108,841
Texas	168,732,160	1,773,812	566,280	0	67,000	18,045	2,080	7,520	879,120	616,780	1,590,545
Utah	52,701,440	1,357,714	917,567	60,864	41,912	272,137	0	53,792	158,647	217,933	744,421
Washington	42,865,280	731,527	167,516	124,101	250,289	191,700	1,054,500	0	492,300	108,170	2,096,959
Wyoming	62,403,840	1,913,527	1,308,766	23,890	187,136	16,739	415,340	177,800	422,760	154,910	1,374,685
Total	1,162,399,360	27,007,568	16,777,833	544,391	2,489,067	2,389,981	7,098,099	3,612,822	6,112,317	4,143,808	25,851,094

[1] Data from Bureau of Reclamation files. Subject to change on issuance of Federal long-range program.

NOTE.—For details as to projects, see State tables 3 to 19 in the appendix.
Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Sixteenth Census Reports. Office of Indian Affairs, and Bureau of Reclamation.

Hydroelectric power is a vital factor in repayment of costs and for pumping in the irrigation development of the Federal reclamation program. Presently installed on Bureau of Reclamation projects are a total of 2,138,137 kilowatts. Authorized for construction are about 4,800,000 additional kilowatts, including the installations of about 1,260,000 kilowatts at Army dams in the Missouri Basin, where the power production will be distributed over transmission lines to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation. A tabulation which shows a schedule as of January 1948 for installations through 1953 is as follows:

Summary of estimated schedule of installations in power plants on reclamation projects, existing, under construction, or authorized (through fiscal year 1953)

[Figures shown in kilowatts nameplate capacity]

Region and State	Projects and plants	Ultimate capacity, kilowatts	Existing capacity,[1] June 30, 1947	Estimated capacity (kilowatts) to be added during fiscal year						
				1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	After 1953
Region 1:										
Idaho	Boise:									
	Black Canyon	8,000	8,000							
	Boise River	1,500	1,500							
	Anderson Ranch	40,500	0							
Idaho	Minidoka: Minidoka	13,400	13,400	0	0	27,000	0	0	0	13,500
	Palisades: Palisades	60,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	30,000
Montana	Hungry Horse: Hungry Horse	300,000	0	0	0	0	0	75,000	225,000	
Oregon	Deschutes: Cove	1,500	1,500							
Washington	Columbia Basin: Grand Coulee	1,964,000	668,000	324,000	108,000	324,000	432,000	108,000		
	Yakima:									
	Prosser	2,400	2,400							
	Rocky Ford	187	187							
	Yakima Ridge	10,000	0	0	0	0	10,000			
	Total region 1	2,401,487	694,987	324,000	108,000	351,000	442,000	183,000	255,000	43,500
Region 2: California	Central Valley:									
	Shasta	379,000	154,000	150,000	75,000					
	Keswick	75,000	0	25,000	50,000					
	Delta Steam	240,000	0	0	0	0	80,000	80,000	80,000	
	Total region 2	694,000	154,000	175,000	125,000	0	80,000	80,000	80,000	
Region 3:										
Arizona-California	Parker: Parker	120,000	120,000							
Arizona-Nevada	Boulder Canyon:									
	Hoover	1,322,300	1,034,800	0	0	0	82,500	82,500	0	122,500
	Davis	225,000	0	0	0	90,000	135,000			
California	Yuma: Siphon drop	1,600	1,600							
	Total, region 3	1,668,900	1,156,400	0	0	90,000	217,500	82,500	0	122,500

Footnote at end of table.

Summary of estimated schedule of installations in power plants on reclamation projects, existing, under construction, or authorized (through fiscal year 1953)—Continued

[Figures shown in kilowatts nameplate capacity]

Region and State	Projects and plants	Ultimate capacity, kilowatts	Existing capacity,[1] June 30, 1947	Estimated capacity (kilowatts) to be added during fiscal year						
				1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	After 1953
Region 4:										
Colorado	Grand Valley: Grand Valley (Palisade)	3,000	3,000							
Nevada	Newlands: Lahontan	1,500	1,500							
Utah	Strawberry Valley:									
	Spanish Fork (Upper)	900	900							
	Spanish Fork (Lower)	250	250							
	Payson	400	400							
	Total, region 4	6,050	6,050							
Region 5: New Mexico	Elephant Butte: Elephant Butte	24,300	24,300							
Region 6:										
Montana	Plants operated by Bureau of Reclamation: Missouri Basin:									
	Lower Marias	1,600	0	0	0	0	0	1,600		
	Yellowtail	120,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	60,000	60,000
	Canyon Ferry	36,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,000	24,000
	Mission	80,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80,000
North Dakota	Missouri Basin:									
	Crosby	70,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70,000
	Des Lacs	70,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70,000
South Dakota	Missouri Basin: Miller Drop	180,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	180,000
Wyoming	Missouri Basin:									
	Boysen	15,000	0	0	0	0	0	15,000		
	Tongue River	25,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25,000
	Riverton: Pilot Butte	1,600	1,600							
	Shoshone:									
	Shoshone	5,600	5,600							
	Heart Mountain	5,000	0	0	5,000					
	Plants constructed and operated by Corps of Engineers (power marketed by Bureau of Reclamation):									
Montana	Fort Peck: Fort Peck	85,000	35,000	15,000				35,000		
North Dakota	Garrison: Garrison	320,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320,000
South Dakota	Gavins Point: Gavins Point	24,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24,000
	Ft. Randall: Ft. Randall	320,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	320,000
	Big Bend: Big Bend	120,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120,000
	Oahe: Oahe	400,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400,000
	Total, region 6	1,848,800	42,200	15,000	5,000	0	0	51,600	72,000	1,663,000
Region 7:										
Colorado	Colorado-Big Thompson:									
	Green Mountain	21,600	21,600							
	Marys Lake	8,100	0	0	0	8,100				
	Estes	45,000	0	0	0	45,000				
	Quillan	28,500	0	0	0	0	0	28,500		
	Cottonwood	11,500	0	0	0	0	0	11,500		
	Rattlesnake	13,500	0	0	0	0	0	13,500		
	Flatiron Mountain	41,000	0	0	0	0	0	41,000		
	Big Thompson	6,700	0	0	0	0	0	6,700		
Wyoming	North Platte:									
	Lingle	1,400	1,400							
	Guernsey	4,800	4,800							
	Kendrick: Seminoe	32,400	32,400							
	Missouri Basin:									
	Kortes	36,000	0	0	2,000	24,000				
	Glendo	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	
Nebraska	Missouri Basin: Harlan County (Army Corps of Engineers)	1,200	0	0	0	0	0	1,200		
	Total, region 7	271,700	60,200	0	12,000	77,100	0	102,400	20,000	
	Total, all regions	6,915,237	2,138,137	514,000	250,000	518,100	739,500	499,500	427,000	1,829,000

[1] Salt River Valley Water User Association hydroelectric plants (capacity 70,950 kw.) and Imperial Valley Irrigation District plants (capacity 14,400 kw.) on All-American Canal not included.

Source: Bureau of Reclamation.

Existing capacity June 30, 1947	2,138,137
Total scheduled through 1953	2,948,100
Total programed after 1953	1,829,000
Grand total authorized projects	6,915,237

The importance of hydroelectric power in connection with the reclamation program is highlighted from the financial side, for returns from the production and distribution of power will not only repay the cost of power facilities with interest but will materially assist in the repayment of the construction costs of irrigation facilities in many instances.

For instance, on a project like the presently authorized Central Valley in California, the irrigation facilities will represent something like two-thirds of the entire construction costs of the project. While power facilities will cost only about one third of the entire investment, the revenues from power will repay approximately two-thirds of the over-all costs. A similar ratio of the assistance by power to irrigation will prevail, I understand, in the Columbia Basin project and to some extent in the Missouri Basin project where nonreimbursable flood-control and navigation benefits are an essential part of the over-all financial picture.

Reclamation appropriations for irrigation are traditionally repayable without interest by the immediate beneficiaries who are the water users on the various projects. The Flood Control Act of 1944 to which I have referred in connection with the authorization for the Missouri Basin project sets a new standard on repayment. The investment in power facilities bears interest, of course, but the power facilities that are a part of the irrigation development are interest-free. Flood-control allocations in reclamation projects are nonreimbursable under the national flood-control policy just as the Army dams constructed for flood control represent nonreimbursable funds of the Federal Government.

From statistics on the total investments, or construction costs already incurred or presently contemplated by the Bureau of Reclamation in carrying out the program, the following tabulation is a summary:

Total expenditures by Bureau of Reclamation on irrigation and multiple-purpose projects to June 30, 1947	$1,083,606,000
Estimated cost to complete irrigation and multiple-purpose projects under or authorized for construction, including transmission facilities (but not power plants of Army dams)	3,556,927,000
Total estimated cost of completed and authorized projects	4,640,000,000
Total estimated cost of irrigation on multiple-purpose projects under investigation or proposed for investigation by 1955, including transmission facilities	3,500,000,000

Thus the reclamation program, including projects constructed, those under construction, or those authorized for construction and potential projects under investigation or proposed for investigation will represent an investment by the Federal Government of more than $8,100,000,000. Of this amount the table shows more than 57 percent has been completed, or for which Congress has given the go-ahead signal through authorizations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, under long-established precedents through a succession of acts by the Congress of the United States three types of projects can be undertaken by the Government under certain conditions:

First. Flood control and the development of rivers and harbors where the benefits exceed the cost, without repayment to the Treasury of the United States.

Second. Irrigation and reclamation, where the actual cost is returned to the Treasury of the United States, without interest, through assessments of such costs to the lands benefited.

Third. Power or other commercial developments in connection with such projects to assist in repayment of costs—bearing interest on the money advanced by the Government, not less than that paid by the Government.

TEMPORARY REGULATION OF CONSUMER INSTALLMENT CREDIT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 157, for the consideration of the Senate.

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in order to protect the Nation's monetary, banking, and credit structure, and interstate and foreign commerce, against increased inflationary pressures, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are authorized, notwithstanding the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 386, 80th Cong.), to exercise, up to and including March 15, 1949, consumer-credit controls in accordance with and to carry out the purposes of Executive Order No. 8843 (August 9, 1941) insofar as it relates to installment credit.

All the present provisions of sections 21 and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (relating to investigations, injunctions, jurisdictions, and other matters), shall be as fully applicable with respect to the exercise by the Board of Governors of consumer installment credit controls as they are now applicable with respect to the exercise by the Securities and Exchange Commission of its functions under that act, and the Board shall have the same powers in the exercise of such consumer installment credit controls as the Commission now has under the said sections.

SEC. 2. (a) The third paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by changing the first sentence of such paragraph to read as follows:

"Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates of not less than 35 percent against its deposits and reserves in gold certificates of not less than 40 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation: *Provided, however,* That when the Federal Reserve agent holds gold certificates as collateral for Federal Reserve notes issued to the bank such gold certificates shall be counted as part of the reserve which such bank is required to maintain against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation."

(b) The first sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "25 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "40 percent."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) To suspend for a period of not exceeding 30 days and from time to time to review such suspension for periods not exceeding 15 days, any reserve requirements specified in this act: *Provided,* That it shall establish a graduated tax upon the amounts by which the reserve requirements of this act may be permitted to fall below the level hereinafter specified: *And provided further,* That when the reserve held against Federal Reserve notes falls below 40 percent, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall establish a graduated tax of not more than 1 percent per annum upon such deficiency until the reserves fall to 32½ percent, and when said reserve falls below 32½ percent, a tax at the rate increasingly of not less than 1½ percent per annum upon each 2½ percent or fraction thereof that such reserve falls below 32½ percent. The tax shall be paid by the Reserve bank, but the Reserve bank shall add an amount equal to said tax to the rates of interest and discount fixed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System."

SEC. 3. Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the sixth paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion, may by regulation change the requirement as to reserves to be maintained pursuant to this section against demand or time deposits or both (1) by member banks in central Reserve cities, or (2) by member banks in Reserve cities, or (3) by member banks not in Reserve or central Reserve cities, or (4) by all member banks; but no such change shall have the effect of requiring any such member bank to maintain a reserve balance against its time deposits in an amount equal to more than 7 percent thereof, or a reserve balance against its demand deposits in an amount equal to more than 29 percent thereof if such bank is in a central Reserve city, 23 percent thereof if in a Reserve city, or 17 percent thereof if not in a Reserve or central Reserve city. No change in reserve requirements made under authority of this paragraph shall continue in effect after March 31, 1949."

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, merely to explain the procedure, on the question of credit the House has taken the measure which we passed nearly a year ago, providing for the extension of regulation W, regulating consumer credit. To that measure it has added two amendments, one dealing with the reserves of the Federal Reserve banks, and another dealing with the reserves of commercial banks.

Rather than refer the amendment of the House to committee, in order to hasten the procedure we have simply allowed it to lie on the table, and we now call it up. However, in effect the committee has considered it. The committee has met and discussed it. It has held hearings on the general question and on the whole question of inflation control, and it now has a report to make on this particular measure, which I think we should consider exactly as though the joint resolution had been referred to the committee and the committee had reported the bill back with amendments. I believe that the committee amendments should be considered first, and thereafter the amendment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Ohio with reference to the procedure to which he has called attention? I have no objection to the consideration of the House amendment without the necessity of referring it formally to committee. However, I do not wish that any Member of the Senate should be thereby denied the right to offer an amendment to the House amendment or to the joint resolution as it will come before the Senate, whether such an amendment be included in the House amendment, or any amendment thereto, or in a report of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, would not the Senator add, "in whole or in part"?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. If we are to take up the joint resolution and consider it, the entire subject should be considered, and any amendment which any Senator desires to offer should be eligible.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that is entirely my purpose. If any suspension of the rules is required to bring that about, I should be glad to see it done. I should like to have the Chair state exactly what the parliamentary situation is in the case of amendments which may be offered to the House amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The parliamentary situation at the moment is that the House version of the joint resolution is pending before the Senate, and is open to amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair whether the House substituted entirely new language for the Senate joint resolution, or whether it amended the language of the Senate joint resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It adopted a complete substitute. Whether or not it includes similar language, the Chair cannot say.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the entire House version is subject to amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state for the RECORD that that was my understanding when I made the request that the amendment of the House be laid before the Senate. The procedure adopted saves the time which would be consumed in sending the bill to the committee. As the House amendment comes before us now, it is open to amendment. Any Senator may offer any amendment he wishes to offer, just as though the measure had been considered by the committee. It is under that procedure that I made the request. I feel that it will expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. President, Senators have asked me whether or not there will be an attempt to reach a vote this afternoon, and whether or not there will be night sessions. We are pressing just as strenuously as we can to debate all these very important issues. I cannot guarantee that there will not be a vote this afternoon. It is our intention to continue in session until at least 6 o'clock, or perhaps 7 o'clock, if we get into a debate which should continue for another hour. But there is no intention to have a long-drawn-out night session at this time.

I understand that certain Senators feel that we should proceed, even with night sessions, to expedite consideration of the pending business; but the present intention of the acting majority leader is that we proceed in an orderly way to the consideration of the business before the Senate. I cannot guarantee a vote on any amendment which may be offered. I think the Senate ought to have plenty of time to consider the joint resolution a. amended by the House, and Senators should have an opportunity to offer amendments to it.

We want to be absolutely fair. All we want to do is to try to expedite the work of the Senate. I will say that unless there is greater demand for night sessions than there is at present, there will be no night sessions. It will be our purpose to conclude at approximately 6 o'clock, or not later than 7.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator, in the first place, for the information. I am not seeking to delay a vote on final enactment of what the Senate does; but in view of the complicated subject with which we are dealing, and the possibility that vital amendments may be offered, I express the hope that no effort will be made to foreclose the offering of such amendments by any attempt to dispose of the legislation this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. I can assure the distinguished majority leader that there will be no effort to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. The nature of amendments which may be offered may not yet be definitely determined.

Mr. WHERRY. The cooperation has been wonderful. We shall get along. The purpose is to proceed to debate the joint resolution, and any amendments which may be offered.

Various Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, can the Senator from Nebraska, the acting majority leader, give us any idea when he believes Congress may be able to adjourn sine die?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the proposed legislation that is now before us for consideration is the only legislation that I know of that has been reported from committee. What the committees will do between now and the time when we dispose of this proposed legislation, I cannot tell. All I can say is that, of course, we are attempting to conclude the session as quickly as possible, but with due consideration to giving ample time for the Senate to consider any other proposed legislation which may come before the Senate from committee.

I assure the Senator that no attempt will be made to cut off any debate or consideration of proposed legislation until the Senate is ready to proceed with a vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that I am not one who is undertaking to keep the Senate in session, but I should like to ask whether it is anticipated that there will be a session tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; let me announce, as perhaps I should have previously, that there will be a session tomorrow; and if the present session does not conclude tomorrow, we shall go right on next week with daily sessions until the session is concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to see the session concluded tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very hopeful that that may be done, but, of course, I cannot tell now.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. This may be of interest to the Senator from Georgia, as well as other Senators: So far as the Banking and Currency Committee is concerned, our desks are cleared with the reporting of a measure by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. We have nothing now pending.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should also like to have the attention of the able chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. Do I correctly understand that no action has been taken or is intended to be taken by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the President's anti-inflation program introduced by the distinguished minority leader?

Mr. TOBEY. Let me answer the Senator by saying that we had a meeting this morning at which various component parts of the President's program were taken up in the form of motions. Some were voted up and some were voted down; and the matter is now about to be placed before the Senate in the form of a measure reported by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] from the committee.

Mr. PEPPER. It is about to be reported; is it?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Is any measure to be reported on the displaced-persons bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the answer to that inquiry is the same as the reply previously given; in other words, there is no proposed legislation about to be before us except the measure about to be reported by the Banking and Currency Committee. If other measures are reported by a committee, they will be presented.

Mr. PEPPER. But the situation is that we might adjourn tomorrow, I understand.

Mr. WHERRY. On that point, the acting majority leader has made it plain that no time for adjournment has been set. I wish the Senator would again remember my remarks made at the opening of the session, and also in reply to inquiry made recently, namely, that this session will not be concluded until all legislation reported from committees is handled on the floor of the Senate. No definite statement is made now as to whether the session will end tomorrow or at any other time.

Mr. PEPPER. Can the Senator state what proposed legislation will be reported concerning minimum wages?

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot tell the Senator, except that we shall consider any proposed legislation that is favorably reported from committee.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me inquire whether it is in order at this time to offer an amendment to the measure under discussion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the ordinary procedure, the amendments which are recommended and submitted from the committee are considered first. The Chair is waiting to recognize the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who no doubt will offer the amendments from the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have been standing on my feet ever since notice was given by the Senator from Ohio of this rather unusual procedure of undertaking the consideration of a measure without its reference to a committee—in this case, the Committee on Banking and Currency. The only information I had with respect to the contents of the House measure—it has not been printed—is what I have obtained by reading the articles in the press.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair inquires whether the Senator is propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; this is a parliamentary inquiry.

I desire to know therefore, whether any consent has been given—certainly that was not done in my hearing—to proceed without referring the measure to the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This is a privileged matter, under the rules, and is not required to go to the committee. It comes in order when laid down by the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I should like to address an inquiry to the Senator from Washington, who has been recognized by the Chair. I should like to ask whether the committee has held any hearings upon the proposal, which I understand was included in the measure which passed the House, to increase the gold reserves for the Federal Reserve banks.

Mr. CAIN. The answer to the Senator's inquiry is "Yes," in a limited fashion. During the last 10 days, testi-

mony has been taken from competent witnesses representing the administration, in part on the subject to which the Senator from Wyoming has just addressed himself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator gives a rather qualified answer; he refers to the hearing as being conducted "in a limited fashion," and he refers to testimony "in part." Will the Senator be kind enough to name the witnesses who testified about the proposed increase of the gold reserves?

Mr. CAIN. My memory indicates that Mr. Marriner Eccles, of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, was one of the witnesses, and also Mr. Sproul, president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, and Mr. McCabe, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. All three of them spoke on this subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator be kind enough to let the Senate know what action the Senate committee has taken on the provision made by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CAIN. I shall be glad to satisfy the Senator's inquiry at this time, and also to inform the Senate as a whole, by stating that the Senate committee has been in opposition to the recommendation presented by the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I take it that the Senate committee has deleted that provision of the House measure.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is precisely correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to hear that.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency to amend the House amendments to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157 in the following manner:

On page 1 of the House engrossed amendments, line 6, strike out "March 15, 1949" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

On page 2 of the House engrossed amendments, beginning with line 5, strike out all down to and including line 15 on page 3.

On page 3 of the House engrossed amendments, line 16, strike out "SEC. 3" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 2."

On page 4 of the House engrossed amendments, line 4, strike out "7" and insert in lieu thereof "8."

On page 4 of the House engrossed amendments, line 6, strike out "29" and insert in lieu thereof "31."

On page 4 of the House engrossed amendments, line 7, strike out "23" and insert in lieu thereof "25."

On page 4 of the House engrossed amendments, line 8, strike out "17" and insert in lieu thereof "19."

On page 4 of the House engrossed amendments, line 11, strike out "March 31, 1949" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

The effect of the amendments may be briefly stated as follows——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator asking for their consideration en bloc?

Mr. CAIN. I should like to have them considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, they will be considered en bloc.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Chair. The effect of the amendments may be briefly stated as follows:

From the effective date of this act they extend to June 30, 1949, the authority of the Federal Reserve Board to reinstate consumer installment credit controls. The bill as amended in the House would have extended this power only until March 15, 1949. This and a similar change in the provisions regarding bank credit will afford the incoming Congress a better opportunity to reappraise the situation in the light of conditions then existing. Secondly, the committee amendment deletes the provision of the bill as amended in the House which would have increased from 25 to 35 percent against Federal Reserve bank deposits and 40 percent against Federal Reserve notes, the gold certificate reserve required to be maintained by Federal Reserve banks. The sponsors of these increases admit it will only have a psychological effect at best. Some concern has been expressed that the increase might make it more difficult for the Federal Reserve system to aid in supporting the Government bond market. Third, the committee amendments allow the Federal Reserve Board to increase the lawful reserve requirements of member banks of the Federal Reserve System by 2 percentage points beyond the existing limit of 6 percent in the case of time deposits, and by 5 percentage points beyond the existing limits in central Reserve cities, 20 percent in Reserve cities, and 14 percent in country-bank cities, the reserve against demand deposits. It was felt that the alternative increases of 1 percent against time deposits and 3 percent against demand deposits suggested by the House amendments are too small to have the desired beneficial effect. The committee amendments further extended this authority of the Federal Reserve Board to June 30, 1949, instead of March 31, 1949, as proposed in the House amendments.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments are pending en bloc. The question is on the adoption of the amendments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think they should be adopted one by one, in the usual manner, in order that the questions may arise seriatim.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as I understand, the only purpose of the amendments is to lay before the Senate the action which was agreed to by the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning, when it took action on the House amendments to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157), which is now pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has ordered consideration en bloc. Is it the desire of the Senator from Ohio that that order be rescinded?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I ask for a separation of the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order for consideration of the amendments en bloc will be rescinded, and the amendments will be submitted one by one.

Mr. CAIN. That is certainly agreeable to the committee.

Mr. TAFT. I take it if they were adopted en bloc it would not be in order to reject any one of them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The amendments involve entirely different subjects, and I think the Senate will desire to consider them separately.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment, which the clerk will read.

The first amendment was on page 1 of the House engrossed amendments, line 6, to strike out "March 15, 1949," and insert "June 30, 1949."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, beginning with line 5, to strike out all down to and including line 15 on page 3.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not particularly insist on an objection, but I think the committee action striking it out is unwise.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the Members of the Senate realize that in this procedure, votes are being taken. I do not want to delay the matter. We have already obtained a unanimous-consent agreement that there may be votes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, would the Senator reserve the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment in order that I may ask a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. It was my information, I should like to suggest to the Chair, that we were simply laying before the Senate for action the amendments of the committee. May I inquire of the Chair whether I am misinformed on that subject?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is submitting the amendments one by one to a vote of the Senate for action.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ecton	Kilgore
Baldwin	Ellender	Knowland
Ball	Feazel	Langer
Barkley	Ferguson	Lodge
Brewster	Flanders	Lucas
Bricker	Fulbright	McCarthy
Bridges	Green	McClellan
Brooks	Gurney	McFarland
Buck	Hatch	McGrath
Butler	Hawkes	McKellar
Byrd	Hayden	McMahon
Cain	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Capehart	Hill	Malone
Capper	Hoey	Martin
Connally	Holland	Millikin
Cooper	Ives	Moore
Cordon	Jenner	Morse
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Eastland	Kem	O'Conor

O'Mahoney	Sparkman	Umstead
Pepper	Stennis	Vandenberg
Reed	Taft	Watkins
Revercomb	Taylor	Wherry
Robertson, Va.	Thomas, Okla.	Wiley
Robertson, Wyo.	Thomas, Utah	Williams
Russell	Thye	Wilson
Saltonstall	Tobey	Young
Smith	Tydings	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the Chair). Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BREWSTER obtained the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. I take it the Senator from Washington has the floor, and that it was agreed between him and the Senator from Maine that I was to yield to the Senator from Maine in order that he might immediately debate the subject of inflation. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHERRY. That was the agreement, was it not? That was my understanding.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

POTATOES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to discuss a matter which was discussed at some length in the Senate yesterday in connection with the farm program, which is vitally concerned with the question of inflation and prices, and particularly because reference was made to potatoes, which are of vital interest to the State from which I come.

I am in general sympathy with the strictures upon the administration of the farm program, particularly in connection with potatoes. Throughout the last 2 years, while there was a surplus of potatoes, which were being removed from the market under the provisions of the Steagall amendment, I urged very strongly and repeatedly upon those in authority that we should adopt the solution suggested by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] yesterday in the matter of feeding Europe.

I was told repeatedly by the authorities in Washington that it was impracticable to ship potatoes to Europe. That flew in the face of the experience of half a century, as I had heard my own father tell me of observing the shipments of potatoes arriving in the United States from both Ireland and Germany at the time of a potato famine in this country. I had been familiar myself, as Governor of Maine 20 years ago, with the shipment of potatoes to Ireland at the time of the potato famine there, and there was a rather curious arrangement by which the shipment of American potatoes was prevented by the allegation that they were infected with the Colorado beetle, which I later discovered meant the ordinary potato bug. As Governor of Maine I carried to the then President of the United States, Calvin Coolidge, the most vigorous protest I could make against the obvious invasion of our trade relations, since at that time the British were allowing freely the importation into Ireland of potatoes from New Brunswick, which is just across an entirely imaginary line from Maine, and I was quite confident, as I think everyone in that area knows, that the potato bugs were entirely unable to distinguish between Maine and New Brunswick, so far as potatoes were concerned. Yet the British allowed the potatoes from New Brunswick to go across to Ireland, while they denied us.

Coming down to more recent times, the demand in Europe for potatoes has exceeded all bounds. I have observed it growing. It is a fact familiar to all interested in the potato industry that Germany was more dependent upon potatoes than any other country in the world. Believe it or not, curiously enough, under their economy they produced and consumed 10 times as many potatoes per capita as were consumed in the United States. They produced approximately 2,000,000,000 bushels a year for 65,000,000 people, while we were producing 400,000,000 bushels a year, or somewhat less, for 130,000,000 people. In other words, they had developed the potato into a significance in their agricultural economy that was beyond that of any other country in the world. They used it not only for human food, but for cattle feed, for industrial alcohol, for potato flour, and a variety of other purposes.

I had observed this situation during the war when we were faced with the problem of feeding German prisoners. Under the obligations of our international agreements they are permitted to receive the same ration given to the enlisted men in our Army. They were being fed on them in the Maine woods while they were cutting pulp, and I was very much interested when I went there to find that these German prisoners had requested that they should have more potatoes in their diet and less of some other items, because they were so familiar with the potato as a food commodity, and their bodies were apparently so adapted to it, that it was potatoes they most desired.

It therefore always puzzled me as to why we were called upon to ship so many hundreds of millions of bushels of grain of various kinds to Europe; and at the same time entirely ignore the contribution which potatoes could make to the problem of feeding Germany, and much of northern Europe as well, where the potato is a familiar article of diet.

For the past 3 or 4 years I had followed this matter very closely, and I discussed it with General Clay when he was here. He told me of the difficulties they were having in connection with securing adequate supplies of potatoes both for food and for seed. I discussed it with Mr. Hoover when he was asked by the President of the United States to go abroad and survey the food situation in Europe. He was the first one who returned and by the emphasis of his report to the Secretary of War, finally compelled an extremely reluctant department to recognize the contribution which potatoes could make. Meanwhile the authorities had been disposing of them, as the Senator from Delaware has indicated in a variety of other ways which were not contributing to the primary problem of human food, which was the most challenging issue before the American people and the people of the world as well. So that I think there was good cause for the criticism which the Senator from Delaware made.

I wish to speak a word in behalf of the humble potato and its right to recognition in connection with our farm program. I have followed this subject ever since I came to Washington, some 15 years ago. While potatoes are produced in practically every State of the Union, they have always seemed, in circles here in Washington, to have considerable claim to being the forgotten crop. It was only after a most vigorous fight that potatoes were recognized in 1935 as a crop that was entitled to consideration, under the leadership of Lindsay Warren, then a Representative from North Carolina, in the Warren potato bill, as it was called. Subsequently the Supreme Court decided the entire program of agricultural legislation was invalid, so that we were never permitted to put into practice what we believed at the time was a sound solution of this problem.

Coming down to more recent times, potatoes finally became recognized, and under the stimulation of the parity theory, production increased from the normal three hundred and fifty to three hundred and seventy-five million bushels, to 450,000,000 bushels, and it was necessary for this great removal program to be carried out, without, as I believe, sufficient regard for the practical solutions which might have been made of the problem.

What I wish to make clear, certainly to all the Members of the Senate and of the Congress, and I trust to the country, is the fact that it was the potato growers of Maine, and I think I speak also for the potato growers of America, who themselves, of their own free will and accord—and whether this is unique in connection with agricultural support prices I do not know—urged very earnestly that the 90 percent parity provision be eliminated, because it was stimulating production beyond the bounds of what we could consume easily, and they urged that it should be reduced to 60 percent. From my study of agricultural legislation I am convinced the potato growers of America who urged that reduction are entitled to most cordial commendation from a Congress which has been inundated with requests for benefactions of various kinds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In my discussion of yesterday I pointed out very clearly that my criticism was not levied against the farmers, nor did I question the right of the potato growers to participate in a farm program. In fact I would join with the Senator from Maine or any other Senator in support of such a program. I also pointed out—and I know the Senator from Maine is correct in his statement about it—that the potato growers of Maine are as critical of the program as it is being carried out by the Department of Agriculture as is the Congress. They do not want the subsidies to the extent they are receiving them. They do not like to see food destroyed after it is grown.

Mr. BREWSTER. I appreciate what the Senator from Delaware says. I

know that the farmers of America have no better friend than the Senator from Delaware, out of the wealth of his experience in agriculture throughout his life.

I point out that in the State of Maine—and I think it is true in other States—we have to pile up some 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 bushels of potatoes in an enormous heap and pour gasoline or oil on them in order to destroy them so as to be sure that they will rot in the field, without any use of any character being made of them. That has revolted the farmers of Maine to the point where I believe it would have been utterly impossible to carry out such a program for another year.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Maine, I am sure, will also agree with me that the potatoes which were destroyed in Maine were suitable for export to Europe?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, every potato grown in Maine is very well adapted for that purpose. We have ample shipping facilities to seaports, and have admirable docking facilities, so our potatoes can be properly shipped abroad.

The story which was told by the Department of Agriculture—and the Department should have known better, it seems to me—with respect to potatoes spoiling in transit overseas, I found to be based entirely upon some shipments of southern potatoes from Charleston, S. C., which had fermented during transit, and caused great difficulty, for reasons which I think a child could understand. For them to condemn the shipment of potatoes overseas on the basis of that situation indicated an ignorance which it is difficult to conceive could properly exist in the Government. We finally persuaded them to try the shipment of northern potatoes, as the Senator from Delaware indicated yesterday, and there was no difficulty with them whatsoever. Those potatoes arrived in beautiful condition, as General Clay told me in Germany. He said that many of them were used as seed potatoes and planted, and others were used for food.

We have shipped, as I believe the Senator from Delaware pointed out, several hundred thousand, if not several million, bushels of potatoes to the Argentine, across the Equator. While the Senator criticized such shipments, and the criticism was was apparently based on a minor reason, it is true that those potatoes arrived in Buenos Aires in most excellent condition, demonstrating what it was possible to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My criticism of the shipment of potatoes to South America was that they were shipped to a country which was not necessarily in need of food at that time, while in Europe there was a terrible shortage of food, and the United States had underwritten that food-supply situation. I felt that the potatoes which were shipped to the Argentine could have been shipped to Europe. I used that as an example. I also criticized the Administration because it sold those potatoes for export, the potatoes to be resold to the Argentine consumers at a lower price than the price at which potatoes were allowed to be sold to the American housewives, and I did not think it was quite consistent with the Administration's policy of pitying the American housewives to be subsidizing another country by shipping to them potatoes at a cheaper price than that at which we permit them to be sold to our own people.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think there was very much basis for that comment on the part of the Senator. However, I would not wish it to appear that the people of Argentina did not need potatoes in their economy. It was true that the Argentine potato crop had entirely failed. I would not want the people of that country to get out of the habit of eating potatoes, so I was glad to see some potatoes go there. But I think we do still have ample supplies to take care of European needs if we should cultivate that situation properly.

Mr. President, I have noted that there have been outbursts of potato stories in the last few days in the press, and the discussion by the Senator from Delaware, of course, further focused attention on the potato problem. I think it would be extremely unfortunate if the people of the United States did not understand that it was the potato growers themselves who had urged the reduction of parity from 90 percent to 60 percent, which is provided for in the legislation sponsored by the Senator from Vermont which he discussed here on the floor yesterday or the day before, and it is the belief of all those familiar with the situation that this reduction in the parity will make it certain that there will not be the incentive to production which has caused very large surpluses of potatoes in recent years, and thrown such a burden upon the Treasury. This proposal is designed to discourage the so-called marginal production of potatoes, and is also designed to put a floor under the price so that we shall not see a recurrence of the situation which we saw 15 years ago, when I first came to Congress, when potatoes were selling for 10 cents a bushel. The farmers were compelled then to dump the potatoes, because it literally was not worth their while to pick them up. But a floor placed under the price of potatoes of 60 percent of parity will be a guaranty that the people of the United States can be adequately provided with potatoes without the impetus of a 90-percent parity which it has been demonstrated in that field certainly serves as a stimulus to overproduction.

I now want to move from potatoes to grain. I hold in my hand a clipping from the New York Times of this week, the heading of which is as follows:

Grain prices rise on export news—foreign shipments expected to be 75,000,000 bushels over early figures.

I read the first paragraph:

Grain markets were on the upgrade on the board of trade today, liberal short covering developing in wheat following announcement that exports this season might be 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 bushels in excess of preliminary figures, despite marked improvement in the European food grain crops.

Wheat was up 3 cents and corn 2½ cents at one time.

* * * * *

Government buying of cash wheat is extremely heavy, purchases in all positions Monday being estimated at 6,650,000 bushels, including 250,000 bushels in Minneapolis, the first grain taken in the latter market in recent weeks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAIN PRICES RISE ON EXPORT NEWS—FOREIGN SHIPMENTS EXPECTED TO BE 75,000,000 BUSHELS OVER EARLY FIGURES

CHICAGO, August 3.—Grain markets were on the upgrade on the board of trade today, liberal short covering developing in wheat following announcement that exports this season might be 75,000,000 to 100,000,000 bushels in excess of preliminary figures, despite marked improvement in the European food grain crops.

Wheat was up 3 cents and corn 2½ cents at one time, but the market reacted late on profit taking. Wheat closed ⅝ cent to 2⅛ cents higher. Corn rose ¼ to ¾ cent, and oats ½ to ¾ cent. Rye gained 2¼ to 3 cents and soybeans 3 to 6 cents. Lard advanced 12 to 30 cents.

There was a lack of pressure in wheat at the start and general local short covering developed, with some mill buying, the latter reflecting a betterment in the domestic and export demand for flour. Cash wheat premiums in Kansas City advanced 4 to 5 cents early, but lost part of the extreme upturn in the late trading when ordinary No. 1 Hard sold at 4 cents under September, compared with 2½ cents under at one time. Yesterday sales were made as low as 9 cents under September.

Government buying of cash wheat is extremely heavy, purchases in all positions Monday being estimated at 6,650,000 bushels, including 250,000 bushels in Minneapolis, the first grain taken in the latter market in recent weeks. Harvesting of spring wheat is making good progress, except where delayed by showers, but threshing returns are not available as yet. Harvesting of winter wheat is about completed, with some damage to late grain by rain.

Professional operations featured the corn market, one large trader buying September and another aggressive on the selling side. At the top September showed 4 cents above the low of yesterday. Cash corn was in good demand and No. 1 Yellow sold at 39 to 42 cents over the future, compared with 35 to 40½ cents over Monday. Country offerings increased slightly on the upturn, purchases of 56,000 bushels being made for deferred shipment. The best bid sent to the country tonight for 10-day shipment was $1.99, or about 34 cents over September. Crop comments remain favorable. A private estimate on the crop will be received by the trade about 10 a. m. tomorrow and is expected to show a good advance over the figures of a month ago.

Oats followed other grains, with hedging in evidence on the advance. However, it was not as heavy as on Monday due to smaller receipts. Cash oats premiums showed little change. Chicago interests were reported as having contracted for storage room for 750,000 bushels of oats in Buffalo and are buying the grain in the spot market to fill the room.

Prices for the principal grains were as follows:

Chicago

WHEAT

	Open	High	Low	Close	Previous close	Last year
September	2.22⅝	2.23	2.22⅜	2.23⅝	2.22	2.32
December	2.25¼	2.27⅞	2.25¼	2.26¾	2.25	2.29¼
May	2.20⅝	2.23½	2.20⅝	2.21⅞	2.19¾	2.28½
July	2.07	2.09½	2.06⅞	2.08⅛	2.07½	2.25¼

CORN

September	1.65½	1.67	1.64⅝	1.64⅝	1.64¼	2.19¼
December	1.48	1.49	1.47½	1.47½	1.47	2.03
May	1.51¾	1.52	1.50¾	1.50¾	1.50	1.98½
July	1.50¾	1.51¾	1.50¼	1.50½	1.49⅞	1.94¾

OATS

September	0.72	0.73⅝	0.71¾	0.72⅝	0.71¾	0.98
December	.75¼	.75¾	.75	.75¼	.74½	.96
May	.75⅝	.76⅝	.75⅝	.76⅛	.75½	.95½
July	.72¼	.72⅞	.72½	.72½	.71½	.92½

RYE

December	1.65	1.67½	1.65	1.67⅛	1.64½	1.48
May	1.68	1.68½	1.67½	1.68½	1.66¾	------

SOYBEANS

November	2.61¾	2.68	2.61¾	2.67	2.61	2.88
December	2.62¼	2.68	2.62½	2.67	2.64	2.80
March	2.63	2.71	2.63	2.70	2.66	------

LARD

	Open	High	Low	Close	Previous close	Last year
September	20.30	20.47	20.10	20.20	20.00	16.75
October	20.40	20.52	20.20	20.32	20.10	17.00
November	20.35	20.60	20.35	20.40	20.10	17.15
December	21.40	21.72	21.35	21.37	21.25	17.85
January	21.45	21.65	21.37	21.37	21.20	18.02

Minneapolis

WHEAT

September	2.16	2.19¼	2.16	2.18¾	2.16¼	2.34½

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe the Senator will agree that all the grain prices have dropped 25 percent to as much as 50 percent since last February.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. And that the prices of wheat, oats, barley, and in fact practically all the grains, are below the support prices, or below cost of production.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am familiar with that, and deeply gratified over it, when this country is under the impression that all prices are going up, particularly of food; but what interested and intrigued me in this statement was the very clear revelation that the price of these products corresponded in some measure to the export policy of the administration. That is a point I want to drive home, because it has seemed to me abundantly clear that the President, holding absolute control of exports under existing law, has complete power in his own hands at any time to turn on or off this spigot and by that action determine whether or not the prices shall go up or down.

The wheat crop of Europe is 450,000,000 bushels more than it was 1 year ago. That happens to be the precise amount that we exported last year. We were planning this year to export 350,000,000 bushels; and this week when prices were sagging somewhat more, the administration announced that it was going to export 100,000,000 bushels additional, and prices promptly rose. I do not think it requires anyone above the primary grade to realize that that action was beautifully calculated—whether or not it was so designed—to bolster the prices which were sagging. I think it warrants an inference that the administration was perhaps considerably more concerned lest prices should go down, rather than that they should go up.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Maine for yielding to me. First I wish to corroborate what he has said with regard to the support price on potatoes. I wish every consumer in the country knew that this support price was put on potatoes in order to bring about the production of enough potatoes to go around. We were becoming short of potatoes. The Government told the potato growers that if they would obtain the new equipment which was necessary, if they would get the higher-grade fertilizers which were necessary, and if they would go to the other necessary expenses to produce an increased crop of potatoes they would be guaranteed 90 percent of parity for their potatoes for the duration of the war and 2 years thereafter. Even this offer, which proved to be liberal, was probably not anywhere near so liberal as the offers which were made to industry when new buildings were constructed for industry, and contracts were let on a basis which would permit paying for the facilities over a 5-year period.

Mr. BREWSTER. Or even less.

Mr. AIKEN. Some were paid for in a 3-year period. So no special privilege was given to the farmers. The potato growers themselves came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this year and asked to have the support price lowered at the end of this period, which ends December 31, and that was done. As the Senator from Maine says, the support level on potatoes will doubtless drop to 60 percent, or not much above, beginning January 1.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Vermont will recall the problem of the northern growers, who do not market their 1948 crop until January, February, or March 1949.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. The committee and the Congress very wisely provided that the 90-percent support for the 1948 crop should continue through the marketing period of that crop.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct in making that statement; and it is perfectly proper that the 90-percent level should be sustained until the 1948 crop is marketed.

Mr. BREWSTER. If we had not done that, the only consequence would have been that the entire 1948 crop would necessarily have been dumped on the Government on December 31, 1948, as the growers would not have dared to take the hazard involved in continuing.

Mr. AIKEN. And the Government does not have adequate storage to handle them.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. So what the Senator says is 100 percent correct.

In regard to grain, the Senate reluctantly agreed to continue the 90-percent support for the basic commodities for 1 year after December 31. As everyone knows, the Senate believed that the reduced price-support program should go into effect at the end of this year, January 1, 1949. I was interested in finding out just what the difference would be between the support levels at the long-range support-program prices, and the 90-percent support with which it appears we shall have to get along for another year, although I feel that it is going to be disadvantageous to agriculture. I feel that the consumer and the taxpayer will become annoyed at us if we go through, as we have already agreed to do, with this high support level for another year.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator will agree that there is much less likelihood of any criticism next year so far as potatoes are concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. There will probably be no criticism of potato support prices next year, because it is doubtful if the potato support-price program will cost the Government anything for next year.

I asked the statisticians of the Department of Agriculture to use their best judgment, taking the Government estimates of this year's production of the grain crops, in estimating, to the best of their ability, the probable total supply on January 1, and in figuring out what the support prices would be under the 90-percent-of-parity program, and what they would be provided the long-range farm program took effect January 1. I have those figures. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a brief statement and all the figures which I have obtained.

There being no objection, the statement and figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The attached table illustrates the changes in support prices which would result if title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948 were made effective on January 1, 1949, rather than January 1, 1950.

The estimated supply percentages are rough estimates that need to be further checked. They are also subject to the influence of a number of factors about which

no information is available at present. The most important of these is, of course, the weather.

The support prices are based on parity prices as of July 15, 1948. This is not a forecast that parity prices will necessarily be the same a year from now. The important factor here is the different support-price provision in the two titles of the act rather than the level of parity prices. For wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts the transitional parity price (95 percent of the parity price according to the present formula) is the price on which the support price is based. For these commodities the maximum support price under title II of the act would be less than the mandatory support level under title I. The maximum support level for rice would be slightly higher than the level under title I.

If conditions were such that marketing quotas or acreage allotment were in effect, the minimum support levels would be as follows: Wheat, $1.73; corn, $1.32; cotton, 25.13 cents per pound; and peanuts, 9.5 cents per pound. These support prices would still be below the mandatory support prices under title I.

The following table illustrates the support prices for the basic commodities:

Estimated support prices of basic commodities, assuming title II of the Agricultural Act of 1948 in effect in 1949

Commodity	Unit	Estimated supply percentage, 1949 crop [1]	Parity price		Support price					
					Title II [2]				Title I [3]	
					Minimum		Maximum			
			Present	New	Percentage of parity	Price	Percentage of parity	Price	Percentage of parity	Price
		Percent			*Percent*		*Percent*		*Percent*	
Wheat	Bushel	116	$2.22	[4] $2.11	68	$1.43	90	$1.90	90	$2.00
Corn	do	108	1.61	[4] 1.53	72	1.10	90	1.38	90	1.45
Cotton	Pound	110	.3112	[4] .2956	71	.2099	90	.2660	90	.2801
Rice	Bushel	102	2.04	2.15	75	1.61	90	1.94	90	1.84
Peanuts	Pound	113	.120	[4] .114	69	.0787	90	.103	90	.108
Tobacco:										
Flue-cured	do		.488	.502			[5] 90	.452	90	.439
Burley	do		.473	.507			[5] 90	.456	90	.426

[1] Does not take into account the influence of marketing quotas or acreage allotments.
[2] Based on prices in new parity column.
[3] Based on prices in present parity column.
[4] Transitional parity price.
[5] The minimum support price for tobacco is 90 percent of the parity price when marketing quotas are in effect.

Other provisions for all practical purposes mean that marketing quotas will be in effect every year unless disapproved by more than one-third of the producers.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the present program, which guarantees 90 percent of parity to the wheat grower for next year, it is estimated that the support level of wheat will be $2 a bushel. It is also estimated that on January 1 there will be 116 percent of a normal supply of wheat in this country. Two dollars a bushel will unquestionably prove to be an incentive price for the raising of wheat next year. According to the best estimates, by January 1 wheat will be in surplus. It means that with fairly good weather next year there will be enough wheat produced under the $2 guaranty so that there is a strong probability that quotas may have to be imposed on the production of wheat for the year 1950. That would be most unfortunate. I do not believe that the growers want it at all.

Nevertheless, if we go through with a high support price level for another year, that will be the result. If the long-range farm program were in effect, the growers would be guaranteed a minimum price—and here again I want to make it plain that this is according to the best estimates obtainable—of $1.43 a bushel. That would be subject to an increase in the event of poor weather or short crop, or other conditions.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator means between now and December.

Mr. AIKEN. If there were a short supply next year, or conditions were bad, the price of $1.43 could be increased; but with normal conditions the guaranty to the wheat grower next year would be $1.43, or a little more.

The guaranteed support price to the corn grower under the 90-percent-of-parity level is estimated to be $1.45 a bushel. Under the long-range farm program it would be $1.10. It would be subject to the same slight increases. That would be the minimum which the Secretary would announce at the beginning of the year.

For cotton the 90-percent-parity support level would be 28.01 cents a pound. Under the long-range farm-support program it would be 20.99, or approximately 21 cents a pound. However, it is estimated that this year's yield of cotton will be so heavy that there will be 110 percent of a normal supply on hand January 1, which will make cotton subject to quotas, and under the formula there would be a 20-percent premium paid on the support level, which would bring it up to about 25 cents a pound under the long-range farm program.

Under the 90-percent guaranty, rice will be supported at $1.84. If the long-range program were in effect it would be supported at a minimum of $1.61 a bushel. Under the 90-percent guaranty peanuts will be supported at 10.8 cents a pound. Under the new long-range program they would be supported at 7.87 cents a pound. Peanuts, however, are another crop which is under quota. So the growers of peanuts also would receive the benefit of a 20-cent premium, and therefore would have a support price of about 9 cents a pound, as compared with 11 cents a pound at the present time.

Because of an amendment adopted here on the floor, tobacco would show an increase of 2 or 3 cents a pound in the support level, if the long-range program were adopted as of January 1, 1949, instead of going over for another whole year.

But I regard it as most unfortunate that we have to go through another year guaranteeing $2 a bushel for wheat, because it is almost certain to result in a tremendous overproduction unless we have very bad weather conditions, and it will have a very unfortunate effect upon the whole farm support-price program. If the support prices on grains were lowered somewhat there would be greater encouragement to feed grains and to market them in the form of meat, dairy products, and poultry products; and in the long run that undoubtedly would prove to be of benefit to the farmers and the consumers alike.

I feel that if we only could have this long-range price-support program take effect January 1, 1949, instead of January 1, 1950, it would have a greater effect on controlling inflation than all the measures which we are likely to approve at this special session of the Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I certainly thank the Senator from Vermont very much for that contribution, as his comments on agriculture always are of value, and particularly in the explanation and application of this program. I am not prepared to express an opinion regarding his formula, but I have been ready to accept it because of the great study he has given to it; and I think the figures he presents today certainly show the wisdom of developing a program of that character, rather than the program heretofore prevailing. The figures he submits certainly indicate how greatly it might contribute to the solution of the problem of inflation.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed at this point in my remarks a clipping from the Wall Street Journal, containing a summary of the anti-inflation program presented by Mr. Eccles, former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, to the House Banking and Currency Committee, dealing with housing, public works, farm prices, and other matters.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECCLES PRESENTS HIS ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM; BALANCING BUDGET IS MOST IMPORTANT POINT—CREDIT CONTROLS LISTED SECOND; TRUMAN PLAN HAS INFLATIONARY ITEMS, HE CLAIMS

WASHINGTON.—Former Federal Reserve Board Chairman Marriner S. Eccles yesterday gave Congress his personal anti-inflation program.

It differed markedly from the President's program, which Mr. Eccles termed "more of a political program than an economic one." This was true, he told the House Banking and Currency Committee, because Mr. Truman's program includes many points which are inflationary, rather than deflationary. Among these inflationary items he placed support of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing bill, broadening social security and increasing minimum wages.

Warning that from all present indications the Government will operate in the red next year, Mr. Eccles said the most important

item in his anti-inflation program was maintaining a balanced budget.

"There isn't much use talking about controlling inflation unless fiscal policy calls for a balanced budget," he said. "It would be impossible if the country should run into a budgetary deficit to put into effect a restrictive monetary and credit policy."

Next most important anti-inflation weapon, the former Federal Reserve Board Chairman said, are controls over consumer and bank credit. He termed these the "easiest, simplest, and most effective" controls, but warned that they are "only supplemental to a sound budget policy." The power to raise reserve requirements, he said, might not have to be used at all—the psychological effect of the existence of the Board's power to increase reserves further might suffice.

ECCLES' PROGRAM

Other points in the Eccles program were:

Housing: "The Federal Government should not, by what seems to me political reasons, encourage a housing program in excess of the amount of labor and materials available and encourage further inflationary trends."

Public works: "The Federal Government should do everything in its power to encourage States to postpone every expenditure that can be postponed, and set an example to the States by doing likewise."

Farm prices: "The Federal Government should do everything in its power to bring down food prices by encouraging more and not less production."

Mr. Eccles made it plain—as he did before the Senate Banking Committee last week—that his program could not prevent a deflationary adjustment but merely cushion the shock of that deflation.

LONGER INFLATION, WORSE DEPRESSION

The longer inflation continued, he told the House group, the rougher time we would have when the inevitable depression comes.

Mr. Eccles did not confine his criticism to the administration, but said Congress and the public generally were equally to blame for the present inflationary condition, which he laid to premature removal in 1945 and early 1946 of the "whole harness of war controls, including the excess-profits tax." It was apparent then, he said, with a record purchasing power available and with a war-accumulated backlog of demand, that to remove these controls made the "inflationary spiral inevitable."

He does not now favor reimposing the excess-profits tax, however, Mr. Eccles said, because it is too complicated for consideration at a special session and because the whole tax structure should be overhauled rather than changed by piecemeal revision.

Mr. Eccles presented his program in an impressive 50-minute extemporaneous speech, "off the cuff and from my heart." He asked both parties to "adjourn political considerations and consider honestly and openly the economic facts of life."

SEES LITTLE HOPE OF SURPLUS

Prospects for a budgetary deficit next year, Mr. Eccles said, "will be increasingly serious if we still have the inflationary situation." He added that he saw little hope of securing a budgetary surplus so long as we have increasing military expenditures with no terminal point or a world-aid program with no terminal point in such amounts as this Government is now spending, and so long as the cost of the veterans' program, interest on the public debt, and other Government expenditures that seem impossible to reduce continue."

Mr. Eccles repeatedly hit at minority pressure groups, each wanting the benefits of inflation for themselves but wanting others to pay for it.

"The farmer wants a floor under farm prices but no ceiling. The real estate and building materials people want easy credit so they can readily dispose at inflated prices of the homes and materials they sell, but they certainly resist any excess-profits tax so that the Government could recapture some of the profits thus made. Labor always wants price controls but vigorously resists wage controls. Bankers want higher interest rates but don't want Federal banking agencies to have increased power over the expansion of credit.

"There has been little or no willingness to face up to it realistically, either by the public, the Congress, or the administration. This situation now has gone so far that to stop the inflationary developments could well bring about a deflationary development."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have offered this article because it seems to me that it lends further support to a recognition of the appropriate approach in this matter.

I have already inserted in the RECORD the figures on wheat, showing the barometer that wheat prices are or the way in which wheat prices promptly responded to the announcement of the export program. I think all those in this country who are concerned with the high cost of living may well address themselves to the simple lesson taught by this matter. I was somewhat disturbed and somewhat surprised to discover last week, in connection with an exploration of the transportation problems on the Atlantic coast—I was told this by representatives of the Army—that in the next 3 months, the critical 3-month period between now and November which spans the period to the election, the Army contemplates the exportation of 2,000,000 tons of various foodstuffs and material from the United States to Europe. That is 4,000,000,000 pounds of a variety of foodstuffs and other materials, many of which certainly are in critically short supply. I am not challenging the use to which they are to be put, but I call attention to the fact that the European wheat crops are increased by 450,000,000 bushels, the precise amount of our exportation last year. So the Europeans are that much better off.

However, I call attention to the plain provisions of the European relief legislation Congress enacted, which in repeated sections, which I read into the RECORD a week ago when this matter was previously being discussed, provided that the President should at all times take into account the needs of the domestic economy. I think anyone with the slightest familiarity with the law of supply and demand knows very well that if we export 4,000,000,000 pounds of foodstuffs and other materials, and if we put into our economy $4,000,000,000 of money of some kind or other, whether it be paper money or banking loans, or regardless of what other inflationary methods are used, and substitute that money in place of the goods, it will mean that in the American pocket there will be money burning a hole, demanding goods which are necessarily in somewhat more limited supply.

Although I do not believe that the export program is the entire reason for our difficulties in this country in recent years in the matter of inflation, nevertheless I do believe that the possibilities of controlling the price structure by the control of our export program have not been used at all to the extent that would be warranted and wise in the interests of the American people, who are suffering under this program at the present time. I believe that if the President were to exercise his plain powers and plain responsibility under existing legislation for the European relief program, there could be little doubt that the prices of these essential foodstuffs would promptly decline to parity, or even, as indicated here by the Senator from North Dakota, go somewhat below that.

Mr. President, I shall not labor this matter further. I think the item which I inserted, which was a small item, or was to me, and I believe would be to the average man in the street unfamiliar with the gyrations of the market, offers rather conclusive evidence that the action of the administration in connection with the export foodstuffs and other essential and critical materials which are entirely under the control of the administration under existing law, and the responsibility for the control of which in the interests of our domestic economy is made exceedingly plain by the legislation we have enacted under the European relief program, indicates that present powers can well be used to deal with much of the problem of food prices for the solution of which we were called back into special session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber yesterday when the Senator from Delaware had a colloquy with the Senator from Illinois regarding an amendment which had been adopted by the Senate last year. Although it is certainly true that we have had a number of major inflationary factors at work in this country, nevertheless, I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Delaware the fact that that has not been true in the case of all the products of the American farmer.

California happens to be one of the major agricultural States of the Union. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator from Delaware to some figures on the average price, in terms of dollars per ton, received by the farmers of my State. The figures are contained in a table, which I shall now read:

	Average price, dollars per ton			
	1944	1945	1946	1947
Raisins	$200.00	$203.00	$312.00	$128.00
Table grapes	110.00	58.00	98.50	45.60
Wine grapes	111.00	62.30	104.30	33.40
Apricots for canning	92.00	110.00	97.60	70.00
Dried apricots	610.00	632.00	600.00	480.00
Cling peaches	61.80	63.00	63.70	49.90
Freestone peaches	79.40	79.40	74.40	45.70
Dried peaches	70.50	73.20	51.40	30.00
Pears	87.10	79.30	96.20	74.90
Prunes	218.00	210.00	256.00	148.00

I want to say to the able Senator from Delaware that in some of the crops in California the farmers found it necessary last year, and the outlook is that they will again find it necessary this year, to tear up the producing orchards because of their inability to get enough out of

the crops to pay for the cost of the labor it would take to harvest the crops. I merely want the RECORD to be complete and to show that while there are many inflationary factors at work in the country, there are also some deflationary factors at work in certain parts of our economy, which if allowed to continue indefinitely without some constructive program might lead to a general collapse of at least a segment of our agricultural economy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield, I may say to the Senator from California that in my speech yesterday I did not say that the prices of the various commodities had declined. In fact, I thought that was why we were here, to bring about a lowering of prices. I merely pointed out the fact that the Government was buying certain commodities. For example, they bought 140,000,000 pounds of dried prunes, raisins, honey, and grapefruit juice. They bought 1,500,000 gallons of grapefruit juice, which was resold at 40 cents a gallon.

I merely wanted to point out that all these commodities were bought for the sole purpose of holding up prices in America. They were resold by the Department of Agriculture on a contract carrying a proviso that under no circumstances—that is what the substance of it meant—should any of the goods so sold be allowed to be resold to the American housewife. I said it was in direct contradiction to the statement by the President that he wanted prices to decline. To show how the program works, the articles alone which I put in the RECORD represented a loss to the Treasury of around $60,000,000, all of which has taken place within recent weeks. The city of Washington, or the District of Columbia, which comprises the city, principally, pays 1¼ percent of all the revenue of the Government. Therefore, to quote it in simple language, the city of Washington has been called upon—that is, citizens of the city of Washington in recent weeks—to pay $750,000 into the Federal Treasury in order to hold the price of food products up. I said at that time we should ask the housewives whether we are really sincere in wanting to put prices down.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want to say to the able Senator from Delaware, I think we must all agree that there is a rule of reason that must be used on this type of situation. I think the very able Senator from Vermont has recognized that situation in wanting and in trying to arrange some kind of formula that would not encourage a constantly inflationary cycle and at the same time would protect the American farmer from a distressed market, because I think we all realize that if there is a collapse of the agricultural economy the time is not too far distant when there will be a collapse in the urban centers of the Nation. The fact of the matter remains that the historical markets for a great many of the agricultural products, particularly in my section of the country, have been in central Europe, and in the period of the past few years, particularly after the Nazis came into power and tended to block off foreign trade, particularly during the war period when the Nazis had taken over most of Europe, the historical markets were closed to the normal agricultural producers in my State and in other States of the Union.

It certainly seemed to a great many of us that in this day and age, when there has been so much hunger in Europe, it did not make sense for agricultural crops to be destroyed on the ground while there was tremendous need overseas for helping to rehabilitate the war-torn world.

Moreover, if the Senator will remember, it was at the time that the inflationary factors affecting wheat were being brought into play and the price of wheat was constantly mounting. It was the contention of a great many of us that for the caloric value, if they would take certain of these items that were soon to become distress items and substitute them for wheat in the feeding program, it would tend to stabilize or reduce the price of wheat to a more normal basis, and that, in turn, would have an advantageous effect upon the meat production in the United States as well. In other words, we felt that we did not want to see food crops in this country destroyed at a time when there was a great need of food throughout the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine will yield further, I should like to say that when the Senator from California presented his first amendment to take care of that situation, I expressed my approval of the amendment and said that the Government should be required to use the surplus products we had for shipment to Europe and hold back some of the scarce commodities. However, the criticism I made yesterday was that they are not carrying out the instructions which were given at that time.

The commodities which are being sold are not among those required under the appropriation for the European recovery program. It is a separate section entirely, and they are being used for a separate program. I said there was no excuse in the world for subsidizing—which is what it was—the agricultural interests here, in order to hold prices up, while at the same time we are trying to hold prices down for the housewife. We simply cannot mathematically work out prices so that will happen.

I notice that the average 10-year price of corn for the past 10 years, according to a report published by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate was 95.3 cents. The parity price under the formula was 1.42. If we support corn at 90 percent of parity, we are supporting it at a point about 35 percent higher than the average prices the farmer has been receiving for the past 10 years. I said that was not economically sound to support a price that high.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to reply briefly to the remarks of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say that under the long-range farm program, if it were in effect now, by January 1 next year the support price would probably be $1.10 a bushel, which is not unreasonable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that had his proposal of a long-range farm program been adopted, it would have been a much better program than that existing now. I think the bill reported by the committee was a much better bill than the one we are working on, and would have gone much further toward correcting some of the things we are criticizing. I do not think it went far enough. That is my criticism. It would have been a step in the right direction. But the facts we have before us now show that we are confronted with a situation in which we have another 1½-year extension of this same wasteful program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Delaware was not on the floor a few minutes ago when I stated that if we could put into effect on January 1, 1949, a long-range program, instead of on January 1, 1950, we would probably go further in the direction of controlling any additional inflation than by any measures we are likely to pass at this special session.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. It seems to me that nearly everyone, in talking about the prices which the consumer pays, always thinks in terms of what the farmer receives. Wheat has dropped in price 33 percent since last February. The price of bread has not dropped more than 1 cent a loaf, and in many cities not any. High prices of food involves high taxes, high wages, high transportation costs, and many other factors. While wheat has dropped 33 percent in price, bread has dropped in price 1 cent or less.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, that is a very interesting comment. I wish to call attention to the fact that a great deal of the difficulty in connection with potatoes grew out of the unparalleled productivity of California acres. California farmers discovered that they could go into some of those broad and fertile lands largely with mechanical means and raise potatoes to the extent that they were running out of their eyes and ears, and they have increased the production of potatoes in California four or five times what it had been previously. That has accentuated the difficulty. We have seen pictures of potatoes on the runways of the airport, and the best advice to dispose of them was to dump them on the air fields, run tractors over them, dehydrate them, and use them for cattle feed.

The former Secretary of Agriculture, who is now a candidate for Senator from New Mexico, was very greatly distressed regarding the constituents of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who were doing only what they were encouraged to do by legislation and by high prices. But it was California, with its optimism, which accounted for a good deal of the problem. I do not know what the current situation is.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Maine that the particular situation in regard to potatoes and the encouragement which may have been given to over-production—and I think that is something which should be guarded against, and we are not encouraging over production—did not grow out of the amendment which the junior Senator from California offered from the floor last year, but from legislation which was passed long before the Senator from California came to the Senate.

Mr. BREWSTER. It was under the application of the Steagall amendment and its formula.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MURRAY BY THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, recently our distinguished colleague the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was deservedly complimented by the American Dental Association. Because American dentistry's evaluation of the Senator's work in the field of health legislation is of import to all of us, I have prepared a few remarks concerning it. I ask unanimous consent that they be set forth in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION PRAISES THE WORK OF SENATOR MURRAY, OF MONTANA

A very few weeks ago, Senator MAGNUSON addressed a plea to the doctors of America for their sincere cooperation with us in the framing of health legislation. In the course of that address he laid stress on the success achieved by Senator MURRAY and his colleagues in drafting such bills as the National Heart Act recently passed by the Congress. That act is both of tremendous importance to the millions of heart disease sufferers throughout the Nation and thoroughly acceptable to the doctors of America. It was acceptable to the doctors, to the people, and to the Congress because the physicians working in the field of heart disease left the propagandists of organized medicine outside and themselves sat down in a spirit of sincere cooperation and helped draft the legislation which Senator MURRAY, in the interest of millions of our people, was concerned with.

Now we have added proof of the success which can be achieved when professional men forget suspicion and distrust of their legislators and cooperate with public officials in honest efforts to secure proper and constructive laws. The dentists of America have done this. They sent dentists rather than public relations men to sit down with Senator MURRAY and to aid in the drafting of dental health legislation. The result was a dental research bill thoroughly acceptable to the dental profession and holding great promise for the children of this country. The following quotes from the American Dental Association News Letter of July 1, 1948, show how well the dentists think of Senator MURRAY. They reflect the thinking of dentists who have actually worked with our distinguished colleague from Montana—of professional men who really know Senator MURRAY.

The comments are:

"ADA SPOKESMAN PRAISES WORK OF REPRESENTATIVE BREHM AND SENATOR MURRAY

"Dr. Flagstad issued a statement commending the action of Congress in writing a successful conclusion to the 8-year-long campaign of the ADA to secure Federal legislation in support of dental research. He named Representative BREHM and Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, as deserving special credit for supporting the dental research bill."

Dr. Flagstad, chairman of the American Dental Association's Committee on Legislation, said in part:

"There are two Members of Congress who deserve special credit for their exceptional service. Representative WALTER BREHM, of Ohio, a dentist by profession, merits the appreciation of the dental profession. * * * Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, from Montana, also merits the association's appreciation because he introduced the original dental research bill 8 years ago and has reintroduced it in every succeeding session of Congress. Senator MURRAY has consistently and energetically fostered our dental research bill and secured its passage through the Senate in two different sessions of Congress."

In recognition of this tribute from American dentistry to Senator MURRAY, I want to add my voice to Senator MAGNUSON'S in urging organized medicine to follow the lead of the heart specialists, the cancer specialists, the mental hygiene people, and the dental profession of the country. If they will but sincerely cooperate with Senator MURRAY in the interests of America's health, they too will find him as interested in protecting their rights as in advancing the health of our people. They too will learn, as Senator MAGNUSON so well put it, that Senator MURRAY is for health insurance because he is against socialized, state medicine.

PALESTINE AND THE NEW NATION OF ISRAEL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to another matter which is also concerned with the current situation, and that is dealing with a problem which has been of recurring consequence to us in the problems presented in the Middle East, particularly in relation to Palestine and the new nation of Israel.

The political platforms of both political parties have some very clear declarations on the issue. I shall later ask to have the planks printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, we were all profoundly gratified when the United Nations took the action they did last November, under American leadership, and recognized the creation of this new state. We were all profoundly disturbed when the administration apparently withdrew the action. We were gratified, and our hopes rose again later on, when finally a truce was arrived at in the lamentable controversy which prevailed there and when the creation of the new state of Israel became a fact and was recognized de facto immediately by the United States with a promptness which certainly did us credit.

We have been called here to consider the implementation of some of the programs provided for in our platform, and there has been considerable somewhat invidious criticism as to what has and has not been done. I call attention to one sentence in the Democratic platform, which says:

We favor full recognition of the state of Israel.

Action on that pledge is in the complete control of the President of the United States today, and I think he could do no more worthy act to demonstrate his desire to carry out the obligations imposed by the platform of his party, which was adopted at Philadelphia, than to transfer the recognition from de facto to de jure. It is a matter absolutely within his control and would qualify Israel for application for admission to the United Nations at the oncoming meeting in September.

Mr. President, I have a memorandum dealing with de facto and de jure recognition, citing several instances in the past few decades in which the United States has recognized a provisional government without waiting upon application or upon the establishment of a permanent government. I want to cite three of the cases, the first of which is Russia. Interesting enough, after the Revolution, when we recognized the provisional government established by Kerensky, full recognition was granted, despite the fact that the government itself was de facto in character, was weak, and later was overthrown by the Soviet authorities.

The citation for this is to be found in Mr. Hackworth's treatment of this matter, volume 1, pages 135 and 136:

(b) Poland after the recent war: The Potsdam Declaration specifically indicates that recognition was granted by Great Britain, the U. S. S. R., and the United States to the "Polish Provisional Government of National Unity." The interesting thing here is that recognition was unqualified at a time when future elections were contemplated and Poland's borders remained to be delimited.

(c) France after liberation: We unqualifiedly recognized the "Provisional Government of the French Republic," although it was understood that elections remained to be held and a new constitution framed and adopted.

Mr. President, I ask that this legal memorandum dealing with the question of the de facto and de jure recognition be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGAL MEMORANDUM ON DE FACTO AND DE JURE RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL

1. There are several instances in the last few decades in which the United States has recognized a provisional government without waiting upon elections or upon the establishment of a permanent government:

(a) Russia after the revolution when we recognized the "provisional government" established by Kerensky. Full recognition was granted—despite the fact that the government itself was de facto in character, weak and later overthrown by the Soviet authorities. See I Hackworth 135–136.

(b) Poland after the recent war: The Potsdam Declaration specifically indicates that recognition was granted by Great Britain, the U. S. S. R. and the United States to the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity. The interesting thing here is that recognition was unqualified at a time when future elections were contemplated and Poland's borders remained to be delimited.

(c) France after liberation: We unqualifiedly recognized the "Provisional Government of the French Republic", although it was understood that elections remained to be held and a new constitution framed and adopted.

2. There would seem to be no reason or warrant for making the nature of our recognition—de facto or de jure—turn on whether the particular government is pro-

visional or final. What a new sovereignty chooses to call its government—whether it decides to regard it as provisional or otherwise—is irrelevant from the viewpoint of another country which must determine whether or not to recognize that government. The Provisional Government of Israel is the legal, de jure government of that country, and what procedure the Israelis choose to follow before drafting a constitution, establishing a permanent government, etc., has no bearing whatever on the issues before the United States.

3. The United States is properly concerned with matters such as these: Whether in fact the Israeli government is in possession of the machinery of the state; whether it governs with the assent of the people; whether it can fulfill its international obligations. But assuming these tests are met—and so far as I am aware no one has denied that Israel can meet these tests—to withhold full or so-called de jure recognition because the Israelis happen to have described their own government as provisional is an act of political expediency, not law.

4. American history offers illustrations where appropriate use has been made of limited recognition. For example, in the case of various South American republics established by revolution; where power has been transferred from one to another group and where the authority of the government in power is under obvious challenge—de facto recognition may be appropriate. But certainly no one in the State Department has yet suggested that the Provisional Government of Israel does not fairly meet the historical tests of recognition. What appears to have happened is that these who were loath to recognize Israel seized on the word "Provisional" in the title of the government and then developed a legalistic thesis that since the government was provisional, American recognition would only be "de-facto." From the viewpoint of reason and precedent this is an absurd non sequitur.

Mr. BREWSTER. It proceeds:

American history offers illustration where appropriate use has been made of recognition.

I further ask that there be incorporated in connection with my remarks an editorial from the New York Post of Tuesday, July 20, denominated "Unhappy Truce," by T. O. Thackrey, dealing with the propriety and the urgency of a recognition of Israel de jure at this time.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNHAPPY TRUCE

(By T. O. Thackrey)

There is a dangerous air of optimism over the truce which has momentarily halted fighting on several, though not all, fronts in Palestine, hardly justified by a sober review of the conditions:

1. Arab acceptance of the cease-fire order—an acceptance not observed yesterday by Syrian and Iraqi forces—is conditioned on embargo of immigration to Israel and loss of Israel's status as a nation.

2. The effect of the Security Council resolution, which was authored by the United States in behalf of American-British joint policy, is to substitute Count Folke Bernadotte as a one-man mandate in Palestine for the indefinite period of the truce. Under a strict interpretation Israel's full sovereignty could be withheld indefinitely, and immigration throttled.

3. Israel's acceptance of the cease-fire order is also conditioned—and properly—upon her right to exercise sovereignty over immigration and recognition as a lawful nation.

4. The mediator, Count Bernadotte, continues to press for all-Arab rule over Jerusalem and has thus become an advocate of British and Arabian partisan claims which run directly contrary to the United Nations proposal outlined in the November 29 General Assembly resolution for establishment of Jerusalem as a free city under UN control. Israel, which might well have claimed Jerusalem as a capital, in view of the preponderance of Jews in the population, agreed to the UN proposal—but Count Bernadotte is pressing to make it an Arab capital, clearly disqualifying himself as an administrator or mediator.

It now appears most likely that whatever the fate of the cease-fire order, the United Nations mediator, relying on United States and British support in taking a pro-Arab position, will propose again to make Jerusalem an all-Arab city, restrict Israel immigration, reduce Israel's borders, and suggest joint Transjordan-Israel sovereignty in Palestine on a pro rata basis; meaning, of course, establishment of Jewish minority villages under Transjordan rule and the dismemberment of Israel's national sovereignty.

President Truman's administration is wholly responsible for the fact that such a state of affairs has been brought about despite the clear pledges of his party to all-out support for Israel.

The deputy representative of his State Department wrote and fought for adoption of the UN Security Council resolution now in effect.

Although his party pledged lifting the arms embargo, the President's representative at Lake Success instead brought about a world-wide arms embargo, more effective on Israel than her enemies since her borders are more readily patrolled.

Although his party pledged full sovereign recognition of Israel, and even pledged that the United States sponsor Israel's membership in the United Nations, President Truman's representative at Lake Success sponsored the resolution that restricts Israel's sovereignty both in the matter of immigration and self-defense.

The resolution does not, happily, impose even by implication any restriction on the right of the United States to grant full lawful (de jure) recognition to Israel and conclude treaties of commerce, trade, and other diplomatic exchanges: But yet, President Truman has not acted to do so.

Until he does, he must be held guilty of flouting the pledges of his party, ignoring principle, and abandoning Middle East policy to the pro-Arab section of his State Department.

He has also succeeded in demonstrating thus far that the pledges of the United States, when made by his administration, are worth less than the paper they are written on; that the pledges work, rather, in reverse.

In today's world, this can hardly be said to be a constructive or sensible demonstration.

Unless his party's pledges are implemented by the time the special session of Congress, called by the President, opens next week, there will be an opportunity for the Republican Party to demonstrate, if it will, that its pledges on Israel are more meaningful.

The Congress, dominated by Republican members, easily has the power to memorialize the President to keep his pledges, recognize and support Israel, and return to the support of the partition policy of the United Nations.

Recognition of Israel at this time by the President would at least be a demonstration that he had read his party's platform.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask that the Republican and Democratic planks regarding Israel be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the planks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Plank in Republican national platform of 1948 dealing with Israel:)

We welcome Israel into the family of nations and take pride in the fact that the Republican Party was the first to call for the establishment of a free and independent Jewish commonwealth. The vacillation of the Democrat administration on this question has undermined the prestige of the United Nations. Subject to the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, we pledge to Israel full recognition, with its boundaries as sanctioned by the United Nations, and aid in developing its economy.

(The full text in the Democratic national platform of 1948:)

President Truman, by granting immediate recognition to Israel, led the world in extending friendship and welcome to a people who have long sought and justly deserved freedom and independence. We favor full recognition of the state of Israel.

We affirm our pride, too, that the United States, under the leadership of President Truman, played a leading role in the adoption of the resolution of November 29, 1947, by the United Nations General Assembly for the creation of a Jewish State.

We approve the claims of the state of Israel to the boundaries set forth in the United Nations resolution of November 29 and consider that modification thereof should be made only if fully acceptable to the state of Israel.

We look forward to the admission of the state of Israel to the United Nations and its full participation in the international community of nations.

We pledge appropriate aid to the state of Israel in developing its economy and resources.

We favor the revision of the arms embargo to accord to the state of Israel the right of self-defense. We pledge ourselves to work for the modification of any resolution of the United Nations to the extent that it may prevent any such revision.

We continue to support within the framework of the United Nations the internationalization of Jerusalem and the protection of the holy places of Palestine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a further point is the assistance which may be appropriately considered for this new Government which has been born under such difficult conditions, although it is the first country in the history of the world which came into being as the result of considered determination of the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world, who had considered this matter, and had recommended that Israel should come into being as a new nation among the peoples of the world.

The President of the United States, at the time of the recognition de facto, indicated his complete sympathy and his desire that America should extend the same character of aid that was being extended to other nations in the re-establishment of their shattered economy. Certainly if there was any country that needed this, in view of the stormy history of recent years, the details of which I shall not here discuss, as they have been fully labored here before, certainly Israel was in that category.

There is now an application before the Export-Import Bank for a loan of $100,000,000 in order to assist in the development of Israel. This, again, comes

within the category of those things which the President had indicated might be seriously considered, and are matters entirely within the control of the administration without further action by the Congress of any character.

The further issue of the admission of Israel to the United Nations will, I presume, be presented at the meeting of the General Assembly in September of this year. I ask that a memorandum dealing with the considerations governing this, and with its practical consequences so far as Israel and the world are concerned, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted on November 29, 1947, provided:

"When the independence of either the Arab or the Jewish state as envisaged in this plan has become effective and the declaration and undertaking, as envisaged in this plan, have been signed by either of them, sympathetic consideration should be given to its application for admission to membership in the United Nations in accordance with article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations" (par. 1–F).

The question now arises whether the state of Israel should be admitted to the United Nations at the forthcoming session of the General Assembly in Paris.

I. ISRAEL'S QUALIFICATIONS

1. The origin of the state: Israel is the first state in history to be created as a result of the investigations, deliberations, and decisions of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Its credential for admission is thus a unique international birth certificate inscribed with a distinguished and honorable parentage. Thirty-three nations voted for the General Assembly's resolution, and would therefore seem to have a moral commitment to favor Israel's early admission.

2. The existence of the state: Israel's existence is now a fact of international life of which the whole world is aware.

(a) External recognition: Although admission to the United Nations and recognition are not synonymous—and many states which have sought admission have not had as many recognitions as the state of Israel—it is significant that the state of Israel was accorded recognition by 15 powers in less than 10 weeks' time. These include: United States, Guatemala, U. S. S. R., Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Nicaragua, Uruguay, South Africa, Hungary, Finland, Rumania, Costa Rica, Panama, Venezuela.

(b) Internal recognition: Fundamental in the establishment of a state is the writ of authority it derives from its own people and its capacity to control its area and carry on the functions of Government. The record of performance since May 15 has demonstrated the representative character of the organs of government established in Israel, tneir acceptance of the people, and their competence to create a smoothly operating apparatus of government serving all the needs of the people.

The United Nations mediator attested to this achievement in paragraph 34 of his report to the Security Council:

"The de facto situation in Palestine today is that a Jewish Provisional Government, recognized by an increasing number of states, exists in an area of Palestine, and is exercising, without restrictions of any kind on its authority or power, all the attributes of full sovereignty, including the waging of war." (In par. 17, the mediator described the war as a defensive one.)

Moreover, although Israel was attacked by six Arab states within a few hours of the proclamation of its independence, its people rose loyally to its defense and not only repelled all attacks but succeeded in carrying the war to the enemy's territory.

II. FIDELITY TO THE UNITED NATIONS

1. Israel's orientation to the United Nations: Israel has given ample evidence of its independence and its freedom from the domination of foreign powers. The very fact that its birth was attended by a union of great powers which have been divided on other issues has developed in Israel an international attitude oriented to the United Nations and to that body alone.

2. Israel's relations with the United Nations: Since its establishment, the state of Israel has fully and faithfully responded to every decision and appeal of the United Nations and its organs. More than half a dozen times the state of Israel willingly complied with calls made upon it by the Security Council, despite the fact that those calls equated aggressor and victim and imposed onerous obligations and conditions which should have been reserved for the aggressors against Israel. This scrupulous and undeviating fidelity to the commands of the United Nations has confirmed the promise that the United Nations would be the keystone of Israel's foreign policy.

3. The experience and attitude of Israel's people: The people of Israel, long before the state was formed, fought for the cause and in the armies of the United Nations. It was against the Jewish people that Hitler first declared war, and 6,000,000 Jews perished in the cause for which the United Nations arose. Their contribution to victory in World War II, both in Palestine and on every front, was far more impressive than that of a number of countries which gave little or nothing to that cause but which nevertheless have been admitted to the United Nations.

III. THE PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES OF ISRAEL'S ADMISSION

1. Its significance to the United Nations: The admission of Israel to the United Nations would be an announcement to the world that the United Nations is prepared to honor its commitments. Delay would be an act of vacillation by the General Assembly which would undermine confidence in that body's disposition and capacity to give effect to its own recommendations. Recommendations of the General Assembly would have little force or meaning to the nations of the world if the Assembly itself were to set an example of indifference to or noncompliance with its own recommendations.

2. As a contribution to peace: The most compelling reason for Israel's admission is that it will, more than any other act at this time, stabilize the situation in the Middle East. Arab aggression against Israel was encouraged by a delusion that Israel could be liquidated. When the Arab states are persuaded to realize that this is an objective impossible of achievement by arms or by diplomatic maneuver, there will be a powerful incentive to reach a peaceful settlement with Israel. But if Israel is denied admission at the forthcoming session, uncertainty will continue for another year, Arab intransigence will be emboldened, and the prospects of negotiations leading to a final peace will be gravely prejudiced.

It should be noted that the language of the General Assembly's resolution, quoted above, deliberately made the admission of the Jewish state independent of the establishment and admission of its neighbor.

It may be argued that Israel's admission should be deferred until an agreement is reached with the Arab states and until Israel has compromised its differences with the Arabs.

Clearly, the situation dictates the opposite course. Agreement with the Arab states is far more likely to be consummated if the international community removes all lingering doubts of Israel's status.

Experience in the Palestine controversy has shown that firm action by the United Nations and its organs facilitated progress toward a solution, and that equivocation and delay retarded a final and lasting settlement.

With the existence of Israel an immutable fact, the establishment of peaceful relations between Israel and its neighbors and the stabilization of the entire Middle East can best be achieved by formal and international confirmation of reality—Israel's acceptance into the family of nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have covered the considerations which it seems to me may be appropriately brought to the attention of the administration at the time of this special session, called to deal with various matters of moment and concern, and to emphasize that, so far as this recommendation is concerned, so far as movement to have Israel admitted to the United Nations is concerned, and so far as the consideration of its application to the Export-Import Bank for aid is concerned, they are all entirely within the full control of this administration and of the President of the United States. I can only hope that early and sympathetic consideration will be given to this matter without further delay.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it will be recalled that the Democratic platform at Philadelphia respecting Israel and Palestine provided as follows:

President Truman, by granting immediate recognition to Israel, led the world in extending friendship and welcome to a people who have long sought and justly deserved freedom and independence. We favor full recognition of the state of Israel.

We affirm our pride, too, that the United States, under the leadership of President Truman, played a leading role in the adoption of the resolution of November 29, 1947, by the United Nations General Assembly for the creation of a Jewish state.

We approve the claims of the state of Israel to the boundaries set forth in the United Nations resolution of November 29 and consider that modification thereof should be made only if fully acceptable to the state of Israel.

We look forward to the admission of the state of Israel to the United Nations and its full participation in the international community of nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, does the Senator realize that I have just inserted this plank in the RECORD?

Mr. PEPPER. Let me conclude. I did not know the Senator included both planks.

Mr. BREWSTER. I included both the Democratic and Republican planks.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the Senator did. I wish to conclude reading this, however. It continues:

We pledge appropriate aid to the state of Israel in developing its economy and resources.

We favor the revision of the arms embargo to accord to the state of Israel the right of self-defense. We pledge ourselves to work for the modification of any resolution of the

United Nations to the extent that it may prevent any such revision.

We continue to support within the framework of the United Nations the internationalization of Jerusalem and the protection of the holy places of Palestine.

Mr. President, that is a forthright declaration of the Democratic Party on the subject of Israel. The Republican platform is also a very favorable statement upon the same subject.

In our respective parties we have our own acts of aid to Israel to which we naturally turn back with pride. We, as Democrats, as well as Americans, are pleased that it was a Democratic President who had the distinction, and, I may say, the heartfelt satisfaction, of extending recognition to the old state of Israel created anew in our own time. I am sure that we share one another's confidence that it is the right thing to extend that de facto recognition into de jure recognition, that we all favor the expeditious transition of the status of recognition from de facto to de jure, and we believe that surely it will be done in the very near future.

I myself certainly entertain the confident hope that the President who extended de facto recognition to Israel reborn, will not lag behind in making his de facto recognition the de jure recognition which will consummate the purpose which he first implied with the de facto recognition.

I also feel that it is only a matter of time, and I hope a short time, until Israel will be granted the economic aid it so sorely needs in its extremity. After we have been so generous, as well as just, with other needy peoples of the world, letting them have billions of dollars, I cannot see why we hesitate longer over a few hundred million dollars to a great people reborn, after the travail of their birth.

I certainly hope that the Congress and the Government will approach both the matter of de jure recognition and the extension of economic aid on a commendable bipartisan basis, and that the Congress, speaking for one part of the Government and, the executive for another, will join hands in seeing to it that these two high purposes are consummated in the immediate future.

One other matter: It seems to me that more progress than at one time appeared probable has been made in the stability of the military situation in Palestine. There does seem to be a truce. We hope that the order of the Security Council that there be a cease fire by both parties will not only be adhered to, but will be implemented as well. I am sure it is the sentiment of all parties in Congress and Government that the United States shall use its full moral and material power to see to it that the Security Council does attend to the cease-fire order, and that we are prepared to implement that order should the occasion arise. By doing so we not only would preserve Israel against attack and aggression, but at the same time we would strengthen the arm of the United Nations as the agency of law, order, and peace in the world.

Mr. President, we should also make it clear that the truce is not to be conditioned upon any contingency which is not consistent with the full sovereignty and independence of the state and the people of Israel, that is to say, it must not be conditioned by anybody or any agency upon the new Jewish state being denied the emphasis of proper sovereignty to determine the conditions of immigration and in other respects to act as any sovereign state is expected to act to determine its own policy and its own destiny with respect to such internal matters as that.

I think it should be made clear at the earliest possible time that the United Nations has prescribed the boundaries of the state of Israel, and that if changes are to be made they will have to be made with the concurrence not only of the United Nations, but also of Israel. I think no real peace can prevail unless the boundaries are changed in the way that the boundaries of any sovereign people might be changed, and in no other way.

Lastly, Mr. President, the Assembly of the United Nations meets in Paris in the fall. What more fit time and place could there be than for the doors of this world organizations to be opened to the embrace of this new State, this new people of Israel? Surely, it seems to me that we as bipartisans, as Americans, can agree also that our Government should take the lead in sponsoring the admission of Israel into the full sisterhood of nations in the United Nations Organization, and that we should do it at the meeting of the Assembly in September, so that before this old year, with so much heartache and travail and tragedy, comes to an end, we may at least offer to mankind one bright hope that we are making steady progress in the long war for democracy, for humanity, and for decency in the world.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, supplementing what the Senator from Florida has so well said in connection with the application for a loan of $100,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank, I might point out that those of us who have had the good fortune to study this situation at first hand in recent years have seen the enormous equity which has been created in Palestine as the result of a contribution of more than one-quarter of a billion dollars, largely from American sources, as the free-will offerings of those who were interested in the welfare of their fellows overseas, and who have poured that money out voluntarily and gladly into the rehabilitation of the economy of the new state of Israel, which is the best guaranty that it is a state to which we might prudently consider an advance of this character, when we have been advancing so freely, I believe since the end of the war, $18,000,000,000, for the rehabilitation of various other economies.

Mr. President, this is of concern not only because it will provide for the unfortunate people in Europe who are looking to this country as a haven, who find here the only hope for reestablishing themselves as the result of the dislocation incident to the war, but because, in my opinion, it is one of the greatest contributions that can be made to the rehabilitation of the entire economy of the Middle East. It will furnish an example of what it is possible to do in these formerly desert areas, because the entire area, particularly in the region a few hundred miles beyond Palestine, in the Valley of the Tigris and the Euphrates, is capable today of being restored as the Garden of Eden, which it once was. One need but to see in that region the drainage canals which existed there 3,000 years ago to realize the rich resources of that soil. If that soil, and the soil of the adjoining Arab regions of Iran, Iraq, and Arabia, were devoted to one-tenth or one-quarter of its possibilities, to the rehabilitation of agricultural economy, the level of living of that entire area would be raised considerably, which would quiet the seething unrest which affects that region today and threatens the stability of the world, because if another World War comes upon the earth, it is altogether likely to emerge as the result of the collisions which are occurring among the starving, deprived people of the Middle East, who are not privileged to have the benefits of the soil and the riches of the soil which is really within their domain.

So, it has always impressed me that the problem of Palestine and Israel was of consequence to us, not merely from the standpoint of relief, not merely from the standpoint of an ancient nation now seeking recognition, but from the standpoint of a contribution to the stability of that entire region of the earth which by its progress will remove itself as one of the greatest problems of this time.

I think the President could make a very great contribution if he should extend de jure to Israel recognition at this time, and give serious consideration to the remaining problems with which we are faced.

THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Washington News entitled "Not Funny, Mr. President." Adjoining the editorial is a cartoon which depicts a whale with the President standing in the bottom of its open mouth. On the whale appear the words "Commies in Government hearings." The President is shown as saying "It is just a red herring."

Mr. President, I consider the Communist problem in the United States a very serious one. The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and many other patriotic organizations have opposed this menace to a free government since World War I. I believe the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, headed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], which is investigating the problem, is doing an excellent work and should be supported and commended.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT FUNNY, MR. PRESIDENT

President Truman charged congressional hearings on Soviet spy activities are a "red herring" to hide the Republican Congress' failure on other matters. In doing so, he

very foolishly accepted a measure of responsibility for an ugly and dangerous situation which previously could not have been charged against him.

Not many people who have followed the testimony in the current hearings will agree with Mr. Truman that the Communist problem in Washington can be laughed off as "Republican politics," in our opinion.

Moreover, the President has further placed himself on the defensive on this issue by denying to the investigating committees information which is pertinent to their inquiries.

The failure of Congress to act upon the President's anti-inflationary program will not in any sense excuse him for his own refusal to cooperate in removing a very real threat to our national security. The issues are not in any way related. Today we are concerned with another problem.

Under Mr. Truman's own loyalty program, laid down by Executive order, it is the announced policy of the Government to bar from positions of trust in "sensitive" agencies any employee whose loyalty may be subject to question.

That policy broke down when William W. Remington was appointed chairman of the Commerce Department's export license committee although it was known he was under investigation for association with a confessed member of a Russian spy ring. That is not something existing only in the mind of Representative KARL E. MUNDT, as Mr. Truman would have us believe. It is an undisputed, unexplained fact. And if the President's loyalty test was not applied in Mr. Remington's case, what reason have we to believe that it has been applied in any other case?

The two congressional investigations, particularly the one being conducted by Senator FERGUSON, have been extremely useful. But neither has more than scratched the surface, in our judgment.

We need a careful, searching inquiry, that will give free access to all pertinent information, conducted by an agency with the ability and the power to purge the Government of all disloyal and unreliable elements. An unofficial civilian commission should be created for this purpose, as a safeguard against the subversion of the Government by enemy agents or dupes.

Such a commission, to command respect and confidence of the public and Congress, should be composed of persons of the caliber of Herbert Hoover, Bernard M. Baruch, Henry L. Stimson, Charles Evans Hughes, Owen D. Roberts, Robert M. La Follette, and James F. Byrnes—men who know government, who respect civil liberties, but who would resolve all doubts in favor of national security.

Let's forget politics when the issue is security.

DISPOSAL OF THE RENO ARMY AIR BASE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program on August 25, 1947, held a hearing on the Reno Army Air Base disposal pursuant to a general demand spearheaded by the American Legion, Department of Nevada.

The hearing was held to permit the city of Reno and the State of Nevada to carry out any plans they might have for a National Guard, veterans or other housing, schools and religious institutions, without interference from any extraneous source whatever.

The work of the committee brought out certain secret and unrecorded agreements, including possible plans to remove the buildings and equipment for private gain with the consent of the then Administrator of the War Assets Administration.

Subsequent developments have proven the value of the work, since the National Guard has now made application to the War Assets Administration for a long list of material, equipment, housing, runways, and land with which to operate at the base—a copy of which is attached to the committee report.

The superintendent of public instruction, Miss Mildred Bray, has just inspected the buildings and equipment at the base, together with the representatives of the University of Nevada, and the administrators of the high schools in the northern and western parts of the State, including Reno, Sparks, Carson City, Fernley, Tahoe, Yerington, and Humboldt and Pershing Counties, and all agree that at least a partial answer to their need for additional classrooms will be found at the base.

The remaining property not required by the National Guard can be cleared almost immediately, and the housing and equipment selected for use by the schools offered for bids; then, since the schools will receive a 95 percent discount from their bid price, they can obtain possession of the property within a very short time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the subcommittee, the list of materials, and so forth, and several communications printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENO ARMY AIR BASE DISPOSAL

(JOINT REPORT of the Subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program pursuant to S. Res. —— and the Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments pursuant to S. Res. 75, November 1947)

(Letter of Transmittal)

Washington, D. C., ——, 1947

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman, Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: There is transmitted herewith to the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments a report of the Joint Committee of the Subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and the Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments concerning the hearing held at Reno, Nevada on August 25, 1947, the subject of which was the pending disposal of the Reno Army Air Base. This report incorporates the findings and recommendations by the Joint Committee as the result of the hearing.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER FERGUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and Subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program

Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program: Owen Brewster, Maine, chairman; Homer Ferguson, Michigan; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; John J. Williams, Delaware; George W. Malone, Nevada; Harry P. Cain, Washington; Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Claude Pepper, Florida; J. Howard McGrath, Rhode Island; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: George D. Aiken, Vermont, chairman; Homer Ferguson, Michigan; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Iowa; John W. Bricker, Ohio; Edward J. Thye, Minnesota; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; Irving M. Ives, New York; John L. McClellan, Arkansas; James O. Eastland, Mississippi; Clyde R. Hoey, North Carolina; Glen H. Taylor, Idaho; A. Willis Robertson, Virginia; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland.

Subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program: Homer Ferguson, Michigan, chairman; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; George W. Malone, Nevada; Carl A. Hatch, New Mexico; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland; George Meader, counsel.

Subcommittee on Surplus Property of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Homer Ferguson, Michigan, chairman; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Iowa; Joseph R. McCarthy, Wisconsin; John L. McClellan, Arkansas; Herbert R. O'Conor, Maryland; Miles N. Culehan, counsel.

The Department of Nevada, American Legion, assembled in convention in Reno, Nev., passed a resolution requesting the joint committee of members of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program and the Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to investigate into and hold a hearing upon the proposed disposal of the Reno Army Air Base. The Legion indicated that certain facts existed which necessitated such a course. Since the joint committee of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program and the Surplus Property Subcommittee was holding hearings in Las Vegas, Nev., on the pending disposal of the basic magnesium plant, the Nevada American Legion suggested that the joint committee hold a hearing in Reno following the hearings in Las Vegas.

Accordingly, on August 25, 1947, a hearing was held in Reno, Nev. Senator MCCARTHY, acting as chairman, and Senator MALONE were present as members of the committee. Numerous witnesses were heard, and the subject of the proposed disposal of the Reno Army Air Base was exhaustively covered.

Based upon a résumé of the facts and findings of the committee attached hereto and made a part hereof, the committee makes the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the acquisition of the airport by the city of Reno, Nev., would be desirable both for the city and the Federal Government in that such a sale could insure the preservation of such airport and its reversion in the event of an emergency.

2. That the city of Reno, Nev., be permitted under Public Law 289, passed by the Eightieth Congress, to make application through Civil Aeronautics Administration to acquire possession of the airport, including such other facilities and properties, to wit, land, buildings, warehouses, railroad sidings, roads, and utilities, all a part of the Reno Air Base, as could be utilized to pay for the maintenance and operation of the airport, if such operation proves feasible, and if not safe for operation as a civilian airport then classified in such manner even if a special act is necessary to not require operation of such facilities by the city, but to preserve it for emergency military purposes.

3. That War Assets Administration forthwith take the proper steps to have such air base reclassified under Public Law 289 and to furnish such aid and assistance that may be necessary to enable the city of Reno, Nev., to accomplish the purposes set forth in recommendation No. 2, and to preserve the airport without necessary operation for the armed services in the event of emergency or for military training.

4. It is recommended that War Assets Administration reclassify two or three buildings as may be necessary to be sold for removal from the site in order to try to meet the requirements of the Legion for a clubhouse. The selected buildings should of course not seriously interfere with or destroy the disposal value of the area.

5. The committee approves the proposed disposal of the chapels to recognized religious organizations pursuant to the directions of the United States Army Chief of Chaplains.

6. The committee desires to remain in close touch with this problem and in order that this end may be obtained requests that War Assets Administration and any or all interested parties keep the committee fully advised of all important developments and negotiations.

The committee finds that the facts are substantially as follows:

FACTS

The Army Air Forces declared the Reno Army Air Base surplus to War Assets Administration pursuant to the provisions of the Surplus Property Act. Under the regulations promulgated by the Administrator of War Assets Administration, it is necessary for real property to be classified before it can be disposed of. When a portion of this property consists of an airport, it is necessary for Civil Aeronautics Administration to determine how much of the entire property shall be classified and disposed of as an airport, and subsequently War Assets Administration must classify that portion which remains. The Reno Army Air Base consists of two areas; one which has been classified as the airport property by Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the other has been classified by War Assets Administration.

War Assets Administration has determined, pursuant to its regulations, that the remaining portion, known as the cantonment area, should be disposed of in place as distinguished from a sale of the facilities to be removed. War Assets Administration officials testified that a sale of the buildings and improvements in the cantonment area for removal from the site would result in a serious loss to the Government, inasmuch as several million dollars have been invested in the utilities, and their only substantial value is, of course, use in place.

Under the Surplus Property Act and the regulations, municipalities are entitled to a priority and a discount in the disposal of airports.

The practice has been to dispose of airports to a municipality in the locality at a 100 percent discount, provided that the municipality agrees to maintain and operate the airport pursuant to the requirements of Civil Aeronautics Administration, and provided further that the city cannot transfer or dispose of any portion of the airport without the consent of Civil Aeronautics Administration, and in the event of a national emergency the property reverts to the Federal Government for such use as may be necessary.

The city of Reno proposes to exercise its priority to acquire the airport property. However, the facts indicate that under the present circumstances the airport operates at a substantial loss, and the city of Reno is not in a position to finance this loss. Official reports also indicate that the airport is not feasible or safe for operation as a civilian airport—therefore the city should not be required to operate it as such, but it should be preserved for emergency military purposes or as a training field even if special legislation is necessary. The city also has a priority under the act to purchase the cantonment area, but must pay fair value for this area and does not receive any discount on such a purchase. The city proposed to exercise its priority to acquire the cantonment area, and then lease both the airport and the cantonment area to a private corporation, referred to as the Merrick Corp., recently organized for this purpose, to operate them and thereby permit the city to acquire the airport and at the same time avoid the annual loss which now accrues.

The private corporation planned to support the operation of the airport by the profit which could be derived from the cantonment area and also by attempting to interest commercial air lines in the use of the airport, and by leasing part of the facilities for use by the National Guard. The airport has since been pronounced not feasible for civilian use, but would be valuable for military training purposes.

The existence of a proposed contract to this effect between the city and the private corporation was testified to by the facts produced at the hearing indicated that the city and the Merrick Corp. had abandoned or dropped the contract. It was suggested by the committee that a formal cancellation of this contract be executed, in order to clarify this situation and make certain that it did not interfere with any other possible bidding. The committee has since been advised that such an instrument of cancellation has been executed. However, the representatives of the corporation stated at the hearing that in the event that they can acquire the cantonment area either through the city's priority or through purchase for their own account, they will still be willing to enter into some arrangement for the operation of the airport so that the city will not be in a position to sustain a loss.

The Nevada American Legion expressed a desire to have the cantonment area sold to veterans exclusively, and classified so that the structures and improvements could be removed from the site. Under the Surplus Property Act, veterans have no priority in regard to real property of this nature. It was also shown that the experience of War Assets Administration in the sale of real property reveals a much larger return in the sale of improvements with the land as compared to the sale of improvements for removal from the land.

The American Legion representatives testified that they were interested in acquiring two or three buildings in the cantonment area for subsequent removal and use as a Legion clubhouse. It was indicated that it was possible legally to reclassify a few of the buildings to permit removal from the site, provided that such removal would not substantially diminish the value of the entire area.

The proposed disposal of two chapels in the cantonment area was the subject of some discussion, but it was determined that the recipients of such chapels are determined by the United States Army Chief of Chaplains, and the recipients are chosen from the applicants for the chapels who are recognized religious organizations.

It was pointed out that since the classification of the airport property by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Public Law 289 was passed in the last session of Congress. Under this act, Civil Aeronautics Administration can include in its classification as an airport sufficient adjacent property to support the operation of the airport. Such an application and classification could still be made.

In the event that the city does not exercise its priority to acquire the cantonment area when it is advertised for sale, then it will be sold at public auction to the highest bidder. This, in all probability, would be the private corporation, and although the representatives of the corporation indicate that they would still be willing to enter into a contract to support the operation of the airport out of the income from the cantonment area, they would, of course, not be bound to do so and could make whatever use of their acquisition as they saw fit.

DEMAND FOR HEARING

The general demand for a congressional hearing spearheaded by the American Legion, Department of Nevada, was aggravated by the lack of available information and rumors of a semisecret and unrecorded agreement between the city of Reno and a private corporation to get possession of the several million dollars' worth of Government property to dispose of as they saw fit under the guise of industrial development and operation of the airport.

It developed that a $6,000 deposit had been made with the city of Reno by the private corporation which was withdrawn when the information was made public through the hearing.

CORPORATION NOT BOUND TO OPERATE AIRPORT

It also developed that while the contract with the city mentioned operation of the airport as a commercial venture that the corporation was not bound to operate it and that by consent of the War Assets Administration the buildings and equipment could be removed for any purpose.

The hearings cleared up what could have developed into an unhappy situation for all concerned and provided the city of Reno a clear field to decide the course best for the city, State, and the National interest.

LIST OF MATERIAL, HOUSING, EQUIPMENT AT THE RENO ARMY AIR BASE REQUIRED BY THE NATIONAL GUARD

RENO ARMY AIR BASE, NEV.,
August 3, 1948.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF REAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Mr. Smith.)

GENTLEMEN: Reference is made to letter from this office dated March 11, 1948, requesting that disposal action be held in abeyance in regard to certain portions of Reno Army Air Base, Nev., which were required for future use by the National Guard.

The requirements of the National Guard have been amended and it is requested that disposal action be held in abeyance in regard to the following lands and facilities, rather than those set forth in the aforesaid letter dated March 11, 1948:

1. The following-described lands in township 21 north, range 19 east.
(a) The west half of section 17.
(b) Section 18.
(c) Section 19.
(d) Section 20.
(e) The southwest quarter of section 21.
(f) The west half of section 28.
(g) Section 29.
(h) Section 30.

2. (a) Building T-5004, crash shed.
(b) Building T-5006, night lighting vault.
(c) Building T-6001, traffic-control tower.
(d) Building T-6101, parachute building.
(e) Building T-6102, administration and operations building.
(f) Building T-7000, oxygen storage.
(g) Building T-7001, personnel equipment and squadron supplies.
(h) Building T-7002, personnel equipment and squadron supplies.
(i) Building T-7003, hangar.
(j) Building T-7004, armament storage.
(k) Building T-7102, link trainer building.
(l) Building T-8001, personnel equipment storage and locker space.

(m) Building T-8002, personnel equipment storage and locker space.
(n) Building T-8003, hangar.
(o) Building T-8101, photo lab.
(p) Building T-8201, classroom.
(q) Building T-8202, supply room.
(r) Building T-8203, classroom.
(s) Building T-8204, classroom.
(t) Building T-8205, communications repair.
(u) Building T-8206, classroom.
(v) Building T-8207, classroom.
(w) Building T-8208, classroom.
(x) Building T-8209, administration.
(y) Building T-T-99, rotating beacon.
(z) Building T-101, ammunition storage.
(aa) Building T-130, filtration plant.
(bb) Building T-204, filtration plant.
(cc) Building T-131, reservoir.
(dd) Building T-132, storage tank.
(ee) Building T-135, well.
(ff) Building T-201, well.
(gg) Building T-110, paint, oil, and dope storage.
(hh) Building T-2404, quartermaster fuel storage pump station.
(ii) Building T-2504, oil and grease storage.
(jj) Building T-1201, warehouse.

3. The equipment described below, installed in buildings which are not to be withdrawn:

(a) Twenty-five horsepower cast-iron sectional boiler, oil-fired, including fuel tank and smokestack complete with hardware, electrical equipment, and plumbing attached thereto. (Now installed in Building T-1204, bakery.)
(b) Blackboards and status boards (now located in Building T-1001).
(c) Supplies and shelving (now installed in Building T-1202).
(d) Issue counters and bins, three large tables, four large storage bins (now installed in Building T-1402).
(e) Clothing bins, partitions (now located in Building T-1501).
(f) Bins, exhaust-disposal unit, step-ladders, block and tackle, wash and grease racks (now installed in Building T-2503).
(g) Guard rail (now installed in Building T-3305).
(h) Bar unit and mirror (now located in Building T-4214).
(i) Orderly room counter unit (now installed in Building T-5209).
(j) Supply-counter unit (now installed in Building T-5216).
(k) Desk unit (now installed in Building T-5301).
(l) Counter unit (now installed in Building T-5312).
(m) Five blackboards, two cabinets, guard rail (now installed in Building T-6201).
(n) Counter unit (now installed in Building T-6303).
(o) Bulletin board and book shelves (now installed in Building T-7205).
(p) Two Westinghouse air units, drawer unit, ventilating fan (now installed in Building T-7401).
(q) Six clothing bins (now installed in Building T-7415).
(r) Six heater fans (now installed in Building T-9014).
(s) Two outside grease racks (located in the vicinity of Building T-2503).

4. The perimeter fence surrounding Reno Air Base.

5. All railroad trackage now installed in the land area requested above, together with the railroad trackage between the Western Pacific Railroad right-of-way and the land area requested above, together with rights of ingress and egress thereto.

6. Water bearing land right-of-way and easements pertinent to the provision of a water supply be made available to the National Guard together with all equipment pertinent thereto, including the following facilities:

(a) Well No. 2 as indicated on United States Engineer drawing No. 121-13-123, sheet 15, unit lay-out map "Utilities" dated April 1943.
(b) Reservoir and water-treatment system and equipment located as indicated on United States Engineer, South Pacific Division drawing "Exhibit A," Real Estate, Reno Army Airfield—including pipe line and power line.
(c) The installed pipe and equipment indicated in red on United States Engineer drawing No. 121-13-118, sheet 9, water distribution system, Reno Airfield.

7. Gasoline distribution system: The following items as shown on United States Engineer drawing 121-13-73, aircraft gasoline fueling system, dated July 1942.
(a) Transfer station.
(b) Transfer line running along Avenue A to four underground tanks located at east end of Avenue A.
(c) Four 25,000-gallon tanks and truck-fill stands located at east end of Avenue A.

8. Electrical system: All pole lines, transformers, switch gear, and other equipment specifically a part of the following systems:
(a) The primary and secondary power and lighting system indicated in red on U. S. Engineer Drawing No. 121-13-118, sheet 2, primary and secondary electrical system, dated April 1943.
(b) Obstruction light system indicated in red on U. S. Engineer Drawing No. 121-13-118, sheet 4, obstruction light system, dated April 1943.

9. That portion of the sanitary sewer system indicated in red on U. S. Engineer Drawing 141-18-118, sheet 6, dated April 1943. 1943.

10. Obstruction lights in outlying areas:
(a) Flashing beacon on Peavine Mountain.
(b) Obstruction light, Station No. 50 located on Flat Mountain.
(c) Obstruction light, Station No. 51 located on West Approach Mountain.
(d) Obstruction light, Station No. 52 located on Clam Mountain.
(e) Obstruction light, Station No. 53 located on Horse Mountain.
(f) Obstruction light, Station No. 54 located on North Mountain.
(g) Obstruction light, Station No. 55 located on Ordnance Mountain.
(h) Obstruction light, Station No. 56 located on Belt Mountain.
(i) Obstruction light, Station No. 57 located on Round Top Mountain.
(j) Radio beacon site located on Bald Mountain.

11. All flying facilities such as pavements, markers, aircraft parking areas, etc., on the flying fields.

It is to be noted that Buildings 6501, 6502, 6503 and 6504 and 8 acres of land in section 29, and Building T-100 and 1.32 acres of land in section 21 were withdrawn from surplus by WD 1145-B and WD 1145-F, respectively.

Sincerely yours,

H. O'NEILL,
Assistant, Management and Disposal Division, Real Estate
(For the Chief, Engineers).

Excerpts from letter from Superintendent of Public Instruction Mildred Bray, dated August 2, 1948; received August 5, 1948:

"Last week, in company with John P. Gifford, representative of the United States Office of Education in San Francisco for War Assets Administration, Mr. J. R. Warren, office deputy, and I went to the Reno Army Air Base to inspect the property and see if it would be suitable for school purposes. The following day Mr. Gifford and Mr. Warren invited the school administrators in this area to go to the air base with them and decide whether they would like to make application for specific property. We all agreed that probably the wings of the hospital could easily be converted into excellent classrooms and would meet our problem. They were so long that approximately three school classrooms could be made out of each ward. The administrators from Reno, Sparks, Carson City, Fernley, and Tahoe selected units which would make about 50 classrooms; and the University of Nevada also is seeking several buildings and the heating plant. Today the superintendents of the Yerington schools, the Pershing County High School, and the Humboldt County High School will inspect the property, and file their applications for some of the buildings."

Telegram sent Miss Mildred Bray, superintendent of public instruction, on this date:

AUGUST 5, 1948.

MISS MILDRED BRAY,
Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Carson City, Nev.:

Have your letter re building and equipment desired at the Reno air base for use of University of Nevada and schools in northwestern Nevada, including Reno, Sparks, Carson City, Fernley, Tahoe, Yerington and Pershing and Humboldt County High Schools. Army has made their selections of buildings and equipment to be retained for National Guard and other purposes, complete list of which is going forward to you today by air mail. Presumably remaining buildings and equipment can be released almost immediately.

Advise you make selections of housing and equipment desired by the University and school system of State immediately and forward list to Robert Bradford, Regional Director, War Assets Administration, 1182 Market Street, room 306, San Francisco, Calif.

War Assets Administration advises that almost immediately they can advertise the equipment on your list for sale and that on whatever you bid for such equipment there is a 95-percent reduction—in other words, you will pay 5 percent of the amount of your bid for the housing and equipment on your list which may then be removed or utilized in any way in accordance with your plans.

I realize the school year is starting very soon and if you will keep me advised I will follow it through and there should be no hitch whatever in the proceedings to make all such equipment in addition to that retained for the National Guard available to the schools of the State.

Regards.

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I intend to follow through in this matter, and keep the Senate and the State of Nevada advised of the use and final disposition of Reno Army Air Base.

TEMPORARY REGULATION OF CONSUMER INSTALLMENT CREDIT

The Senate resumed consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to offer an amendment to the pending measure, to be printed and lie upon the table; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, ordered to be printed and lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. REVERCOMB to the House amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide

for the regulation of consumer credit for a temporary period:

At the end of the House amendment insert the following:

"There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

"SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of the present high prices of consumer goods and (2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than January 2, 1949, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

"SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

"SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

"(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 157 contains three provisions. First, it contains a provision which was passed by the Senate nearly a year ago, permitting the reinstallation of consumer-credit controls as they were authorized by Presidential order issued under the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917. That authority is extended until March 15 of next year. The committee has recommended its extension until June 30.

The second provision, which has been eliminated by the committee, would increase the gold reserve requirements against Federal Reserve notes from 25 percent to 40 percent, and the gold-reserve requirements against deposits in Federal Reserve banks from 25 to 35 percent. Those are the percentages which have always been in force until we reduced them approximately 3 years ago, in 1945, when the war was still in progress, to 25 percent. The House amendment proposes to restore them. The Senate committee—I do not know by what vote—proposes to eliminate that increase.

The third provision increases the power of the Federal Reserve bank to require reserves in commercial banks against time deposits and against demand deposits. The House amendment would authorize the Federal Reserve Board to increase those reserves by three percentage points: In the case of central Reserve cities, from 26 to 29 percent; our committee goes on to 31 percent; in the case of Reserve cities, from 20 percent to 23 percent; our committee increases it further to 25 percent; and in the case of country banks generally, from 14 to 17 percent; our committee proposes to increase it two points more, to 19 percent.

Mr. President, this measure deals with the general question of credit and the control of credit by the Government on the theory that the increase in credit which has occurred and which is likely still to occur is one of the causes of inflation. I have discussed at other times the general causes of inflation, but there can be no question that an increase in bank loans and an increase in consumer credit creates additional currency and additional dollars which may be spent, and which go into the market against a supply which is not necessarily increased by that operation.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Did the Senator mention the provision in the House amendment with respect to time deposits? I think he referred to demand deposits in the various percentages.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I did not give the percentages on time deposits. The present requirement as to time deposits is 6 percent. The House increased it to 7 percent, and the Senate committee proposes to increase it to 8 percent.

As to the actual increase in consumer credit, in 1945 the total consumer credit outstanding in the United States was $6,638,000,000. I am reading from pages 96 and 97 of the President's Midyear Economic Report, received last week. By June of 1947, a year ago, it had reached $11,230,000,000; and in June of this year $14,100,000,000, or more than double since 1945, an increase in 1 year of nearly $3,000,000,000.

This measure applies only to installment credit. Installment credit, however, has provided the greater part of the increase. In 1945 installment credit was $2,365,000,000. By June of 1947 it had doubled, increasing to $4,919,000,000; and by June of this year, it had increased to approximately $7,200,000,000, or a total increase of about two and one-fourth billion in 12 months.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator is now discussing the consumer credit provision, which has to do principally with the curtailment or discouragement of installment buying, does it not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. I was about to ask the able Senator if he thought the curtailment of installment buying would materially affect the prices of food, my own thought being that food is not the sort of thing which is generally the subject of installment buying. Installment buying involves to a greater extent things like automobiles, radios, and so forth. Would the consumer credit measure, even if it discourages what might be called consumption or purchase of durable or semidurable consumer goods, materially affect the price of food?

Mr. TAFT. The whole installment credit business affects general prices only as I have suggested; but the fact that there is an increase of $2,250,000,000 in purchasing power has some effect on the entire economy. It is not one of the largest elements in increasing purchasing power, but it does increase it by $2,250,000,000. It is not as important as bank credit, to which I am coming next.

Mr. PEPPER. In my opinion, the observation which I have made is equally applicable to clothing, and other things which are not ordinarily the subject of installment buying.

Mr. TAFT. To some extent the question of prices is a question of particular things; but also there is no question that the steady rise in prices of all kinds in the past 3 years is due to the fact that we have more money than we have supply of goods. We have more demand than there is supply of goods; and to the extent credit is created, we simply add that much more purchasing power out of thin air. Ordinarily we create purchasing power by producing goods and paying money to those who produce them. That is a perfectly normal process, and we get no more purchasing power than we get goods. But when we increase credit, we increase the number of dollars available for purchasing power. Of course, if the Government is running a deficit, that represents an increase. It was the big increase in Government credit—$50,000,000,000 a year increase in debt—which created this problem in the first instance. Now we no longer have that factor, but we do have an increase in consumer credit which, as I have pointed out, is about $2,250,000,000 a year. We have an increase in bank credit, and we have an increase in housing credit. Those things create general purchasing power in excess of the goods produced, and have a general effect in keeping the spiral going up a little all the time—perhaps one-half of 1 percent a month.

Mr. PEPPER. I believe that the national income is now in excess of $200,000,000,000. What I wanted to ask the able Senator was this: Assuming that all the measures embodied in the House amendment should be enacted—if we should increase the gold-reserve requirements, if we should raise the requirements with respect to deposits of various sorts, and if we should impose burdens on installment buying, how much does the able Senator believe that would diminish the national income?

Mr. TAFT. I doubt if it would particularly affect the national income.

Mr. PEPPER. How much would it curtail the purchasing power of the people of the country?

Mr. TAFT. I think it would curtail the purchasing power of the people of the country. There are a good many other causes besides an increase in credit, but that is one cause, and one which it is proposed to restrain.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to have the Senator's opinion as to what would be the relative diminution in the purchasing power of the people if all those measures were enacted.

Mr. TAFT. I have no means whatever of telling the Senator. We have a great many different causes of the general inflation. We have the steady increase in wages, and the Government encouragement of it just after the war. We have the high Government spending. We have the factor for which I criticized the Congress the other day. The Government is competing with the entire construction industry by building Government works. We have high Federal taxes, and we have a stimulation of exports. We are exporting about $8,000,000,000 more goods this year than we import, which obviously also creates an inflationary pressure. I believe that the only way to do is to deal with the various factors one at a time and try to reduce them all. However, each of those programs has great merit, in the opinion of its proponents, and each of them has tremendous popular support. The efforts to restrain them have not been generally successful.

Mr. PEPPER. Was it not inevitable, and is it not now inevitable, that unless by violence we force down the price structure and the wage structure and the entire economy of the country from where it was in wartimes, with the demands which the Marshall plan and our other international obligations impose, with the demands of our defense program and all that is incident to it, we shall have more purchasing power than we have goods; and therefore is it not inevitable that we shall have excessively high prices unless there is some sort of governmental control and restraint upon prices, and upon the other essential factors?

Mr. TAFT. My answer is "No." It is not inevitable, because, as a matter of fact, up to date the Army program and the shipments abroad have been paid for by money taken from the people through taxation. So, while they have an inflationary effect to some extent, I do not think it is a very vital inflationary effect. I think that when credits are created out of thin air, if that is continued in great volume, it probably will bring about a continued rise in prices.

I see no reason why the economy should not be stabilized. We were close to it last year. I think there is some hope that the economy may be stabilized; but I think there is no question that the Federal Reserve Board has power today to restrain the inflationary spiral. I have no objection to giving the Board some additional powers—which is what we propose to do by this measure—at the particular point where today the expansion of total credit creates purchasing power out of thin air.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me ask whether it is a fact that prices rose more or substantially as much after the time when price controls were removed than they did during the war, when controls were in existence.

Mr. TAFT. I think so; I think that is a fact; yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Then, is not the conclusion inescapable that we have in our economy factors which inevitably will force high prices unless there are arbitrary restraints on prices; and can the Senator give us any hope that the price of meat and the price of bread will be substantially reduced by these measures?

Mr. TAFT. I think that by the general situation of which this is part, such prices will be reduced. Already the price of grain is reduced. The price of wheat is reduced a dollar a bushel, as of today; and that is bound to be reflected in the price of bread.

The price of corn is down 75 cents, or about, I think, to the support price. The new crop will come in at the lower price. With that change, I think everyone agrees the price of meat will come down. The price of meat will not reflect that change at once; it is doubtful whether it will reflect it before next year, but I think the price will come down.

Mr. PEPPER. All of us know that the countries that have kept their controls have been the ones that have maintained the most stable price structure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I absolutely deny that we know anything of the kind. In France, where controls were maintained, they became a joke. Everything was sold on the black market, at 3 or 4 times the price that was fixed. There was no stable economy in France. Not only that, but the attempt to maintain the controls reduced production to the point where the French were obliged to ask us to feed the French people out of our surplus.

Mr. PEPPER. I have particularly in mind Canada, in which the situation is analagous to the situation in this country.

To go back to the experience we ourselves have had, it seems to me that so long as the expenditures we are making today must be made, and so long as the Government is not going to reverse its foreign policy and its domestic defense policy, the only way we are going to bring prices down is by forcing them down; and the only way we shall keep them down is by holding them down. If the Senator is not willing to face that necessity, painful as it may be, experience will prove his hopes as erroneous as were his hopes that production would increase and prices would decrease if controls were removed.

Mr. TAFT. I did not make any such statement. I thought that if controls were removed, prices would go up, although I did not think they would go up as much as they have, as the constantly increasing spiral has gone on.

However, there is no question that if we permit controls to continue, there will be no way by which we can escape permanent inflation. Inevitably, as soon as the war came to an end, inflation in the form of black markets, proceeded to break through all the price levels. For instance, 80 percent of the meat was sold on the black market, at the time when controls were removed by President Truman in 1946. I say that inevitably there was an effect, but I think the effect has fairly well worn off. We still have, I think the Board estimates, about $2,000,000,000 worth of our goods to be purchased abroad, and of course that is a cause of inflation, because the result is dollars which come back to the United States to compete for the purchase of our goods. I suppose unquestionably there is still a certain amount of inflation hanging over from the war, in the case of individuals who are able to spend money now which they would not otherwise spend. But inasmuch as net savings are steadily decreasing, the spending of savings cannot be in the amount of a very large sum.

So I feel that we are fairly near a stable condition; and if we curtail some of the governmental programs—we do not have to eliminate them, but if we reduce them to some extent—and if we restrain the use of credit, I think unquestionably there is a very fair hope that we may reach a stability of prices.

The moment we propose to cut any of these programs, immediately some very plausible arguments are presented to show that if we do so, we shall have a depression. No sooner do we say that we should restrain credit in order to prevent inflation, than some one says, "If you do that, you will have deflation." Certainly if there is to be a balance, some steps must be taken.

It is claimed that if Government bonds are permitted to reach their normal price on the market, the moment that is permitted to happen, depression will be started.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have been following the Senator's presentation with much interest, and I should like to ask him a question, purely for information, because it relates to a matter which I did not clearly understand as the Senator presented it.

In his discussion of the portion of this measure which relates to the control of bank credits, I did not clearly understand whether that portion of the measure will apply to or is designed to apply solely to member banks of the Federal Reserve System, or, instead, to apply to all banks. Will the Senator enlighten me on that point?

Mr. TAFT. I was just coming to the question of bank reserves or, rather, the increase of bank loans. The increase of bank loans has been as follows, according to the table appearing in the President's economic report.

In December 1945 bank loans were $26,100,000,000.

A year later, in December 1946, they were $31,100,000,000, or an increase of $5,000,000,000.

In December 1947 they were $38,100,000,000, or an increase of $7,000,000,000 during that year.

At the same time there was an increase of about $1,000,000,000 in other securities, which in some ways, from an inflation standpoint, other than Government bonds, may be looked upon as a further inflation of credit.

In June 1948, bank loans had only increased to $39,700,000,000, or $1,600,000,000 in the last 6 months. There are signs, however, that they are increasing again. The seasonal effect was somewhat less at that time, and I think also the general payment of the Government debt in such large amounts had some effect on that increase.

The proposal in the bill is to give the Federal Reserve Board power to increase reserves on member banks only. The Federal Reserve Board, I think, recommended an increase of 10 points in the case of all bank reserves, of all demand deposits, which was in fact an increase of 50 percent, and, in the ordinary city, from 20 percent to 30 percent. There was very wide protest from the banks. Such an increase, if applied overnight, would unquestionably require the calling of loans, and the stopping of all new loans. I think no member of the Board was willing to say how much the Board would increase reserves. The best opinion is that during the next 6 months they may possibly increase the reserves not more than 2 percent, or two points.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I would rather finish, if I may. The House fixed it at three points, which they felt would give the Federal Reserve Board power to increase the reserves as much as anybody has even suggested they should be increased, until 6 months from this time, when Congress will be back in session, if they want further power. The moment bank reserves are increased, under present conditions, the banks simply turn around and sell Government bonds to the Federal Reserve bank and replenish their reserves. It is not a very effective weapon at best, but I think it can be used with the other powers.

The best opinion today certainly is that if the Federal Reserve Board really wants to restrain bank credit, it can raise the interest rate on short-term Government bonds, and in effect let short-term Government bonds go below par. It does not make much difference, of course, because they are paid within a year anyway, and we cannot go very far wrong, by increasing the interest rate on Government bonds. I understand that many members of the Federal Reserve Board itself think that the rate could be increased from 1½ percent. It has been increased from seven-eighths percent to 1⅛, to 1½. In fact the most the Federal Reserve could do would be to help the Treasury of the United States keep the interest rate down, to avoid what is clearly an inflationary element.

I think there is some feeling about the matter. All last year there was a difference between them as to whether they really wanted to restrain the inflation in bank credit or whether they did not. They have now more or less agreed, the Treasury going along at least with this particular increase in reserves. Whether they are yet willing to permit the increase of interest on short-term Governments, I do not know. If that is accompanied by an increase in the rediscount rate, it will have a substantial effect.

They say "We also want the power to increase reserves." If they want that power also, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to give them as much as there is any possibility or likelihood of their being able to use during the next 6 months; and that is what this bill does.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I recall hearing the able Senator from Ohio a few days ago making some comment about the President not having exercised, not "legal" but some sort of persuasive authority he has over the Federal Reserve Board, to cause them to take action to restrict the economy, so as to tend toward lower prices. Here, when the matter is one of giving effective and decisive power perhaps to the Federal Reserve Board, our sister party leaves out a great part of the banking structure of the country, and does not include it at all, so that the Government through the Federal Reserve Board would have no power to affect them. In the second place, when they ask the 10-point authority, the Congress presumes to say, "No, you could exercise only 3 points, and therefore we are not going to give you authority to exercise restraint beyond 3 points." If Senators really want the Federal Reserve Board to restrict the economy so as to tend toward lower prices, why do they not give them power to act?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have already some days ago suggested that the President had some persuasive power with the Federal Reserve Board. I have extended that statement today to say that not only has he persuasive power, and not only has he failed to exercise it, but he has exercised his power through the Secretary of the Treasury, whom he controls, to prevent the Reserve Board from exercising the power of increasing the interest rate on short-term Governments, to the point at which it will really act as a restraint on the increase of bank credit.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Ohio will yield, does he propose legislation to curb that, if it is a wrong?

Mr. TAFT. That is a matter that must be left to discretion. It is impossible for us to say, "the interest rate on short-term Governments shall be 1⅛ or 1⅜ or 1½." We cannot do that here. We must entrust somebody with power to do it.

So far as the increase in reserves is concerned, I think, used in connection with other powers, it can be useful to the Federal Reserve System. It certainly shows our desire to indicate to the banks that we think credit should be restrained. We are granting more power in order to restrain it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I should like to say one thing further.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. I shall wait. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to answer some more of the Senator's questions. He asks so many at one time it is a little difficult to handle them.

The Senator has asked why we leave out the nonmember banks. Of course, in the first instance, when the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury came in with this bill, and when the distinguished Senator from Kentucky introduced his bill, they left out the nonmember banks. That was their policy. Subsequently, I understand, by a very close vote the Federal Reserve Board overturned that policy, and came down with a new recommendation that nonmember banks be included. I fully agree that if we took the Federal Reserve Board's recommendation of making an increase of 10 points, we could not do it without including nonmember banks. The discrimination would be so great that actually many banks would be driven out of the Federal Reserve System.

One reason why I think the committee has made a mistake in increasing it five points instead of three, which was in the House bill, is that it tends to discriminate more against the member banks. If it is confined to three points, and if it is temporary, as it is, I do not think any member bank is going to leave the Federal Reserve System, simply because of the temporary enactment of a three-point increase in reserves. But even with the five, I think it is doubtful.

On the question of whether the nonmember banks should be included, there is first the constitutional problem of whether that can be done. In the second place, there would be an intense feeling on the part of member banks and of many State banks that every bank in the country should not be forced into the Federal Reserve System and under Federal control. There is a very strong feeling along that line. We have debated that subject in the Senate. It would produce very bitter and determined controversy if we tried to do it. It seemed to me the House was right in saying, "We will not try to do it at this time. This is only a temporary measure. We ought not to consider a substantial change in the whole banking structure of the country, in a temporary measure. If we are finally to undertake to increase reserves, then we can consider it at that time. We do not think we had better require more than three points of the member banks because we do not want to drive member banks out of the Federal Reserve System."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not want to be captious in this criticism, but I believe experience will prove the justification of the criticism which I am about to make of the program of the majority. All these things are in the right direction. Every one of the suggestions is a good one, but, so far as results are concerned, I predict that it will be another example of too little and too late. If we are to face this problem at all—and the Senator says we do not want to exert controls again, which I myself think we shall have to do if we are to accomplish anything effective—certainly we should let some agency, such as the Federal Reserve Board, have great power

to regulate our economy in such a way that gradually prices can be forced down. When we get to that question, what do we do? We deal with half of the banks, on the ground that the others are State banks, and then when the Federal Reserve Board requests 10 points authority to use to psychological advantage, we cut them to 3.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Florida says "half the banks"——

Mr. PEPPER. Nearly half.

Mr. TAFT. However, the loans of a nonmember bank are only 15 percent of the total. Not only that, but they are scattered in places where they do not much affect the general tone, so to speak. Therefore it is not a very material factor. We can leave out that 15 percent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have received several communications from banks in Boston which raise two questions regarding which I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have been asked whether votes will be had on these amendments tonight, and how long the session will last tonight. So long as we are debating this measure we should continue in session and have all the debate we can have today. I have consulted with the minority leader and those interested in the legislation, and I am wondering if the Senate would now be ready to consider a proposal to vote on the measure now before the Senate and all amendments to it at the hour of 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. If it meets with the approval of the distinguished minority leader, there might be an equal division of the time tomorrow from 2 o'clock until 4 o'clock, divided equally between the proponents and opponents, with the idea that the Senate will convene at 11 o'clock in the morning, rather than at noon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before that request is made, in view of the fact that a considerable number of Senators are not on the floor, I think we should have a quorum call. I have no personal objection to the fixing of the time. I would want to discuss further the question of a division of the time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of a quorum call?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brooks	Connally
Baldwin	Buck	Cooper
Ball	Butler	Cordon
Barkley	Byrd	Donnell
Brewster	Cain	Dworshak
Bricker	Capehart	Eastland
Bridges	Capper	Ecton
Ellender	Lodge	Robertson, Wyo.
Feazel	Lucas	Russell
Ferguson	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Flanders	McClellan	Smith
Fulbright	McFarland	Sparkman
Green	McGrath	Stennis
Gurney	McKellar	Taft
Hatch	McMahon	Taylor
Hawkes	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Hickenlooper	Martin	Thye
Hill	Millikin	Tobey
Hoey	Moore	Tydings
Holland	Morse	Umstead
Ives	Murray	Vandenberg
Jenner	Myers	Watkins
Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor	Wherry
Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Kem	Pepper	Williams
Kilgore	Reed	Wilson
Knowland	Revercomb	Young
Langer	Robertson, Va.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, now that the quorum has been developed, I propose a unanimous-consent agreement to the Senate, as follows:

Ordered, that on the calendar day of Saturday, August 7, 1948, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon any amendment that may be pending and upon any amendment that may be proposed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 157; that no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of said joint resolution shall be received. Ordered further, that on the said day of August 7, the time between 1 o'clock—

And I am inserting this at the suggestion of the minority leader—

and 4 o'clock be equally divided between the proponents of the committee amendments and the opponents thereof, and controlled respectively by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] for the proponents and the distinguished minority leader the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] for the opponents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, would the Senator mind inserting a proviso to this effect, "*Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent a vote on the committee amendments prior to 1 o'clock?" I think it possible if we can vote on matters which are not controversial before 1 o'clock it might be desirable to get them out of the way.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to disposing of them. They would be automatically considered first, anyway.

Mr. TAFT. If we do not reach a vote on them by 1 o'clock, they will be acted on under the agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; I add that to the proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be authorized the printing of Senate Joint Resolution 157 with the House amendments, showing the amendments of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk, to the joint resolution, to be inserted at the proper place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it desired to have the amendment read?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I want it printed, and to lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment which I offer is the bill which I introduced a few days ago minus titles 1 and 2. Titles 1 and 2 deal with the Federal Reserve question and consumer controls, which are embodied in the report of the committee.

Title 3 of the bill deals with prices and wages. I have introduced that as it is in the joint resolution, with the exception that I have changed the date for the level of prices from November 1947 to August 1, 1948, which eliminates the so-called roll-back, and provides a standard and level of wages which will be applicable as of August 1948.

Title 4 of the bill deals with priorities and allocations in the same manner as contained in the bill.

Title 5 is the title dealing with rent control.

Title 6 deals with the regulation of commodity exchanges, which has been before the Senate heretofore.

Title 7 is a miscellaneous title defining the President's duty in regard to the proposed legislation.

I do not care to discuss the amendment further, I desired only to call attention to these titles.

I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That order has heretofore been made.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Ohio, if he will be so kind, tell us what the distinction will be in the method of treatment of the member banks and the nonmember banks.

Mr. TAFT. Under the House measure there is an increase of 3 points in the reserve requirement, or the power of the Federal Reserve to impose requirements on commercial banks which are member banks, and there is no power over nonmember banks. Our committee increased that from 3 points to 5 points, but put in no provision about nonmember banks. So that as the measure is today, it deals with member banks and not with nonmember banks.

The Federal Government has never prescribed or claimed the power to prescribe, up to this time, at least, the reserves of nonmember banks.

Mr. LANGER. How would the rediscount rates be affected?

Mr. TAFT. The rediscount rates would not be affected. They are within the discretion of the Federal Reserve Board to an unlimited degree.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator two questions which are based on information I have received from bankers in Boston concerning the possibilities of administrative action helping to solve the problem of inflation which faces us without the enactment of legislation.

My first question is, Is not the present rediscount rate one of the lowest in the history of the Federal Reserve System, and could not that properly be raised, and thus help to take out of circulation a certain amount of currency, which is a desirable thing to do?

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is correct; I believe the rediscount rate is probably lower than it has ever been, and it has not been increased. If it were raised, it would have the effect of restraining the increase of banking credit.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is now about one-half of 1 percent, is it not?

Mr. TAFT. That is what I understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And that is lower than it was at any time during the war period, is it not?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. I do not know about it being lower, but it is as low.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My other question is this: At the present time the Federal Reserve supports the Government bond market. That was perfectly proper during the war period. We all agree that that is a very difficult matter to regulate, and to regulate correctly.

I understand that at the present time the Federal Reserve holds $22,000,000,000 of short-term Government bonds. Would it not be helpful if the interest rate were very gradually changed in order to have a somewhat freer market in Government bonds, thus helping, we may say, the insurance-policy holder, thus helping institutions and businesses to sell their bonds on the market, thus encouraging business, encouraging production, and bringing about a freer exchange of Government securities between banks and the Federal Reserve System, rather than forcing them always to sell their bonds to the Federal Reserve, because there is no other market at the price?

Mr. TAFT. Broadly speaking, I should say that I agree with the Senator. The interest rate on short-term Governments was seven-eighths of 1 percent at the end of the war. That rate has been advanced by the Federal Reserve Board to 1⅛ percent. It is the general opinion, I think, that it should be raised to 1½ percent on short-term Governments without affecting the 2½ percent rate on long-term Governments.

Ordinarily when the officials speak of holding Government bonds at par, they mean holding the long-term 2½'s at par. That interest rate of course affects other interest rates. There have been times in the past when the short-term rate was higher than the long-term rate. Today I believe we could raise the short-term rate to 1½ percent without endangering the holding of the 2½-percent rate. That would be an important factor in restraining bank credit. That and the raising of the rediscount rate and the increase in the reserves could all be used together to do that if the Government wanted to do it.

As I have pointed out, however, it is perfectly apparent that although the Federal Reserve Board wants to do something in that direction, the Secretary of the Treasury has insisted on holding down the interest rate on short-term paper.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. These are all steps, are they not, that can be taken by administrative or Executive action without legislation being required?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. The legislation is only supplemental. I think practically everything can be done without it that can be done with it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I received an inquiry from a company in Connecticut which manufactures building material. Its inquiry is whether or not there is anything in the measure which interferes by imposing credit controls upon the purchases of building materials for repair and maintenance. As I have read the measure I cannot see that it does. I think it is entirely up to those who administer the law and the Federal Housing Administration. Am I correct in that supposition?

Mr. TAFT. The limitations contained in the measure mean that the controls under section 1 can only be exercised on what is called consumer credit. So the sale must be in the first instance to the ultimate consumer.

In the second place it is only a limitation on installment credit. I do not know what the terms of Executive Order 843 are; whether it is limited or not; but I do not think it applies to building materials, if that is what the Senator wants to know.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in connection, therefore, with the banking reserves, and because I do not think it is wise to start to try to impose controls at the present moment on nonmember banks and becoming involved in a long dispute on that subject, I think it would be better to accept the House rate rather than to increase it. I would be willing to put down a large wager that the full amount of the House rate will not be used by the Federal Reserve bank before the 31st of next March or the 30th of next June, and I think it is a mistake to give more power than is actually required.

The other amendment which the committee has presented deals with striking out the proposal to increase the reserves of Federal Reserve banks. I think that is an interesting question which should at least be discussed by the Senate. I might start the discussion by reading an editorial published in this morning's Wall Street Journal, as follows:

INFLATION'S CAUSE

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder repeats his opposition to the proposed legislation to restore to 40 percent the gold reserve behind Federal Reserve notes. The present requirement is 25 percent.

Mr. Snyder is quoted as saying this is not the proper time to make such an adjustment because "we need the extra margin in our debt management program."

If there were 40 cents in gold behind each dollar of Federal Reserve currency, it would be possible, at the present level of reserve gold holdings, to issue about $14,500,000,000 in additional currency.

But the Secretary of the Treasury says that this may not be enough margin. We think this is a fair question: Does he contemplate a situation where the present inflated currency supply may be further inflated to an extent greater than $14,500,000,000?

Representative PATMAN, of Texas, is more specific. He thinks that the President should veto a bill with the 40-percent-gold-coverage provision, because it would "cripple, if not end, the efforts of the open-market committee to support the Government bond market and will increase interest rates."

So quite obviously Representative PATMAN contemplates a situation where Government evidences of debt may be monetized through the central bank to an extent much greater than $14,500,000,000.

Stripped of all technical financial verbiage, the objections to raising the gold reserve behind the currency boil down to this:

There cannot be even a remote check on the power of the Government to engage in an operation which is equivalent to printing money.

So long as that attitude prevails, there will be no effectual check on the growth in the money supply and so long as that is not checked, the pressure created will force prices and wages upward.

The rates to which we are proposing to return were in effect ever since the beginning of the Federal Reserve System up until 3 years ago, and we, including myself, were persuaded by Mr. Eccles that they should be reduced to 25 percent. Mr. Eccles took the position very frankly that in his opinion we do not need any gold reserve at all. He does not believe in gold reserves. He thinks paper currency is sufficient. But he said that as a concession to prejudice he was willing to have a 25-percent reserve. During the war a situation was brought about due to the fact that we had been losing our gold. We had lost about $2,000,000,000. We were in the middle of the war. We were confronted with the necessity of being able to do more financing at any moment in the interest of national defense. The gold reserve had slipped away until we had come to the point where if the loss had continued at the same rate there would have been no possibility of continuing to issue Government bonds to pay the war deficit. We would not have been able to do so if for 6 or 12 months more the gold had continued to slip away. So we reduced the rate. Moreover, after the end of the European war, before the Japanese war had ended, there was a general fear of a depression after the war. That was the objection by the Government economists with which we were faced. That was an inflationary move. I think it is a deflationary move to take the opposite step. Many people feel that we would be better off if we returned to a gold standard, if we were to pay out gold coin on Federal Reserve notes when they are presented. I think that is a perfectly possible system to consider. I myself have never been quite willing to say I would go that far, but certainly that is something which ought to be settled.

As I see it, a larger gold reserve does not have any immediate effect. The

Federal Reserve banks today have 51 percent in gold against their notes and Federal Reserve deposits. But it certainly sets up a red light a little closer than it is today against a further expansion of the Federal Reserve System and the issue of more and more Federal Reserve notes, which might be brought about if they had to buy very large quantities of Government bonds. So we could change the system back if it appeared at any time that we ought to do so.

On the whole I believe it is wise to return to a gold standard. I think it would indicate our desire very clearly that we want to stand as far as we can on a gold basis, on the kind of a gold basis at least that we have today, and I should be inclined to vote for the House provision and to oppose the committee proposal. However, I think that is up to the Senate to decide. Whatever the Senate does, the effect will be more psychological than it will be actual during the next few months. Whether the action is taken or not, I believe its effect would be more psychological than otherwise. Yet inflation is usually a psychological matter. Therefore, I believe it is desirable to retain the House provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio know that the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Mr. Sproul, testified before the committee against the 40-percent reserve?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and so did Mr. Eccles, and so did Mr. McCabe. The Federal Reserve banks are like everyone else; they want to restrain everyone else's power but they do not want any restraint placed upon their own powers. The only witnesses before the committee who were against the proposal were members of the Federal Reserve Board or of the Federal Reserve System.

What I should like to suggest is that the Senate study the matter, think it over this evening, and discuss the question somewhat further tomorrow, and perhaps take a vote on it. I do not think it absolutely vital; yet I think it is, on the whole, a very wise step to take in an inflationary situation such as we have today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to read a bit of testimony offered by Mr. Sproul, because he quoted from the statement of the Senator from Ohio when the reserve was reduced to 25 percent. I do this merely because I think the Senator's suggestion that the question be given consideration is a wise one.

Mr. TAFT. I may say to the Senator that I have all my remarks before me. I supported the 25-percent reduction at the time. Under the same conditions which existed then I would support it today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I felt sure that would be the attitude of the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. In a deflationary situation I would probably support it again; but I believe that under the conditions today the action proposed is justified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to read a portion of Mr. Sproul's testimony:

> I can do no better than to quote from a speech made by Senator TAFT at the time the present reduced requirement for Federal Reserve banks was adopted by the Congress in 1945. He said when the bill was before the Senate in April of that year:
>
> "I cannot understand why a 25-percent gold-reserve requirement is not a sufficient one for the currency of our country. I think 25 percent as a gold reserve is adequate. I cannot conceive that gold would be demanded in anything like the amount of 25 percent. If there were any such tremendous rush it would swamp 40 percent just as much as it would swamp 25 percent. I do not see the necessity for a 40-percent reserve, but I do see great danger involved in constantly agitating as to what the reserve should be."

Then Mr. Sproul continued:

> I think that was good advice when Senator TAFT gave it, and I think it is good advice now. Our people are not afraid of the dollar. They are gravely concerned about rising prices, but they are not rushing to get out of currency and into things, as people do when there is a run-away inflation. Those who risk creating such fears about our currency, no matter how devious the approach, are performing a real disservice.

I might add that my own view about this matter is influenced largely by the effect which increasing the gold reserve would have upon the open-market operations. I feel that the Senate should not risk hampering in any way the power of the Government to support Government bonds. I think if we risk that power we shall be playing with fire.

I merely wish to content myself with expressing the hope that the committee amendment will be sustained. I think it was a very sound and wise act on the part of the committee to recommend the elimination of the House provision.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what I was anxious to bring home at that time and today is that the reduction in the reserve did not in any way invalidate the notes. A 25-percent gold reserve is sufficient so far as credit to support the Government notes which are outstanding is concerned. I thought the action we were taking then should not be taken as in any way indicating that the currency was weaker. I do not think it is. I do not think we are making it any stronger in this way. It is rather the effect on the Federal Reserve banks of saying to them, "There is a limit beyond which you cannot buy Government bonds and monetize the debt." Today, with a reserve of 25 percent, $30,000,000,000 or so can be bought. If the rate is increased to 40 percent the buying would be limited to about $14,000,000,000. After they have bought about $8,000,000,000 more and are getting anywhere near that limit, we ought to reexamine the question.

So in a way we are merely setting up a red light of danger. If we get somewhere near the point where the Federal Reserve bank open-market committee is limited in its power to buy Government bonds, we ought to take a look at the situation. It is a long way off. I do not know how much more they could buy under present conditions—perhaps $30,000,000,000 or so. I think it is just as well to have the red light a little closer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will pardon me, I think he is not taking a look at the situation. On the contrary, he is acting without looking.

The point of the matter is that the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department are now studying this very point. I agree with the Senator. I doubt very much whether there will be any demand for Government bond purchases involving anything like $14,000,000,000, but that is precisely the reason why I feel that we should not undertake at this moment to jump from 25 percent to 40 percent, because that would be doing precisely what the Senator from Ohio warned against in April 1945. It would be tampering with the base and arousing fears that something was wrong with the currency.

THE INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish briefly to complete the record in respect to another matter which was submitted to the Congress by the President in connection with this special session. I refer to the International Wheat Agreement, in which many Senators have expressed a very earnest and intimate interest, and in which I know there is a very widespread public concern.

The subject came to the attention of the special session in a paragraph in the President's message, from which I read:

> The international wheat agreement is another vital measure on which the Congress should act. This agreement is designed to insure stability in the world wheat market in the years ahead when wheat will be more plentiful. It would guarantee American farmers an export market of 185,000,000 bushels of wheat at a fair price during each of the next 5 years. Since the agreement is in the form of a treaty it requires only ratification by the Senate. Although this agreement should have been ratified by July 1 of this year, we have good reason to believe that it can still be made effective if it is now ratified promptly.

The day after the Chief Executive had delivered his message to the Congress the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations resumed its labors in consideration of the International Wheat Agreement and the new concepts upon which it is based. As a result of continuous study the committee has come to a unanimous conclusion. I am happy to submit another in the long line of committee reports by the score of 13 to 0. The committee has come to a unanimous conclusion which undertakes to do two things: First, to recognize the great importance of fully exploring this new concept, the principle of surplus agricultural marketing by international agreement. Second, to assure time for its careful and prudent study.

Our problem has been to find a meeting of minds to resolve these two objectives. I am happy to say that we have unanimously done so, and I wish to read the very brief, three-paragraph report which the committee instructs me to

submit to the Senate in returning Executive F of the Eightieth Congress, Executive Session, to the Senate for the Executive Calendar. The official statement of the committee is as follows:

[Ex. Rept. No. 12]

REPORT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reports the international wheat agreement to the Senate Executive Calendar because of the committee's earnest belief that the principle of surplus marketing by international agreement is sound and because it wishes to encourage this objective. It will not ask for Senate consideration until early in the next Congress because of contingent factors which make it impossible, as it is also unnecessary, to apply the agreement to this year's wheat crop, and because these factors can more wisely and safely be resolved at that time.

One of these factors involves resignature to the agreement by other countries which have withdrawn since July 1 and which are necessary in order to make the agreement effective. Another involves the necessity for implementing the treaty with general legislation to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to finance these export deficits when they occur. There are other factors which the committee believes can be helpfully explored in the interim to create a better domestic understanding of the issue and the widest possible degree of agreement upon the treaty.

The committee regrets that it was physically impossible to complete work on the treaty at the recent regular session in the relatively few weeks available for this purpose. In view of its novelty and its complications and its controversies, there was no chance to reach a responsible finality. These complications increased in the brief recess preceding the present special session. But so also did the conviction that a useful principle is involved. So also did the committee's desire to revive the treaty and keep it open for ratification or renegotiation.

Mr. President, that completes the official statement of the committee; and I ask unanimous consent to file it as a report with the treaty, requesting that the treaty go to the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the matter a little further, so that Senators can be fully informed upon the problems involved, because I know of the very deep interest which exists in the country in connection with this subject.

On the one hand, we have the great farm organizations earnestly, unitedly, enthusiastically, and insistently asking for ratification of the treaty because of the belief that through a new concept of international surplus contracts it may be possible to anticipate the disposition of future agricultural surpluses. On the other hand, there is an equally insistent viewpoint in the country which disbelieves in the treaty, challenges the concept, and earnestly opposes ratification of the treaty. There are somewhat similar differences of opinion regarding details in the committee itself. Somewhere between those two schools of thought, lies the correct answer.

The committee itself, differing among its members, I repeat, in respect to some phases of the problem, has concluded that the wise and sensible and constructive thing to do is to bring the treaty back to the Senate for the Executive Calendar, so that it remains alive, so that it is available for future consideration, subject at that time, of course, to amendment or reservation, as the situation may ultimately recommend, but, while bringing it to the Executive Calendar, to take it definitely out of current consideration, and put it into the next session of Congress.

Mr. President, I wish Senators to know precisely why this postponement seems to be advisable; and certainly it is most earnestly supported by the chairman of the committee and, I am happy to say, unanimously agreed to by the committee itself. We confronted a peculiar situation in connection with this International Wheat Treaty. It did not reach Congress until April 30, 1948. In other words, we had only 4 or 5 totally inadequate weeks in the regular session in which to deal with it. It was immediately sent to a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. The subcommittee held extensive hearings on May 14, 15, and 17, and made every effort to complete at least a preliminary record, to see if it were possible to conclude action before the adjournment of the last session of Congress. It became entirely impossible to give this new export subsidy device adequate study and analysis within the time available; and when the subcommittee reported to the full committee that it was felt that it was impossible to proceed to ratification in the regular session, it was the agreement of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, without dissent, that that was the case. In my view, there could have been no other responsible verdict at that time.

Unfortunately, however, under the terms of the treaty the time of primary signature lapsed on July 1, 1948. Therefore, the net result of the situation in which we found ourselves was that when the special session met, we were technically beyond the deadline for signature.

Since July 1, 1948, when the signatures closed for the time being, five countries withdrew from the International Wheat Council, which is the administrative body under the International Wheat Agreement. Those five countries are the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, and Denmark. They withdrew undoubtedly because of the fact that the United States had not adhered; and obviously the utility of an International Wheat Agreement without the presence of the United States was next to nothing.

I may say parenthetically that one of the original complaints against the agreement—a complaint which still is good—was the fact that it did not—and does not—include the Argentine and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, two of the great wheat producers of the world. But when these other signatories withdrew after July 1, that left as the only signatories the following six countries: Austria, Canada, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, India, and Sweden. Of course, it would be completely futile to discuss an international wheat agreement which could not have any effectiveness whatever if it included only those six countries.

That is the technical form in which the treaty came to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during this special session, for consideration and ratification. Obviously, with only two of the world's great wheat producers—to wit, Canada and the United States—in the international compact, there would be no possible hope for an effective and a conclusive operation. Yet those who so deeply believe in this new concept felt that if there was some way to keep the interest, some way to register the fact that there was still some substantial life in the official interest of the Government of the United States in this new concept of handling export market surpluses by anticipation, it would be well worth while; and it was felt that if the United States indicated the continuation of its interest beyond the deadline, even though the deadline had been passed, that would become an effective inspiration to the countries which had withdrawn to renew their interest.

The official, textual possibility of reactivating the treaty, despite the deadline, was indicated by a resolution of the International Wheat Council on July 6, which suggested that despite the mortality on July 1, the agreement should be kept alive, looking toward the renegotiation of a new agreement effective August 1, 1949.

Therefore, in connection with the international wheat agreement, the committee confronted a situation which really defies conclusive action at the present time, but not primarily because of any hasty adjournment of this session of the Congress, in fact, substantially unrelated to that subject, because the reasons why effective action on the international wheat agreement is impossible at the present moment are of an entirely different character; and I have indicated one, namely, the fact that at the present time the prospective membership of this international wheat agreement is in flux and in doubt and has to be resolved so that we may know who our associates are, before we undertake to conclude with finality any such agreement.

Then there was a second problem involved, and there still is, which could not be resolved at the immediate moment. Those who are familiar with the international wheat agreement will realize that it involves a prospective 5-year contract for the export, sale, and distribution of 185,000,000 bushels of American wheat per annum between fixed floors and ceilings of prices. Without going into the highly technical and often controversial features of the method in which the formula works, because that is one of the things which still needs effective exploration, I suggest to the Senate that the thing of basic importance that I now bring to its attention is that in the event the Government of the United States were required to furnish wheat abroad under the agreement at a time when the international contractual price is lower than the support price of wheat in the United States, it would be necessary for

the Treasury of the United States by way of subsidy to American farmers to equalize the difference between the minimum contract price in the wheat agreement and the support price at home.

These subsidies in prospect have been variously estimated between $50,000,000 a year and $150,000,000 a year. In any event it was and is the purpose to pay them from the Commodity Credit Corporation, in line with the general activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation in that field of action. But this is a totally new subsidy. I do not mean that the Commodity Credit Corporation has not frequently been used to pay export subsidies; I mean that there never has been a contractual international export subsidy of the character here involved. It is because it is a new device, a very great novelty, that the committee, among other reasons, has felt that the agreement ought to have even greater and more careful consideration before there is any ultimate and final conclusion in respect to the congressional decision.

In order to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the new type of subsidy, the State Department and the Agricultural Department sent down draft legislation for an implementing statute to be passed by both Houses of Congress as a supplement to the ratification of the international agreement. Obviously that was the correct course to follow, because obviously the House of Representatives is entitled to voice in connection with any decision in respect to new uses of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The only alternative method of reaching the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation under the international wheat agreement, if subsidies be required, the only alternative method in the absence of this new implementing legislation, the only method would be to stretch the existing general powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation, powers that were defined and written long before this new international concept had ever arisen. It would be necessary to stretch those general powers to cover the payment of the new subsidies, if, as and when they should accrue.

It was the opinion of the committee, and I must say it was the very deep conviction of the chairman of the committee, that it would be highly improper to arrange a new subsidy project of this kind and to provide this entirely new concept of international surplus disposal, involving deficit liabilities chargeable to the Commodity Credit Corporation, that it would be entirely improper to launch this new obligation against the American taxpayers without definite and explicit statutory authority from the Congress of the United States. Everybody agrees that this would be impossible at the present time. The reason is unrelated to the current expiration of the present special session. It is the second reason—among others including serious question about some of the escape clauses which might neutralize the values to our wheat exports—why the committee has concluded that it is infinitely better from the standpoint of sound legislative process as well as from the viewpoint of the best interests of an ultimate wheat agreement itself, it is best to postpone the final decision until the next session of the Congress, when the International Wheat Agreement, under the plan submitted in the committee's report, will become one of the first orders of business. It will then be open to amendment and reservation, as the developments in the interim may dictate, if such be the case.

The nub of it all then is that we feel in this fashion we have been fully fair to the freest, unbiased chance for the evolution of this great concept in which organized agriculture is so desperately and so rightly interested, and yet fair with the responsibilities of the Senate in respect to fundamental legislation of this character particularly in respect to the fiscal obligations that may be involved.

For myself, I want to say I think this is the happiest possible conclusion that could have been found with respect to a desperately complicated matter, which has held the attention of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee continuously for the past 10 days, in quest of a meeting of minds which could accomplish the greatest good to the greatest number, and I am very glad to have been able to file the committee report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have listened to most of what the Senator from Michigan has said. I came in while he was speaking. I, personally, and I am sure a good many other members of the committee, regret very much that the committee and the Senate were not able to complete ratification of the treaty at this time. As a matter of fact I feel we could have ratified it, if the committee and the Senate had more time in which to act. All the large farm organizations are strongly supporting the measure—the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers Union, and, I assume, some of the smaller organizations.

The treaty was designed to assure the American farmer an export outlet for wheat in periods of surplus, at a guaranteed price; that is, at a price guaranteed within certain limits. It, of course, involves obligations on our part as well as obligations on the part of foreign countries that are recipients or importers of wheat.

The Senator from Michigan spoke about the necessity of implementing legislation. That, of course, is necessary, but before there can be implementing legislation there must be a treaty. We must first ratify the treaty. As a matter of fact it was made clear in the hearings by representatives of the Department of Agriculture that by the general law under which the Commodity Credit Corporation now operates they could get along for a limited period without implementing legislation.

On the whole, the committee decided it was impractical to take up the treaty and undertake to ratify it at the present session of the Senate. The committee has filed a report. I have not read it, but I am sure it conforms to what has been said. It is our hope that at the next session of the Congress the first item on the calendar of the Committee on Foreign Relations will be the International Wheat Agreement, and that we shall be able to work it out in such a fashion as to meet the objectives which we have had in mind for several years, and which have been discussed at one or two international conferences.

I think it is a fine conception. Of course, no plan is exactly perfect. All of the joints are not greased at the proper time and all of the gadgets are not adjusted, but we think, on the whole, it is a splendid plan for the disposition of American surplus wheat in time of overproduction at home. It would afford foreign countries some assurance that they could get wheat when they are in dire need of it.

The committee has worked diligently on the matter. The report was not delivered to the Senate until toward the last of April. The committee has given very careful attention to the subject. It has had a very able subcommittee working on it for a long period, holding rather full hearings. So the committee has not been in the slightest degree neglecting its duties with respect to the matter. If we had more time at the present session we could probably dispose of the question to the satisfaction of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BUTLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield? If so, to whom?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not want to lose the opportunity to say a word, in addition to what has been said by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in regard to this treaty. I wish, first, to express my profound regret that it has been impossible to ratify the treaty and make it effective in connection with the wheat crop of 1948. Whether it could have been ratified within such time is now a moot question and is water over the dam.

The subject is one which has been under discussion and negotiation between our Government and other governments for a long period of time. The treaty was brought to Washington and signatures were begun on it, I think, on the 6th day of March 1948. By the first of April the signatures had been obtained to the document, it was submitted to the Senate by the President on, I think, the 3d of April, and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. A subcommittee of that committee held hearings for 3 days on the matter, around the middle of May. There were some serious problems facing the subcommittee which no doubt caused it to delay reporting to the full committee. The result was that the regular session went by without any action on the part of the committee. I suppose it is not unfair to say that if the President had not included it in his message to the special session, the Senate would not now have the committee's report. The committee probably would not have taken the matter up for consideration at all during this special session. So the President's recommendation that the Senate consider the treaty and ratify it has at least accomplished the report of the treaty to the Senate, with the explanation made by the chairman of the committee, the

Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Mr. President, I was one of those who were ready to vote for the treaty to be reported without reservation for immediate ratification. It is unfortunate that the time limit—it is not really a time limit except in the technical sense, so far as the 1948 wheat crop is concerned—which was set as July 1, elapsed without our ratification. Due to that fact other countries withdrew because it was obvious that without any ratification during this year the treaty could not become effective for the wheat crop of 1948 and that whatever happened in regard to it hereafter could only apply to future crops, thus making it a 4-year agreement instead of a 5-year agreement, eliminating the 1948 crop.

I think it is an advantageous agreement to the wheat growers of the United States. I realize the anxiety of the chairman of the committee to bring in a unanimous report. Regardless of its contents, in a sense, even though admittedly postponing consideration of the treaty to the next session of the Congress, it does hold out the hope to the nations which have withdrawn and which withdrew because of our failure to ratify, that they may still re-adhere and come back into the fold, and if the treaty is ratified it can take effect for the 1949 crop and subsequent crops.

Although I agree that it is always desirable for the Committee on Foreign Relations to have unanimity, this treaty stands on a little different basis from that of the ordinary treaty involving foreign relations. It is not a foreign-relations matter; it does not necessarily involve our foreign policy. It is an agreement with respect to a market for wheat, a domestic problem, affording a market for American-grown wheat at a price fixed for a period of 5 years. It is not an absolute, irrevocable price, but there is an effort over that period of time to guarantee a market for our wheat growers at a price which they at least think is reasonable and would be beneficial to them.

I hope the report which has been made in putting the treaty on the calendar of the Senate will offer encouragement, hope, and assurance to those nations which have withdrawn to come back, because without them we all feel, naturally, that the treaty would be of little value because of the small number of nations involved.

So, Mr. President, I join in the report, because it was obvious that without regard to anyone's fault, if anyone be at fault, we could not ratify the treaty at this time, in view of the time limit which Congress has placed upon itself for adjournment. It is unfortunate that the time limit of July 1 was effective, so far as the treaty was concerned. In my judgment, it is unfortunate that the stopwatch time limit set for this Congress interferes with the proper ratification of the treaty. I hope that when Congress returns the nations which have withdrawn will reenter the compact and that the treaty will be promptly ratified so as to take effect for the wheat crop of 1949 and subsequent years.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as Senators know, I am from a wheat-producing State of considerable importance. I have been greatly interested in the proposed treaty, and have made a statement thereon which, I hope, does not give the impression that I am against the consideration of an International Wheat Agreement if, as, and when it can be taken up with a prospect of receiving the consideration which it deserves at the hands of the Senate.

I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the members of the committee who have spoken for the unanimous action they have taken and for the report which they have filed. I think it is a very wise decision at this time. In order to complete the record, however, I should like to read a release made by the Department of Agriculture regarding the wheat situation. This release is dated August 3, only a few days ago, and indicates that United States approval of the proposed wheat agreement would be an empty act, of no effect at this time, and that the Wheat Council itself does not believe that the agreement requires immediate United States approval.

The release which was made by the Department of Agriculture reads as follows, under date of August 3:

> The International Wheat Council at a meeting in Washington July 7 decided to abandon further efforts to apply the international wheat agreemen to the 1948 production.

This matter was referred to by the distinguished Senator from Michigan in his remarks a few moments ago.

> The agreement had not been ratified by the Government of the United States and by the governments of some of those countries which had already ratified the agreement withdrew because the guarantied quantities of the countries which had formally accepted the agreement were insufficient to insure its successful operation. The meeting on July 7 agreed that later consideration should be given to the possibility of considering an international wheat agreement on the lines of the document signed in March 1948, to be brought into operation on August 1, 1949. A preparatory committee was appointed to keep under review the prospects of concluding such a new agreement. This committee consisted of the representatives of Australia, Benelux countries, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, France, India, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Concluding, Mr. President, I for one am very pleased at the report which has been made by the committee and will join with them in earnest consideration of the proposal at the beginning of the next regular session.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to add just a few words in this burial ceremony of the international wheat agreement. I am keenly disappointed that the agreement was not ratified at this session of the Congress. I think that its defeat will prove a disastrous blow to agriculture in the United States, not only to wheat farmers, as stated on the floor of the Senate, but to others, because the price of wheat is always reflected in the prices of all other grains and generally in the prosperity of all agriculture.

Agriculture has been most prosperous in the United States when we had a large part of the European market. Following the last war, as soon as we lost that market, prices of farm products were depressed in the United States, and shortly after that we had a Nation-wide depression.

Farm organizations have worked desperately in an endeavor to preserve the European market we now have for farm products, and I believe the failure to act on this agreement will be a disastrous blow to American agriculture.

TAX ADVANTAGES TO COOPERATIVE CORPORATIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should prefer not to yield further until after my remarks have been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware declines to yield further during the course of his remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am sending to the desk an amendment to the general tax revision bill, H. R. 6712, relating to income-tax treatment of cooperatives, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Since Congress is preparing to adjourn soon, it is generally understood that H. R. 6712 will not be considered by the Senate at this session; however, I am offering this amendment and asking that it be referred to the Finance Committee in order that this important question might be studied during the recess.

Next year when the general tax revision bill is considered in the House, it is hoped that they will see fit to include this provision as a part of that bill; however, should the bill come to the Senate without this provision being included, I shall reoffer this amendment with the hope of having it adopted by the Senate.

I do not claim that the amendment is the perfect solution to this problem, nor does it attempt to deal with the other inequitable tax exemptions allowed under our existing laws; but it will, in my opinion, go far toward correcting the situation and at least form a basis upon which we can start to work.

It is the purpose of the proposed amendment:

First. To tax what are at present exempt cooperatives on their income except patronage dividends paid in cash, and to require, as a condition for eligibility for deducting cash patronage dividends, that the association restricts its operations to selling or buying for its members only;

Second. To tax presently nonexempt cooperatives—and those cooperatives which do not restrict operations to selling or buying for their own members—on all income, including all income paid out or allocated as patronage dividends;

Third. To make all cooperatives taxable on accumulated profits in the same manner as corporations are taxed under the present law; and

Fourth. To require cooperatives to file information returns concerning accumulated profits, patronage dividends, and the interest of the members in the association similar to the information returns at present required of corporations

concerning dividends paid or declared, accumulated profits, and so forth (sec. 148 of the code).

To accomplish these objectives, it was thought that the best approach would be to repeal outright the present tax exemption of cooperatives, and to provide in lieu thereof a recognition for tax purposes of cash patronage dividends paid by those cooperatives to which, as a matter of policy, it is believed this should be done. In carrying out this approach to the objective, it was also necessary (1) to redefine gross income so as to include income though paid out, credited, or allocated as patronage dividends and (2) to stipulate that such dividends are not to be deducted or excluded from gross income, except where paid in cash by certain cooperatives.

In this manner of approach to the problem, it was thought unnecessary to give special treatment to the problem of accumulated reserves of cooperatives—patronage dividends not paid out to members or patrons but retained by the association. The present provision permitting exempt cooperatives to accumulate reserves for any purpose would be eliminated by the repeal of sections 101 (12) and 101 (13). All patronage dividends not paid in cash would be taxable to any cooperative. Therefore, section 102 of the code, which taxes profits of corporations accumulated above reasonable needs, would be applicable to all cooperatives.

Under this amendment we are not attempting to deal with the tax-exemption extended to those corporations rendering public-utility services, such as the REA cooperative, mutual associations, foundations, or other presently tax-exempt organizations, each of which are important enough in themselves to deserve an independent study by the committee.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the proper place in title I of the bill, insert:

"SEC. —. Cooperative corporations.

"(a) Repeal of exemption of farm cooperatives: Section 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code are repealed.

"(b) Imposition of tax and computation of income:

"(1) Technical amendment: Section 4 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting at the end of a new subsection reading as follows:

"'(m) Cooperative corporations—Supplement V.'

"(2) Taxation of cooperatives: Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 421 a new supplement reading as follows:

"'SUPPLEMENT V—COOPERATIVE CORPORATIONS

"'SEC. 431. Tax of cooperative corporations:

"'(a) In general:

"'(1) Cooperative corporation: For the purposes of this chapter the term "cooperative corporation" means a corporation (A) that calls itself a "cooperative" or "co-op," or (B) that represents to any persons or classes of persons which deal with it that their patronage will or may entitle them (i) to the payment, either actually or constructively, of patronage dividends, or (ii) to an equity interest in any of the corporation's assets, or (C) that is otherwise operated for the mutual benefit of persons or classes of persons that deal with it; but such term does not include a mutual insurance company or any corporation exempt under section 101.

"'(2) Net income: In computing the net income of a cooperative corporation there shall be excluded patronage dividends paid or payable to patrons, but only if—

"'(A) The activities of such corporation during the whole of the taxable year did not extend beyond (i) marketing commodities acquired solely from members, and transactions ordinarily and necessarily incident to such marketing, or (ii) selling goods or commodities to, or performing services for, members, and transactions ordinarily and necessarily incident to such sales or services;

"'(B) The patronage dividends are paid in money exclusively not later than 60 days after the close of the taxable year; and

"'(C) Such patronage dividends are derived exclusively from marketing commodities acquired from members, or the sale of goods or commodities to, or performance of services for, members, or from transactions ordinarily and necessarily incident to such marketing, sales, or services.

"'(3) Gross receipts: The gross receipts from the sales of goods or services used in computing the gross income of a cooperative corporation shall be determined without the exclusion or subtraction of any patronage dividends, paid or payable to patrons.

"'(4) Cost of products bought from producers: In determining the cost to a cooperative corporation of products sold to it by a producer for resale (whether or not in their original form), only amounts, other than patronage dividends, paid or payable to such producer on account of such sales shall be used in computing such cost unless under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the corporation establishes that the application of this paragraph would more clearly reflect income, in which case the prevailing market price on sales of such products by producers, or the amounts, including patronage dividends, paid or payable in money on account of such sales, whichever is the lesser, shall be used in determining the cost to the corporation of such products so sold to it for resale.

"'(5) Patronage dividend: For the purposes of this chapter the term "patronage dividend" means an allocation or a distribution paid or payable (whether or not in money and whether described as a refund, rebate, price adjustment, or payment of a balance due under a marketing agreement) to member patrons or to member and nonmember patrons on some basis related to their sales to or purchases from the corporation during the taxable year, if (A) the allocation or distribution is conditional (i) upon profits or margins being earned by the corporation from all its operations or a class of its operations during its fiscal year, or (ii) upon income attributable to the resale of the producer's product along with products or a class or classes of products of some other producers less any deductions, determination of which is within the discretion of the corporation, or (B) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined only with reference to the amount of the profits, margins, or income earned, or (C) the amount of the allocation or distribution can be determined only after declaration or payment of dividends on any class of stock of the corporation or only after the fixing of sums to be transferred to capital, reserves, or surplus.

"'(6) Member of cooperative corporation: For the purposes of this chapter, a person shall be considered a member of a cooperative corporation only if such person has paid in to such corporation not less than $10.00 for capital stock of, or membership or equity in, such corporation, is entitled to exercise voting rights, such capital stock or evidence of membership or equity has actually been issued by the corporation to such person, and such person has otherwise qualified for membership under the corporation's charter, rules, or by-laws.'

"(c) Information returns required of cooperatives: The Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting between sections 148 and 149 a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 149A. Information by Cooperatives:

"'(a) Payments of patronage dividends, refunds, or rebates: Every association organized and operated as a cooperative shall, when required by the Commissioner, render a correct return, duly verified under oath, of its payments of patronage dividends, rebates, or refunds, stating the name and address of each member in the association, and the amount of payments paid to each member and patron.

"'(b) Accumulated earnings and profits: When requested by the Commissioner, every association organized and operated as a cooperative shall forward to him a correct statement of accumulated earnings and profits, including patronage dividends, rebates, or refunds allocated to, but not paid in cash to, members and patrons, and the names and addresses of members and patrons who would be entitled to the same if divided or distributed, and the amounts that would be payable to each.'

"(d) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments and repeals made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this amendment does not have the effect of repealing the present tax exemption of bona fide cooperatives, nor does it prohibit a group of farmers from joining together, pooling their purchases or sales and dividing the proceeds received therefrom. It does remove their tax exemption, however, if and when this same group decide to set themselves up as a competitive business organization, buying and selling in competition with private enterprise. It is then under the amendment that they become subject to the same tax laws as applied to other corporations.

A study of the original law as enacted by Congress in 1916 reveals that at that time it was clearly the intention of Congress to extend tax exemption only to those cooperatives doing business with their members at actual cost plus necessary expenses, and had their business been conducted on this basis as described in the law, it is true that there would be no profits to tax. However, during recent years corporation tax rates have reached a peacetime level of 38 percent, and during the war period when the excess profits taxes were applicable, the rate reached 95 percent, at the same time cooperatives were being exempted either under the law or by Treasury Department regulations. As a result, the competitive advantage which the cooperatives today enjoy over private industry has reached such dangerous proportions that Congress is going to be compelled to take action.

At the outset let me make this clear. This whole subject is more than a mere principle of taxation, and the answer we give to the question will, in my opinion, determine the future of our system of free competitive enterprise; will determine whether that system, which has given us the highest standard of living

in the world, is to continue as the bulwark of American democracy; or whether by virtue of cooperative tax advantages, all business will be transformed to a cooperative basis.

The extraordinary rise in Federal corporation taxes during the war years has brought this question into bold relief.

The problem before the United States Senate is not whether we are to destroy the cooperative movement, as its defenders assert, but whether they should, as competitive business enterprises, pay taxes on an equal basis with all other business.

The power to tax is recognized as the power to destroy. The Socialist and Communist Party leaders know this very well. Through this power competitive free enterprise is being challenged, and those who want cooperatives to continue to escape the payment of taxes would by their votes limit individual initiative and ultimately concentrate economic power in an all-powerful state.

I make bold to assert, therefore, that if this issue is not resolved, the American way of life as we have known it for a century and a half will ultimately be destroyed.

It should be emphasized that those here who believe they can limit competitive business, but leave other freedom intact, are fooling themselves. Economic and political independence for the individual can never be separated. To my way of thinking, when the final vote is taken upon this issue, it will constitute the most important test of our domestic economic policy ever to face the United States Senate.

Let us state some of the facts involved in this issue. They are:

First. Private enterprise pays 38 percent Federal income taxes on profits. Cooperatives pay little or nothing, depending on their policies, practices, and organizational form.

Second. Cooperatives, as a direct result of this tax favoritism, are expanding at a terrific rate, violating, as I see it, the intent of the original law which exempted from Federal income taxes only farmers, fruit growers, and like organizations doing business at cost.

Third. In 1939, before corporation taxes were drastically increased, cooperatives in the United States did a business of only some $4,000,000,000. In 1947 this had grown to more than $14,000,000,000. It is conservatively estimated that by 1950, under the present tax structure, the tax-exempt business volume of cooperatives will reach the sum of $20,000,000,000.

I think that at this time it might be profitable to review the legislative history of this subject.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Income-tax exemption of farmers' cooperatives was first provided in the Revenue Act enacted by Congress in 1916. This provision as thereafter amended—contained in section 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code—begins by exempting from tax on corporations "farmers', fruit growers', or like associations" organized and operated on a cooperative basis—

(a) For the purpose of marketing the products of members or other producers, and turning back to them the proceeds of sales, less the necessary marketing expenses, on the basis of either the quantity or the value of the products furnished by them, or

(b) For the purpose of purchasing supplies and equipment for the use of members or other persons and turning over such supplies and equipment to them at actual costs, plus necessary expenses.

And section 13—

Corporations organized by an association exempt under the provision of paragraph (12), or members thereof, for the purpose of financing the ordinary crop operations of such members or producers, and operated in conjunction with such corporations.

The law enacted in 1916 exempting farmers' cooperatives was very simple and direct, limiting the scope of its effectiveness to "farmers', fruit growers', and like associations," acting as mere selling agents for their members. In 1921 the legal exemption of farmers' cooperatives was expanded to include purchasing as well as marketing activities.

Between the years 1921 and 1926, cooperative corporations were given more preferences and advantages, largely by rulings issued by the Treasury Department, which advantages and liberalities the Congress legalized in the Revenue Act of 1926, under which cooperatives were enabled to become corporations paying up to 8 percent on capital stock and were permitted to establish reserves. This act also permitted farmers' cooperatives to do 50 percent of their marketing and purchasing business with nonmembers.

The 1926 act also eliminated the phrase "sales agent" and "purchasing agent." This elimination authorized cooperatives to take title to property and otherwise to engage fully in competitive business enterprise.

Congress has likewise extended many other privileges to cooperatives since the original enactment of the 1916 exemption. Among these are:

(a) The Capper-Volstead Act of 1922 which recognized the cooperative system of business and in effect exempted farmer cooperatives from prosecution under the antitrust laws.

(b) The Farm Credit Act of 1933 creating the Farm Credit Administration which was authorized to lend money to cooperatives on favored terms.

(c) The Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, under which cooperatives are permitted to give rebates and discounts of a type illegal if done by other businesses.

(d) The Securities Act of 1933 under which farmers' cooperatives were permitted to issue securities without the security and approval of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

These are the principal examples of important preferences which cooperative businesses enjoy over private enterprise.

PATRONAGE DIVIDENDS

The question of patronage dividends forms the basis of the chief controversy on the question of the taxation of cooperatives.

The heart of this question is whether the Government should tax patronage dividends in the hands of the corporation and again in the hands of the recipient member. Ordinary business corporations, large or small, are taxed that way. Cooperatives, however, through rulings of the Internal Revenue Bureau of the Treasury Department, permit patronage dividends to be deductible from taxable income of the cooperative. If the ruling was upon the same basis as applied to ordinary business corporations, the income in the hands of the cooperative doing business with nonmembers in competition with private industry would be subject to Federal income tax before the distribution of the patronage dividend to the members.

Insofar as competitive advantage enjoyed by cooperatives is concerned, this could theoretically be eliminated by the elimination of the double taxation of corporate earnings. The problem, as I understand it, is now being intensively studied by the Treasury Department and by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. However, so long as this double tax is applied under the present law, it certainly should be applied equally to corporations of every character, including cooperatives.

RAPID BUSINESS GROWTH OF COOPERATIVES UNDER TAX EXEMPTION

Under the low corporation tax rates cooperatives grew at a moderate rate prior to World War II. While an advantage existed, it was one which private enterprise could meet because the corporate tax rate was never higher than 16½ percent and normally much lower.

However, with the advent of World War II income taxes have become a major cost of doing business. Rates were increased to 40 percent on normal income and up to 90 percent on excess profits. This differential almost overnight gave the tax exempt and tax-avoiding cooperatives an advantage that approximated 65 percent on the average.

Recognition of this fact by the cooperatives is evidenced in a speech to the American Institute of Cooperatives in 1942 delivered by Mr. A. G. Black, at that time Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. He said:

Farmer cooperatives, as such, have been given by the people, through their Congress, some very important advantages—advantages not accorded to privately or corporately owned business. If no changes are made in laws relating to these advantages, they are going to bulk larger and larger. For example, tax exemption under certain conditions, if there is no change, will result in a tremendous advantage to the cooperative form of organization. As taxes on private and corporate business increase that advantage to cooperatives becomes greater. Under conditions of low taxes, of course, it is of some advantage, but when taxes are absorbing a large part of the earnings of private business, the cooperative form of business really provides an enormous advantage.

A study of this subject shows that the cooperatives themselves are not just a small group of farmers, operating for their own account, but that today the cooperative movement has reached such staggering proportions that numerous cooperatives are in reality monopolies.

A Treasury Department bulletin recently released discloses that out of the total volume of business as reported by 4,397 cooperative organizations doing a business of $2,233,904,000 during the year 1944, over 60 percent of this volume of business was done by 322 cooperatives,

each of which showed gross income and receipts in excess of $1,000,000. In other words, 7 percent of the cooperatives reporting were doing over 60 percent of the business.

Another Treasury Department bulletin disclosed that 2,909 cooperative corporations examined showed assets of $489,044,000. Of this total, 16 corporations, each with assets ranging from $5,000,000 to $50,000,000 represented 33⅓ percent of the total. In this instance one-half of 1 percent of the cooperatives reporting controlled over 33 percent of the assets.

This clearly proves beyond any doubt that when we deal with this subject we are not speaking of small farmers; we are truly speaking of big business.

At this time I shall insert some specific examples of how these institutions have grown under this tax exemption. The major portion of this information has been taken from the hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee. It is understood that these figures are subject to revision up or down according to progress made by the cooperatives since that time.

UNION EQUITY COOPERATIVE EXCHANGE, ENID, OKLA.

This cooperative was organized in 1926, at which time it purchased a small elevator for a reported price of $5,000. Twenty years later, in 1946, this same cooperative claimed total assets of $2,270,000.

During the fiscal year ending April 30, 1947, this exchange reported a business volume of over $50,000,000 upon which it had net earnings of approximately $1,200,000. A regular corporation with similar earnings would have been called upon to pay an estimated Federal income tax of over $450,000.

It now owns a 12,000,000-bushel terminal elevator which, according to its own statements, is the largest in the world.

CALIFORNIA FRUIT GROWERS EXCHANGE, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

This cooperative has an annual estimated business volume in excess of $300,000,000. It operates three subsidiaries, the Exchange Orange Products Co., the Exchange Lemon Products Co., and the Fruit Growers Supply Co., through which they market more than 85 percent of all the lemons and over 33 percent of all the oranges in the United States.

In addition to practically controlling the citrus-fruit markets of the United States, this same cooperative owns 100,000 acres of timberland. They operate three lumber mills and they own the entire town of Westwood, Calif., including the telephone, water, electric, and sewerage systems of that town which they purchased from the Red River Lumber Co. in 1944 at an estimated price of $11,000,000. Also included in the purchase of the town was a railroad.

This same Red River Lumber Co. had paid in the year prior to their purchase by this cooperative nearly $1,000,000 in Federal income taxes, revenue which henceforth will be lost to the Federal Treasury. It should be reemphasized here that every time a taxpaying private enterprise is absorbed by a cooperative those who will remain in private industry must make up the deficit.

NATIONAL FARM MACHINERY COOPERATIVE, BELLEVUE, OHIO

This cooperative was organized in April 1940, largely through the efforts of the Indiana Farm Bureau Corp. They reported a business volume for the year ending June 1946 of more than $3,000,000. At the same time they announced that they expected to reach a volume of business in 1947–48 of approximately $19,000,000.

Shortly after its organization this cooperative purchased the Ohio Cultivator Co., which is now operated as one of their divisions. In the year prior to their absorption by this cooperative the Ohio Cultivator Co., operating as a private company, paid income tax of $197,000. As previously mentioned in similar cases, this revenue is now lost to the Treasury Department for as long a period as cooperatives enjoy the present tax exemption.

LAND O' LAKES CREAMERIES, INC., MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Beginning originally as a butter marketing agency in 1921, this cooperative has now expanded to an annual business volume of more than $100,000,000. As of December 31, 1946, it had assets totaling nearly $24,000,000. Total assets of this cooperative increased at the rate of $4,500,000 during 1944, $4,600,000 during 1945, and $3,250,000 during 1946. The earnings for the year 1946 were estimated at approximately $1,940,000, upon which amount of earnings an ordinary corporation would have been required to pay a tax of approximately $737,000. The manner in which these substantial tax-exempt earnings have been used to build up this supercorporation can best be explained by quoting from one of their own bulletins issued in March 1945 in which they said: "The capital structure of our association, now amounting to $6,411,319.42, is made up entirely of members' and patrons' equities. * * * The members' and patrons' equities have been built up during the past years almost entirely from earnings and savings which accrue only to the patrons on the basis of patronage."

This cooperative operates, among other facilities, 3 butter-making plants, 3 cheese plants, 21 dry-milk plants, 7 poultry and egg processing plants, and 1 evaporated-milk plant.

COOPERATIVE GRANGE LEAGUE FEDERATION EXCHANGE, INC., ITHACA, N. Y.

This cooperative owns 3 feed mills, 10 fertilizer and chemical plants, 3 canning plants, and controls 223 service stores, owns 44 bulk petroleum plants, and sells through 46 other local cooperative associations.

Its sales for 1945 exceeded $170,000,000 on which earnings totaled over $4,300,000. An ordinary corporation with equal earning power would have paid on corresponding earnings for the same period over one and one-half million dollars Federal income taxes.

In 1945 the net worth and reserves of this corporation equaled $17,234,751.31. The records disclose that their net worth had increased during the past 10-year period approximately 330 percent.

EASTERN STATES FARMERS EXCHANGE, WEST SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

This cooperative operates principally in Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the New England States.

It owns a feed mill at Buffalo, N. Y., valued at $5,780,000. The volume of business in 1946 was estimated at over $56,000,000 and earnings were listed as $1,452,000 which was divided as follows: $953,207 was retained for capital expenditures, while the remainder of $499,296 was declared savings. At the end of 1945 this cooperative had assets totaling $9,331,179.

CONSUMERS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC., NORTH KANSAS CITY, MO.

The Consumers Cooperative Association was incorporated in 1929 with seven members and a capitalization of $3,000. In 1946, 17 years later, the invested capital was listed at $9,614,557.15, an increase of more than 3,000 percent.

It owns a soybean mill, a cannery, a cola bottling plant, an oil compounding plant, a printing plant, a feed mill, an alfalfa dehydrating plant, and 11 warehouses.

In 1939 it organized a subsidiary cooperative, Cooperative Refinery Association, Phillipsburg, Kans., to build and operate an oil refinery with a rated capacity of 3,400 barrels daily. In 1942 they purchased a 1,500-barrel refinery of the Terry Carpenter, Inc., at a cost of $700,000. One year later the 13,500-barrel refinery at Coffeyville, Kans., was purchased from the National Refinery Co. for $4,000,000. In 1943 this cooperative joined with the Central Cooperative Wholesale of Superior, Wis., the Midland Cooperative Wholesale of Minneapolis, Minn., the Farmers Union Central Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., and the Farmers Union State Exchange of Omaha, Nebr., and organized the National Cooperative Refinery Association with an authorized capital of $2,010,000. This newly organized cooperative then purchased the 17,500-barrel refinery of the Globe Oil & Refining Co. at an estimated cost of $5,000,000. Prior to 1943 the Globe Oil & Refining Co., which they purchased, had been paying Federal income taxes for the previous 11 years. Included in this purchase was a 229-mile pipe line from McPherson, Kans., to Council Bluffs, Iowa.

In 1946 the Consumers Cooperative Association sales volume equaled $26,243,652.71; earnings for this same year were reported at $1,665,293.82.

The manager of this giant cooperative has been given the credit for coining the phrase "Factories are free to cooperatives."

The operations of this giant cooperative had reached such staggering proportions and had drifted so far from the original concept of a farmer cooperative that last year Hon. Edward F. Arn, the attorney general for the State of Kansas, thought it necessary to instigate a suit asking for the dissolution of this giant cooperative, which, using his own terms, was characterized as an "industrial empire." The suit asked for the dissolution and charged them with violating State marketing act and the sale of $7,000,000 unregistered securities in violation of the laws of Kansas.

The attorney general also pointed out that this giant cooperative which was operating under the immunity which Congress had originally intended for the benefit of small farmers only, had extended their operations in international trade and that such sales included 3,000,000 gallons of motor oil exported to 10 foreign countries during the year 1946.

The net result of the gradual accumulation by this giant cooperative of these various once privately owned enterprises meant the gradual reduction of the number of taxpayers who were carrying the load of our Government expenditures.

In the bulletin published by the Farm Credit Administration entitled "Handbook on Major Regional Farm Supply Purchasing Cooperatives, 1944 and 1945," the following statement was contained in reference to this same corporation:

Of the net worth as of August 31, 1945, 19 percent was accumulated through sale of stock and 81 percent represented retained savings.

FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL, MINN.

This cooperative was incorporated in 193[illegible] with a capitalization of $30,000 and by 1946 their net worth had increased to $10,680,000.

This cooperative owns six terminal elevators. One of these elevators is located at Superior, Wis., with a capacity of 4,500,000 bushels.

This cooperative through its subsidiary, Farmers Lumber & Supply Co., now operates 75 lumber yards and 54 coal yards located throughout 6 States.

It now handles more than 100,000,000 bushels of grain a year.

Through another affiliate, Farmers Union Grain & Supply Co., it manufactures feed, processes poultry, operate a locker plant, and handles farm supplies for distribution.

In 1946 they showed net earnings of $3,650,000 upon which an ordinary corporation would have paid Federal income taxes of nearly $1,400,000.

This cooperative does not distribute patronage dividends in cash but in stocks and certificates of equity. Through this method this cooperative has been able to capitalize its rapid expansion almost entirely out of tax-exempt earnings.

The ninth annual report of this cooperative, 1946, shows that—

If the net savings for the year ending on May 31, 1946, had been paid out in cash refunds, this is what your GTA could not have done:

GTA could not have increased its liquid capital, $864,399.54.

GTA could not have paid off the mortgage debt, $1,249,650.

GTA could not have purchased additional properties, $817,700.

THE SOUTHERN STATES COOPERATIVE, INC., RICHMOND, VA.

This cooperative was originally organized in 1923 as the Virginia Seed Service. It was reorganized in 1933 under its present name, with total assets of only $191,692.01.

Up to 1946 it is reported as servicing 200,000 patrons in Virginia, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, and West Virginia. It is composed of 7 subsidiary corporations, 80 cooperative retail service stores, 3 cooperative freezer-locker plants, 17 petroleum cooperatives, and 3 marketing cooperatives. It also operates three fertilizer plants—one in Norfolk and two in Baltimore—and it is understood others are soon to be constructed in Nashville, Tenn; Winchester, Ky.; and Bowling Green, Ky.

In addition to distributing farm supplies through its own retail outlets, the Southern States Cooperative also sells through 59 independent local cooperative associations and some 484 private dealer agencies. The supplies consist of feed, fertilizer, seed, petroleum, and farm supplies.

The following table shows the dollar volume, net earnings, total assets, and net worth of Southern States Cooperative for the 10-year period 1938 to 1947, inclusive:

Year	Dollar value	Net earnings	Total assets	Net worth
1938	$7,949,829.91	$177,185.53	$2,419,636.76	$1,026,278.88
1939	7,868,899.75	433,483.27	2,771,207.90	1,303,955.32
1940	10,168,855.76	590,097.64	3,165,858.48	1,493,633.77
1941	11,513,995.19	581,201.22	4,169,589.56	2,098,083.91
1942	17,723,696.23	1,093,795.45	6,491,625.78	3,275,699.31
1943	27,503,932.87	1,596,689.88	7,343,119.82	4,682,808.74
1944	40,130,581.02	2,719,067.66	8,911,887.29	6,915,234.38
1945	40,459,448.01	1,312,241.63	9,703,300.14	8,687,127.83
1946	41,939,193.02	1,392,916.44	12,685,968.62	11,430,945.38
1947	53,162,125.85	1,512,161.66	19,449,279.40	13,988,002.21

As this table shows, during this 10-year period, Southern States' assets increased from $2,419,636.76 to $19,449,279.40, or more than eight times in this brief period of time. Its net worth grew from $1,026,278.88 to $13,988,002.21, or more than 13 times. The reason Southern States made this extraordinary record is by virtue of its tax exemption. It today enjoys a 38-percent tax advantage over private enterprise.

The loss in income to the Federal Government resulting from this tax exemption has conservatively been estimated at $300,000,000 annually; and assuming that there is no action by Congress to correct this exemption, and that the current rate of expansion is continued by the cooperatives, in less than 5 years this tax exemption is expected to equal the staggering sum of $1,000,000,000.

While the loss in Federal taxes is important, the impact on our private-enterprise system in America of such inequities of taxation is even more important. It is bound to wreck our free-enterprise system.

A study of the history of numerous countries in Europe disclosed that their adoption of a socialistic and communistic state was preceded in many instances by special tax exemptions and privileges granted to favorite groups.

We must support and defend the American system of free, competitive enterprise, otherwise we shall find ourselves confronted with socialism here. There is no middle road.

This amendment which I have offered here today may not be the perfect solution to this problem; however, it is a step in the right direction, and I sincerely trust that Members of the Congress during the recess will give this matter their most earnest consideration, and that at the next session we shall be able to submit an answer to this serious problem.

I know of no better way to emphasize the seriousness of this problem to our American system than by quoting a portion of the platform of the Socialist Party in 1944, which said:

In conformance with the Socialist ideals, consumer cooperatives are specifically designed for social ownership and democratic management. They have already demonstrated that they are instruments which can be molded to handle wide areas of economic life on a nonprofit basis. They are not merely a means to the Socialist end, but are a part of that end. Socialists will therefore use every effort to build cooperatives both as an immediate need of today and a major part of the world of tomorrow.

CLAIMS OF AMERICAN NATIONALS AGAINST GERMANY AND JAPAN

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement concerning the status of H. R. 4044, which was passed on June 19, the last day of the regular session of this Congress.

The bill establishes a War Claims Commission to hear and determine claims of American nationals against Germany and Japan and makes provision for immediate payments to American soldiers who were prisoners of war, to civilian internees, to workers who were captured while working on military installations, and to churches and religious organizations situated in our posessions who gave relief to our soldiers and civilians when no other help was available.

When the bill came to a subcommittee of the Judiciary, composed of myself as chairman and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it was found that provision was made for immediate benefits to civilian internees only, that benefits to workers were specifically excluded, that benefits for veterans were postponed, and that religious organizations were omitted.

After hearing testimony of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and AMVETS, and from Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Congressman from Pennsylvania, and former commander of the VFW, and from numerous veterans of Bataan, with respect to veterans' benefits, and from Mr. Walter Mason, legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor, and from others in the interest of the civilian workers, we wrote into the bill provisions to fairly compensate American soldiers and workers who suffered, as well as civilian internees.

Due to the fact that the bill was passed on the last day of the Congress, no appropriation was made. I have written Mr. JOHN TABER, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the House, asking

that an appropriation be made, so that the operation of the bill will not be postponed until the next session of Congress. The letter is as follows:

AUGUST 6, 1948.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TABER: I am writing this letter to request that action be taken to provide necessary appropriations for H. R. 4044, Public Law 896, which was passed by the Congress on June 19, and approved July 3.

In a statement made at the time of approval, the President criticized Congress for failing to make appropriations to carry out its purposes. In my opinion his statement was very unfair, in view of the fact that he knew that it had been passed on the last day of the session and that it was impossible to make appropriations after its passage. Further, the administration at no time manifested any interest in the bill, or assisted in any way in its passage.

The bill establishes a War Claims Commission of three persons to hear and determine immediately four types of claims of American citizens arising from injury caused by Germany or Japan during the war, and to make recommendations to the Congress concerning the determination and payment of other claims.

The four types of claims for which immediate provision is made are as follows:

1. American soldiers who, as prisoners of war, were deprived of the standard of food required by the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1927, at the rate of $1 per day.

2. American citizens who were interned by the Japanese Government in territories and possessions of the United States attacked or invaded by the Japanese Government.

3. A small group of some 1,300 workers who were employed in the Pacific area in the construction of military installations and were captured and interned by the Japanese Government.

4. Churches and religious institutions located in American possessions, who rendered aid to American prisoners of war and internees.

I desire to emphasize that an appropriation of funds necessary to carry out the purpose of the bill until the next session of the Congress will not call for any increase in expenditures of the Government. The act provides that all costs and benefits shall be paid from a war claims fund, which is created on the books of the Treasury, and which will consist of sums paid into the fund from German and Japanese assets held by the Alien Property Custodian.

It is indicated that $470,000 will be needed to initiate the operation of the act.

In view of the fact that it benefits American soldiers, civilian internees, workers, and religious organizations, who contributed in great measure to the successful prosecution of the war, and who suffered greatly, and in view of the fact that no expenditure is imposed on the people of the United States, and that all benefits will be payable from German and Japanese assets, I earnestly urge that your committee make the necessary appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. COOPER.

Mr. President, I should like now to speak on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it has been my opinion since the call of this session that the place of announcement of the call and the time at which it was made created an atmosphere in which no extensive program of legislation could be properly considered or enacted.

Nevertheless, neither these circumstances, nor the motives of the President, nor the evident unsoundness of many of the proposals made by him, free us of responsibility for action upon sound legislation which is of an emergency nature.

Without excluding other legislation in which I am interested, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate a measure which is of an emergency nature, and which could be enacted by the Congress at this session.

I refer to Senate bill 472, entitled "The Educational Finance Act of 1948," and more popularly known as the Federal Aid to Education Act, which was passed by the Senate on April 1, 1948, by a vote of 58 to 22, and which is now before the House.

It is unnecessary to detail at length the compelling arguments made by teachers, educators, and many Senators, which led the Senate to pass S. 472.

I assert again, as I did in a speech on the Senate floor on March 31, 1948, that there is no greater responsibility resting upon the Congress than to take the initial step toward assuring to all the children of the Nation equality of educational opportunity, an equality which in my opinion cannot be obtained except through Federal aid.

I assert again that low salaries received by teachers in many States of the Nation, including my own State, Kentucky, are deterring young men and women from entering the teaching profession and are driving qualified and faithful older teachers into other occupations and professions.

Many States have found it necessary, and will find it necessary in this school year, to use emergency teachers. As an example of this situation, I pointed out in my speech on March 31 that in my own State in the school year of 1946–47, 5,229 of the 18,164 public-school teachers were not regularly qualified but taught under emergency certificates.

A similar situation prevails in many other States.

Those who suffer most because of this situation are the children of these States. The ultimate sufferer is the Nation, whose strength and progress will be determined in great measure upon the degree to which educational opportunity enlarges the capacity of our citizens to render the informed judgments upon which our governmental system must rest.

I have written the Speaker of the House urging him to take immediate steps to see that the House is given the opportunity to vote upon the bill at this special session.

I earnestly hope that the vote will be taken, and that S. 472 will become law at this session.

TEMPORARY REGULATION OF CONSUMER INSTALLMENT CREDIT

The Senate resumed consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I had hoped to make some remarks on the pending legislation; but the hour is growing late.

In view of that fact, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain telegrams, news releases, and statements pertaining to the anti-inflation legislation.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *August 5, 1948.*

Senator J. J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building:

Railway labor regards the passage of adequate housing and inflation measures before adjournment of this special session as imperative. We must have good laws on both to avoid increasing difficulties in our economy in the immediate future. We urge you and your associates to press for action on these two paramount problems. Our people desire to be heard on any new measures dealing with these subjects, which the special session may consider.

FRED N. ATEN,
President,
Railway Employees' Department,
American Federation of Labor.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1948.*

The Honorable J. J. SPARKMAN,
The Senate:

According to the public press and radio, Congress has already planned to adjourn its special session without enacting adequate anti-inflation and housing measures. The continually rising cost of living and the wholly inadequate housing program are a dire threat to our economy and are therefore a very vital concern to the plain citizens of our country.

The International Association of Machinists, representing 600,000 wage earners who, with their families, aggregate approximately 2,000,000 plain citizens, urge you and your associates to remain in session until the two aforementioned basic issues are adequately dealt with in a manner that will bring immediate tangible relief to the plain citizens of this country. The International Association of Machinists further requests that we be given an opportunity to be heard in connection with any anti-inflation or housing measure which the present special session of Congress may consider.

H. W. BROWN,
International President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. J. J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building:

The Sheet Metal Workers International Association representing 75,000 workers regards as imperative the passage of adequate and suitable anti-inflation and housing legislation at this special session and urges that Congress remain in session until this is accomplished.

ROBERT BYRON,
President.
L. M. WICKLEIN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *August 5, 1948.*

The Honorable JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Banking and Currency Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks representing over 300,000 men and women in transportation industry regards it as imperative that suitable and

adequate inflation controls be enacted at this Congress and urges that Congress remain in session until such legislation is passed.

GEO. M. HARRISON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. J. J. SPARKMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D C.:

The train dispatchers of the United States insist upon immediate action by this Congress to enact measures to curb inflation and provide adequate housing. Regardless of politics this action is absolutely necessary to protect our economy and we feel that further delay will be disastrous.

O. H. BRAESE,
President, American Train Dispatchers Association.

DETROIT, MICH., *August 5, 1948.*

JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Committee on Banking and Currency,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of 300,000 maintenance of way employees on the various railroads throughout the United States, I strongly urge your active support of adequate housing and anti-inflation measures before the present special session of Congress adjourns. Prompt enactment of adequate and sound legislation on these two basic problems is of the utmost importance to the welfare of our Nation and failure to act promptly and effectively may well bring about serious difficulties in our national economy in the coming months. We earnestly hope that these important issues will receive your favorable consideration and action. We also urge that authorized representatives of railway labor be given an opportunity to be heard on any new anti-inflation or housing measures which may be considered by the present special session. Please address reply to 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit 2, Mich.

T. C. CAROLL,
President, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. J. J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Order of Railroad Telegraphers represents more than 50,000 men and women engaged primarily in the handling of train movements throughout the United States. Many of them are returned veterans and are located in practically every county, city, and hamlet in our country. The increase in the cost of living has affected all of them to such a degree that their meager standard of living has already been reduced and, in many instances, their living quarters are deplorable. Such conditions should not be permitted to exist in a country like ours. They demand that Congress pass adequate measures to combat inflation and adopt a realistic housing program before it adjourns. They insist that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill should be passed to provide housing relief and that the Wolcott bill be defeated. The anti-inflation measures adopted must be effective. The needs of our people are imperative. Action is necessary before adjournment.

G. E. LEIGHTY,
President, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers.

CHICAGO, ILL., *August 6, 1948.*

Hon. J. J. SPARKMAN,
United States Senate:

Railway labor believes it to be absolutely necessary that the passage of adequate housing measures and anti-inflation measures be accomplished at this special session of Congress. Accordingly, I urge you and your associates to do everything possible to bring about proper action in connection with these two very important matters.

M. G. SCHOCH,
President, Railroad Yardmasters of America.

KANSAS CITY, KANS., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America regard as imperative the passage of adequate housing and anti-inflation measures before the special session adjourns. On behalf of the thousands of members of our organization who I represent I urge that you and your associates take action on these two basic problems. We must have good laws on both if our economy is to avoid increasing difficulties in the months immediately ahead.

CHARLES J. MACGOWN,
International President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge you defeat McCarthy amendment and support housing bill reported by Senate Banking Committee, Thursday, August 5.

A. F. WHITNEY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

JULY 30, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee.
Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee:

The American Veterans' Committee supports the President's anti-inflation program. We feel that control of inflation is one of the most important problems facing our Government today. We do not feel that it is necessary for your committee to hold long drawn-out hearings in order to establish the fact that a dangerous inflation does exist. Therefore, we urge that you report favorably on the President's program immediately. What the American people need at this time is a comprehensive, intelligent, and strong program such as offered by the President, designed to control run-away prices which threaten to wreck our economy. However, if you plan to continue your hearings, the American Veterans' Committee requests an opportunity to testify in favor of the President's program.

JOSEPH A. CLOREFY,
Acting Chairman.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1948.*

DAVID D. LLOYD,
Director, Research and Legislation, Americans for Democratic Action:

Have sent the following telegram to Senators TAFT, WHERRY, BARKLEY, LUCAS, TOBEY, SPARKMAN; and Congressmen WOLCOTT, SPENCE, MARTIN, HALLECK, RAYBURN, and McCORMACK.

"According to the public press and radio, Congress has already planned to adjourn its special session without enacting adequate anti-inflation and housing measures. The continually rising cost of living and the wholly inadequate housing program are a dire threat to our economy and are therefore a very vital concern to the plain citizens of our country. The International Association of Machinists, representing 600,000 wage earners who, with their families, aggregate approximately 2,000,000 plain citizens, urge you and your associates to remain in session until the two afore-mentioned basic issues are adequately dealt with in a manner that will bring immediate tangible relief to the plain citizens of this country. The International Association of Machinists further requests that we be given an opportunity to be heard in connection with any anti-inflation or housing measures which the present special session of Congress may consider."

H. W. BROWN,
International President.

[Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.]

CIO DEMANDS TIME TO TESTIFY ON INFLATION, HOUSING, PROFITS TAX BILLS

The CIO today protested against "abrupt cloture" of congressional committee hearings, and demanded of Republican leaders that four CIO national officers be allowed to present labor's views on bills affecting inflation, housing, civil rights, and excess-profits taxes.

It voiced bitter criticism of the Republican Policy Committee's decision that "rain or shine, inflation or no inflation, the Congress must adjourn next Saturday night."

CIO Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey made public the texts of telegrams sent last night (Wednesday) to Senator ROBERT TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, Speaker of the House JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican, of Massachusetts, and Senator CHARLES TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. Carey said the CIO had been informed that the Banking and Currency Committee would limit its witnesses to Government representatives and representatives of the banking fraternity on the all-important question of inflation. He said that although there is no need for long hearings to establish the need for anti-inflation legislation, the meaningless bill now being considered makes it mandatory for organizations representing the public interest to be heard.

In the telegram to Senator TAFT and Representative MARTIN, Mr. Carey asked that the GOP hold the Congress in session in order to hear the views of President Philip Murray on inflation, Secretary-Treasurer Carey on the civil rights program, Vice President Emil Rieve (head of the textile union) on the excess-profits tax bill introduced by Representative DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, and Vice President Walter Reuther (head of the auto union) on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

Senator TOBEY was told that the CIO was shocked by the "abrupt cloture" applied to the Banking and Currency Committee hearings, and by the "unprecedented classification of private bankers, whose banks happen to be members of the Federal Reserve System, as Government witnesses.

"The discrimination in favor of the bankers on the one hand and against other citizens and their organizations on the other hand is an unfortunate precedent which, we prefer to believe, you personally would not seriously defend."

Text of the two wires are attached.

TELEGRAM TO SENATOR TAFT AND REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN

"When the Congress adjourned in June it left behind an unprecedented record of unfinished business. Bills to meet the needs of the American people were ignored, pigeonholed, or amended beyond recognition. The special session of Congress called by President Truman gave Congress an opportunity to rewrite its record. Food that cost $1 in June 1946, now cost $1.47. Other necessities like clothing, which cost $1 in June, 1946, now cost $1.25. The doubling up of many American families, due to the housing shortage, is a crime. With both political parties

committed to the passage of civil rights legislation, the effect of Senator VANDENBERG's ruling prevents this issue from coming to a vote.

"The Congress of Industrial Organizations was informed this morning that, due to a decision of the Republican Policy Committee, the Congress will adjourn Saturday having heard, outside of Government witnesses, only the representatives of the banking fraternity on the all-important question of inflation.

"The phony filibuster successfully conducted by the Southern Democrats is a decided contrast to the prompt squelching by the Republican leadership of the recent filibuster led by Senator LANGER to include a civil rights program in the recently enacted Selective Service Act. Senator VANDENBERG's ruling, which allowed the filibuster to continue, makes a mockery of the deliberative process and, in view of the arbitrary adjournment date, made it easy for the Republican Party to do nothing effective to control inflation, to do nothing to provide decent homes for the returned veterans, to do nothing to protect and extend the civil rights of all the people.

"Although it would appear that there is no need for long hearings to establish the need for anti-inflation legislation, the meaningless bill now being considered makes it mandatory for organizations representing the public interest to be heard. Senator CAPEHART has publicly stated that the people were not interested in the cost of living. He claimed that there were no requests to testify on the need for legislation to halt the upward inflationary spiral, despite the fact that the CIO and many other groups representing the average American have requested time to be heard on this subject.

"In the interest of the general public, we urge that you as leaders of the Republican Party exercise your influence to hold Congress in session in order to hear the views of President Murray on inflation, Secretary-Treasurer Carey on the civil rights program, Vice President Rieve on the excess profits tax bill introduced by Congressman DINGELL, and the need for enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill by Vice President Reuther. This special session of Congress cannot afford to adjourn without establishing this record on which the American people will vote November 2.

"I would appreciate an early reply so that if Congress is to stay at work and do its job we can inform our membership and arrange for the appearance of our witnesses."

TELEGRAM TO SENATOR TOBEY

"We were shocked to be informed today that the CIO has been denied an opportunity to testify during the hearings being conducted by your committee on proposed anti-inflation legislation.

"The 6,000,000 members of the CIO and their families are suffering daily what may properly be described in the language of the Republican Party's Presidential candidate as 'rightful impositions' caused by the high and rising cost of living resulting from uncontrolled inflation that, if continued, is bound to result in bust and depression. We believe our testimony would be of interest and value to your committee. In any event, we feel that we should have an opportunity to present it on its merits and under circumstances that will make it possible for the members of your committee to test its validity by questioning.

"More shocking than the abrupt cloture invoked before opportunity had been given to us or to other organizations to present facts, opinions, problems, and criticisms of pending legislation is the reason stated for breaking off hearings, namely, a decision by the Republican Policy Committee that, rain or shine, inflation or no inflation, the Congress must adjourn next Saturday night.

"Most shocking is the statement that only Government witnesses would be heard and the unprecedented classification of private bankers whose banks happen to be members of the Federal Reserve System as Government witnesses. As we understand it, they are members of the Federal Reserve System purely for regulatory purposes.

"The discrimination in favor of the bankers on the one hand and against other citizens and their organizations on the other hand is an unfortunate precedent which, we prefer to believe, you personally would not seriously defend.

"We urge you to reconsider and to support our request to Senator TAFT and Speaker MARTIN that Congress be kept in session until effective action has been taken on the emergency items of inflation, housing, and civil rights.

"We will appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience."

[Americans for Democratic Action, Washington, D. C.]

The following is the text of a statement issued by Leon Henderson, national chairman for Americans for Democratic Action, on the announced intention to close congressional hearings on the anti-inflation proposals now pending before the Congress:

"The House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees have announced that their hearings on the President's anti-inflation program have terminated.

'Statements by majority leaders indicate that the only portions of the President's program which will receive serious consideration in the executive sessions of these committees will be those proposals having to do with the control of bank and consumer credit.

"ADA has requested both committees for an opportunity to testify and to present the case for a complete inflation control program, in the event that the committees feel that the evidence and information which they have already acquired does not sufficiently justify prompt and favorable action on the President's program.

"High prices of consumer goods are imposing increasing hardships on every American family. Banking and credit controls, while important, are only one feature of the President's program and will not in themselves provide relief in the near future for American consumers. The chairman of the Senate Banking Committee has already stated that such controls will affect high prices only indirectly and in the distant future.

"The American people have a right to ask that Congress take immediate steps to aid them. The cost of living has reached an all-time high. We ask the National Legislature not to turn a deaf ear to pleas of millions of Americans.

"If Congress, as the majority leaders have stated, can pass banking controls in the next 3 days, it should certainly be possible to remain in session for another week and to enact other measures which will have a more direct effect and which will give more direct relief to the American family."

PEOPLE WANT ACTION ON INFLATION—RESULTS OF AN ADA POLL IN BALTIMORE

The Baltimore chapter of Americans for Democratic Action recently conducted a public-opinion poll on a scientific basis to determine public attitudes on the special session and on inflation controls. The poll was conducted with the accepted techniques of market research experts on a sampling basis. The questions were asked between July 28 and August 2, 1948.

The public response showed 54 percent of the people as approving the President's action in calling a special session of Congress and 85 percent as in favor of action by Congress in the special session on the subject of rising prices. Eighty-two percent of those questioned also believed that Congress should act on the high cost of housing at this session and 66 percent believed that Federal aid to education should be passed at this time.

The results of this poll, while it represents the sentiment of only one city, probably could be duplicated throughout the country. The majority of the people are clearly in favor of effective action by Congress at this time to curb the cost of living.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks some excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Marriner S. Eccles before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives on August 3 of this year, relating to the same legislation.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF MARRINER S. ECCLES BEFORE THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 3, 1948

Mr. ECCLES. There has been some talk about a compromise then on this bill, and only making it 5 percent. Well, I would say that the 10 percent is still not a very restrictive requirement in itself. * * * There is nothing in this proposal that would bring about or force a credit contraction. It may be too mild. It may be altogether too mild to have very much effect, because if the banks own $65,000,000,000 of Governments, and they could sell $10,000,000,000 to meet the requirement, they still have a huge potential for credit expansion. * * * I am not saying that they would do that. I think if you raised the short-term rate, and you had the power to put this 10 percent additional on, that the desire of the banks, under these conditions, would be to try to keep liquid, based on the experience of the thirties, and that might well restrain credit expansion. It certainly would make them extremely selective and very cautious and would put much more restraint on than any voluntary program can or would put upon the banks. I just hope that if anything is going to be given to the board it would not be an amount that would be completely inadequate, because the whole question of the use of this is, as I said, supplementary to other things, but at this time I believe it is desirable and possibly the most helpful thing that could be done in a hurry to help hold the line.

* * * * *

Mr. TALLE. But the change was made from 40 percent and 35 percent to an even 25 percent for both, in June of 1945. Would it not be desirable to move back to the larger percentages, under present conditions?

Mr. ECCLES. I do not think that (a return to the gold-reserve requirements of Federal Reserve notes and Federal Reserve bank deposits to 40 and 35 percent, respectively) would be desirable. I think it would do no immediate good and may well give the public a feeling that it was an anti-inflation action whereas it would not be effective and it would not do any good for the present.

At the present time the reserve requirements, if they were increased—the gold reserve requirements—if they were increased to 35 and 40, respectively, on currency and bank deposits with the Federal Reserve banks, it would require $16,089,000,000. The excess of gold now held by all of the banks of the Federal Reserve System is $5,717,000,000. But, as a practical matter, the excess amount is $4,642,000,000, because in practice we have found that you cannot get closer to 3 percent of the limit, within the limit. There is an operating ratio. So that I would say that if we increased the reserve requirements to 35 percent and 40 percent, you would have $4,600,000,000 of excess reserves. Therefore, there would be no pressure whatsoever upon the ability of the Reserve banks to expand currency to meet

the public demand for currency, or to purchase Government securities in the market, or to make loans to member banks in order to provide reserves.

If the excess amount that I have mentioned disappeared, as it was used up, through an expansion of currency, or if inflation continued, or through an expansion of the purchase of Governments by the Federal Reserve System in the support of the market, then you would be up against this problem: The Federal Reserve System would be entirely unable to help the Government in its refunding operations, would be entirely unable to support the Government market, and we would likewise be unable to meet the increased demand for currency from the member banks whose customers required currency, and we would have to come back to the Congress, as we did before, and say to the Congress: "You must reduce the reserve requirement because if you do not reduce the reserve requirement, the responsibility for a collapse in the Government bond market that should eventuate, or our inability to supply the banks with currency, and, in turn, their inability to be able to furnish it to their customers would seriously impair the whole banking system," and I am sure that the Congress would merely reduce the requirement again. But it does not make very much sense, it seems to me, to try to control the expansion and the contraction through the medium of an indirect gold standard. That is really what we are trying to do, and when we say we want to impose that reserve requirement, there is a much more honest and a much more direct way of dealing with the problem. It would amount to this: As the excess reserve got close to the limits, the smart people, the people that understood the restrictions, would immediately say: "Well, the Federal Reserve System Open Market Committee now is limited in its purchase of Goverments. They will not be able to buy more than another billion dollars or another $5,000,000,000. Their limit is there. Or perhaps $2,000,000,000." So the big boys, the insurance companies, and others, might say, "I think we had better sell our securities to the Federal Reserve System while we know that they are able to support the market," and you may well have enough sale of Governments that they would use the excess reserve they held rapidly, whereas others would not use it at all, but the very fact that it had a limitation, the very limitation itself, could induce a lot of selling of Government bonds, which certainly would be undesirable and unnecessary, and I see no value whatever in changing to that, except if the Congress indirectly wanted to say to the Reserve System, "You shall not support the bond market." Of if they wanted to say, "We are going to put you in a position where you cannot support the public credit."

I say the much more honest way to do that is to say, "Do not support the 2½ percent rate," and the other way is to not vote for appropriations or for tax reductions that create budgetary deficits, but support budgetary surpluses, so that the question of the Government being able to take care of its refunding can be accomplished without any help from the Reserve System. That is really the direct way of getting at it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on Wednesday of this week Mr. Leon Keyserling, Vice Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, appeared before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. Although I am not a member of that committee, I attended those hearings and listened to Mr. Keyserling's testimony. He discussed the dangers and maladjustments which have been and still are generated in the inflationary processes. He discussed the outlook if they are left unchecked, and he presented an economic analysis of some of the problems and programs being currently discussed in connection with inflation. He discussed the recommendations made by the President.

I believe Mr. Keyserling's presentation was one of the finest and clearest on this subject that I have ever heard. Since there has not been time to have his statement printed by the Banking and Currency Committee, I now ask unanimous consent that his testimony may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Keyserling?

I am sorry to keep you waiting, sir. We did the best we could.

STATEMENT OF LEON H. KEYSERLING, VICE CHAIRMAN, COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. KEYSERLING. My name is Leon Keyserling. I am Vice Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Keyserling, you are one of the board of three—what do you call the organization?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Council of Economic Advisers.

The CHAIRMAN. To the President?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You report directly to him?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been in that position?

Mr. KEYSERLING. About 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Your associates are who?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, and Dr. John D. Clark.

The CHAIRMAN. How often do you meet?

Mr. KEYSERLING. We meet constantly.

The CHAIRMAN. Continuously?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you came to this position, what was your work?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Immediately before that I was General Counsel of the National Housing Agency.

The CHAIRMAN. Prior to that time, you were a lawyer by profession?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I had done teaching and study in economics, as well as legal work and study. I had done a variety of writing on general economic and legal subjects, particularly relating to the problems of employment.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand that what this committee is charged with here is consideration of the President's program. We would like any contribution you can make. We will give you half an hour, sir.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I am particularly appreciative of the opportunity to discuss with this committee some current facts about our economy and some of the economic analyses which may be applied to these facts, because this committee had initial legislative responsibility for the Employment Act of 1946 under which I served as vice chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. The high purpose of this act was that, while no men are infallible and economics is not an exact science, men of good will could be aided by the known and tested tools of economics in evaluating and deciding upon national policies in the national interest.

I am deeply conscious that my only function here is to lay before you some of the facts and some of the methods of economic analysis which may help you in evaluating proposed public policies. This task of ultimate evaluation is yours, not mine, and if I should overstep this boundary it will not be intentional.

For almost 2 years, the members and staff of the Council of Economic Advisers have been devoting constant study to the task and trials of our complex and tremendous economy during a period of postwar transition characterized for the most part by the central problem of inflation.

In the course of our studies, we have received additional evidence that no economist will ever have a perfect answer to practical problems. But because we have assumed a public responsibility, these imperfections have not turned us from seeking clearer understandings, more workable answers, and a wider range of common agreement.

Considering the difficulty of our work, and the imponderables involved, we have arrived at a surprising degree of agreement as to what the facts say, what they mean, and what should be done about them. That appears clearly from various publications issued by the council as a whole, such as its recent report on the economic situation at midyear 1948. However, I ought to say that my statement here today is my own in the sense that no two individuals in a field such as economics ever use exactly the same process of reasoning or stress exactly the same points in reaching results.

In the current economic situation, as I see it, there are compelling reasons why inaction is fraught with danger, and why men must act even if they cannot be absolutely certain of every step they take.

The material that I should like to bring before you classifies easily into four main parts:

First, as an aid in the interpretation of specific data and problems, I shall attempt to state a few general principles and uncover a few current fallacies. Without this as a foundation, we all seem to be confronted with a hopelessly baffling welter of facts, contentions, and conflicting viewpoints.

Second, upon this foundation, I shall attempt to build a fair portrayal of some of the most serious maladjustments and disparities which our economy is generating in the process of inflation, and to indicate how these maladjustments and disparities are now imposing genuine hardships upon millions of our people and how they threaten all of our people if they are not corrected.

Third, I shall endeavor to show why the prospects for continuing inflation are so substantial as not to justify the belief that relief will come quickly, or come at all without involving even more serious dangers, if this inflation is left to follow what might be called its normal course.

Fourth, I shall try to apply some economic analysis toward an evaluation of various proposals now before the committee for consideration, in terms of their relevance to the current and immediately prospective economic situation.

BASIC PRINCIPLES AND CURRENT FALLACIES

Generally speaking, we are now and for some time have been in an era of rising prices, wages, and other incomes, accompanied by rising costs. In popular terms, this situation and the processes by which it is unfolding are called inflation. It is frequently stated that this inflation is taking place because demand for goods is being exerted in the market in excess of the supply of goods flowing into the market. This demand for goods is made manifest by money exerted as spending power; and consequently, it is said that inflation is taking place because the money supply is unusually high in relation to the volume of available goods.

The total money supply, which was 26.5 billion dollars in 1929, rose to $37,000,000,000 in 1939, and to 115.1 billion in 1947. In June 1948, it stood at 110.4 billion dollars. (See chart 1.) Manifestly, the money supply has increased much more than the volume of available goods.

The proposition that the relationship between the money supply and the available supply of goods has a basic influence upon the level of prices and incomes of all kinds is obviously correct as a statement of fact.

But it does not in itself tell us much about causes and effects. More important, it does not in itself tell us why the current inflation is dangerous, or where the particular dangers lie, or why we need to worry if nothing is done about these dangers, or what ought to be done about them. Until this is firmly recognized, we are likely to be misled by oversimplified or distorted solutions focusing attention upon the money supply alone. This is true because it is not demonstrable that a generally rising price level interacting with a generally rising money supply is bad per se. We had a falling price level after 1929, and the country was certainly not on the way to prosperity. We had a rising price level after 1932, and yet the country was on the way to increasing employment and production. We had a fairly stable price level in the later twenties, and yet obviously something must have been wrong with the economy in view of what ensued although everyone will not agree as to just what was wrong. In short, there is no arbitrarily sound or even preferable price level or course of price movements—such as those of 1926 or 1939 or 1946—as distinguished from some other price level or course of price movements; and, therefore, there is no arbitrarily sound or ideal relationship between the size of the money supply and the available supply of goods.

To detect whether our economy is in a state of danger or safety, we must concentrate foremost attention upon other things besides the over-all levels or movements of prices and the money supply. In a period such as the present, when prices, wages, and other incomes are far above prewar levels, and when employment and production and other indexes of useful business activity are also far above prewar levels, the most important thing to be considered is the relationship among these various factors in the economy rather than the absolute magnitude or course of each factor viewed separately. This is particularly true when the relationships among these separate factors, as well as the absolute magnitudes of each of them, have been changing substantially for some time and are changing rapidly now.

Since 1939 (see chart 2) these relationships have changed enormously, and they have been changing greatly during the accelerated inflationary process since the middle of 1946. To select a few items, employment since 1939 to the middle of 1948 has increased about 28 percent; consumers' prices about 70 percent; wholesale prices about 112 percent; weekly earnings in manufacturing about 118 percent; gross national product in current dollars about 173 percent; manufacturing sales about 231 percent; and corporate profits after taxes about 272 percent. The base year that I have chosen, 1939, is used only to illustrate the point generally that relationships have changed greatly. The use of this base year should not be taken as an assertion that it is the best base year for all purposes of comparison or analysis.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is your cost of living there?

Mr. KEYSERLING. The cost of living is represented by the consumer price index; that has gone up 70 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt you? I am puzzled. Hold that a second.

Kindly show me the relative difference between the cost of living and the wage income.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I will show that in much greater detail, Mr. Chairman, in the further charts.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. KEYSERLING. In probing the significance of these changes in relationships, there are two current fallacies to be avoided. First, it is fallacious to assume that dangers or maladjustments have been created in our economy simply because the indexes of various items have moved upward, or that the cure lies simply in moving them downward. For example, it is certainly desirable that employment and production are much higher now than in 1939. Likewise, it is to be expected that both wages and profits should be higher now than in 1939. The second fallacy to be avoided is the idea that there is any danger or maladjustment in the current situation simply because some of these items have moved upward faster than others. In a changing and growing economy, some items must move upward faster than others. For example, wages should be expected to move upward faster than consumer prices during a period when there have been vast increases in production for civilian use. Profits should be expected to move upward faster than prices during a period which has carried us from large-scale unemployment to full employment. Thus, persons who attempt to prove that dangers or maladjustments exist solely because some items have moved upward faster or more slowly than others are simply misjudging the nature of our economy in action.

The real problem we face now, in order to detect dangers and maladjustments, is to examine carefully and objectively whether the relationships among various factors in economy have changed and are changing soundly or unsoundly by reasonably derived objective tests; whether these changes are bringing us into a state of better balance or worse balance throughout the economy; whether they are curing discernible maladjustments or causing further discernible maladjustments; in short, whether they are moving us nearer to a zone of safety or further and further into a zone of danger.

On the basis of these principles, we may turn to a more specific examination of the relationships that are developing in our current economy during the continuing process of inflation. The evidence, as I shall try fairly to present it, is that the changes that have occurred and are still occurring in the process of inflation are progressively creating dangerous maladjustments which now inflict hardship upon millions of individuals; and also maladjustments among price relationships, wage relationships, and price-wage relationships which are now interfering with essential national objectives, and which are also distorting the pattern of production, consumption, and national income in ways that will eventuate in a general economic decline of employment and production if they are not corrected promptly.

CURRENT MALADJUSTMENTS AND THE DANGERS THEY PRESENT

The first serious maladjustment to which attention should be turned involves the effect of the continuing rise in consumers' prices upon family standards of living.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is the most important.

Mr. KEYSERLING. It is extremely important, perhaps the most important.

Since June 1939 (see chart 3), the consumers' price index for all items has risen 74 percent; for food it has risen 129 percent. By far the most rapid increases took place immediately after June 1946; since then, the increase has been 29 percent for all items and 47 percent for food. The increases since June 1947 have been 9 percent for all items and 12 percent for food. While the net increases during the past year have not been as rapid as in the preceding year, they have, of course, come on top of earlier increases. Furthermore (see chart 4), the net increases during 1948 have been reduced by the downswing which followed the commodity break near the beginning of the year; but since the middle of March the index for all cost-of-living items, and particularly for food, has been rising very sharply. In the second quarter of 1948, the food index rose at the rate of about 2 percent per month. In recent months, the cost-of-living index has been reaching new peaks.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you take that away, the lower strata there gives some evidence, that rent control, although it is much maligned and created some injustice, has been effective in keeping costs down?

Mr. KEYSERLING. There is no doubt about that. You will notice in this connection, Mr. Chairman, the beginning of the rise in rent after the mid-1947 period.

The impact of the rising cost of living, in terms of hardship, is necessarily associated with the distribution of family income. According to the most recent comprehensive studies covering 1947 (see chart 5), about 50 percent of all families had incomes below the $3,200 a year estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to be necessary to maintain an urban family of four at a reasonably satisfactory standard of living. Between a quarter and a third of all families had incomes of less than $2,000 a year, and more than 10 percent had incomes of less than $1,000 a year. Even allowing for the fact that many of the families included in these statistics were of smaller size than four, and that many of them were rural families where the cost of living is somewhat less, it is nonetheless a palpable fact that a large proportion of our population is being literally submerged by the high cost of living.

It may be said, of course, that "the poor are always with us"; that millions of families were submerged even before the war and before inflation; and that, relatively speaking, low-income families are better off now than they were during prewar periods. If we take the whole span of years since 1939 into account, these assertions are undoubtedly true, because our total national output has gone up so much since 1939 that practically everyone has benefited to a degree. But this would not be true since 1946, when postwar inflation got started in earnest; since then, families of low income and moderately low income have undoubtedly lost ground in the race with living costs. And 1946 is a fairer base of comparison than 1939 for this purpose, because our national output now is quite similar to 1946 but far and away above 1939.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of that situation shown by the crossed lines under $3,200, in view of the price level and cost of living, it might not be an overstatement to say that within the scope of those crossed lines is a very definite, concentrated section of human beings in misery.

Mr. KEYSERLING. There is no question about it.

Moreover, as a study of developments in 1946 and 1947 indicates (chart 6), while a majority of the families in the middle-income and upper-income brackets have received increases in incomes as the cost of living has advanced, a majority of those in the lowest-income brackets have either received no increases in income or have actually suffered decreases in income. Among families with incomes under $2,000, a full quarter suffered actual decreases of income during this period, and an additional 40 percent of these families received no increases in income. Thus, the families who have been the worst victims of the advancing cost of living because their incomes are low are also the families who have been least able even to hold their ground during the process of inflation.

The sheer physical problem of being unable to maintain a satisfactory standard of living has been compounded by the psychological problem of going deeper into debt. In 1947 (see chart 7) about 57 percent of the families with incomes below $1,000 and about 41 percent of the families with incomes between $1,000 and $2,000 either spent more than they earned or barely broke even. By early 1948 (see chart 8), about 27 percent of all spending units had no liquid assets, while another 15 percent had liquid assets of less than $200, and still another 13 percent had liquid assets between $200 and $500. Cumulative, about 55 percent of all spending units had liquid assets of less than $500.

These hard facts illustrate one of the clearest and most undebatable evils of spiraling inflation. There can be no disputing the truth that inflation is imposing an intolerable and ever-increasing burden upon millions of families. While it is hard to draw the line between matters of social and economic significance, it is obvious that a social maladjustment so extensive in its range must have great economic significance in a nation of people who believe rightly that the ultimate objective of their economic system is to promote the welfare and security of its citizens as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. We will recess at this point. I do not think we will be gone more than 10 or 15 minutes, and we will extend your time.

(Brief recess.)

The CHAIRMAN. Come to order, please.

You may proceed, Mr. Keyserling.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Mr. Chairman, the main concern I have is that these factual matters which I am presenting to you are the basis for a brief discussion of how the various measures now before your committee tie into this analysis.

I don't want——

The CHAIRMAN. That brings us nearer and nearer to the $64 question of what we are going to do with it.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I don't want to burden you with the facts to the extent of not getting to the very point and purpose of how I think I can be helpful in the evaluation of measures, but I do think that the facts are important.

Having covered the question of the effect of the price structure upon people as individuals and families, I now turn to the wholesale price situation, and will use this as a basis for what might be called the economic as distinguished from the predominantly social question.

A second area in which the inflationary and uneven march of prices is aggravating present maladjustments and storing up dangers for the future is revealed by an analysis of wholesale price trends and relationships.

Since June 1939 (see chart 9), the wholesale price index for all commodities has increased 120 percent; for farm products, the increase has been 214 percent; for foods, 168 percent; and for products other than farm and foods, 86 percent. As in the case of retail prices, the sharpest increases have come since the middle of 1946. The significance of these trends in wholesale prices may be appraised by examining (a) the relative trends of agricultural and industrial prices, (b) the trends of a few specific industrial prices with particular stress upon events of this year, and (c) the more general trends of prices as they affect the relationship between funds available for business investment and funds available for consumer use.

The relative trends of agricultural and industrial prices may be evaluated by the test of equity, and also by the test of their implications for the maintenance of economic stability at maximum levels of employment and production. By the test of equity, I do not share the viewpoint of those who have belabored the proposition that agricultural prices have increased more than industrial prices since 1939 or since some other base period. In the main, I think it can be demonstrated that the relatively greater gains in agricultural prices and incomes have tended to redress the unfairly disparate position in which farmers and farm families found themselves before the war in a predominantly industrial economy.

While farm prices may well have climbed a bit too high at their postwar peaks, in broader perspective the changes that have taken place since 1939 for the most part not only represent an equitable gain, but also represent a relationship between farm income and other incomes that will maintain our whole economy in better balance if it can be substantially retained. Moreover, by this vital test of effect upon general economic stability, the quick adaptability of farm prices to changes in the supply and demand situation gives reasonable assurance that a substantial break in general levels of employment and production will not be engendered by inflexibility or stickiness on the part of farm prices. In fact, experience thus far in 1948 (see chart 10) illustrates quite clearly the almost unique sensitivity and responsiveness of agricultural prices to the market situation and outlook, compared with the fairly sustained pulse of rising industrial prices. Thus the most recent experience tends to corroborate the comments that I have just made with respect to the problems of agricultural prices and industrial prices over the longer period since 1939. I venture the prediction, and it is one of the very few that I shall make, that in the ensuing months and years the problem of preventing agricultural prices and incomes from getting too high will be less pertinent and less difficult than the problem of preventing agricultural prices and incomes from falling so low in relation to other prices and incomes as to jeopardize balanced national growth. This balanced growth, as we have learned from experience, depends in large measure upon such parity between agriculture and industry as assures a high demand on the part of our farm population for the products of our factories and city workers.

On the other hand, the fairly steady upward march of industrial prices since 1939, which has been maintained th s far in this year 1948 (see again chart 10), is a cause of genuine concern. The reason for this is that these prices are in large part administered or at least partially administered prices, which we know from repeated experience do not respond so rapidly or so sensitively as farm prices to changes in the composition of demand. If industrial prices go beyond levels at which they can be permanently maintained, and this they would seem already to have done, the necessary reductions in such prices particularly if they are allowed to advance still further along lines indicated by current trends will not be accomplished quickly enough without being preceded by wide-scale unemployment and large cutbacks in production. It follows that, although farm prices happen now to have reached higher levels in relation to a prewar base, there is a large margin of error in the oft-repeated proposition that the problem of restraining industrial prices is less serious than the problem of restraining farm prices. There will be something further to say about the trends in industrial prices, in connection with further analysis of current dangers and maladjustments from the more general perspective of price-income relationships throughout the economy.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that line, may I ask? Farm products? That sharp digression downward back in July 1948. What are those products that went down like that?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I would have to furnish you with a break-down of that.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is interesting.

Mr. KEYSERLING. It is partly grains, but I would have to give you a break-down.

The dangers in advancing industrial prices are further revealed by examining some specific price trends in the industrial field (see chart 11). During 1948, sustained and substantial industrial price advances in highly significant areas have been occurring for metals and metal products, and for building materials, as well as for fuels and lighting products. This continued upswing is taking place in fields where the postwar demand thus far is extraordinarily high, in view of the business reconversion and equipment boom, the cumulative shortage of housing, and the special demands of the preparedness program and the foreign-aid program. True, if our economy is maintained at full employment, it may continue to need an output of metals and building materials as large or even larger than the present output. But it is extremely doubtful whether a demand sufficient to absorb an output of this size can be maintained at current price levels when the special temporary factors in demand just cited have spent their main force.

For example, the country needs, for at least 10 years, an annual volume of housing output as large, or even considerably larger, than the current high level of house construction. But when the relatively thin market of those who can buy high-priced or luxury housing is saturated, and when the residential construction industry is faced with the task of supplying the mass market of those who need far more moderately priced housing, there is certain to be a collapse in the postwar building boom, analogous to that which took place after 1925, unless prices are drastically lowered. My personal belief is that the postwar building boom at current prices cannot be sustained for as many years as it was after the First World War. This forces upon us the unpalatable conclusion that the rigidity and stickiness of industrial prices in crucial fields will lead to serious unemployment and cut-backs in production if the price level is permitted to move further and further above levels that can be permanently maintained.

The continued upward surge of these industrial prices is also of great significance in its effect upon the foreign aid and preparedness programs. This upsurge of prices confronts us with the unhappy choice either of carrying these programs forward at a slower pace than our national interests require, or of serving these interests fully at the cost of greater damage to the civilian distribution of the commodities involved than would result if a more restrained price policy were pursued.

In connection with this phase of the industrial price situation, there is to be considered the price-wage spiral. The movement for higher wages through collective bargaining is not responsive solely to changes in the cost of living, although most of the attention has focused upon this aspect since the war. The demand for higher wages rests also in large degree upon the price-profit picture in the industries that pay the wages. Even if the cost of living should be leveled off or reduced, no one familiar with the realities would predict that the price-wage spiral can be stopped so long as industrial prices are moving upward and resulting in such large net returns as now seem both present and prospective.

This brings us to an examination of price trends in terms of their effect upon the flow and use of national income. Particular emphasis should be placed upon the key problem of maintaining a workable balance between productive capacity and consumer buying power. There is a general tendency to overlook this venerable problem in the midst of inflation, although one of the main dangers of inflation is that it stealthily creates conditions which will ultimately throw this problem at us with stunning impact.

The CHAIRMAN. Which is coincident with deflation.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Which is coincident with deflation, and this is the real central danger of inflation, from the economic point of view. The paradoxical thing about it is that inflation masks this danger to the point that it is hard to see it while the inflationary period lasts, but it is there nonetheless.

The growing maladjustments taking place during the process of inflation in the relationship between income available to stimulate and finance production and income available for consumer use may best be revealed by examining trends in the gross national product and in its composition.

Since 1929 there have been enormous changes in the gross national product measured by current dollars, and very great changes in real output are evidenced when the current dollar figures are deflated to take account of price changes (see chart 12). Our real national output is about 72 percent higher now than in 1929, reflecting a profound and presumably permanent change in the national economy. The gross national product in real terms was only very slightly lower in 1947 than it was in 1946 when it still reflected conditions carried over from the war. During the first half of 1948, the product has been running at about the same annual rate as during 1947 as a whole. The slight variations since 1946 are not very significant, because of changes in the composition of the product which make available measurements inexact. It is significant, however, that total output since 1946 has not increased as might have been expected in view of the volume of employment and the improved quality of plant and equipment.

The gross national product may be translated into receipts and expenditures by consumers, government, business, and in the form of net foreign investment (see chart 13). For the purpose of appraising trends in the composition of demand, the expenditures figures are relevant. The expenditures of consumers, which may be taken to represent the pull of consumers upon the total supply of goods and services, dropped from 71.1 percent of the total gross national product figure in 1939 to 65.2 percent in the first half of 1948. Contrasting the same two periods, the expenditures of government rose from 18.5 percent of the total to 19.4 percent; net foreign investment rose from 1 percent to 1.5 percent; and business investment rose from 9.5 percent to 13.9 percent. Thus, the most significant changes in the composition of demand since the last prewar year have been the sharp downturn in the relative size of consumer expenditures, compensated for mainly by the sharp upturn in the relative size of business investment. This reflects industry's postwar reconversion boom, and does not in itself reveal anything undesirable.

However, the present composition of expenditures or demand cannot be expected to maintain as we move to a more characteristically peacetime economy. To preserve a workable balance between productive capacity and ultimate consumption, consumer expenditures or demand will need to assume a relatively larger role, not only because business will be through the reconversion and reequipment period but also because the relative role exerted by Government expenditures and net foreign investment must be expected to decline with the advent of a more normal international situation. Yet, when we examine the income relationships being developed in the current inflationary process, and remember that income is the foundation for expenditures or demand, we find that these developing income relationships threaten to militate against rather than to facilitate the necessary adjustments.

This conclusion rests on national income analysis. The total of national income, like the total gross national product, has increased in real terms by more than 70 percent since 1929, and has not changed significantly since 1946 (see chart 14). Upon examining the composition of national income (see chart 15), it appears that the following developments have taken place: Compensation of employees has dropped from 65.9 of the national income total in 1929 to 63 percent in 1947, and to 62 percent in the first half of 1948. During the same three respective periods, business and professional income has increased from 9.4 percent to 11.5 percent to 11.8 percent. Farm income has increased from 6.5 percent to 7.8 percent to 8.4 percent. Corporate profits and inventory valuation adjustments have increased from 8 percent to 12.2 percent to 12.3 percent. Interest and rents dropped from 10.6 percent in 1939 to 5.6 percent in 1947, and remained at the latter level during the first half of 1948. The most important changes have been the increase in the farmers' share, the significance of which I have already discussed; the decrease in the share represented by compensation of employees; and the very substantial increase in the share represented by corporate profits and inventory valuation adjustments, accompanied by a lesser increase in the share represented by business and professional income.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it correct, sir, do I interpret that chart right, that compensation to employees has been practically at parity from '47 to '48?

Mr. KEYSERLING. That is substantially correct, as a percentage of the total national income, contrasting 1947 as a whole with the annual rate during the first half of 1948. There has been a slight downward movement of compensation to employees, from 63 to 62 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. How about corporate profits?

Mr. KEYSERLING. There was a slight change upward, hardly discernible on the chart, from 12.2 percent to 12.3 percent, between 1947 and the first half of 1948. The great change in the corporate profits percentage of total national income was from 8 percent in 1939 to more than 12 percent in 1947 and in the first half of 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. That cannot be right, compensation to employees in 1939 is 72 billion.

Mr. KEYSERLING. No; that is the total figure for the whole bar, representing total national income.

Senator SPARKMAN. You seem to have one element in the 1939 column that is not in the column to the right. I guess it is. Is that business and professional income?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes, they are all in.

Senator SPARKMAN. It seems a little lighter on this side.

Mr. KEYSERLING. It is the same. The width of the bars, rather than the height of the bars, indicates the change in the total size of the national income (deflated), which was 72.5 billion in 1939, raising to 126.4 in 1947, and to an annual rate of 127.1 for the first half of 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. For the sake of ordinary minds like ours, you could elucidate that a little better in your chart to make that distinction.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I would like to try to do that.

Senator SPARKMAN. Let me see if I understand. You have a percentage bar running up and down on both sides.

Mr. KEYSERLING. The percentage bar indicates the percent of the total that is taken by these various factors.

Senator SPARKMAN. The percentage of the total which the compensation of employees bears in 1939 is not greatly out of line with '47 and '48, the percentage, not the quantity.

Mr. KEYSERLING. It depends on what you mean by "greatly." The change has been from 65.9 percent, Senator, to 62 percent. When you are dealing with large compounds, that is quite a substantial change.

Senator SPARKMAN. It looks slight there.

Mr. KEYSERLING. It is a substantial change.

These relative trends in the main types of income would not seem to correlate at all well with the composition of expenditure or demand that will be needed in a balanced economy at maximum employment and production as we move toward workable peacetime relationships. But before embracing this conclusion, it is necessary to examine the trends in corporate profits and in consumer incomes a bit more specifically. Looking first at the corporate profits picture (see chart 16), these profits when measured as a percentage of sales were 5.4 percent in 1929; 3.9 percent in 1939; 4.6 percent in 1946; 5.2 percent in 1947; and 5.2 percent in the first quarter of 1948 according to the best available estimates. Measured as a percentage of investment, these corporate profits were 5.1 percent in 1929; 3.5 percent in 1939; 7.4 percent in 1946; and 9.6 percent in 1947. Estimates for 1948 are not yet available. Together with these figures, it is noteworthy that during the first half of 1948, retained net earnings and depreciation reserves continued to supply the major part of corporate financial requirements (see chart 17). It appears from the available data that business income is on the high side in relation to the amounts required to sustain the volume of business investment compatible with peacetime economic balance. At the same time, consumer incomes, of which the compensation of employees forms the major part, have been reflecting a decreasing share of national income. Furthermore, total real per capita personal income after taxes is now lower than during 1946, although it has been fairly constant since the second half of 1947 (see chart 18).

The foregoing analyses strongly presage the emergence of an inadequacy of consumer income when production mounts, when reservoirs of wartime savings have been further depleted, when those expenditures of Government which reflect the tense international situation decrease, and when business investment comes to assume a relationship to total economic activity more nearly in line with peacetime experience. It may be said, in dissent from this conclusion, that total consumer income is now adequate, or more than adequate, to take the supply of goods now available for consumer use, as evidenced by the fact that prices are still being pushed upward. This would be a comforting conclusion if we could but ignore the lesson of experience. For experience during past periods of adjustment leaves little room for belief that wages would be increased voluntarily or prices decreased systematically at the very time when the business outlook might be dampened by a decline in Government-created demand for foreign aid and preparedness. Experience indicates, rather, that the delay of adjustment until that time would result in curtailment of employment and production, followed by disorderly price breaks and a general economic decline—the spiral of depression.

It would be far safer if real consumer incomes were now kept more nearly abreast of increases in domestic output. If compelling reasons of national policy require for a time that an extraordinary part of this output be diverted away from domestic consumers, the worst way to deal with the situation is by price increases that ration goods unfairly and enormously magnify the coming problem of peacetime adjustment. A more prudent approach, for the time being, would be to keep income relationships in sounder balance by a restrained price policy, and to cut consumer spending rather than consumer incomes by voluntary savings and high taxes. We should then have a better chance to maintain a full economy by not cumulating maladjustments against the day of reckoning.

The CHAIRMAN. Are all those charts in this?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

Senator SPARKMAN. What number will be the one that you are about to put up?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Chart 19 is coming up. This chart shows the final type of maladjustment which I shall discuss, now appearing in the process of inflation, which is a consequence of unequal trends in the real earnings of individuals. For all wage earners (see chart 19), the index of real earnings has declined about 10 percent since June 1946, and this is to be regarded as an unfavorable development for reasons already stated. But more significant than this, in some ways, is the much greater decline in real earnings suffered by such groups as clerical and professional workers. This group has been thrown for a loss of about 15 percent during the same period. Mean-

while, a few groups have fared much better than the average.

The CHAIRMAN. I confess I am surprised at that, sir. I had supposed that the wage scale was fully as high today as it was then.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Not in relation to the price level.

Senator SPARKMAN. This is the real wage?

Mr. KEYSERLING. The real wage, in relation to the price level. This is made more realistic by adjusting it to the price level.

Quite aside from the inequities involved, these widely disparate changes in the wage and salary structure are not a basis either for social contentment or for uniformly calm industrial relations. Moreover, in the extremely tight labor market of full employment, these disparities do not result in the distribution of marginal manpower along lines consistent with the best national interest by any reasonable test. An outstanding example of this, of course, is the situation of the teaching profession, where the shortage of teachers is growing while the number of school-age children is increasing rapidly.

Due to historic and other reasons, disparities in wages and salaries among groups where most people would not say that the differentials in training or skill justified the differentials in pay, is to a degree normal even if not entirely fortunate in a complex economy. But disparities as great as those that have been developing in the process of inflation are neither normal nor desirable. They constitute some of the worst manifestations of the inflationary process. These disparities also indicate the superficiality of the argument that an effective anti-inflationary program must "hurt everybody a little bit," when in fact the essence of an effective anti-inflationary program is that it be selective enough to help those who have already been hurt too much, while it restrains those who have been going too far.

We may now summarize briefly the dangers and maladjustments which have been and still are being generated in the inflationary process.

First, the inflationary process is working untold hardships upon millions of families. Not only have these families failed to participate in the rising standards of living that have been made available to others as the end of the war has released more goods for civilian use. More than that, these millions of families are now losing ground in absolute as well as relative terms. Their money incomes are going down; their real incomes are going down; their accumulated savings are disappearing or have already disappeared; they are spending more than they earn; their debts are increasing. Whether one calls this a social or an economic problem—and it is certainly a mixture of both—it is a problem that no great nation can discount or ignore without facing the prospect of mounting discontent, friction, envy, and suspicion, at a time when there is desperate need for unity of endeavor. Under such circumstances, wily or misguided agents can more easily sow the seeds of trouble in the field of discontent.

The CHAIRMAN. It has some religious aspects, too.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think it is fundamentally a moral question.

The CHAIRMAN. I think so.

Mr. KEYSERLING. As most economic questions are ultimately.

Second, the inflationary process is creating price and income and production maladjustments of increasing size throughout the economy. It is threatening, though few as yet perceive it, to revive the post-World War I problem of disparity between agricultural income and industrial income and thus to complicate the problem of price supports. It is pushing specific industrial prices, such as those in metals and building materials, to the point where output cannot be permanently disposed of at these price levels, while if the threatened further rise of these prices occurs it will make readjustment of these prices to maintainable levels almost impossible without being preceded by large cutbacks in employment and production. The inflation is creating enormous disparities in the wage structure which are indefensible on equitable grounds, and which are inconsistent with the availability of an adequate supply of workers for some of our most vital national needs such as primary and secondary education. The inflation is so distorting the composition of national income that the old danger of inadequate consumer buying power to provide a market for the maximum output of industry and agriculture at full employment is threatening to reappear; and this danger should not be overlooked because inflation by its very nature tends to conceal the danger until it suddenly descends upon the economy in full force. There is stewing in the boiler of inflation the main ingredients for an economic explosion, and we cannot afford to wait until these ingredients fuse themselves into the combination that will touch off that explosion.

Third, even if in the process of inflation many of the changes in the price-income-production structure were not changed in the direction of further maladjustment, which in fact they are, we could still be certain that the speed with which these changes are taking place prevents any responsible factor in the economy from getting its true bearings. By keeping everyone off balance, inflation is profoundly unsettling everyone. This is best illustrated by the price-wage spiral (see chart 20). Quite independently of whether prices are outrunning wages or wages are outrunning prices, quite independently of who is blameworthy or blameless in this process, the very fact that prices and wages are chasing each other at such a mad speed around so many dark corners means that serious collisions are bound to take place unless both management and labor can slow down for a while and get their bearings.

The CHAIRMAN. When Mr. Ben Fairless came before the Joint Economic Committee last spring, I happened to be present, and in the course of his prepared statement he made this statement, I think verbatim:

"Under no circumstances should demands for increased wages follow increased profits."

I wrote it down. When he got through I asked him the question and he said he did say that.

My question was: Suppose he wasn't Ben Fairless, president of the Steel Corporation, but Ben Fairless, one of the open-hearth operators in Pittsburgh, and he is intelligent as most men are who are in labor today, and he thought the steel corporation was making large earnings of $11.70 on a share after taxes and reserves and $120,000,000 net profit, when would Ben Fairless, now John Smith, hearth worker, feel that he was entitled to increased wages when the concern he represented was making the largest earnings in the history of the country?

He didn't like the question. I was thinking in terms of when the reverse happens. Then they close the plants and John Smith goes out on his ear, and his income is lost, and his family is in distress.

I am asking you on this theory about labor and the demand for wages and all, when would they expect to get increased wages if it wasn't at a time when profits were being paid and made from profits which they produced.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think what you say, broadly speaking, is correct, Mr. Chairman. I would say that I have tried to approach this subject objectively, and as I said near the beginning of my statement, it doesn't always follow that wages and profits should increase at the same rate.

There are periods when profits should increase faster than wages, because the profit structure is more volatile. When the economy is going downhill, when it is running into a period of large-scale unemployment, profits sometimes fall below the zero point, and manifestly we couldn't allow wages to fall below the zero point. And likewise, profits have to increase faster than wages at times to make up for the times when they have decreased faster.

At other times, wages should increase faster than profits. I think the second formula is closer to the correct formula for a well balanced, healthy maximum employment and maximum production economy.

What has been happening at the present time is partly illustrated by this chart (20) showing the relative movements in prices and wages from June 1946 to June 1948. The line moving upward is the price line. The line moving sideward is the wage line. The dates on the lines indicate the points at which particular spurts occurred, and they are important for the purpose of showing you how you have had a sequence of a price jump and a wage jump and a price jump and a wage jump. That is the spiral. The line, of course, does show that the prices have moved upward more rapidly than the wages.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it possible in your judgment as an economist for the mind of man to devise some scheme whereby the dollar may be tied into the values and factors that make up the cost of living something along the line of a commodity dollar, whereby that dollar would reflect in the exchanges which a man receives for his wages and go along in juxtaposition with changing conditions?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Irving Fisher had an idea something like that and worked for many years on it. It wasn't very widely accepted for a variety of reasons. It may have some merit, but it still would leave you with the real problem, Senator TOBEY, which is the fundamental problem of the distribution of the product, because you cannot simply say that the wage at all periods should change simply comparable to the cost of living. If it did that, you would have a constant standard of living, although production might be increasing. If you are in a period when production is increasing, you should have an increase in the real wage. This is a generally accepted proposition. The real question is how much of an increase. The real question is how much of that increased production should take the form of further capital expansion financed or stimulated in part by profits, and how much should go immediately to increased consumption. This is the problem at its core.

As an economist, I would say that in one form or another we are always going to have this problem with us in the free society we want to maintain. But we can, I believe, reduce this problem by developing some economic judgments to promote a better balance in the economy than is generated by the unrestrained price-wage spiral during inflation.

Senator SPARKMAN. Before you get away from that, may I ask you this question?

I think the whole country has been interested in the recent price and wage increase in steel. I am just wondering if you and your group of analysts have analyzed that situation. I don't vouch for the accuracy of these figures, but I have heard something like this:

The increase in the wage amounted to somewhere—nearly $5 a ton—$4.70 or something like that; but United States Steel almost immediately announced an increase in its product of nearly $10 a ton—$9.94, I believe.

I also saw somewhere that the profit they were already making after taxes was something over $12 a ton. As I said, I don't vouch for the accuracy of those figures; I wonder if you have analyzed that situation so as to be able to say whether or not there was

any justification of this in such a price increase, on steel, following that wage increase, and particularly in view of the already existing high corporate earnings?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Senator SPARKMAN, I don't have the detailed figures before me now, and a generalization in a matter of this kind is always difficult. I am prepared to say, however, directly in answer to your question, that it has seemed that the price advances which have taken place in certain key industries, steel being one, have been more than were justified or necessary in view of the whole economic situation. In other words, in such cases the level of profits after taxes has afforded a higher rate of return than has been necessary amply to stimulate and support the level of investment and production required to keep a fully employed labor force and plant at work and to use the resources that should at this time or shortly be turned to production purposes. This conclusion is generally implicit in my analysis of the production picture, and it was developed a little more specifically in the charts and figures which I have submitted on the profit picture in general.

Senator SPARKMAN. Are they in the report?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

Senator SPARKMAN. I do not recall whether or not in this midyear economic report to the President, which the President in turn transmitted to Congress, you and your associated economists called attention to the effectiveness of an excess-profits tax in drying up those high-level corporate earnings.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I shall touch on that question as I come to an evaluation of specific proposals.

Mr. Chairman, I have cited three of the dangers and maladjustments occurring in the current inflation. I should now like to cite two others.

Fourth, the pace of the inflationary process is breeding a psychological uneasiness throughout the economy. This psychology is based upon the observation that booms in the past have ended up in busts; and the question of whether history must repeat itself becomes irrelevant in view of the fact that history will repeat itself if enough people think that it is going to.

Fifth, the inflationary process is jeopardizing our whole program of aid to the free countries of western Europe, along with all of our objectives for the restoration of better international economic relations as a foundation for permanent world peace. The inflation is confusing many of our own people into the mistaken belief that the foreign-aid program is primarily responsible for the hardships they are suffering under inflation, and thus is tempting them toward the relinquishment or abatement of an imperative undertaking of policy. The inflation is reducing the value of the financial aid that we are extending to other countries, planting in their minds legitimate concern that America may be heading for another depression, and therefore militating against their cooperation with us on the full and trustful basis which the world situation demands. The inflation is affording a talking point for such enemies of our foreign policy within our own gates as look elsewhere than to America's best interests for their guidance or command.

THE OUTLOOK FOR INFLATION IF LEFT UNCHECKED

If these be the dangers of inflation, what are the prospects that these dangers will disappear of their own accord, except through a process of deflation and depression which would mean infinitely larger dangers?

There is little need at this point to enter into an extended demonstration of the fact that inflation is still on the march. Prices are still going up, and reaching new peaks. The price-wage spiral is augmenting. The suffering of the primary victims of inflation is increasing. While a year ago, or 6 months ago, there was a division of opinion as to whether the forces of inflation were nearly spent, there is no such division now. Business journals and business economists join with others in appraising the current situation as highly inflationary. The proponents and opponents of the anti-inflationary program now before the Congress are not divided in this appraisal. The overwhelming majority of them seem to agree that inflation is still very much with us; their division of opinion is limited to what are the main causes of inflation and what are the main remedies to be applied. Some favor the proposals that have been advanced on the ground that they will help remedy the inflation, while others oppose the very same proposals on the ground that they would aggravate the inflation; but almost all agree that the inflationary problem has become more acute. Under such circumstances, to bring before this informed committee the accumulated evidence that the danger of inflation is still here, beyond the evidence contained in the various charts and figures already referred to, would be carrying coals to Newcastle. The question is no longer what the factual situation is, but rather what to do about it.

The only prospect now being held out for relief from the dangers of inflation in our strained economy, without benefit of an affirmative program, is that there will be a general softening of demand which will reduce prices. This is nothing more than a sugar-coating of the bitter pill that inflation of course will be over when unemployment mounts and when the economy passes from a sellers' to a buyers' market. There is nothing new about that kind of relief for inflation, and by the same token there is nothing desirable about it. There is no assurance that an adjustment along such lines would afford succor to the millions of families who are the primary victims of inflation; on the contrary, we know full well that rising unemployment and a slackening of industrial activity would put these families in an even worse position than they are now. Nor is there any assurance that such an adjustment, even if tolerable, would stop at some nice and convenient point between what is called inflation and what is called deflation. The prospect is all too real to be overlooked that our highly sensitive economy cannot start rolling down this kind of hill without rolling into the valley.

In essence, the bad thing about inflation is not the high price level in itself, but rather that the maladjustments and disparities which are occurring in the process of inflation victimize countless individuals and threaten the maintenance of maximum employment and the achievement of maximum production. The main reason for wanting to combat inflation is that it jeopardizes prosperity. We cannot wait for or solicit the kind of cure that kills the patient.

The CHAIRMAN. You are pretty nearly through; are you?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask you a question? Here is a committee, sitting here. We are charged with the responsibility of doing something. You, I assume, can testify you were consulted in drawing up the administration bill; is that correct?

Mr. KEYSERLING. In drawing up the administration bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Not as a technician on the details.

The CHAIRMAN. You are familiar with the bill?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You know how important price control is to most of us?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Here we are in a tropical sea in here, and this inflation is going on. We have Mr. Eccles' thesis that we are going to have a bust. When, as, and if is the question.

Forgetting the political side of this entirely, what do you think we ought to do?

Mr. KEYSERLING. That is what I want to come to now. My statement thus far has attempted to provide the factual and analytic foundation for evaluating proposed measures. I want to take these few remaining minutes that you may give me—and I am terribly sorry if I am delaying the Secretary of Commerce, but I got started about an hour after I was scheduled.

The CHAIRMAN. He is getting an education, too.

Mr. KEYSERLING. On this foundation, we may make a general appraisal of the relative weight and significance of some of the explanations advanced as to the causes of inflation and some of the economic proposals made to combat the dangers and maladjustments of inflation.

THE ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF PROPOSED REMEDIES FOR INFLATION

Inflation and foreign aid

The very first point to be made involves firm, unalterable recognition that we must conquer inflation while meeting our essential obligations as a nation, and not by avoiding these obligations. Sufficient examples of this are the foreign-aid and preparedness programs. Even if these programs were complicating the inflation problem far more than they in fact are, we would have to carry these programs forward nonetheless. To be sure, if we abandoned foreign aid, and preparedness, and agricultural price supports, and the good living standards that come with good wages, and the goal of maintaining maximum employment and production, and many other things that make our Nation what it is, we would then have no problem of inflation. But we would lose infinitely more than we would gain.

It is true that if we decide to divert more of our resources to a particular purpose, such as foreign aid or preparedness, we will for the time being not have those same resources available for other purposes. But there is no good reason why a decision on grounds of national policy to divert manpower and other productive resources to one purpose rather than to another should prevent us from dealing more equitably with our people at home or from checking the economic maladjustments which are now under way. During the war, we diverted about half of our output to noncivilian use, and yet through affirmative economic policies we actually raised civilian standards of living and ended the war on a fairly promising footing for lasting economic prosperity. Growing maladjustments have developed since then, not because we have undertaken certain essential programs such as foreign aid and preparedness, but because we have done so little to deal with the disruptive forces which have been released by the actions of men and can likewise be contained by the actions of men.

Inflation and increasing production

The second point in evaluating measures to combat inflation is that increased production alone is not a feasible solution. In the first place, with full employment (see chart 21), shortages of materials, and almost full utilization of our resources, we cannot increase production very much in the short run and must live with that fact. Certainly, price inflation is not driving production upward (see chart 22). In the second place, mere increase in production will not by itself correct the maladjustments already indicated in the price-income structure; taken alone, it might even accentuate some of these maladjustments, particularly the general balance between production and consumption. If this were not true, no one would be able to understand how a business upswing ever turns into a business downswing. The truth is that our immediately soluble problem is less one of total produc-

tion than of the composition of production and the distribution of the product. Prices under unrestrained inflation are operating to induce the production of too much of some things and not enough of others at a rather fixed level of total production. Some lines are expanding relatively too fast, and others relatively not fast enough, to serve national needs or to avoid eventual disruption of production generally. In short, while the problem is partly to relieve inflation by more production as fast as we can, the bigger problem is that inflation is impairing production in detail and in the long-run will impair it in general. If we can deal vigorously with inflation, production for the most part will take care of itself.

INFLATION AND DECREASING DEMAND

The third point in evaluating anti-inflation measures is that reducing total demand is by no means a full solution, although it is frequently hailed as such. Demand means spending power in the market. If all demand throughout the economy were reduced pro tanto, we would indeed have a lower price level, but price-income relationships and the distribution of goods and services would remain approximately the same as they are now. The submerged families who are not now getting enough goods would still not be getting enough goods; and some others who are getting relatively too much would still be getting relatively too much. On the demand side, as on the supply side, the immediate problem is mainly one of relationships rather than of totals. Some types of demand need to be curbed, while other types need to be made more effective. Effective demand in the market determines the kind of work that people do, the kinds of goods that are produced, and how these goods are distributed. When we are faced with trouble on the demand side in a full-employment economy, the real task is not to reduce all demand but rather to readjust relative demands either for reasons of equity or national policy or in the interests of general economic stability. We need to do this now for all three reasons.

INFLATION AND HOUSING

A good example of the demand problem is in the field of housing. The point has been made that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill is inconsistent with an anti-inflation program because it would add to demand.

This point is not well-founded. If there is a shortage of housing, and if this is contributing to excessive housing costs in the same way that a shortage of food would contribute to excessive food costs, then the production of more housing is anti-inflationary in the same sense that the production of more food would be anti-inflationary. It may well be that, for a time, we cannot divert much more labor and materials to the total production of housing in view of other competing national needs. But let us make sure that they are competing national needs and not competing nonessentials. And even then there would still remain the question of the composition of the housing that is being produced. It would still be sound and desirable to produce relatively more low-rent housing for veterans and others of modest means, and relatively less high-priced housing for families who can get along very nicely for a while with what they already have. The Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill is designed basically for this purpose, although this is not true of the title VI provisions contained in the bill. Thus, under present circumstances, talk about damping down the demand for housing is indiscriminating and mistaken until one breaks the demand down into various types. Some types of housing should be expanded, other types should be contracted.

INFLATION AND GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

What is true of housing is equally true of other expenditures, including expenditures under Government programs. Some types of expenditures, of course, should be held low or reduced. Those types of expenditures which represent essential national purposes, or serve essential individual needs, cannot be reduced below the point of safety or basic welfare. Some of them, for example, educational outlays, need to be increased. The problem is to translate the more necessary expenditures into effective goods and services, and this can be done only by reducing, on a selective basis, other types of expenditures which are drawing goods and services away for less essential purposes. The problem here again is one of the composition of expenditures and their relationships one to another.

INFLATION AND PRICE-WAGE-PROFIT POLICIES

The price-wage-profit problem in the current stage of inflation cannot be met by deciding arbitrarily that all prices should be held where they are now, or that all wages should be held where they are now, or that all profits should be held where they are now. Some items are relatively too high, and others are relatively too low, both on grounds of equity and on grounds of economic stability. A program which sought to hold everything just as it is now, even if it could be successful, would merely freeze current maladjustments where these exist, and if current maladjustments did not exist there would be no crying need for the program at all. The fact is that some items need to be raised, and others need to be lowered, in relation to the general structure of prices, wages, and profits.

INFLATION AND PRICE OR WAGE SUPPORTS

As a further example of this point, there is nothing intrinsically inconsistent between proposals on the one hand to maintain agricultural price supports, and proposals on the other hand to check such prices as are found to be rising too fast. Preventing some prices from falling to levels that are relatively too low is just as much a part of a sound economic program as preventing other prices from reaching levels that are relatively too high. Likewise, there is no inconsistency between raising minimum wages, or seeking to improve the real earnings of those who are discriminated against in the current price-income structure, while at the same time seeking to restrain such wage increases as would break through necessary price ceilings.

TREATMENT OF INFLATION SHOULD BE SELECTIVE AND NOT INDISCRIMINATE

For these reasons, there is little merit in the high-sounding notion that a genuine anti-inflationary program should get equally tough on everybody, and that a program which gets tough at some points and not at others is unsound or disingenuous. For example, inflation cannot be remedied by getting tough on those who are already its chief victims. The very essence of a corrective program is that it increases pressure at some points and relieves pressure at other points so as to get things into better balance. The only kind of economic development that gets tough on everybody is a depression.

An effective anti-inflationary program must be both comprehensive and selective. It must embrace a variety of measures because the problem is complex, and it must treat each of these problems carefully and not with a meat ax. Maladjustments can be cured only by treating everybody fairly, not by treating everybody the same.

In the light of these standards, it becomes easier to evaluate the main proposals now before the committee, relating to credit controls, materials allocations, and selective price control.

CONSUMER CREDIT CONTROL

The control of consumer credit has an appropriate place in a rounded anti-inflation program, because it can be used to curb the effective demand for goods on the part of those who are now securing too many goods in relation to what the economy at current levels of production can make available. But manifestly, consumer credit controls cannot and should not be used to decrease the amount of goods made available to those who are already receiving relatively too little. In short, consumer credit controls by themself cannot do much for the primary victims of inflation, and for this reason as well as others they need to be combined with other measures.

Let me illustrate that a bit more specifically, Mr. Chairman. If consumer credit controls were to be directed primarily against those whom I call the primary victims of inflation, in other words, those at the bottom of the structure, isn't the manifest truth that it would operate to lower their living standards much more rapidly than it would operate to lower the whole price-wage structure to the point where they might be among the beneficiaries of that general lowering?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, because they haven't the fat.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Certainly. In other words, consumer credit control is a selective device that can be used effectively in connection with other measures; taken alone, it would be a puny device indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand what the committee is charged with in the next few minutes, is to put you on the spot in view of your background. Tell us what you, Leon Keyserling, would do if you were charged with full authority—carte blanche—to go ahead and remove the danger of inflation.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I am certainly relieved not to have that responsibility. It is my responsibility to put before you, as the makers of policy, as objectively as I can, the facts and some of the results of analysis. It is up to you to decide basic policy.

I think I have sufficiently discussed consumer credit controls. The next proposal relates to bank credit.

RESTRAINT ON INFLATIONARY BANK CREDIT

This proposal has great merit as a part of a rounded program, but I don't think that it should be ridden to the point where anyone would regard it as a sufficient remedy by itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you also agree with me in a remark made last night in the committee that by no circumstances would the common people be justified in feeling that relief from this burden of high prices would accrue to them from regulation of bank credit?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Taken alone, it is not nearly enough, in my judgment.

The control of inflationary bank credit, by whatever devices may be used, has fruitful usages and is subject to obvious limitations in the kind of inflation we now have. If such controls are used selectively to abate the types of business enterprises which should not be undertaken at this time, they can be useful. But if they were to be used in a blunderbuss fashion to contract the total volume of business activity, they would be utterly inconsistent with the sound idea of striving to increase total production, and would be consistent only with the fallacious and dangerous notion that inflation can be cured by bringing on a mild recession in the general level of employment and business activity. Such controls, moreover, have other inherent shortcomings which prevent them from being the whole answer or even enough of an answer to the current inflationary problem. Some of the lines of enterprise and expansion which ought to be relatively reduced under present circumstances are not dependent upon outside credit to an extent

that they would be affected perceptibly by these controls. Conversely, some of the types of production that should be relatively stimulated under present conditions would not be helped by such controls and might be impaired by them. And, manifestly, there controls would not reach into the crucial problem of the price-wage spiral generally, unless they were applied so extremely and so unwisely that they brought about a serious contraction in Nation-wide levels of business activity—which is just the reverse of what we should want to do. Therefore, neither by the test of relieving the primary victims of inflation, nor by the test of curing the maladjustments in the economic structure, which are the central danger of inflation, do credit controls afford more than a part, albeit a necessary and essential part, of a workable program for checking inflation.

So, without laboring the point too much, and I will carry it further if you have any additional questions, it seems clear that consumer credit controls and bank reserve controls taken together are highly selective measures to be judicially employed for limited purpose, but they hardly touch some of the most strategic elements of danger in the current inflationary situation.

The CHAIRMAN. What are they?

Mr. KEYSERLING. First, the hardship inflicted on the primary victims of inflation; second, the question of the allocation of materials and productive effort to necessary uses in the short run, and to uses that will build up the most favorable conditions for sustained maximum employment and production.

The CHAIRMAN. And the lever there would be to have some power of allocation over these things.

Mr. KEYSERLING. That is right. This brings me to the subject of allocations.

ALLOCATIONS

Because it is neither desirable to contract the total level of economic activity nor feasible in the short run to expand it very much, the real problem is to weigh the composition of this activity in favor of our most urgent national needs. This means that a vigorous and fully implemented program of allocation of basic commodities in relatively short supply ranks high on the list of effective measures from the viewpoint of general economic analysis. So long as there is not enough steel for everyone to get as much as he wants or has the money to try to buy, it is imperative that a program such as the preparedness program not be jeopardized because too much steel is being drained off in other directions. It is likewise important, even to the extent that effective measures exist for getting steel for the preparedness program, that the amount of steel which this program leaves available for general civilian use is wisely directed and sanely used. The same principle applies to other basic commodities in relatively short supply, whether because of domestic conditions or because of a combination of domestic conditions and the foreign aid and preparedness program. We should not want to reduce the total production or the total use of these basic commodities through general contracting measures which would both impoverish the country and create unemployment; the problem is rather to channel them to the most effective use. And in appraising what is the most effective use, we need to take into account not only short-run urgency but also the longer range problem of the balanced development of interrelated facilities. The worst danger of relative shortages is the distortions which they create.

Senator SPARKMAN. I suppose every Member of the Senate received just a few days ago from Mr. R. R. Young, President of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad, a letter and an article that had been published in some railway publication dealing with the unavailability of steel with which to build needed railroad cars, whereas trucks and automobiles apparently were getting all they needed.

I don't recall the figure, definitely. I believe he said they were having a shortage this year of 28,000 railroad cars.

He pointed to the fact that when the time comes for transporting the great fruit crops of this year, the grain crops, we were going to feel that. Is that what you mean by taking care of the more essential needs?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Very definitely.

Senator SPARKMAN. At the expense of the less essential.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Very definitely. There are illustrations of this problem at numerous key points in the economy. Some of the specialized agencies working in the various commodity fields would be able to illustrate this better than I.

This brings us to what the Chairman calls the $64 question—price control.

SELECTIVE PRICE CONTROL

I very genuinely feel, as I know every member of the committee does, that there is involved here a question of balance. On the one hand, there is to be weighed the inconveniences, the black market possibilities, and the administrative difficulties, of imposing this kind of restraint. On the other hand, there is the fact that unrestrained prices have become immensely dangerous.

In weighing this issue, we cannot say that price control is basically inconsistent with our form of government or our basic freedoms, because we have used it before without endangering these precious values. Nor can we set the proposal for price control aside on the ground that it won't work at all, because we know that despite the black markets and inconveniences and aberrations it did work to hold a fairly stable level of prices and that it did bring us out of the war on a much sounder economic footing for postwar prosperity than we now have, because of the maladjustments which have crept up particularly since mid-1946.

If price control is going to be excluded from the tools made available to fight inflation, this can reasonably be done only on the ground that its inconveniences outweigh the need for meeting the great dangers and hardships in the existing economic situation, or on the ground that other proposals than price control are in themselves sufficient without price control.

I have indicated my reasons for believing—and I most reluctantly reach this conclusion—that the other proposals taken alone would be insufficient; that the other proposals taken alone would seem even to be inequitable; that the other proposals taken alone would seem to have an even greater shortcoming—they would seem to impose upon our people the belief that their Government had taken adequate steps to cure the situation when in fact it had not, which I think, as an economist, should be a cause for great concern.

Senator HAWKES. Might I ask a question there? I am not on your committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to wait until he gets through? We will question him when he gets through.

Mr. KEYSERLING. You are the chairman. It is up to you.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought there was nobody else asking. We will wait until you get through.

Go ahead.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Then we come to another question which has been raised, and this is whether selective controls can be effective. The argument has been made that selective controls must necessarily move to all-pervasive controls.

Purely as an economist, I think that this argument proves too much. It proves too much because it seems to run to the conclusion that a nation cannot take moderate measures to deal with—I won't say a moderate situation, but a developing situation—but must wait until you have a total situation and then take all-out measures.

It seems to me that such an approach is inconsistent with prudence, and inconsistent certainly with the "stitch in time saves nine" idea that this Committee and the Congress approved by a great majority in the Employment Act of 1946 under which I serve.

The reason that we moved from selective controls to all-pervasive controls earlier in this decade was not by any inexorable law of logic that if you do something, you have to do everything. It was rather because of the fact that we moved from a defense period which presented a relatively lesser strain to a war period which had a terrific impact on our economy.

During the war, we were devoting about 50 percent of our total resources to noncivilian use, and at the same time, because we were financing the war mainly through borrowing rather than by taxation—and I am not criticizing that policy—the volume of purchasing power in the economy went up as fast or faster than production went up, but the production was not going to civilians although civilians were getting the income. Thus there was a perfectly terrific spread between purchasing power and goods. In that situation, of course, we needed all-out measures. We needed all-out rationing, we needed all-out price control, we needed all-out compulsory savings, and other extraordinary things besides.

We haven't that kind of all-out situation now. A comparable emergency in peacetime would be a large-scale depression, which would be as great a danger to our economy as a war, or nearly as great. If we now waited until we arrived at such a critical situation, we would need all-out measures, though different from wartime measures. But there is no reason, as I have said, why the application of certain limited measures to the limited dangers of today should lead to all-pervasive measures unless we neglect the situation until a crisis is at hand. I don't want to burden the committee with detail, but I think the Canadian experience with selective controls has worked fairly well, if you measure it by the test of holding down the cost of living. I think it can be done.

The point I want to stress again is that this is not the kind of situation where it would be safe to compound a series of remedies which fairly clearly cannot do the job. Anyone would be pretentious who said—and I am not prepared to say—that any series of remedies offer sure-fire 100-percent proof, in advance, of their perfection. The real test before us is to select those proposals which, looking at the situation as a whole, we think are most likely to do the job with reasonable safety and dispatch.

If this covers the questions raised sufficiently, I can turn to the excess-profits-tax matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

THE EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

Mr. KEYSERLING. You asked me to discuss the excess-profits-tax proposal. That is not before this committee. Nonetheless, this committee has to consider that the whole range of anti-inflation proposals are interrelated.

I think that, in the present economic situation, there is merit in the proposal for the excess-profits tax.

First, by definition, the tax does not apply to restrain either normal or legitimate levels of profits. I am not using the word "legitimate" in the legal sense. I am using it in the popular sense.

Second, in the current economy, as was indicated by my general analysis and further brought out by one of Senator SPARKMAN'S questions, there clearly are important instances where the level of profits after taxes is higher than needed to provide adequate incentives and funds for the highest rate of

present and prospective investment that our resources can sustain.

Third, I think that the excess-profits tax would help to moderate the price-wage spiral for this reason: Although wage negotiations recently have concentrated largely upon the question of the cost of living, it is only realistic to recognize that the cost of living is not the only question or rationale underlying collective bargaining. Even if the cost of living should be held at its present levels, there is a general philosophy which we cannot set aside that there should be some relationship between the earnings of a business and what those who work therein receive. There is a philosophy which we cannot set aside that, at a stable cost of living or a stable price index, wages should go up as productivity increases to reflect increasing standards of living. Because these issues enter into collective bargaining, I think that a restraint upon excess profits would relieve tension and help to moderate the rate of wage increases. This does not mean that it would be a panacea, but it would help.

The fourth point I would make relates to the argument that an excess-profits tax would operate actually to raise prices because, since the return after taxes would be lower with the excess-profits tax than without it, even higher prices would be charged in order to keep the return stable. Putting aside entirely the fact that this argument is directly contrary to accepted principles of economics, there still remains the fact that the repeal of the excess-profits tax when it was repealed had no restraining effect upon prices. The price-wage spiral continued.

In the present inflationary situation, in those administered price areas where businessmen make conscious judgments as to prices, the price does not necessarily represent the highest price that can be charged at any given moment. I think that there has been some restraint in this respect. But it does represent what some businessmen regard as the highest price that it is wise to charge, and their judgment may sometimes be wrong, although the principle of seeking the optimum price is right and proper in the profit system which we all want to retain and support. I think that, where there are excess profits, the judgment is wrong from the point of view of the interests of the whole economy. For these reasons, in an inflationary economy operating at full employment and very high demand, I do not believe that an excess-profits tax would operate to drive administered prices higher, because in any event they tend during inflation to come near to the highest level that those who administer prices think they can safely charge. I think that the spiral of inflation will take prices still higher, if firm measures are not applied.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not contend that you can increase production by price-control measures?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I would make two points. I would say, first, that it has been clearly demonstrated from a chart (22) which I have already discussed that spiraling prices do not increase production. Second, while I would admit that price control in itself does not directly and immediately increase production, we have learned from experience that production can be increased greatly while price control is in effect, if the manpower and resources are available to increase it. Moreover, by helping to check inflation, price control would help to remove one of the main dangers to both employment and production. The maladjustments that are developing in the course of inflation will turn us downhill if they are neglected. If we can stop inflation, without a recession or depression, production will be quite satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. If wage controls are necessary, in your judgment, is not the pending legislation deficient in that respect?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that the formula in the pending legislation relating to the relationship between price control and wage control is a sound formula. I think that if we look at the situation in the main, Senator TOBEY, on the factual side, economic analysis will not support the proposition that the total level of wages has risen relatively too fast in relation to the whole complex of the national economy. Wages, since inflation got started in earnest, have been trying—and not with complete success—to keep up with the cost of living. Nor has the total of compensation to employees been too high in relation to other distributive shares of national income, as my earlier remarks have indicated in more detail. The outrunning has been mostly in parts of the price structure and in certain levels of profits. For these reasons, I do not think that there would be an acute problem on the wage side if the cost of living could be held measurably in line, and if the exacerbating factor of some excessive profits could be dealt with.

The formula in the bill, however, does not sidestep the wage problem. It says simply and directly that in those cases where it is necessary to impose a price ceiling because of the price structure, the Government should have authority to prevent those types of wage increases which would break through the price ceiling, except where necessary to relieve hardship or maintain living standards or correct inequities or maladjustments. Wage increases based on productivity or payable out of margins without breaking through a price ceiling should not be interfered with.

The CHAIRMAN. There are those who do not think that strong enough.

Mr. KEYSERLING. There are those who don't think it strong enough, and there are those who think it too strong. I disagree with both. It is a middle approach.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to give my colleagues the privilege of asking questions. Senator BUCK?

Senator BUCK. I have no questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator CAIN?

Senator CAIN. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator FULBRIGHT?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Mr. Keyserling, would you say the imposition of credit controls alone would be worth while if the whole program is not undertaken?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I find it hard to answer that question, Senator, although I do not want to duck it.

Mr. Chairman, the question asked me was whether I would say that the imposition of credit controls alone would be undesirable if the whole program were not undertaken. I did not intend to say that, and I do not think that I said it.

Senator FULBRIGHT. You didn't put it that way.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I said that I did not think that credit controls alone would be nearly adequate to deal with the current inflation.

Senator FULBRIGHT. I was trying to clarify what you meant. I realize you did not use the words I used, but I was trying to get at your meaning, because all of your remarks were in the background of an over-all program, including several things. I don't think as a practical matter the whole program is going to be given serious consideration. It is generally thought in the Senate that this credit control, particularly bank credit and consumer credit, is the only feature of this program that may be given consideration. As a Member of the Senate, I am intensely interested in whether or not that alone is worth while.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Senator FULBRIGHT, I think we are talking in an area where it is important for me to distinguish between the functions of the economist and the functions of the legislator. I don't want to step over the line. I understand your question, and it is reasonable, but it is a very hard question for me to answer. About as far as I can go is to say that it seems clear to me that a rounded and sufficient program to deal with the inflationary situation requires the range of measures that I have discussed, and that anything short of this range of measures would be insufficient. That much I can say as an economist. When you go beyond that and ask me to advise whether or not, if I were a member of the Senate, I would vote for a partial program, being unable to get a whole program, I think that this is a practical question of legislation beyond my appropriate province. Frankly, I don't know what I would do if I were in your place, but I don't have to make that decision.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Do you think the repeal of the excess-profits tax in 1945 was a proper measured move to take at that time?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think it was well-intentioned at the time, but in view of subsequent events I think it would have been better not to have taken such action.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Do you think the decrease in income tax this spring was a proper measure from the inflationary point of view?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that from the inflationary point of view it was a mistake to do this at that particular time.

Senator FULBRIGHT. We will assume for purposes of this question that we do impose some credit controls, the ones proposed. Do you think at the same time that we increase the availability of money for the housing program that that would not have the effect of offsetting——

Mr. KEYSERLING. I am glad you asked that question, Senator FULBRIGHT. It raises the whole point which I have labored throughout my statement to develop, namely, that in a situation like the present it is impossible to get a formula which says: "We are going to fight inflation by clamping down on everything." Every expenditure is in a sense inflationary. Expenditures for production are in that sense inflationary. Raising the wage of the fellow who is getting $14 a week and who can't live under inflation is inflationary in a sense.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a question of objectives, is it not, and of human needs?

Mr. KEYSERLING. It is a question of balance. On the housing program I would say this: If you look at it solely from the demand side, obviously when you create more demand for housing it is inflationary. If you look at it on the production side, then a proposal to increase the volume of housing because the inflationary situation in that area is caused partly by a shortage is no more illogical than if we were proposing to increase the production of steel or to increase the production of food because there were shortages in such areas. As I understand it, the proposed housing program is primarily designed to increase the production of housing. It is quite different from something like consumer credit, which does not increase the production of anything.

Further, even if we have reached the point where for a while we cannot increase the total volume of housing because of shortages of manpower or resources or materials, we still have to be concerned tremendously about the composition of the housing product. We should have a combined program, which on the one hand cuts down the amount of certain types of housing which are being built, like luxury housing, high-priced housing, twelve- to fifteen-thousand-dollar-a-unit housing, while at the same time filling in the gap with a relatively greater diversion of the product into low-rent housing which now represents a much greater need on the part of veterans' families and others with low

and moderate incomes. I think that the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, which has been before this committee, is sound at this time because its main immediate purpose is to deal with the composition of the housing product. We are in a situation where at any given level of housing production we should have relatively more low-rent housing available at moderate charges for the kinds of families who now are suffering most from the housing shortage.

Senator FULBRIGHT. As I understand it, as a practical matter, title VI is about the only feature that is receiving serious consideration.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that would be a most serious mistake, to act on that feature alone.

Senator FULBRIGHT. That is really what I meant by housing. I am not sure about that because the agenda of the Congress is still uncertain, but has nothing definite to say.

It seemed to me that that alone would do the very thing which you say should not be done.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Exactly, Senator Fulbright. Housing is the best example of the point that what is needed is a well-rounded, selective, anti-inflation program. We can't just take an oversimplified solution and say that we want to cut down on everything, because that would cut down on employment and production. We can't say we want an over-all solution that will cut everybody's income, because that would cut the income of the people at the bottom faster than the income of anybody else. We can't say we want a program that is just going to contract credit, for that would reduce necessary production as well as unnecessary production. We need a selective program in this kind of situation, and that is why I think a balanced program of credit controls, allocations, selective price controls with its attendant features, and fiscal measures, is the kind of program adjusted to the kind of situation we are in.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Just one other question. Why is it that the control of bank credit by the increase of reserves is more appropriate now than it was last January, when it was first proposed and apparently was not supported?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that this would have been a desirable measure last January, and I recall that it was proposed.

Senator FULBRIGHT. What?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that this would have been a desirable measure last January, and I recall that it was proposed.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I understand the administration didn't approve of it last January. I understood that; I thought there was some change in the economic situation that might very well have justified that difference of view.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I have tried throughout my statement here to give you my objective views as I hold them, and not to defend——

Senator FULBRIGHT. I understand that.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Not to defend or disclaim.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Unfortunately, we have to make that decision.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I have answered your question in the one way that I can. You asked me about the control of bank credit last January, and my answer is that I think it would have been a good thing if it had been done then.

Senator FULBRIGHT. That was a mistake, then, not to have done it then——

Mr. KEYSERLING. I do not know who made the mistake.

Senator FULBRIGHT. If it is proper to do it now.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Whoever may have been responsible for the mistake, I think it was a mistake. As to who was responsible, that is not within my province.

The CHAIRMAN. Carrying that out further, we are 8 months farther down the river, nearer the breakers.

Senator MYERS. I surmise that just the restriction of bank credit last January would have been just as inadequate as the restriction of bank credit alone today might be?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that is correct, Senator MYERS.

Senator MYERS. And you needed a balanced program last January in 1947 just as much as you need a balanced program today.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I think that is correct, except possibly that it is even more clearly needed today.

Senator HAWKES. I was going to ask the gentleman, at the time he said he didn't think we ought to hold out a plan that you know will not work, did he say that? Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. KEYSERLING. I said that I, as an economist, had concern about that.

Senator HAWKES. I thought you said that you didn't think we should hold out a plan that we know will not work. I want to ask you whether you know that this plan you are suggesting will work?

Mr. KEYSERLING. Well, no; I cannot be certain of the future. I have said that very frankly. I said that——

The CHAIRMAN. You made a qualifying statment.

Senator HAWKES. I was not here at the beginning.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I said that in the kind of world we live in, we cannot get universal agreements, or absolute surety, even among technicians.

Senator HAWKES. That is correct; or legislators.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Also, we cannot be absolutely certain of every step we take. However, that is generally true in dealing with practical problems. But this does not mean that, where a situation is sufficiently critical and the pressure sufficiently acute, no steps should be taken until they are as certain as a mathematical demonstration. It is necessary to make the best possible judgment as to whether, on the basis of experience and analysis, the steps proposed seem like wise or foolish steps.

I have tried to indicate, in response to questioning, what seemed to me to be wise or foolish steps by the test of economic analysis. I didn't intend in any way, Senator HAWKES, to have that carry over into an expression of what I felt members of the committee or of the Congress ought to do as they weigh from a somewhat different perspective the whole range of competing considerations.

Senator HAWKES. The point I had in mind was to ask you this question, if you can tell us a single nation that has gone to and stayed with controls, price controls and allocations, the things that are being asked, that has been successful in doing the thing we want to do in the United States.

Mr. KEYSERLING. I don't think, Senator HAWKES, that I suggested in any way that we should stay with price controls permanently. They should be employed temporarily, and selectively, and such is the proposal before you.

Senator HAWKES. That is all right. We don't need to have so much conversation. What I wanted to do is to get right down to the point that if you get them on, these other countries, their leaders, promised that they would not stay on, but they did stay on, and habit is very strong, and when you get it going, it is very hard to get it off.

We who got OPA off the backs of the American people happen to know how hard it was to get it off. It was a very difficult thing. The countries who have adopted the plan that the President is recommending to us now and that you are talking about, are all socialistic today, and they are all in the junk pile, and we are sending millions of tons of foodstuffs and things of that kind over to keep them from starving to death.

I am not saying I am right, and you are wrong. I am saying that this is a very debatable thing, and I think every serious-minded man in the Congress and in the Senate realizes it is a debatable thing, and we are trying to find out if there isn't some way to do this thing without fastening controls again upon the American people and destroying voluntary cooperation and incentive.

Mr. KEYSERLING. In conclusion, I want to say just a word about timing.

THE PROBLEM OF TIMING

Nobody can foretell just when the dangers and maladjustments of inflation will culminate in a crash. But is it not a strange paradox that those who believe that this ultimate calamity is some time off should on that ground be skeptical of prompt remedial action? Is it not more prudent to take remedial action while the common judgment is that there is still time for it to be effective? I think that these questions pose one of the supreme issues of our generation, which is a moral issue as well as an economic issue. Will our democracy make manifest its innate sense of justice which rebels against hardship for so many people even in the presence of prosperity? Will our democracy make manifest the strength and the unity to act before the ultimate crisis appears, just as we have made manifest the strength and the unity to act upon the event of crises—especially when we know that some of these crises would never have appeared if we had acted in time?

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to say, now that you have come to the conclusion of your talk, and I sat all through it, that you have in a more comprehensive way than any witness that has come before us in my memory met this situation that you came to talk to us about.

Speaking from this chair and for myself only, I do not doubt very much, reflecting the minds of some others here, you have shown a grasp of the situation, you have shown a manifest fairness, you had a lucidness of utterance of expression, and you have not been dogmatic, and you have impressed me with the fact that you realize how delicate the situation is; and all of these things after all, are experimentations, but you have a reason for the faith that is within you.

I want to pay you a compliment, if I can, and say that as far as this fellow is concerned, I invite the committee to join me, I envy the mental equipment that God has given you and that you use so well, and thank you for being present.

Mr. KEYSERLING. Thank you very much.

Senator BUCK. Because I have to leave, may I at this point ask consent of the committee to only introduce at the conclusion of the hearings a statement which was sent to me by Mr. Dodge of the American Bankers Association?

The CHAIRMAN. We will be very glad to have it in the record.

Senator BUCK. He comments upon the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. I now ask the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, to come to the stand.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES SAWYER, SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sawyer, we regret very much that due to the exigencies of a tense schedule today, we had to keep you waiting, but I do now, to put it very frankly to you, it was with some degree of being edified by what you have heard and you will now contribute to our edification, I am sure.

Secretary SAWYER. May I say this with reference to Mr. Keyserling: He has left me less confused than any economist I ever listened to.

The CHAIRMAN. I feel the same way, now.

You are going to speak as I assume, because the subject is one that is in the purview of our consideration here in pending legislation, more pertinently on the subject of allocations; is that right?

Secretary SAWYER. I learned at noon that I was expected to come and I have here a statement which my staff has prepared for me, which I shall either go through or not, as you wish.

The CHAIRMAN. How long is it? How many pages?

Secretary SAWYER. Twenty.

The CHAIRMAN. I wonder if you will not put the statement in the record and talk to us in your own way; just around the country store at night, conversing about what you think about the situation?

Secretary SAWYER. I am perfectly willing to omit the statement—in fact, I would be very glad to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty pages would take very nearly 50 minutes, and it is now 6 o'clock, and these gentlemen have some plans made for evening engagements and so I thought we could just put in a quarter of an hour here and you talk intimately and we will read your statement, at least, the chairman will, some of us will, at least, I think. That would be very helpful.

Secretary SAWYER. I shall be very glad to. I think perhaps I could accomplish the same purpose if I referred briefly to certain parts.

The CHAIRMAN. Do it in your own way, please.

Secretary SAWYER. One or two things which have been handled in the Department of Commerce, which is the only department with which I am familiar—at the present time the Department of Commerce is making use of several statutory provisions to assist in meeting problems which I have described, including principally the voluntary agreement provision of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, export controls, and the priority and allocations powers under the Second Decontrol Act. While these statutes are necessary in the areas where they are applicable, there are many situations where they do not assist us.

I have spent most of the day with another Senate committee, considering one of the so-called voluntary agreements, dealing with the allocations of 59,000 tons of steel for prefabricated steel houses.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that the Lustron Co.?

Secretary SAWYER. Yes. The allocations to go to five companies, but it is that the major part of it, theoretically, at least, and probably actually, if the agreement goes through, will go to the Lustron Co.

That hearing was an excellent example of the situation of shortages which face us now not only in the country at large, but of course particularly in the Commerce Department, where we are trying to operate this voluntary program.

I might say to you, Senator, that with reference to specific suggestions which I understand you would like to have, I would suggest, further, that the Congress extend this voluntary control program that is in Public Law 395. I think I wrote to you and one or two others previously on that, because the date at the moment is March 1, 1949, and by reason of the steps that need to be taken and the time that must elapse we can't operate up to that date. At least, that is the opinion of those in the office who are carrying on the program.

I assume that the reason for things like fixing that date was that the next Congress would be able to decide in the light of what happened what it wanted to do. My suggestion is that date be extended to June 30, at least, 1949, perhaps even longer.

If I may, I would like to make another suggestion in connection with that voluntary-agreement program, and that is that you give us the same power which was given to the ECA, for instance, to employ experts and consultants without subjecting them to the possibility of prosecution under the statutes against the conflict of interests, bribery, and so forth, with which you are more familiar than I.

Perhaps I can just let my statement go altogether and just discuss this thing if that is what you would really prefer.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that would be helpful.

Secretary SAWYER. It seems that the problem which has arisen in connection with the voluntary-agreements program is typical of the entire problem. It is one of shortages. And while originally the shortages were not so acute, they are daily growing more acute.

It is quite clear to me, and I am sure to everyone in contact with the situation, that every time you make a voluntary agreement and by that much cut down the steel which is available, the balance becomes more desirable, and the influx of applicants for voluntary agreements is growing, and will continue to grow.

I might also say that if any addition should be made to the job that was given the Department of Commerce, I hope we will have an additional appropriation, because we can't do this without personnel.

We have, as you doubtless know, made some voluntary agreements, and if it would be of interest at all, I will list what those are.

The allocations of steel are, first, to the Atomic Energy Commission, 20,000 tons a month. Freight cars, I heard those mentioned a while ago, during Mr. Keyserling's testimony, 240,000 tons a month.

Senator BRICKER. What number of cars will that provide?

Secretary SAWYER. They are operating under the theory that it is ten thousand. Of course, as you know, Senator, only during 1 month, I think, has that goal been met.

Senator BRICKER. Actually been reached?

Secretary SAWYER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How is that apportioned between the different car building companies, as to proportions of output—how is the allocation made?

Secretary SAWYER. The allocation is made by voluntary agreement. I myself don't know at the moment just how much each company gets, but it is divided between the companies that make cars.

Senator TAYLOR. Is anything being done or can be done to increase steel production?

Secretary SAWYER. I am told that there are things being done, but, of course, in order to increase steel production they themselves must get steel and other things to build their mills. I am quite sure there are things being done.

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't there also the inhibition automatically with the steel companies as with any sound business, they hesitate about going ahead with high prices and extending plants extensively when the recession some day coming will change the whole picture?

Secretary SAWYER. I have understood that was their argument against very large enlargement of their plant facilities.

I would not be qualified to speak on that. I do know that at the moment the problem of allocating what steel is available is a very critical one, and as someone mentioned a few moments ago, we not only have our own domestic requirements, but we are asked at all times to ship steel abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. Steel is the bête noire, the chief situation, is it not?

Secretary SAWYER. Steel is the heart of the whole problem. There is no doubt of that, although lead and copper and zinc and tin are others. Both steel and nonferrous metals are beginning to be more critical. Even aluminum, which has been in fair supply, is getting short.

The CHAIRMAN. What, if anything, are we doing to build up critical materials in the event of any world-wide catastrophe?

Secretary SAWYER. We have the stock-piling program, and one of the things which has made the allocation of various materials more difficult is the fact that we have now begun to put more effort in that, and actually have stock-piled more, that is, the Munitions Board has; the Commerce Department and others have assisted in that, by putting more in the stock pile than has been done before.

That, of course, just adds to the urgency of the situation, and is one more element in addition to the requirements of the defense program which has been handled by voluntary agreement.

That will call for about 106,000 tons per month.

All of those elements tend to make the situation more critical and of course, I am sure it is apparent to you, tend to make it more difficult to operate a voluntary program.

Senator BRICKER. Are the limitations in the other fields of the metals that you mentioned a moment ago due to the same factors, limitation of production facilities, that you have in steel, or is it a variety of reasons?

Secretary SAWYER. I am not sure what the causes are. I don't feel I could testify as to that today. I think it is partly due to domestic demands and partly due to the demand from other countries.

For instance, a large delegation from Venezuela came in to see me the other day, one of the few countries in the world that has plenty of dollars. They furnish, as you doubtless know, a large portion of oil, in fact most of the oil, I believe, that we import from other countries comes from Venezuela.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it be true today as against the Arabian oil?

Secretary SAWYER. I think it is still true; that we get more from Venezuela than any other place.

Senator BRICKER. What did they want?

Secretary SAWYER. They want steel, and they want steel not only for their oil fields, but they want steel for other purposes, and they argued, and I must say it is rather persuasive, that being one of the few countries in the world that is sending us products which we badly need, they are entitled to it.

Senator BRICKER. And have dollars to pay for what they get.

Secretary SAWYER. And they have that; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How about the export of steel pipe to Arabia?

Secretary SAWYER. As you know, I am sure, we have held that export up for that pipe across Arabia, the Saudi-Arabian line. We did agree on, I think it was 12,000 tons, not a very large amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Are domestic oil interests in the West able to get what pipe they need now for drilling, and also in the South?

Secretary SAWYER. They claim not; and I think their claim is good.

The CHAIRMAN. Is second-hand pipe selling for phenominal prices?

Secretary SAWYER. That I don't know. There is a black or gray market in steel.

The CHAIRMAN. How about nails?

Secretary SAWYER. Well, there is a shortage of nails, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Has it improved much in the last few years?

Secretary SAWYER. I think not. The situation is worse, I think.

The picture gets darker, and the situation gets more critical day by day, and steel which we are now dealing with, and in other commodities, as you know, control now over tin and antimony, and other commodities, in my opinion, should be put in that category.

I suggest some other departments be given the job of handling it, but I still think that something of that sort should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. In the pending bill which is before us, the bill introduced by Senator BARKLEY, S. 2910, you know, you have read the bill, you are familiar with the allocation features of it—what have you to say as to your views about that?

Secretary SAWYER. I think it would be well to give compulsory powers to the President, but as I say, I would just as soon they be

given to some other department, eventually, of the nature which we now have with reference to tin. I think it is probably desirable to give some inventory control power.

I think that the voluntary agreements program—this is my own personal opinion, should be retained, and supplemental controls of a compulsory nature should aid in that.

We have had an example of what we can do by voluntary control and agreement.

Perhaps it would be better, Mr. Chairman, if I were to let you ask me the questions.

The CHAIRMAN. That is why I put that question as I did there, and you said you would like to see these things continued, and you gave your reason for it.

Have you any questions?

Senator CAIN. No; I am just listening, thank you.

Senator BRICKER. What committee was hearing the Lustron matter this afternoon?

Secretary SNYDER. The Wherry Small Business Committee.

Senator CAIN. They were hearing it perhaps from a point that a contract presumably had been agreed to some time ago, and yet no houses were resulting from it.

Secretary SAWYER. No; they were hearing it from the standpoint of the effect of the allocation of this 59,000 tons of steel upon many other types of steel fabricators who can't get enough steel as it is.

It was an effort to bring out all sides of the question.

Senator CAIN. Trying to determine that you would build houses that use less steel; that is, the usual houses?

Secretary SAWYER. That was one of the angles. Of course, as I have learned, and as the Senator suggested a while ago, you come back to steel, no matter where you start, or where you go. And one of the things which we are trying to do under the voluntary agreements program is to get some steel scrap out of Germany.

I am seeing tomorrow morning a man who has been in Germany and has just come back here, who has been over there for the sole purpose of seeing how much of that 10,000,000 tons of German scrap we can get back here.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you suppose the cost will be over prevailing scrap here, transportation and all, handling?

Secretary SAWYER. There is a fixed price. They have fixed a price of $26 a ton. I don't know what the transportation cost is. The experts are of the opinion that the matter of cost isn't a critical factor. They just can't get scrap.

Senator BRICKER. Is the same thing true in the Pacific?

Secretary SAWYER. The Navy has done very well. We are getting quite a bit of scrap from the Pacific.

Senator BRICKER. Have you the production figures on steel for this year; that is, anticipated?

Secretary SAWYER. Sixty-five million tons.

Senator BRICKER. What was the figure last year?

Secretary SAWYER. It was less than that. I don't know how much it is up.

Senator BRICKER. And they will increase it in spite of the loss due to the coal strike?

Secretary SAWYER. No; that is the estimate—65,000,000 tons.

Senator BRICKER. That will be an increase over last year; is that right?

Secretary SAWYER. That is right.

Senator BRICKER. They lost about 1,200,000 tons because of shortage of coal.

Secretary SAWYER. There was quite a loss, but there is no doubt about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other questions around the room?

Senator TAYLOR. No.

Senator CAIN. Just one question, Mr. Secretary:

Do you approve in detail of the provisions covering your operations included within the so-called Barkley bill that is before us?

Secretary SAWYER. I approve of the suggestion that we have some compulsory powers with reference to this matter of allocations and the matter of inventory control. I feel that the situation is getting more critical and that as it gets critical, as I said a moment ago, it will be more difficult to work out voluntary agreement proposals, although I want to say that the steel people have been very cooperative and in the programs which I have mentioned a moment ago have indicated a desire to do all they could to carry out that instruction of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, again I feel I owe you an apology. It is regrettable that after the painstaking statement you prepared we had to treat you rather impersonally this afternoon, due to these exigencies.

It has been a tough day for us here. I hope you understand it. You have met your part splendidly and I thank you for it.

Secretary SAWYER. Let me add that I am just as pleased as you are not to have to read my statement.

So, if I may leave it with the committee, and the two or three suggestions I have made, I assume that my part of this performance is over.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir; thank you for it.

We will meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in executive session.

(Whereupon, at 6:25 p. m., the committee recessed until 10 a. m. of the following day.)

DIVISION OF THE POWER OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Eightieth Congress generally, and this special session in particular, has been harshly attacked by many of the citizens and by the press of this country. As a Member of this body I feel that it is my duty to say a few words, at least, in explanation of the underlying circumstances with which we have been confronted, and to state briefly my views about this session and the issues before us.

I quite agree that the Eightieth Congress, and this special session, has to a very great extent been an ineffective, do-nothing Congress. The reason for this, however, is not primarily because it is composed of men who are less intelligent or less high-minded than were the Congresses which preceded it. The fundamental reason for our futility is that our Government, with its coordinate branches, can never function positively and effectively for the welfare of this Nation when the executive power is under the control of a party different from that which controls the legislative power. Our history demonstrates clearly that when the power of government is thus divided between the two parties, a stalemate, a period of quarreling futility, is the result.

In January of 1947, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 29, providing for an amendment to the Constitution designed to prevent in the future the recurrence of this paralyzing division of power. The negative reception that it received in the press and in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary showed that the seriousness of this defect in our governmental machinery was not then and is not now recognized. Even today the critics, both those in the press and outside the press, persist in castigating the individual Members rather than seeking to understand the real cause of our trouble. I suppose that this is because it is so easy and natural to find fault with one's public servants, whereas it requires hard thinking to understand, and there is no reader interest in explaining, the principles which underlie our complex governmental machinery.

The fact is that even when a single party is in control of both the executive and the legislative branches of the Government, it still is very difficult to formulate and carry through a positive, coordinated program. The character of our country, its great diversity in economic interests, in cultural and social customs, and in its racial and human resources, while a source of strength, in one sense, at the same time presents a formidable obstacle to easy agreement in any streamlined action by the National Congress. Under our system there is little interdependence, or at least it seems so to many Members of the Congress and to many Presidents, between the legislators and the Executive. In fact, under our constitutional division of power, there tends to arise a certain amount of competition, if not antagonism, between the legislative and the executive, even when they belong to the same party.

If, in addition to the constitutional division of power, there is superimposed the further division based upon party allegiance, we have a condition in which, as a practical matter, we have merely a caretaker government, without power to generate and carry through a positive program. This weakness in our system, which has often afflicted us, was tolerable so long as we were an isolated nation with a relatively simple economy. However, since the First World War we have paid an extremely heavy price for it. During the last 2 years of Woodrow Wilson's administration, under a divided Government, we failed to throw in our lot with the nations desiring to build a peace, and we had a second war. During the last 2 years of Herbert Hoover's administration, under similar conditions which prevented our doing anything, we permitted the most disastrous depression in history to develop, without turning a hand.

During the past year and a half, we again have been unable to do anything to prevent the development of an inflation, which may very well wreck not only our domestic economy but also all our plans for creating a peaceful world.

I submit, Mr. President, that those members of the press who are so violent in their criticism of the Congress or of the Executive, should consider carefully and thoroughly these circumstances, before venting their spleen upon the individuals who compose this Government. It is not a question of individual patriotism or intelligence or morals. It is a question of having a governmental structure through which the power of the Nation can be focused upon the achievement of an objective. When our objectives were limited to the protection of the individual's liberty within our own borders, and when our economy was relatively simple, our power was adequate. But now that our freedom is primarily threatened from abroad, and our industrial economy is complicated and sensitive, there has arisen a need for the con-

tinuing ability to focus our power effectively upon the problems which confront us abroad, as well as those at home. In other words, we have come of age as a world power, and it is time that we devise the political methods to utilize our power at all times, for our own and the world's protection. I believe that the people and the Congress should give immediate and serious consideration to the problem of reforming our system so that at all times we may have a Government that can function positively and affirmatively.

Mr. President, in order to keep the record straight, I wish to state that in November of 1946 I pointed out the danger of a divided government and the probability of a stalemate. I wish to read several paragraphs from a statement which I made at that time, in order to show that this is not merely hindsight as to the occurrences which have been taking place in the past few months. I quote now from the statement I made at that time, in 1946:

As for the welfare of the Nation, I am quite unable to see why it is not highly desirable to have at all times, but especially in a time of tense international relations and confusion at home, a government capable of functioning in a definite, positive manner. Practically every responsible commentator on national affairs has agreed that, as a result of the divided responsibility in our Government we are faced with a stalemate for the next 2 years. Typical of these views is that of the Washington Post:

"If the next 2 years are passed in mutual evasion of responsibility, with the only activity the playing for advantage at the next Presidential election, then the outlook is dark indeed. No government is a luxury this Nation can no longer afford. Nor could the world survive it. Surely there is enough common sense left in the parties to avoid this catastrophe."

But history and our common sense plainly show us that under these conditions of divided responsibility there is no reasonable expectancy of that high degree of common sense or statesmanship which could overcome the very natural impulses that will arise in contemplation of the Presidential election of 1948. The rising fervor of bitter recrimination and faultfinding as the next election approaches is too familiar to us to require argument. It simply is not human nature to be nonpartisan in ones views and actions as the election approaches.

An extremely important benefit accruing from giving the Republicans this responsibility would be the clarification of the minds of the people as to just what the Republican Party stands for and how efficient they can be in the practical application of their campaign promises. It is exceedingly important that the people be given some basis for an intelligent evaluation of the two parties in the Presidential election of 1948. Without full responsibility the Republicans can and undoubtedly will insist in 1948 that if they had had control of the Executive during these 2 years things would have been better; and of course no one can prove the contrary.

I submit that the experiences of the last year and a half fully justify the opinions expressed in November of 1946.

INFLATION CONTROL

Mr. President, with regard to the so-called anti-inflation bill that is now before the Congress, I intend to support it; but I want to make it clear that I think it will have very slight effect upon the rising spiral of inflation.

It is my belief that the forces of inflation have already been permitted to grow too strong, and that it would require drastic measures to mitigate the ill effects which we are likely to experience from these forces. This bill certainly is not a drastic measure. I understand, however, that the leadership of the majority of the Congress has definitely decided that it is this bill or nothing—therefore, I shall support it, ineffective as it is.

In order to keep my own record straight on the question of inflation, I wish to read a few excerpts from a speech that I made in October 1945, in opposition to the repeal of the excess profits tax. The full speech may be found on page 10033 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 26, 1945.

I desire to quote from that speech again, because I do not wish to be accused of using hindsight rather than foresight. I think it may possibly contribute to a better understanding of why inflation has become such a serious threat to us today. At that time, October 1945, long before the major postwar strikes got under way, and long before the really serious dislocation between prices and costs arose, I had this to say:

Mr. President, the main reasons for high wartime taxes, including the excess-profits tax, were, first, to hold down the deficit and the need for borrowing, particularly from the banking system; second, to reduce inflationary pressures at a time of greatly excessive demands for goods and services relative to supply; and, third, to curb profiteering out of the war.

These underlying reasons for maintaining high taxes apply with equal or even greater force during the critical period of reconversion, because, first, we still face a heavily unbalanced budget; every dollar of Government expenditures not raised by taxes will have to be borrowed, and to the extent that banks furnish these funds new supplies of money will be added to the already enormous accumulations of liquid funds in the hands of the public as a result of war financing; second, demands, both domestic and foreign, upon our economy are and will continue for an indefinite period to be greatly in excess of supply; and, third, the profits to be made in the next year, at least, will be a direct result of war expenditures and thus just as much war profits as if they were derived while hostilities were still in progress.

Taxation is the last real bulwark against inflationary forces because of the weakening of other controls, such as the War Labor Board exercised over wages and hence prices, and such as the WPB exercised in the construction field. The most prudent course at this juncture would be to defer tax reductions until such time as supply is more nearly in balance with demand and we have begun to approach a balanced budget. At this stage we would be wise to err on the side of too much rather than too little revenue—taxes can always be reduced.

I wish to remind the Senate that the real period of inflation in connection with the last war was not so much during the war as it was soon after the war. In fact it began about 6 months after the war with the removal of what controls there were during that war, and we are facing exactly the same situation.

A little later in the same speech I said:

It is significant that expectations of outright repeal of the excess-profits tax are having four adverse effects: First, it is doing much to boom the stock market, drawing into this vortex of speculation funds that the Government ought to be getting. Second, whetting the appetite of labor for bigger demands, reinforced by strikes.

I think that statement certainly was borne out by the experience during months that followed.

Third, inducing corporations in the excess-profits group to avoid any further sales in the last quarter of this year, because, obviously, profits after January 1 would go untaxed so far as the excess-profits tax is concerned if Congress repeals it as of that date. Fourth, inviting inventory speculation in anticipation of profits resulting from rising prices together with lower taxes.

In summing up I said:

To sum up, if any reductions are to be made at this stage, they should benefit primarily those at the bottom of the income scale, not those individuals and corporations best able to pay taxes. Repeal of the excess-profits tax, in particular, not only favors the few and the financially strongest corporations, but it would grant them these benefits, including refunds, at the Government's expense when revenue is of critical importance; it sets an example in pocketing what are, in fact, war profits that makes it difficult to argue that labor should be denied correspondingly large wage increases; and the effect is to invite the familiar wage-price upward spiral.

I again read those portions of my speech of October 26, 1945, on June 26, 1946, in discussing the conference report on the OPA bill. On the latter date I also said:

I am very doubtful about the efficacy of this OPA bill or for that matter any other OPA measure standing alone. I think it is very doubtful, even if we should extend the present OPA without any change, that such an act would effectively control prices after we have removed the deterrent of the excess-profits tax, the benefits of which we had all during the war, and after we have already created a dislocation between costs arising from increased wages and the prices which have been established and the OPA is attempting to maintain.

During the war there had been worked out, by the combination of these three methods of control, a fairly satisfactory relationship between costs and profits; and while we all had complaints from the business people within our districts or States, on the whole I believe that the system worked quite well. I believe that if we could have maintained that relationship and those three controls, the system might well have worked for one more year, during which we could have attained production sufficient to have relieved much of the pressure which now exists against the prices which we are attempting to maintain.

Under the present circumstances I believe it is misleading to encourage the people to feel that we have discharged our duty in the control of prices. I doubt that it can be done by any single legislative act dealing with price control. It will require a tremendous upsurge of understanding and cooperation on the part of the people themselves—the consumers as well as the producers—to exercise self-restraint during the next few months or the next year, if there is to be any effective control of prices. I think it is perhaps beyond the ability of any single legislative act such as this, or the one under which we are now operating, to control prices. The only thing I could suggest, in a legislative way, would be the reinstitution of something similar to the excess-profits tax, and some agreement with labor, or the reinstitution of some agency such as

the War Labor Board, which could to some extent control wages. But there has been no serious move to do either of those things. As I have just stated, the excess-profits tax was repealed, against my vote and against my best opinion at that time. And without the excess-profits tax, I doubt the effectiveness of the proposed new OPA Act. If I recall correctly only three or four Senators opposed its repeal at that time. Many of those who now complain of the ineffectiveness of OPA supported the repeal of excess-profits tax then.

I believe we are in for some very serious inflation, regardless of what we do with this report, except with respect to the suggestions which I have made, but which I have no hope of having adopted, because apparently there is no support for the reinstitution of the excess-profits tax or anything like the War Labor Board. The destruction of price control began with the repeal of excess-profits tax, the abolition of WLB, and the theory that wages could be raised without raising prices.

On July 11, 1947, I again made reference to this question, when the tax-reduction bill was being considered, and at that time, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 93, Part 7, on page 8660, I made this statement:

Mr. President, it seems to me the problem now facing the country is not so much one of increasing production and inducing further investment in productive capacity, but the real problem is to attain some stability in our economy; that is, that every measure affecting our economy should be designed to prevent anything which will contribute to an undue deflation; in other words, to try to smooth out the great variations in our level of production and employment.

I think the proposed tax reduction is premature. If the effect of the tax reduction at this time will be what the sponsors say it will be, I do not believe that effect would be a proper one. The sponsors say we now need inducement for further investment of capital to build greater productive capacity. I think that is the wrong result to seek at this time. I think the time will come when the present productive machinery begins to become more obsolete, when production begins to fall, when the much-discussed recession takes place, when an incentive to greater profits will be very important, and I think then will be the time to reduce taxes, along with other measures designed to increase employment and production.

I think the Members of the Senate will find the debate on the tax bill which took place on July 11, 1947, very interesting in connection with a discussion of inflation. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance based his argument partly upon the theory that we were likely to have recession. I shall read one or two excerpts from that debate, found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 93, Part 7, on page 8661:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Basic in the Senator's—

This relates to the Senator from Colorado—

Basic in the Senator's argument is his prophecy that a depression will be upon us next year.

This was, as I said, in July 1947.

I submit that he cannot, with any greater justification than other experts in the Government, prophesy what is going to be the case. At the present time I cannot see a single tangible sign, either in prices or in any other factor of our economic system, which indicates that the depression is beginning. In fact, the signs are all to the contrary. Within the past 2 weeks there has been a new lease on the inflationary spiral.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am inclined to agree that those who do not predict an early recession have the better of the argument, but in the management of our fiscal policy I suggest that it is only prudent to base calculations on some recession. In the budgetary set-up we are figuring on a recession from the present rate of national income payments of $178,000,000,000 to an average of $170,000,000,000. Obviously, if it were to average out that way, it would take us seven or eight points below $170,000,000,000. That would increase present unemployment of probably 2,000,000 people to 4,000,000 or 4,500,000. An unemployment figure of 4,000,000 or 4,500,000 does not denote a cataclysmic state of unemployment. It is not what the technicians call a drastic recession. I suggest, however, that it is a prudent estimate of recession, and if we do not meet it we are all to the good. If it should develop, we have made provision for it.

I merely mentioned that to show how far wrong the estimate of the committee was, which I believe lends support to the argument that the timing of the tax bill was entirely erroneous. There is one further excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 93, Part 7, on page 8363. I should like to quote two paragraphs from my remarks:

I am only asking that we try to be a little more farsighted and make some sacrifice now in order to prevent that extreme variation in the level of industry and the standard of living in this country. That is really what it comes down to—a matter of timing.

I understand from the remarks of the chairman of the Committee on Finance that the bill is based on the assumption that there will be a depression next year. He said I could not anticipate there would be inflation, and I do not think he is any more justified in making his assumption than I am in arriving at mine. The signs today, especially in the home town of the Senator from Illinois, Chicago, all indicate the opposite of his prediction.

On the same page the following appears:

I cannot say when is the right time—

These are my remarks, Mr. President—

and I do not think the chairman of the Committee on Finance or anyone else can say just when the conditions will come about which will justify tax reduction. My idea is that tax reduction should be responsive to the economic conditions in the country.

There are several other remarks along the same line. I only wish to refresh the memory of the Senate in order to bring to the minds of Senators the fact that the bill with which we are dealing is such a puny bill that it cannot possibly have any substantial influence on inflation. The time for real measures against inflation was when we were discussing the tax bill and when we repealed the excess-profits tax in 1945. I think the wrong action of the Senate has now created the basis for an inflation which I do not think can be avoided. In my opinion, the pending bill is not calculated to any great extent to mitigate the bad effects of inflation.

I think the sentiments I expressed in July 1947 are certainly valid, as judged in the light of events since that time. The fundamental mistakes of this Congress were made when we repealed excess-profits taxes, reduced income taxes, and permitted regulation W to lapse. The abolition of allocation and wage stabilization prematurely in 1945 is a part of the sorry picture. I believe that the forces of inflation are now so strong that the puny, mealy-mouthed bill we are now considering is of insignificant value. The circumstances require drastic measures, but the leadership of this body is not disposed to consider such measures.

Mr. President, in order that the bill may have more strength to it and that some little help be given to the everyday citizen of the country, I send to the desk an amendment which I have been intending to propose to the bill, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The amendment which I am offering is a bill which is well known to the Senate. It passed the House of Representatives by greater than a 2-to-1 vote in April and has been approved by the Committee on Finance, with a very slight amendment. I am offering the bill which passed the House and I am sure there will be no difficulty in the House accepting it, because the House has so clearly expressed its views. I think the amendment would give to the pending bill some significance, some slight relief to the ordinary citizen of this country from the gradually increasing effects of the high cost of living. I am sure it would be a much greater relief than anything that could happen to them as the result of the passage of the bill in its present form. So I am sure that the Senate will be glad to consider the amendment at the proper time. I know the people of the country will be gratified by the adoption of my amendment, for not only will it make a contribution to the living standards of the people, and to the reduction of the high cost of living for the average citizen, but it will also correct an ancient wrong which has already persisted too long on our statute books.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which would strike out section 2 of the House substitute, beginning on page 2, line 5.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for the information of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, let me say that the unanimous-consent agreement included a provision relative to amendments. No doubt the Senator is well aware that in the event he wants to offer an amendment at the proper time tomorrow, the provision of the agreement applies only to amendments which are germane to the subject matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am aware of that, and I think it is quite clear that my amendment is germane, and will contribute more effectively to the objective desired than will some of the other amendments to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That will be a matter which will be contested if a point of order is raised as to the germaneness of the amendment. I simply raise that question for the information of the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Do I correctly understand that there will be no voting this afternoon?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on August 3 the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] made a very able address on the comprehensive health program which the President and his leadership in Congress insisted that we enact at this special session. The speech of the Senator from Missouri coincides so fully with my own views that I am anxious that the people of my State have an opportunity to read it, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

The Republicans in the Congress, including myself, have strongly opposed the type of legislation proposed by the President, particularly Senate bill 1320, known as the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill. I point out that if the Democratic Party should regain control of the Senate and the House, and their leaders should again control the committees which have charge of this legislation, a strong effort will be made to enact the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill into law.

During the last regular session of the Congress the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, gave the Nation a comprehensive report on the progressive action which the Eightieth Congress has taken in the field of health, without imposing Federal control. I hope it will be widely read.

Again, Mr. President, I commend my colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] for his able speech.

There being no objection, Mr. KEM's speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, President Truman in his recent message to the joint session of the Congress on July 27, 1948, recommended a comprehensive health program based on health insurance.

There is nothing new in this proposal, or in Mr. Truman's espousal of it. On November 14, 1945, Mr. Truman, in a message to Congress, advocated a compulsory health-insurance system which, he solemnly assured the Congress, is not socialized medicine. Later the President let the cat out of the bag. In his message on the state of the Union on February 7, 1948, Mr. Truman stated: "Our ultimate aim must be a comprehensive insurance system to protect all our people equally against insecurity and ill health." In order to protect all our people, the scheme must be compulsory. So there is no question where Mr. Truman stands on socialized medicine. Apparently he finds this term distasteful. Nonetheless, he has decided to go all out.

We also know, by way of contrast, where Mr. Dewey stands. In some extemporaneous remarks before the house of delegates of the Oregon State Medical Society in Portland, Oreg., on May 1, 1948, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey stated his position very clearly and in language anyone may understand:

"Compulsory socialized medicine is no good. It cannot be done. Accordingly, I have spent the last 2 years of my life knocking down every proposal that anybody has made to regiment the medical profession and the people of America through any program of socialized medicine. * * * I don't want to run the risk of happening to the health of our people what has happened to the health of every group of people which has tried to drag the medical profession down to the Socialists' level. You won't drag anything up. You will enlarge the volume of medical care but utterly destroy the quality of medical care the minute you try that process."

Again Governor Dewey said:

"This idea which has been shared by the last two occupants of the White House that you can improve medical care by passing a law must be stopped. We must get vast broad educational ideas to the people as to the quality of care that now exists and, as to a greater program that is going forward by men of medicine, we must have a program all can take a share in. Let's get some good public-relations men and get the businessman to do his share and get the lawyers and the labor leaders and everybody else. They are the ones who will lose most of all, if freedom in medicine is ever lost."

The issue between the two major candidates for President of the United States is clear and clean cut. Mr. Truman believes as an ultimate aim there must be a compulsory comprehensive insurance system to apply to all our people. Governor Dewey believes that compulsory socialized medicine is no good. For my part, I believe that the position of the Republican candidate, Governor Dewey, is sound, backed up by theory and experience. I believe the ideas of the Democratic candidate, President Truman, are a distinct threat to the medical and allied professions as we now know them and to our American way of life.

The advances in public health in the United States already made show that our basic institutions are sound. Existing shortcomings—and some are admitted—can be corrected within the framework of our time-tried, time-tested system of nonpolitical medicine. Relying in the future, as in the past, mainly upon individual initiative and personal cooperation, we may reasonably expect the health of the people of the United States to continue to improve.

There are two ways of life competing for supremacy in the world today. One is the Russian system, based on the Marxian principles of the abolition of private enterprise as the means of production. The other, the American system, is based on the principles of free enterprise and personal initiative. Our English friends are trying to combine the two with conspicuous lack of success. Under the Marshall plan England is receiving from us more than one-third of our total gifts to western Europe. These goods and commodities produced under our free-enterprise system, are going forward to England as free-will gifts from the American people because the English tell us that under their present regimented economy, which now includes socialized medicine, England is not producing enough to maintain a fair standard of living for her own people.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield until I finish my prepared address. I shall then be glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Socialized medicine is not new. Nations throughout the world have for decades been experimenting with one form or another of government-sponsored programs. Germany, for example, adopted a socialized-medicine plan in 1883 when Bismarck was forging his "golden chain" around the necks of the German people. Australia followed with a similar program in 1888. Britain took the first step in 1911, and completed the socialization of medicine when the Socialist majority in Parliament passed the National Health Service Act, which went into effect on July 5 of the present year. This legislation is designed to unify medical and auxiliary services in an insurance scheme directed by the state and supported by compulsory contributions by all citizens. In other words, Britain has achieved that point which Mr. Truman now described as his ultimate aim.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate, invited the Brookings Institution, the outstanding research organization famous for its impartiality, to prepare a report on the issue of compulsory health insurance. The conclusions and recommendations furnished the Senate committee came as a bombshell into the camp of the advocates for socialized medicine, who have been extolling the virtues of various foreign systems.

These are some of the conclusions reached in the report published in April 1948:

1. Probably no great nation in the world has among its white population better health than now prevails in the United States.

2. The United States, under its voluntary system of medical care, has made greater progress in the application of medical and sanitary science than any other country.

3. The nonwhites in the United States have materially poorer health than the whites, but the evidence does not indicate that this condition is primarily or even mainly due to unavailability or inadequacy of medical care.

4. The advances in health among both the whites and nonwhites that have been made in the United States in the past four decades do not suggest basic defects in the American system.

The learned professions of the United States have always enjoyed a distinction not found in any other field of human endeavor. The clergyman, the lawyer, the physician, and the dentist have always dealt directly with humanity. A personal relationship is the touchstone of their service to mankind. To the present day in the United States no man has intervened between them and those who sought their aid, counsel, service, and assistance. Contrary to the claims of the advocates, schemes for socialized medicine place a middleman between the doctor and the patient. For my part, I hope the learned and respected profession of medicine, as well as its allied professions, will be able to withstand this onslaught on its cherished heritage. If they are unable to do so, what does the future hold for the other professions?

The Republican Eightieth Congress has been unusually alert in matters connected with the health of the American people. It established a National Heart Institute within the United States Public Health Service to fight America's No. 1 killer, diseases of the heart and circulation. It provided $500,000 to the Research Institute to combat these diseases which affect 1 person in every 16 and cause 1 out of every 3 deaths.

It authorized a National Institute of Dental Research, the functions of which in the dental field are similar to the Heart Institute.

In addition, it provided $28,400,000 for the National Cancer Institute to study the disease of cancer and to disseminate knowledge on how to reduce its terrible toll of lives.

Furthermore, it passed a bill establishing a National Science Foundation to develop and encourage a national policy for scientific

research and scientific education, and to initiate and support scientific research in medical and other sciences. The National Science Foundation bill passed by the Congress was vetoed by President Truman for reasons best known to himself. These measures are directed to the improvement of the health of all our people, without resort to socialism.

After all, the American way of life has given us the American standard of living—the envy of the rest of the world.

I am proud to say, the Republican Congress in all of these acts has been alert to protect the American way, to cherish and preserve it for our children and our children's children.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, apparently the work of the Senate has been concluded for today, and I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, August 7, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 6 (legislative day of August 5), 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DIVISION OF CUSTOMS

David N. Edelstein, of New York, to be Assistant Attorney General in charge of customs, vice Hon. Paul P. Rao, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Vice Adm. George D. Murray, USN.
Vice Adm. Gerald F. Bogan, USN.
Vice Adm. Russell S. Berkey, USN.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the grades hereinafter stated.

LIEUTENANTS

Bloomer, Francis W.
Gillis, Arthur W.
Standish, John C.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Chamberlain, Lewis C.
Johnson, Carl M.
Noga, Edward L. S.
Vasey, Charles A.

ENSIGNS

Applegate, Craig
Case, George O.
Gibson, John C.
Havener, Millard F.
Knight, Richard H.
Morgan, Bobby Gene
O'Neil, Gerald P.
Sorge, Monroe B.
Stewart, Donald R.
Winslow, John Arthur

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the grades hereinafter stated.

LIEUTENANT

Chesnut, Luther T., III

ENSIGNS

Cassidy, Earle M.
Collier, James R.
Coyer, Charles B.
Gaddis, Paul O.
Mascenik, John (n)
McGuire, Larry C.
Nichalson, Leroy F.
Otto, Carl W.
Walton, Albion W., Jr.

The following-named officer of the Supply Corps of the Navy for permanent appointment in the line of the Navy in the grade hereinafter stated.

ENSIGN

Ryan, Joseph C., Jr.

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

OFFICERS OF THE LINE

Theodore C. Lonnquest
Louis Dreller
David H. Clark
John E. Gingrich
Austin K. Doyle
Thomas H. Robbins, Jr.
William G. Tomlinson
Richard F. Whitehead
Charles Wellborn, Jr.
Daniel V. Gallery, Jr.
Walter F. Boone
Joseph F. Bolger
Oswald S. Colclough

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the line and staff corps of the Navy:

OFFICERS OF THE LINE

Oliver W. Gaines
William L. Pryor, Jr.
Mario G. Vangeli
Willard M. Sweetser
Clarence Broussard
Karl F. Poehlmann
James F. Byrne
William G. Cooper
William L. Anderson
Etheridge Grant
Clarence W. McClusky, Jr.
Wendell F. Kline
Donald L. Mills
Samuel M. Tucker
Clifford H. Duerfeldt
Paul W. Watson
Louis E. French
Clarence O. Taff
Jesse L. Hull
Upton S. Brady, Jr.
Charles N. Day
John F. Greenslade
John A. Winfrey
Theodore R. Frederick
William A. Dolan, Jr.
Theodore C. Aylward
Eugene F. May
William T. Jones
William Miller
William R. Smedberg III
Francis L. Busey

OFFICERS OF THE MEDICAL CORPS

Omar J. Brown
John R. Weisser
Kenneth H. Vinnedge
Milton R. Wirthlin
Thenton D. Boaz

OFFICER OF THE SUPPLY CORPS

Fred L. Haerlin, Jr.

OFFICER OF THE DENTAL CORPS

Clifford E. Allen

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

Franklin A. Hart

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

John T. Walker

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Lawson H. M. Sanderson

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Walter W. Wensinger

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Nate L. Adams II, a citizen of Virginia.
Edwin W. Hakala, a citizen of Michigan.
Lawrence W. Hetrick, a citizen of Ohio.
Donald V. McCloskey, a citizen of California.

The following-named enlisted men to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Rodger I. Eddy
John J. Gates
Edward W. Snelling

The following-named midshipman to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Thomas H. Johnston

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 1, 1948

Maj. Walter Francis Dix, AO50892, United States Air Force.

Lt. Col. Lothar Charles Maurer, AO41332, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Reginald Carl Harmon, AO28786, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kirk Hamilton Scott, AO50896, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. Llewellyn Goode Duggar, AO28799, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. Ralph Wright Totman, AO50899, United States Air Force.

Maj. Wayne Milton Roberts, AO50900, United States Air Force.

Lt. Col. Willard Gardner Barker, AO41387, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Merritt Smith, AO28807, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Reineman Forbes, AO28808, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Rogers Alan Gardner, AO16066, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Grant Bryte, Jr., AO16076, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edgar Turner Noyes, AO16271, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Llewellyn Wheeler, AO16304, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norme D. Frost, AO16305, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Linus Dodge Frederick, AO16306, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Milton Miles Murphy, AO16309, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Emory Lee Bruns, AO41391, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. Francis Wilson van der Veer, AO50906, United States Air Force.

Maj. Robert Ernest Osborne, AO50907, United States Air Force.

Maj. Cecil Lloyd Stratten, AO50909, United States Air Force.

Col. Carroll Shaw Miller, AO41395, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Fletcher Pollard Jaquess, AO28817, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ellis Harold Wilson, AO28821, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Samuel Norman Van Meter, AO41402, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William McKinley Miles, AO28828, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry William Generous, AO28829, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Alstein Rollison, AO50914, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ronald Francis Wilson, AO39530, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. Edward Lee Hurlburt, AO28832, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Parker Archibald, AO28833, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edgar Winfrey Gardner, AO38603, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. Francis David Glasheen, AO50915, United States Air Force.

Lt. Col. Robert Jackson Knight, Jr., AO39531, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Raymond Fisher, AO50916, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Edwin Turner, AO41407, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Denard Cooper, AO28841, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Samuel Gershon, AO28843, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Colville Myers, AO28846, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Harley Holmes, AO28849, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Frederick Wiseheart, AO41410, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Burnett Rhodes, AO41412, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Plympton Mayhew, AO41413, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lebbeus Bigelow Woods, AO28853, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Fitzpatrick Payne, AO41415, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Siebenaler, AO41417, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Russell Weaver, AO41419, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Wagner Marshall, AO28863, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert George Foote, AO39535, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Anthony Westphal, AO50920, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Gordon Spillinger, AO28869, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel Wallace Van Meter, AO16383, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force.).

Col. Henry Raymond Baxter, AO16461, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Winslow O'Connor, AO16560, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Narcisse Lionel Cote, AO16569, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Hall Sparhawk, AO16686, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Felix Guillett, AO16570, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick August Bacher, Jr., AO16646, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. F. Edgar Cheatle, AO16663, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton William Davies, AO16690, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. John Dozier, AO50924, United States Air Force.

Lt. Col. Frank James Shannon, Sr., AO41434, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Merle Eugene Parks, AO50925, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. Lewis Welling Jones, AO50926, United States Air Force.

Maj. Jean Paul Harrison, AO28878, United States Air Force.

Lt. Col. Frank Edward Hoffman, AO28881, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. John Franklin Carter, AO39543, United States Air Force.

Lt. Col. Franklin Hornor Colby, AO41445, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Erwin Franklin Gardner, AO41373, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John James Wilson, AO41446, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Bernard Brice Smith, AO50931, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. Charles Francis Reed, AO39546, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul Adkins, AO28891, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter Louis Weinaug, AO41450, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Oscar Moody, AO28893, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gerald Charles Ward, AO50937, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Burton Gordon, AO28896, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. Milton Blair Samuel, AO50939, United States Air Force.

Col. Earl Clinton Robbins, AO16714, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Russell Keillor, AO16716, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Andrew Morehouse, AO28898, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. George Edward Percefull, AO50943, United States Air Force.

Maj. Joe Luther Dukes, AO50945, United States Air Force.

Lt. Col. Joseph Wells Jones, AO50946, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. Leroy Gordon Cooper, AO41460, United States Air Force.

Maj. Lowell Emmett Peaster, AO28914, United States Air Force.

Col. Charles Henry Voeller, AO50951, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Bennett Moseley Venable, AO41464, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gus Benning Hoffman, AO28917, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Baily, AO41466, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bertrand Ellwood Johnson, AO28920, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lee Bird Washbourne, AO16746, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Earl Thiebaud, AO16785, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lewis Easton, AO16933, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter William Gross, AO16983, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John N Jones, AO16987, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Philip Marstin, AO41468, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Lucas Mason, AO41470, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Kane, AO28925, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. George Oren Hanford, AO41471, United States Air Force.

Col. George Richard Geer, AO17014, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Melvin Newstrom, AO17026, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ivan Maurice Palmer, AO17030, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Atticus Morris, AO38611, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Wendell Crane, AO28931, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Neal James O'Brien, AO41476, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Orron Moore, AO39361, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hampton Ray Kenaston, AO39562, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Ivon Doty, AO28948, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harley Sanford Jones, AO28952, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Beverley Habersham Rockwell, AO50980, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clare Wesley Bunch, AO41513, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Nicholas Dick, AO39583, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leroy Gray Heston, AO29002, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bradford Allen Shaw, AO29007, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick Jensen Dau, AO17077, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Raymond Bienfang, AO17162, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elmer Wentworth Gude, AO17272, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis Wadman, AO17277, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Marshall Ambler Glazebrook, AO41542, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Solomon Jack Zoller, AO29025, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Anderson Zartman, AO38620, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frederick Funston, Jr., AO51007, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Melvin Spedden Hollidge, AO38624, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Edward Baumeister, AO29058, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Monroe Thompson Smartt, AO41572, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Oscar Bond, AO29066, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Oscar Allison, AO28897, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bernard Cecil Rose, AO29075, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Donald Menzies Hamilton, AO41580, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Warren Herbert Higgins, AO17387, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willard Reno Shephard, AO17389, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Roland Ogden Strand Akre, AO17403, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Guy Frost Hix, AO17418, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Terrell Edward Phillips, AO29083, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ira David Snyder, AO29087, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Edward Jost, AO29090, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sam Williamson Cheyney, AO17438, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Rhudy, AO17444, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Mueller Jacobs, AO17470, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Wilson Stewart, AO17482, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Irvine Dugan, AO17486, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edgar Morris Scattergood, Jr., AO29115, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ward Terry Abbott, AO17515, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clayton Earl Hughes, AO17536, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Lee Scott, AO17545, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Lewis McCulla, AO17580, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Gilmer Bowyer, AO17663, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Melie John Coutlee, AO17699, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Luke Bruce Graham, AO17755, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Richard Lynch, AO17768, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Llewellyn Charles Howell, AO29121, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Lewis, Jr., AO38632, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jerome Brooks McCauley, AO29336, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Philo Orson Rasmusen, AO29354, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joe A. Bennett, AO29359, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Alton Moody, AO39631, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Barlow Lancaster, AO41638, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Phil Nell, AO39635, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Curtis Warren, AO41641, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph Kennedy, AO51078, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Harvey Baxter, AO17925, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roy Thomas Wright, AO17929, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Waldron Egan, AO17948, Air Force of the United States (major U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Wiley Baylor, AO17968, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Meldrum Kuhfeld, AO38663, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Algene Earl Key, AO29397, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Dahl Farr, AO38666, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lester William Light, AO41632, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Edward Reilly, AO39679, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Edward Brooks, AO41691, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gerald Hoyle, AO17994, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Archibald Johnston Hanna, AO18017, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Cechmanek, AO38671, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Van Gorder Dunn, AO29423, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marshall Gordon Lassek, AO38672, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. LeRoy Bartlett, Jr., AO18032, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles William Haas, AO18056, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Phillips Waller Smith, AO18112, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Neal Edwin Ausman, AO18137, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Brazelton Fillmore Dice, AO18162, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Othel Rochelle Deering, AO18164, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Buford Russell Nyquist, AO18173, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richards Montgomery Bristol, AO18184, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gerry Leonard Mason, AO18221, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. H. Paul Dellinger, AO18222, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Duncan Stenhouse, AO29444, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elvin Freestone Maughan, AO18259, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Walton Peterson, AO29453, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Elmer Mayberry, AO41800, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John David Howe, AO29459, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert James Goewey, AO41801, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Stanley Dolan, AO41803, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Sledge, AO38675, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Stewart Sherman Maxey, AO23620 Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ethelred Lundy Sykes, AO29494, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Michael Norman Wright McCoy, AO39693, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Hardin Lyle, AO41825, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Daniel Campbell, AO29498, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frederick Worgum Eley, AO38679, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edward Rentz, AO41841, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Urbach, AO29527, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Mel Schweizer, Jr., AO29554, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hamilton Monay, AO29559, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Tracy Kemp Dorsett, AO41874, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. William Charles Kingsbury, AO38694, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elwin Herklas Eddy, AO18364, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force)

Lt. Col. Roger Willard Moore, AO18370, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alfred Christian Gay, AO18377, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Francis Carroll, AO18390, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. A. J. McVea, AO18401, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Pickering Corbin, Jr., AO18402, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William John Bell, AO18441, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Edwin Barr, AO18459, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Augustine Guenther, AO18462, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jermain Ferdinand Rodenhauser, AO18470, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Millard Chester Young, AO18472, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Force).

Col. Robert Freeman Fulton, AO18484, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Frederick Hartman, AO18501, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Wilbert Carlmark, AO18504, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles North Howze, AO18506, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Hungerford Wise, AO18507, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Francis Densford, AO18508, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Travis Clayton, AO51239, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Irwin Barnard Anderson, AO41900, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Allen Wood Rigsby, AO24289, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Blanchard Foote, AO29596, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Gilbert Kirk, AO29603, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Rex James Elmore, AO51251, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Valentine A. Rutherford, AO51253, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth William Mosher, AO29617, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Wesley Schott, AO29632, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Aram Senekerim Tootelain, AO41924, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman Louis Callish, AO29636, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Marshall Allen Elkins, AO29639, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Dross Ellis, AO29643, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Curtis Morgan Anderson, AO29648, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leonard Prine Kleinoeder, AO29655, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ralph . red Gallogly, AO51280, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Harvey Rothrock, AO29663, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Chester Grant Martz, AO41993, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. John Riley Kane, AO29680, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Bradford Richard, AO29682, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Douglas Hopson, AO29686, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orville Laird, AO29699, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Walter Holmes, AO29716, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Lester Loewenberg, AO42035, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Frank Junior MacNees, AO29942, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lester Maxwell Taylor, AO29722, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Harold Jacobsen, AO29723, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Francis Babcock, AO38717, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Troy William Crawford, AO39778, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Gaston Davis, AO29752, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur Hanson, AO42063, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Ray Hoehl, AO18665, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stanley Ronald Stewart, AO18675, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Torgils Grimkel Wold, AO18705, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benjamin Jepson Webster, AO18714, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Forsyth Thompson, Jr., AO18717, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Cecil Porter, AO18746, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Merle Robbins Williams, AO18820, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nicholas Earnest Powel, AO18823, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Edward Stoltz, AO18839, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walden Bernald Coffey, AO18858, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Richard Nuzum, Jr., AO29764, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Arthur Miller, AO29768, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Einar Axel Malmstrom, AO29775, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Davis Giddens, AO42083, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Clemons Slagle, AO29779, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Lee Halsey, AO29785, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank John Seller, AO29791, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alexander Stuart Young, AO42097, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Casper Sloan, AO42108, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Theron Herman Whitneybell, AO38729, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Fred Oscar Easley, Jr., AO29832, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Fred McClendon, AO29834, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Aaron Lowell Johnson, AO42129, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Stewart Cassady, AO29861, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard William Henderson, AO29879, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roscoe Townley Nichols, Jr., AO29883, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Carl Allen Addington, AO29884, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Francis Delaney, AO29913, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carlos John Cochrane, AO29932, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Otto Gerhard Quanrud, AO29940, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cecil Parker Lessig, AO29947, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Hogan Clark, AO29732, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Nathan Cowles, AO29960, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Platt Linn Welker, AO29985, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Bernard Card, AO18980, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Allen Glass, AO18997, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Livingston Travis, AO19009, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Joseph Hale, AO19018, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Glenn Armstrong, AO19029, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vernon Cleveland Smith, AO19051, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Stephen Bishop, AO19055, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Henry Fairchild, AO19062, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Edward Deane Marshall, AO19092, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Nelson Burkhalter, Jr., AO19106, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Douglas Moore Cairns, AO19129, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Martin Breit, AO19171, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leo Harold Heintz, AO19177, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Haller King, AO19184, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Corwin Paul Vansant, AO19199, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alton Alexander Denton, AO19219, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Thomas King, Jr., AO19232, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roland Arthur Elliott, Jr., AO19234, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Truesdell, Jr., AO19258, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Millard Loren Haskin, AO19274, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Mattern Montgomery, AO19289, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Aubertin Bott, AO29995, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Johnson Nesbitt, AO30002, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clyde Daniel Gasser, AO30005, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Senter Robbins, AO30007, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Harold Monahan, AO51442, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Woodward Berkeley Mann, AO30012, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Charles Chambers, AO30013, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Anthony Helm, AO29597, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Taylor Thurman, AO26374, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Eaton Rankin, AO30052, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Durham Smith, Jr., AO30057, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Elmer Jung, AO42298, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Roger Taube, AO30132, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gilmore Vincent Minnis, AO30139, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Theodore Albert Fuller, AO30141, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Millard Archibald Libby, AO30153, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Clifford Jensen, AO30155, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lewis Olinger, AO30182, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wilfred James Smith, AO42370, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Maxwell Williams, AO30199, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Haskell Erva Neal, AO30202, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph D. Croft Caldara, AO30226, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Vernon Jones, Jr., AO30229, Air Force of the United States (captain U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harris Benjamin Hull, AO30230, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orville Ernest Mohler, AO51530, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Orlin Butler, Jr., AO39915, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Neil Gray, AO42415, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Jones Schofield, AO42416, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Burroughs Cary, AO19352, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Carter Ashworth, AO19362, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Walter Moore, AO19376, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Curtis Delano Sluman, AO19378, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Sebastian Stone, AO19384, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Loveland Rogers, AO19388, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Bernard Dany, AO19389, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawson S. Moseley, Jr., AO19393, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jean Paul Craig, AO19395, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Leslie Crystal, Jr., AO19400, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frederic Wood Barnes, AO19401, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Jack Holzapfel, Jr., AO19409, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gene Huggins Tibbets, AO19431, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Tompkins Hanley, AO19435, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Edward Shuck, AO19436, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John dePeyster Townsend Hills, AO19443, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. William Monte Canterbury, AO19451, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Edward Blair 2d, AO19454, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles John Bondley, Jr., AO19462, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dale Orville Smith, AO19465, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Perry Bruce Griffith, AO19478, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wilson Hawkes Neal, AO19496, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elvin Seth Ligon, Jr., AO19497, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Burton Winkle, AO19501, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Monroe Hutchison, AO19508, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arno Herman Luehman, AO19513, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Lawrence Barton, AO19514, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Judson Reeves, AO19523, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Harvey Wise, AO19527, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Andrew Legg, AO19528, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harvey Thompson Alness, AO19531, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Theodore Wilson, Jr., AO19543, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John William White, AO19550, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Lafayette Inman, AO19559, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stanley Joseph Donovan, AO19560, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Edward Barzynski, Jr., AO19595, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bruce Harley Perry, AO42435, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Claude Bryant Thompson, AO30276, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Channing Ernest Beasley, AO42476, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Thomas Quirk, AO42483, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Emmett Buckner Cassady, AO42493, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Christian Dale Kauffman, AO42497, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Luther Moran Bivins, AO51588, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Arthur McKerley, AO51593, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Berthold Eugene Nowotny, AO30388, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Stolle, AO42542, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ned Baker Chase, AO30395, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benjamin Grad Holzman, AO30412, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marion Daniel Unruh, AO42573, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James William Smith, AO42594, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lee William Fulton, AO30465, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Van Henry Albertson, AO42600, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Ovid Newell, AO51631, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis DeVos, AO30502, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Joseph Shower, AO19714, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Wallis Hickman, AO19718, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leighton Ira Davis, AO19721, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Van Gorder Wilson, AO19744, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Kimball Brown, Jr., AO19758, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Morris Stillman, AO19760, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Elmer Ellsworth, AO19767, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Gordon Russell, AO19795, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Paul Bergquist, AO19802, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Allison Fickel, AO19809, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Downs Eugene Ingram, AO19813, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Howard Walsh, AO19824, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willis Fred Chapman, AO19832, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Henderson Baynes, AO19835, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Aaron Warner Tyer, AO19847, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. German Pierce Culver, AO19855, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Morris, AO19869, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Carlton Boys, AO19876, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lamont Saxton, AO19896, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Orin Houston Moore, AO19909, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Cebern Musgrave, Jr., AO19916, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Thomas Joseph Gent, Jr., AO19927, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Pelham Davis Glassford, Jr., AO19937, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Hollis Strauss, AO19940, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt Col. Maurice Monroe Simons, AO19941, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Roberts, AO19963, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Curtis Thompson, AO19978, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel Barcus Knowles, Jr., AO19979, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Baird Buck, AO19981, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Dale Franklin Pocock, AO30508, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ray Willard Clifton, AO19987, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Randolph Lowry Wood, AO19988, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arnold Theodore Johnson, AO19989, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Frederick Stalder, AO19991, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Noel Francis Parrish, AO19992, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dolf Edward Muehleisen, AO19993, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Swyter, AO19994, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Cole Weller, AO19995, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Morris Gavin, AO19996, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Edward Jarmon, AO19997, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Neff Moyers, AO20000, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Bynum Stanley, AO20003, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clarence Morice Sartain, AO20005, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Hughes Price, AO20006, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Caruthers Moore, AO20007, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Scott Fulwider, AO20008, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lester Stanford Harris, AO20009, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Newman Wackwitz, AO20011, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clair Lawrence Wood, AO20014, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Bennett Harvin, AO20015, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bob Arnold, AO20017, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Burton Wilmot Armstrong, Jr., AO20018, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Lee Neely, AO20020, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Erickson Snowden Nichols, AO20021, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jasper Newton Bell, AO20022, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Russell Lee Waldron, AO20023, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Foster Day, Jr., AO20024, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Daniel Edwin Hocks, AO20027, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Patten Todd, AO20028, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Glenn Workman, AO20499, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Owen Brown, AO20042, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clayton Baxter Claassen, AO20045, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Thomas Hudnell, AO20046, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Lawrence Kreider, AO20047, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Oman Neal, AO20048, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Agnew Sebastian, AO19561, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Vincent Thomas Cannon, AO42660, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walden Alexius Sundell, AO30562, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ralph Irwin Williams, AO51679, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Holmes Congdon, AO39995, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Herbert McCann, AO30574, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edward J. Hopkins, AO30587, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Harmon Lewis, AO30589, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Albert Milton, AO30620, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Rollo McNitt, AO30625, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Collins, Jr., AO30630, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. C. Pratt Brown, AO30638, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Russell Vaughn Ritchey, AO30369, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jack Eugene Thomas AC30644, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Xavier Krebs, AO30645, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Donald Neely, AO42720, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Abe Shumsky, AO42732, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Durson Formar, AO30672, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Thomas Black, AO30673, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Allen Adams, AO42761, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alban Boardman Ogden, Jr., AO40024, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ellery David Preston, Jr., AO30706, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. David Spinx Blackwell, AO38836, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elmer Van Ness Schuyler, AO30770, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Louis Clark, AO30781, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joe Kennith McNay, AO30785, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Winzer Davis, AO51802, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Gifford Norman, AO30800, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Oliver Garfield Haywood, Jr., AO20113, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cecil Edward Combs, AO20121, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Barnard Stewart, AO20126, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dwight Oliver Monteith, AO20127, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benjamin Oliver Davis, Jr., AO20146, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gordon Harrison Austin, AO20161, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jay Dean Rutledge, Jr., AO20164, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Frederick Frost, AO20166, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Dean Gapen, AO20175, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howell Marion Estes, Jr., AO20183, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Knox Arnold, Jr., AO20188, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton Dermott Vincent, AO20189, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Henry Carmichael, AO20203, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Walter Gillespie, AO20206, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Rutland Gunn, Jr., AO20207, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nicholas Tate Perkins, AO20210, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col Albert Patton Clark, Jr., AO20218, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Richard Kelly, AO20225, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman Calvert Spencer, Jr., AO20228, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick Reynolds Terrell, AO20230, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Bernard Tyler, Jr., AO20232, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fredrick Bell, AO20233, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Milton McCorkle, AO20239, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Denton Cairnes, AO20247, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wilfred Henry Tetley, AO20252, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Walter Twaddell, Jr., AO20254, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col William Russell Grohs, AO20255, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force)

Col. William Swinton Steele, AO20260, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Milton Bartella, AO20261, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton Utterback True, AO20271, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Turner Clifton Rogers, AO20272, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Paul Champion, AO20279, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Garnett Lee, Jr., AO20308, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Warren Newcomb Wildrick, AO20323, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Von Roy Shores, Jr., AO20335, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Ellerbe Covington, AO20336, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Rigden Van Dickson, AO20350, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clark Lewis Hosmer, AO20356, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Wesley Jones, AO20358, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph James Nazzaro, AO20364, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edmund Whritner Miles, AO20371, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Levere Kimball, AO20372, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Samuel Holmes, Jr., AO20379, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wallace Conrad Barrett, AO20381, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Conrad Francis Necrason, AO20384, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Hermann Wagner, AO20385, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Philip Holden Best, AO30817, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Martin Menter, AO30826, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William James Cummings, Jr., AO31325, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles James Lester, AO40058, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Grady MacDaniel, AO31359, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bernard M. Wootton, AO42916, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Henry Curtis, AO31383, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. Marvin Maxwell Harvey, AO31390, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. Roland Ellsworth Sliker, AO31393, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Godfrey T. McHugh, AO31403, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Berton Root, AO20459, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Melville Brown, AO20462, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herman Alfred Schmid, AO20464, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Pauahi Hopwood, AO20449, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Arthur DeMarco, AO20451, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Day Lee, Jr., AO20434, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leslie Raybold, AO20457, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wilbur Walter Aring, AO20458, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Oscar Guthrie, AO20425, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Phillip Hollstein, AO20426, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Lindley Randolph, AO20424, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Homer Astley Boushey, AO20438, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Orville Darrow, AO20429, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Austin Gunn, AO20443, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Leslie Rivard, AO20422, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Henry Miller, Jr., AO20416, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Allen Hilger, AO20437, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Clinton Coddington, AO20452, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Richardson Cook, AO20420, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Engberg Todd, AO20453, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis William Proper, AO20460, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Charles Rockwood, AO20435, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Tom Jefferson Cunningham, AO20432, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Henry Gist, Jr., AO20430, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Ross Robertson, Jr., AO20463, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Stanley Holtoner, AO20423, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Clyde Selser, Jr., AO20427, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Douglas Ellsworth Williams, AO20455, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lewis Leo Mundell, AO20417, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brooke Empie Allen, AO20465, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Beaumont Cornett, AO20446, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Hal Jeffus, AO20419, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Boyd Hubbard, Jr., AO20431, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman Lewis Peterson, AO20450, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Victor Raymond Haugen, AO20433, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hilmer Cannon Nelson, AO20439, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Parker Fisher, AO20461, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Windeck Hall, AO20454, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Howard Dane, AO20466, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Graves Hubbard Snyder, AO20418, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chester Witten Cecil, Jr., AO20440, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Markward Reynolds, AO20448, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Wester Luker, AO31417, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Augustus Maine Minton, AO42941, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Iddings Fletcher, AO31429, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Henry Mackey Smith, AO42956, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Virgil Floyd Fairfax, AO38906, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Allen Gardner, AO31452, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Bernard Hohman, AO42977, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Bohn, AO42992, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Oliver Tillman Simpson, Jr., AO38912, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Cobb Mallary, AO43017, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter George William Clatanoff, AO40159, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. Miles Howlett Thompson, AO20555, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Emmett Murchison Tally, Jr., AO31545, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Curbo, Jr., AO43065, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Samuel LeNoir Moise, AO51899, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Bruin Ocamb, AO31605, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Orrin Beckwith, Jr., AO31611, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Leofric Temple, AO31613, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Alexander Gunn 3d, AO31616, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Norman Donohew, AO20574, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Dudley Stevenson, AO20583, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nils Olof Ohman, AO20586, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Lawrence Holcomb, AO20587, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Ray Clingerman, Jr., AO20591, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Asher Burtis Robbins, Jr., AO20596, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Eckman, AO20602, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Noel Snouffer, AO20607, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Phillip Klocko, AO20608, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis Batjer, AO20627, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Sayre Wade, AO20631, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Gordon Eriksen, AO20635, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert William Griffin, AO20641, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Risley Barden, AO20644, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Allen Russell, Jr., AO20645, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard William Fellows, AO20655, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Whiteford Carlisle Mauldin, AO20659, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bruce Keener Holloway, AO20664, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Arthur Preston, AO20673, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ivan Wilson McElroy, AO20677, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Kienle Horrigan, AO20678, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alan Doane Clark, AO20683, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Hensey Herman, AO20686, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Linscott Aldin Hall, AO20691, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Richard Ostrander, AO20697, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Caldwell McDowell, AO20709, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Young Parker, AO20712, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sam Wilkerson Agee, AO20714, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Taylor, 3d, AO20715, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Thomas Shields, AO20722, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Curtis Raymond Low, AO20732, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Borden Broadhurst, AO20744, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Bainbridge Westover, AO20746, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel Charles Gurney, Jr., AO20753, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harvey Charles Dorney, AO20755, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul William Scheidecker, AO20764, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Junious Harrison, AO20776, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Emmett McDonald, AO20778, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Russell Ulricson, AO20783, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. Lawrence Augustus Spilman, AO20785, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Grover Hipps, AO20787, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph George Focht, AO20791, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marshall Randolph Gray, AO20792, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Augustin Mitchell Prentiss, Jr., AO20796, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Woodrow William Dunlop, AO20814, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Oliver Sanborn, AO20819, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Joseph Cain, Jr., AO20833, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Malcolm Green, Jr., AO20836, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles William Stark, AO20839, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Morton David Magoffin, AO20847, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Ragland Maxwell, AO20849, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Theo Posey, AO20850, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wesley Skilton Calverley, AO20854, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leo Belton Smith, AO40189, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur Howland Baker, Jr., AO20873, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George William Croker, AO20910, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willard Wright Smith, AO20911, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hart Hanson, AO20912, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Jenkins Huddleston, AO31657, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Neywood Hutchings Roberdeau, AO31658, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Earle Teal, AO40197, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel McClure Smith, AO31667, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Lafayette Musgrave, AO43358, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Nelson Ewbank, Jr., AO31702, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James William Thomson, AO43376, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Audley Thorpe, AO43379, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Alban Gibbs, AO20932, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leon Howard McCurdy, AO31733, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Morgan Thomas, AO31750, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Daniel Martin Harvey, AO31759, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Herman Biase, AO31770, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Robert Orr, AO43427, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Daniel Graham Hawes, AO31782, Air Force of the United States (captain U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carlton Julian Martin, AO43460, Air Force of the United States (captain, United States Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Lester Hamrick, AO31838, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Louis Gordon Thorup, AO31847, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Chaney Segrist, AO43478, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Barton Morrow Russell, AO31850, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Johnnie Radford Dyer, AO40253, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Joseph Friedman, AO31870, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Carl Woodrow Andrews, AO31871, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Douglas Howder, AO40256, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frederick Mauger O'Neill, AO31873, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John William Oberdorf, AO52168, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clinton Douglass Bannister Smith, AO43545, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Pierce Hall, AO31927, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Hall Waller, Jr., AO31947, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Edward Herrelko, AO31960, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Allen Breitweiser, AO21055, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Theodore Preuss, AO21060, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harold Killian Kelley, AO21068, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Brett Kieffer, AO21075, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leo Vernon Harman, AO21077, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Marshall Batterson, Jr., AO21082, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Kenneth Skaer, AO21091, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Prescott Miner Spicer, AO21093, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Leland Crouch, Jr., AO21100, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Craddock Coleman, AO21104, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roy Cleveland Heflebower, Jr., AO21112, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sherwood Ernest Buckland, AO21115, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Dale Ryan, AO31117, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Peterson Sights, Jr., AO21123, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Omar Ellsworth Knox, AO21125, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Pleasants Sturdivant, AO21140, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Earl Johnson, Jr., AO21146, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Doan Kenzie, AO21149, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph York, AO21151, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bertram Cowgill Harrison, AO21152, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Keith Kincaid, AO21157, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clifford Field Macomber, AO21158, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Douglas Clinton Polhamus, AO21164, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Edward Coira, AO21166, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Robert Lee Snider, AO21168, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ashley Burdett Packard, AO21169, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Ward Saunders, AO21172, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Peek Brett, AO21174, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Herbert Spangler, AO21183, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Horace Chavasse, AO21187, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Charles Huglin, AO21183, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Cornelius Morrison, AO21191, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Franklin Bromiley, AO21199, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Raymond Lemon, AO21201, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Virgil Lee Zoller, AO21205, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Carleton McBride, AO21206, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Neil David Van Sickle, AO21209, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Cozart Pitchford, AO21210, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Robert Hawes, AO21220, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hugh Blanchard, AO21223, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Castex Paul Conner, AO21224, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hugh Douglas Wallace, AO21232, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Rhea Luper, AO21240, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carter Eugene Duncan, AO21242, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Murray Dean, AO21245, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Henry Frederick, Jr., AO21262, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Vincent Morgan Miles, Jr., AO21264, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Breece Wells, AO21266, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harris Edward Rogner, AO21269, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roy Ray Brischetto, AO21278, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gibson Emerson Sisco, Jr., AO21281, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Elam Sims, AO21282, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Mathes Young, AO21292, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Merrick Bayer, AO21294, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Littleton James Pardue, AO21300, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wallace Stafford Ford, AO21312, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Joseph Claude Reddoch, Jr., AO21315, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Horace Isbell, AO21350, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Boddie Coleman, AO21352, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Felix Moses Hardison, AO21354, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Monroe Means, AO21358, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Danville Brown, AO21384, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Philip Leber, Jr., AO21388, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Michael Joseph Coffield, AO21394, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Waymond Austin Davis, AO21397, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Henry Dalton, Jr., AO21400, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Ray Kilgore, AO21402, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henley Vedder Bastin, Jr., AO21403, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Shepard Chickering, AO21405, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Guy Leonard Hudson, Jr., AO21407, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Robert Carl Orth, AO21412, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George William Prentice, AO32000, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter Erath Arnold, AO32458, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Mark Everett Hubbard, AO32026, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter Moore Bridgers, AO38960, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hugh Harcourt Master, AO43646, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. James Joseph Stone, Jr., AO32052, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Lewis Jones, AO21484, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Madison West, Jr., AO21486, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Dodge Shoemaker, AO21487, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Alvin Roubal Luedecke, AO21488, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Russell Spicer, AO21489, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willard Van Deman Brown, AO21490, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Haldane Councill, AO21492, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Ray Kreps, AO21493, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Peter Havens Remington, AO21494, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Blaine Ballif Campbell, AO21497, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Morris Henry Shedd, AO21498, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Mayhue Delbert Blaine, AO21500, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Fish Nichols, AO21501, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Beeton Klein, AO21502, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marion Malcolm, AO21503, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick Lawrence Moore, AO21504, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Emlen Marion, AO21505, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ben Ivan Funk, AO21506, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard William Simons, AO21508, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Spencer Hardy, AO21510, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Louis Donicht, AO21512, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ladson Green Eskridge, Jr., AO21514, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Harry Matthews, AO21515, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ryder Waldo Finn, AO21516, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Franklin Hardy, AO21517, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Wietzel Zehrung, AO21519, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Jenkins Pierce, AO21520, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Francis Worden, AO21521, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Bradford Baker, AO21523, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Reed Volin, AO21525, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. T. Alan Bennett, AO21526, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Garfield Thorne, Jr., AO21527, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Baskin Reid Lawrence, Jr., AO21529, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sam Philippe Triffy, AO21530, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Earl Bernard Young, AO21531, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Mason Reid, AO21533, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bernard Adolf Schriever, AO21536, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Ernest Watson, AO21537, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cy Wilson, AO21538, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Craven Clark Rogers, AO21539, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Lewis Curry, AO21540, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Audrin Rotha Walker, AO21541, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Calvin Ely Peeler, AO21542, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold S. Ecklund, AO21544, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Kay Martin, AO21545, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. John Beverly Montgomery, AO21546, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Allen Way, AO21548, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Ferguson, AO21549, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Brewer Keese, AO21550, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Frederick Hunker, AO21551, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Bell David, AO21554, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Francis Burnham, AO21555, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clyde Box, AO21556, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chris Henry William Rueter, AO21558, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Horace Armor Shepard, AO21559, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Louis Wilhelm, Junior, AO21560, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Franklin Kendall Paul, AO21562, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ben Allen Mason, Junior, AO21563, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raleigh Hunter Macklin, AO21564, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Graeme Stewart Bond, AO21565, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marcus Fleming Cooper, AO21566, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Victor Schwanbeck, AO21567, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Melville Caldwell, AO21568, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Joseph Abbott Thomas, AO21569, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elbert David Reynolds, AO21570, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Sheldon Garman, AO21571, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Ernest Frederick Wackwitz, Jr., AO21572, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Christian Demler, AO21573, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cecil Hampton Childre, AO21574, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jacob Jerval Brogger, AO21575, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Irvine Alfred Rendle, AO21576, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Junius Waldo Dennison, Jr., AO21577, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Wilbur Keating, AO21580, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Sutton Brewer, AO21581, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Irving Lewis Branch, AO21582, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Charles Carlson, Jr., AO21586, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Eades, AO21587, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald William Eisenhart, AO21588, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sam Maddux, Jr., AO21589, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Lewis Polifka, AO21590, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Reed Stewart, AO21591, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Klahr McNown, AO21592, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert William Ryder, AO21595, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Avelin Paul Tacon, Jr., AO21598, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Conrad Joe Herlick, AO21599, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Evart Wilbur Hedlund, AO21600, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Franklin Helmick, AO21601, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Loughery Johnston, AO21603, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James John Roberts, Jr., AO21604, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Atwood Walker, Jr., AO21605, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur William Schmitt, Jr., AO21606, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Ray Martin, AO21608, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Edward Glaser, AO21609, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Franklin Strickland, AO21613, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Ovide Bordelon, AO21618, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clyde Charles Harris, Jr., AO21620, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jean Rogers Byerly, AO21621, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward George Kiehle, AO21624, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Eugene Bates, Jr., AO21625, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. David Wade, AO21627, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. J. Francis Taylor, Jr., AO21628, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Wilford Maschmeyer, AO21629, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ray Hamilton Martin, AO21632, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick John Sutterlin, AO21633, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Murray Alston Bywater, AO21634, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Delmar Edmond Wilson, AO21635, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joshua Thomas Winstead, Jr., AO21636, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Duncan Jones, AO21637, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Haywood Beverly, AO21638, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Edward Schaetzel, AO21640, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Grenville Huish, AO21641, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Claude Edwin Putnam, Jr., AO21642, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Carl Woltz, AO21645, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Edwin Rouse, AO21648, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vernon Lake Stintzi, AO21650, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clarence Theodore Edwinson, AO21651, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Carroll Cochran, AO21653, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Whitmell, Tompkins Rison, AO21656, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leslie Ethridge Martin, AO21658, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gwen Grover Atkinson, AO21660, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harold Michael Keeffe, AO21661, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Wesseler Bicking, AO21662, Air Force of United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Fred Edward Hild, AO32063, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Mark Curtis Bane, Jr., AO32078, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Vincent William Howard, AO40320, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Holliday Chick, AO32567, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Byron Manning Sansom, Jr., AO32095, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Hewitt Terrell Wheless, AO32096, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Glynn Poff, AO32100, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leslie Wallace Holman, AO32102, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Screven Bond, Jr., AO40330, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Patrick Gerrity, AO32147, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Rader Powell, AO32151, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leonard Thomason Nicholson, AO32157, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Eugene Kofahl, AO32162, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kyle Loyd Riddle, AO32161, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Wendell Moore, AO32165, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Thornal Compton, AO32174, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert George Ruegg, AO32183, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Morris Brown, Jr., AO32188, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ola Paul Thorne, AO32207, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glen Robbins Birchard, AO32217, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Leonard Johnson, AO32221, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Howell Starbuck, AO32228, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sydney Thomas Smith, AO43803, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Oscar Reynold Schaaf, AO32262, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Arnold Delahay, AO32266, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Johnson Pugh, AO32269, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elmer George Prohaska, AO43833, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Edgar Goldsworthy, AO32283, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Loren George McCollom, AO32298, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Narce Whitaker, AO38985, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ralph Buchert, AO32336, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hugh O'Neill McTague, AO32340, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. William Staats Rader, AO32342, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Delmer Joseph Rogers, AO21740, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Spoor Samuel, AO21742, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roscoe Campbell Crawford, Jr., AO21752, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Yount Jumper, AO21763, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Crandall Newcomer, AO21770, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph George Perry, AO21771, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Harriman Curtin, AO21773, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Norman James McGowan, AO21778, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Josephus Alan Bowman, AO21785, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Benjamin Miller, AO21787, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Wilson Carpenter 3d, AO21790, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wayne Laverne O'Hern, AO21793, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Edmund Howard, Jr., AO21806, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adam Kirk Breckenridge, AO21815, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roland Wallace Boughton, Jr., AO21816, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Arthur McDavid, AO21817, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Crenshaw Pulliam, AO21824, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Rufus Hardy Holloway, AO21826, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Allen Forrest Herzberg, AO21827, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Riggs Sullivan, Jr., AO21830, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Lawrence Dickman, AO21833, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul Joseph Long, AO21834, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Hillhouse, AO21838, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roger Edwards Phelan, AO21842, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Merwyn Wray, AO21843, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Andrew John Kinney, AO21845, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Allen Romig, AO21856, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orin Henry Rigley, Jr., AO21861, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elbert Owen Meals, AO21872, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin John Latoszewski, AO21875, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Daniel Curtin, AO21888, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Wallace Iseman, Jr., AO21889, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Barclay Knapp, AO21890, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil Cerel McFarland, AO21894, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benoid Earl Glawe, AO21902, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Carver Sears, AO21906, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Evans Greer, AO21910, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Shepler Ward Fitzgerald, Jr., AO21912, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Roy Little, AO21917, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Leslie Evans, Jr., AO21925, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Steele Morrison, AO21951, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Bernard Whitehouse, AO21958, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Daniel Farrington Tatum, AO21959, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Gordon Lycan, AO21968, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Wallace Roger Zethren, AO21970, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Strother Banks Hardwick, Jr., AO21973, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Charlwood Richardson, 3d, AO21975, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Brereton Bestic, AO21976, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Urban Brombach, AO21978, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elliott Vandevanter, Jr., AO21989, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Winston Bailey, AO21991, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Mercer Higginson, AO22003, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jack Gordon Merrell, AO22004, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Stein Boyd, AO22012, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Thomas Smith, AO22014, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alfred Virgil Walton, AO22020, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Lee McDowell, Jr., AO22029, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ray Joseph Will, AO22030, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert John Rogers, AO22032, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Perry Milo Hoisington 2d, AO22044, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Salvatore Edward Nanzo, AO22053, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leonard Neil Palmer, AO22055, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Kemp Martin, AO22061, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Royce Gideon, Jr., AO22064, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Prentiss Davis Wynne, Jr., AO22084, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ellsworth Reily Jacoby, AO22089, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Vincent Reardon, AO22111, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Theodore Kingsley, Jr., AO22112, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Lt. Col. John Christian Habecker, AO22117, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Carlos Edwards, AO22131, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Louis McCoy, AO22141, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Willard Barber Atwell, Jr., AO22142, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Manly Walton, Jr., AO22145, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Peter Schmid, AO22156, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lewis Wilson Stocking, AO22160, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Matthew James McKeever, Jr., AO22161, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Walter Wilson, AO22174, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Milton Bernard Adams, AO22178, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ronald Fredric Fallows, AO32382, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Sterling Leland, AO43930, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Henry Berkenkamp, AO43932, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Byron Benjiman Webb, AO22197, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Bruce Miller, Jr., AO22220, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dale Donald Brannon, AO22228, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Thomas Crimmins, Jr., AO22242, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Batchelder Fletcher, AO22243, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Leonard McNickle, AO22249, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Weeks Ingenhutt, AO32424, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brooks Albert Lawhon, AO32446, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Bayzand Seim, Jr., AO32448, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oswald Weeks Lunde, AO32454, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Franklin Bronson, Jr., AO22324, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elbert Helton, AO22325, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Viccellio, AO22326, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Colbert Gray, Jr., AO22327, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Lowell Wassell, AO22329, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Osmond Jay Ritland, AO22332, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Lenvik Anderson, AO22339, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joe Gordon Schneider, AO22340, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bourne Adkison, AO22342, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harold Douglas Courtney, AO22343, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Benjamin Greene, Jr., AO22344, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Kenneth Crain, AO22345, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Loring Franklin Stetson, Jr., AO22346, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glendon Philip Overing, AO22347, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oscar Allen Heinlein, AO22348, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Emanuel Eubank, Jr., AO22349, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edward Greer, AO22352, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hubert Zemke, AO22353, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Thomas Kight, AO22356, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William John Bohnaker, AO22357, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Crawford McGehee, AO22358, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jo Kyle Warner, AO22359, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Stephen Chennault, AO22360, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Leroy Robinson, AO22362, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Herbert Snavely, AO22364, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Edward Northcutt, AO22365, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clarence Arthur Neely, AO22366, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Alton Cheney, AO22370, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Allison Pechuls, AO22372, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Lynn Sullivan, AO22375, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hiette Sinclair Williams, Jr., AO22378, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Delaway Stevers, AO22379, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Carlyle Nye, AO22380, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Columbus Agan, Jr., AO22381, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Gordon Ford, AO22382, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lee Bannerman Coats, AO22383, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Air Force).

Col. Murray William Crowder, Jr., AO22385, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edwin Basye, AO22386, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wayne Earl Thurman, AO22390, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Miles Ramage, AO22391, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Coupland, AO22392, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Quentin Timson Quick, AO22393, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Beverly Howard Warren, AO22394, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Van Hatton Slayden, AO22395, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Wilbur Anderson, Jr., AO22398, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Daniel Aynesworth, AO22399, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Erwin Elder, AO22402, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hervey Haydon Whitfield, AO22405, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edgar Davis, Jr., AO22406, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Hodder Gibson, AO22410, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Jay Barrett, AO22411, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Walter Ohlke, AO22415, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Vernon DeShazo, AO22417, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Bream Diehl, AO22418, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chester Lee Sluder, AO22419, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald James French, AO22422, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Julian Marian Bleyer, AO22423, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Frederick Setchell, AO22428, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Theodore Barthelmess, AO22429, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Donald Stuart Dunlap, AO22432, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bruce Burns Price, AO22434, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Duane Louis Kime, AO22435, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Arnold Tate, AO22437, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Allman Tenney Culbertson, AO22440, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Wesley Hughes, AO22442, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Ross Greening, AO22443, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Walter Gray, AO22447, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Norman Luellen Ballard, AO22448, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Clyde Bagby, AO22449, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leonard Boston Storm, AO22451, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Bosworth Darling, Jr., AO22453, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Austin Ames, AO22454, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Julian Mason, AO22456, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Paul Fulcher, AO22457, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hugh Boyd Manson, Jr., AO22460, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Stanley Emrick, AO22461, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. A. J. Bird, Jr., AO22463, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Stoll Zipp, AO22465, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Estes Moore, AO22466, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edgar Wade Hampton, AO22468, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Richard Rowland, AO22470, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Albert Rouse, AO22472, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Allen Kurtz, AO22473, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Rector Hughes, Jr., AO22480, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James William Chapman, Jr., AO22481, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. David Mudgett Jones, AO22482, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Warren Philbrick, AO22483, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clair Arthur Peterson, AO22484, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Stanley Anthony Zidiales, AO22485, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bingham Trigg Kleine, AO22486, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hubbert Cleveland, AO22487, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Benjamin Reed, AO22488, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Dean Berry, AO22490, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theron Coulter, AO22491, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton Curtis Wasem, AO22493, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Philip Henry Greasley, AO22497, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cyrus William Kitchens, Jr., AO22499, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Troy Keith, AO22504, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Henry Schwartz, Jr., AO22506, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Bennett Putnam, AO22508, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brian O'Neill, AO22509, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Colonel John Timothy Fitzwater, AO22510, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gladwyn Earl Pinkston, AO22511, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oliver George Cillini, AO22517, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Henry MacDonald, AO22518, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Kelly, AO22519, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur William Kellond, AO22520, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Broadus Beene Taylor, AO22522, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Monty Duran Wilson, AO22523, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Ray DeBolt, AO22525, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Joseph Harold Moore, AO22527, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank B. James, AO22529, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Theodore Wightman Tucker, AO22530, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Frank Rudell, AO22532, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph William Rodieck, AO22533, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Norton Harding Van Sicklen 3d, AO22534, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Gardner Chandler, Jr., AO22537, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Vandenburgh Endress, AO22538, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Air Force).

Col. William Sydnor Barksdale, Jr., AO22539, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Danforth Van Auken, AO22540, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Edwin Roberts, AO22541, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leland Stanford McGowan, AO22542, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Carpenter Averill, AO22543, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Keith Karl Compton, AO22545, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack William Saunders, AO22546, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Christopher Otho Moffett, AO22548, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Eugene Dougherty, AO22550, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul Christian Droz, AO22552, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Baird Tipton, AO22554, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Affleck Dunning, AO22556, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Lee Strickland, AO22557, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dalene Edward Bailey, AO22558, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clemens Kieffer Wurzbach, AO22562, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Pinkham Smith, AO22563, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William David Gilchrist, AO22566, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Dellinger Dick, AO22569, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. J. C. Bailey, AO22571, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Valentine Edmundson, AO22573, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adam Joseph Heintz, AO22575, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vincent George Huston, AO22576, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Joseph Holt, AO22577, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ansel James Wheeler, AO22580, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Guy Hamilton Rockey, AO22581, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leo Francois Dusard, Jr., AO22585, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Kenton Hester, AO22586, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Blake Young, AO22589, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Milton Wade, AO22592, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Renwick Nevitt, AO22595, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Giannatti, AO22599, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Richard Anderson, AO22600, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Milton Herbert Ashkins, AO22604, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry J. Bullis, AO22605, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Simmons Jenkins, AO22606, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Henry Mears, AO22608, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Adolph Edward Tokaz, AO22609, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Dickson Terry, Jr., AO22611, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Huie de Russy, AO22612, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Rufus Yancey, AO22613, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Robert Feeney, AO22614, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clifford John Heflin, AO22617, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

×Col. Kenneth Andrew Cavenah, AO22618, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Theodore Chadwell, AO22620, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Allison Johnson, AO22621, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Jacob Rau, AO22623, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sam Wilkins Westbrook, AO22624, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Melvin Francis McNickle, AO22628, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theodore Romaine Aylesworth, AO22629, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William James Wrigglesworth, AO22630, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Addison Blakey, AO32460, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Isadore Wood, AO22657, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul Howard Long, AO32489, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Randall Holzapple, AO32490, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Allen Doss, AO32504, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Dumont Greenfield, AO32503, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Elroy Watkins, AO32535, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lewis Plank Ensign, AO32554, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Watterston Veal, AO32568, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Salvador Phillip LaBarbera, AO32570, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Clayton Robertson, AO44101, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Benson Downer, AO32579, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Charles McPherson, AO32586, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Norman Gayle Morris, AO32597, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Oren James Poage, AO32601, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Ira Cornett, AO32617, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Tarleton Harvin Watkins, AO32623, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Osborn Hall, AO32624, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Gorden Cook, AO32639, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lee Delashaw, AO32646, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Charles Tates, AO32653, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harley Camden Vaughn, AO32654, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Haile Callahan, AO32672, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Walter Elliott, AO32675, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Frederick Anderson, AO52433, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Robert Large, Jr., AO32707, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Barnard LeBailly, AO32720, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harvard Wendell Powell, AO44223, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Dittman, AO32752, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Andrew Loberg, AO32757, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Warfield Tibbets, Jr., AO32761, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Todd Crowell, AO32769, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Owen Patteson, AO32779, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ronald Dean Hubbard, AO32785, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert William Fletcher, AO32794, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wallace Packard Mace, AO32800, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John George Glover, AO32806, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hallock Peter Kindle Walmsley, AO32814, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert William Witty, AO32818, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil Herbert Scott, Jr., AO32821, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joe Lennard Mason, AO32831, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roswell Freedman, AO32839, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Arthur Burchinal, AO32840, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charlie Rankin Bond, Jr., AO32850, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Dalton Jones, AO52511, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Churchill Hutchinson, AO22802, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Peter Bostrom, AO22804, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Otto Wangeman, AO22805, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richmond Archibald Livingstone, AO22806, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sylvan Davis Hand, AO22807, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Copeland Paul, AO22809, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Franklin Whisenand, AO22812, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roland John Barnick, AO22820, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Harber Holbrook, AO22822, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Bernard Hammerle, Jr., AO22824, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John William Weltman, AO22825, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert John Koster, AO22828, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Daniel Mayden, AO22831, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Anthony Vincent Grossetta, AO22832, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Henry Carter, AO22833, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Brunow William Felling, AO22838, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glen Webster Martin, AO22839, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Gregory, AO22841, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Marion Eisenhart, AO22843, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gilbert Louis Meyers, AO22848, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Keith Wesley Dech, AO22849, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Lowry Dunn, AO22856, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Jerome Hughey, AO22857, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Everett Wilson Stewart, AO22859, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Robbins Pancake, AO22861, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Wallace Momyer, AO22862, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Nelson Boaz, Jr., AO22867, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph James Preston, AO22868, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Randolph Maney, AO22871, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Tarter, AO22872, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Dewey Slocomb, Jr., AO22873, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adriel Newton Williams, AO22877, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Constantine Schauer, AO22879, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Echelbary Cranston, AO22882, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Loran John Anderson, AO44355, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Lawrence Pritchard, AO32873, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Victor Edwin Warford, AO32914, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin McConnell 2d, AO32920, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Elroy Kimmel, AO32926, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Winston Cureton Fowler, AO22893, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Cutright Sheetz, AO22895, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Austin James Russell, AO22906, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Albright French, AO22908, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Nathan Louis Krisberg, AO22931, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Applegate, AO22933, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Carey Law O'Bryan, Jr., AO22936, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jack Stewart DeWitt, AO22956, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Webster Bagstad, AO22986, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Hamilton Warren, AO22989, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Manford Jay Wetzel, AO22990, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Josiah Kent, AO23005, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Willis Franklin Lewis, AO23013, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Wilbur Wilcox, AO23020, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Sargent Abbey, AO23022, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Clare Gideon, AO23034, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Philip Courtney Loofbourrow, AO23050, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Davison Dalziel, AO23071, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edward Buck, Jr., AO23072, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Joseph LaBreche, AO23075, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Raymond Starrat Sleeper, AO23088, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Robert Wilbraham, AO23091, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Beverly Campbell, AO23101, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Fant Berry, AO23125, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Dill Baynard Ellis, AO23133, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Everett Houston Ware, AO23134, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Reginald James Clizbe, AO23155, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ernest Bryant Jones, AO23163, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Maurice Earle Parker, AO23166, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Andre Ringgold Brousseau, AO23209, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Ross East, Jr., AO23212, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lester Cecil Hess, AO23214, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert William Strong, Jr., AO23215, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Hudson Norman, Jr., AO23216, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John William Norvell, AO23223, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Allan Ashley Crockett, AO23227, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Warren Curtis Stirling, AO23230, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Raymond John Downey, AO23233, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roy Willard Nelson, Jr., AO23238, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur Theodore Frontczak, AO23246, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Stanton Thomas Smith, Jr., AO23266, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Julius Boswell Summers, Jr., AO23271, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Karl Tweeten Rauk, AO23272, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Francis Coleman, AO23280, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Burton Elmo McKenzie, AO23289, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Mason Smelley, AO23291, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Air Force).

×Lt. Col. William Powell Litton, AO23300, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alvan Cullom Gillem 2d, AO23302, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theodore Ross Milton, AO23307, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kermit Robert Dyke, AO23318, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Frederick Stewart, AO23332, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Wendell Rogers, AO32929, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Olien Turner, AO44433, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Robert Royal, AO32933, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hubert Stonewall Judy, Jr., AO32937, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Weldon Marion James, AO23353, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Norton Reynolds, AO23354, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Elza McEntire, AO23355, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bryan Brand Harper, AO23356, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alvin Edward Hebert, AO23360, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Miles McNeese, AO23361, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Condie Sanders, AO23366, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ernest Roderic Manierre, AO23367, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Fleming Harris, AO23368, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Baseler, AO23371, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gerhard John Schriever, AO23373, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adolf Milton Wright, AO23374, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil James Looke, Jr., AO23375, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Edward Glober, AO23377, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Afton Gayle, AO23379, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orville Herman Rehmann, AO23383, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orie Olin Schurter, AO23384, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Ellsworth Boyd, AO23389, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alexander George Evanoff, AO23391, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jerry Dentler Page, AO23392, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Rollen Henry Anthis, AO23393, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Austin Cunningham, AO23394, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dorr Ellsworth Newton, Jr., AO23396, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Leonard Clark, AO23397, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Stanley Jeffrey, Jr., AO23400, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Stephen Davenport McElroy, AO23467, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roger McKee Crow, AO23476, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Horace Albert Hanes, AO23480, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stuart Moss Porter, AO23481, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alvan Neavitt Moore, AO23484, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Lee Wood, Jr., AO23485, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Norton Graves, AO23506, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Robert Ford, AO23508, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Carl Paul Walter, AO23521, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ariel Wayne Nielsen, AO23537, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Barkeley McPherson, AO23538, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Edward Nitsche, AO23557, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

NOTE.—All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be first lieutenants

*First Lt. Raimon William Lehman, O56586, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 2, 1948.

*First Lt. John Paul Vann, O38485, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 2, 1948.

*First Lt. Robert Anthony Ryan, O56587, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 3, 1948.

*First Lt. Melvin Jordan Sowards, O39473, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

*First Lt. Walter Parks Blanton, O39474, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

*First Lt. John Neal Kennedy, O50425, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

*First Lt. Robert Herman Siegrist, O39475, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

*First Lt. Louis George Selig, Jr., O50427, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 6, 1948.

*Second Lt. Winfred Bullard, Sr., AO56588, United States Army, with rank from July 6, 1948.

*First Lt. John Hilary McAuliffe, O56594, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 7, 1948.

*First Lt. Otto Paul Scharth, O41337, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 14, 1948.

*First Lt. Gordon Sumner, Jr., O38489, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 23, 1948.

Second Lt. Charles Liston Gambill, O50435, United States Army, with rank from July 26, 1948.

Capt. Charles Raymond Sniffin, O50437, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 29, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Louis Pomerene, O50438, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 30, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Lee Moriarty, O50440, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 4, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Bruce Elliott, O50442, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 5, 1948.

First Lt. Loren Ralph Keefer, O38492, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 7, 1948.

Second Lt. Victor David Green, O50445, United States Army, with rank from August 11, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Bertram Ledford, O38496, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 13, 1948.

First Lt. William Joseph Farrell, O38488, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 14, 1948.

First Lt. Jefferson DeRosenroll Capps, O50447, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 15, 1948.

First Lt. Ernest Mahlon Monroe, Jr., O38497, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 15, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Francis Gioe, O56619, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 16, 1948.

First Lt. Raymond Godfrey Lehman, Jr., O56621, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 17, 1948.

Capt. Donald Cary Schaffer, O38231, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 28, 1948.

Capt. Charles Lenton Stark, O50451, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 29, 1948.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

*First Lt. Thomas Ross Ostrom, O50576, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 7, 1948, subject to examination required by law.

Second Lt. James Rock Walpole, O38579, Medical Service Corps, United States Army, with rank from August 3, 1948.

First Lt. George Raymond Krough, O38580, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 22, 1948.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

First Lt. Catherine Nelda Cotsones, N1506, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from April 26, 1948.

*First Lt. Amalia Rita Lazaro, N1519, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Patricia Anne Donaldson, N1709, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army, with rank from July 1, 1948.

*First Lt. Rosemary Witt, N1520, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 1, 1948.

*First Lt. Joan Martha Wissing, N1710, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 3, 1948.

*First Lt. Ellen Marie McDonald, N1187, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 6, 1948.

*First Lt. Marie Josephine Schmahl, N1521, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 13, 1948.

*First Lt. Nancy Bolt Power, N1626, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 14, 1948.

*First Lt. Gladys Irene Breault, N1522, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 16, 1948.

First Lt. Margaret Maria Kish, N1523, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 1, 1948.

To be majors, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, with rank from July 19, 1948

*Capt. Elsie Kuraner, M10033, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Edna Lura, M10034, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Harriet Shannon Lee, M10001, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Felie Woodrow Clark, M10002, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Brunetta Avis Kuehlthau, M10019, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Eleanor Lois Mitchell, R10035, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Hilda Muse Lovett, R10061, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Nell Wickliffe, R10036, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Grace Smith, R10001, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Helen Alice Dautrich, R10002, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Ethel May Theilmann, M10055, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Myrtle Aldrich, R10003, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Agnes Patterson Snyder, M10003, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*Capt. Helen Morris Davis, R10004, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps

*Second Lt. Harriet Louise Wood, M10066, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army, with rank from July 2, 1948.

*First Lt. Betty Ann Harlan, M10016, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 10, 1948.

*First Lt. Angela Barreras, M10047, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 10, 1948.

*First Lt. Frances Jane Johnson, M10031, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 10, 1948.

First Lt. Margaret Eileen Mahoney, M10017, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 9, 1948.

Second Lt. Barbara E. Bangs, J20, Occupational Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army, with rank from August 27, 1948.

NOTE.—Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

IN THE NAVY

Admiral Raymond A. Spruance for appointment in the permanent grade of admiral in the Navy as authorized by Public Law 791, Eightieth Congress.

The following-named midshipmen (Aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Archie E. Benton, June 4, 1948.
William J. Brantley, June 4, 1948.
Hermann J. C. Burchardi, June 4, 1948.
Frank L. Cheek, June 4, 1948.
Walter R. Delaney, June 4, 1948.
Frank J. Drechsler, June 4, 1948.
Francis G. Gergen, June 4, 1948.
George C. Hafner, June 4, 1948.
William J. Hepburn, June 4, 1948.
Stanley J. Kakol, June 4, 1948.
Ralph C. Knight, June 4, 1948.
Ted R. McGinnis, June 4, 1948.
Donald P. McKay, June 4, 1948.
Donald B. Oblad, June 4, 1948.
Lyle R. Olson, June 4, 1948.
Jack W. Perry, June 4, 1948.
John J. Smith, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Roy Z. Taylor III, June 4, 1948.
Robert H. Wade, June 4, 1948.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Lester N. Hill, June 4, 1948.
Robert F. Valentine, June 4, 1948.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy:

David "P" Barker
Raymond J. Borntraeger
Charles O. Brown
Woolson S. Brown
James D. Bryan, Jr.
Eugene R. Christie
William R. Crawford, Jr.
Donald L. Egger
Oliver N. Evans
Ernest D. Fife
Fred A. W. Franke, Jr.
Donald A. Gillham
Roy V. Gunther
Russell L. Handy, Jr.
Arthur R. Hasler, Jr.
John G. Herndon
Alvin S. Hibbs
Rowland P. Hill
John L. Hotes
John G. "W" Jackson
Richard E. Lewis
James A. McCaig
Richard K. McCorkle
Ralph I. McFarland
Max R. McGlamry
William "E" McLuckie, Jr.
John C. Mape
LeRoy O. Mosher
James F. Murphy
Raymond P. Notson
Leon M. Orcutt, Jr.
William B. Otto
Frank J. Roehrenbeck, Jr.
Richard D. Schwartz
Emory R. Sourbeer, Jr.
Raymond W. Spangrud
Max W. Stults
Joseph L. Sunderlin
James J. Thompson
Robert N. Wallis
Howard W. Westervelt, Jr.
Frank M. Wilson, Jr.
Richard E. Young

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

James A. Brimson
Karl R. Whitney

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Morton J. Aronson
Jack S. Biesenkamp
John W. Bisenius
Winton R. Boyd
Leland C. Brannon
Carl A. Broaddus, Jr.
Jack E. Byrd
Edmundo V. Castillo Amy
Frederick A. Clark, Jr.
Walter T. Colbert
Keith S. Ditman
Donald W. Edwards
Stanley J. Geller
William L. Hall
Robert L. Hill
Clarence H. Johnston
Paul W. Johnston
Hoyt Kirkpatrick, Jr.
Kenneth L. Krabbenhoft
Joseph L. Mays
John A. Meier
Robert E. Mitchel
Robert S. Mutch
Ira B. Patton
Robert O. Peckinpaugh
Maurie D. Pressman
James S. Reed
David R. Rogers
Neal D. Sanborn
Ray T. Smith, Jr.
Ernest A. Sneddon
James E. Stark

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

George I. Chegin
Jack Dillard
Harry C. Dolbeck
Glendale M. Eaton
Herschel B. Hamric, Jr.
William H. Jeffery
William M. Kirkpatrick, Jr.
Milton E. Kreyenhagen
Robert S. Leventhal
David F. Morrow
Lawrence C. Murdoch, Jr.
Kay K. Thurman

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Paul W. Chalfant
Joseph F. Cloonan
Henry T. Lavin
Charles A. Szczesny
John A. Widman, Jr.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Raymond B. Oskin
Martin J. Roddy, Jr.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

William C. Brandon, Jr.
William E. Crolius, Jr.
Clarence E. Saunders

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Melvin L. Calton
William H. Cock, Jr.
John J. Fritz
John W. Hardwick
Robert E. Hill
Harold R. Hudson
William B. Kovacs
Frank A. Marmarose
Ward E. Quilter, Jr.
Paul H. Satterlund
John P. Scullin
William T. Strahan

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Jane E. Alexander
Sara J. Barton
Ann A. Bergen
Lucille M. Bernson
Mildred J. Bishop
Arkie A. Bothwell
Opal E. Bridges
Shirley L. Brooks
Irene R. Broski
Jean D. Cairns
Oleta M. Cameron
Viola "C" Carboy
Betty V. Carden
Ann E. Carlson
Margaret E. Chapman
Barbara A. Chappell
Nell M. Chumley
Kathleen Claffy
Virginia M. Cleary
Pauline T. Cote
Mary L. Crouch
Betty M. Davis
Nettie A. DeLisa
Florence J. Delynko
Alice "M" DeReyes
Mary V. Dewey
Louise H. Dewing
Patricia L. Dowell
Rose C. Fidale
Dorothy J. Garber
Roma E. Garner
Allene H. Gherardini
Mary M. Gilmore
Dorothy J. Goodell
Alice T. Griffin
Shirley A. Hakius
Shirley A. Harbaum
Laura C. Haring
Ima G. Harrell
Annie P. Hartin
Cristina Hernandez
Enid Y. Horning
Joan L. Huber
Billie J. Johnston
Lenora M. Judy
Mary J. Kaelin
Mary L. Kaiser
Florene Kelly
Arline L. Kennedy
Julia Kidda
Margaret E. Kissinger
Geraldine M. Kolha
Aldona Krushinski
Cornelia F. Long
Anna McConnon
Eleanor C. Mahoney
Ann Manley
Dorothy L. Martin
Fannie I. Martin
Eileen LaV. Mehrmann
Lois C. Merritt
Betty M. Millsop
Jean E. Moury
Margaret M. Murphy
Maribelle Paige
Audrie M. Peplinski
Shirley A. Raymond
Nathalie A. Roark
Ruth C. Robinson
Eva K. Roth
Betty L. Sharp
Katherine G. Shea
Mary C. Sheridan
Dorothea M. Short

Dorothy B. Slaven	Georgia Vassilakos
Mary R. Staehling	Mary M. Wein
Anna M. Stary	Dolores Weisman
Diane M. Steiner	Florence J. Welty
Ada M. Strickland	Marjory H. Werne
Alfreda Szkodna	Lola E. Wilkinson
Barbara J. Taylor	Loree Young
Elizabeth Taylor	Marvis E. Young
Kathryn A. Terhune	Kathryn E. Zabel
Mary F. Trocchi	Joan B. Zdeblick
Dolores Troskoski	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDERS

Vernal G. Backman	Thomas P. Rogers
Vernon E. Martens	Henry J. Wiser

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Warner D. Bundens, Jr.

LIEUTENANTS

John R. Bierley
Walter H. Jarvis, Jr.
Leo S. Madlem, Jr.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

William F. Bennett Jr.	Martin O. Greaney, Jr.
	Walter F. Hansen
William E. Carter	Raleigh M. Hood
Nathaniel M. Cohen, Jr.	Donald H. McCowan
	George T. Van Petten
David C. Dixon	Frederick L. Whitlark
John S. Graettinger	Burton Willard

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Joseph R. Grysbeck
Joseph W. McAleer
Willard R. McClellan

LIEUTENANTS

George I. Gilchrist, Jr.
Arthur L. Loring

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Richard "C" D'Vincent	Enrique Valentin, Jr.
	Walter F. Woodward
Neale H. Morrow	

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

John J. Beretta
William J. Perry

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Andrew D. Singleton

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Regina M. L. Harty	Marion F. Wardell
Esther V. Walenga	Helen L. Young

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Catherine M. Cirillo	Ruth L. Price
Martha L. Gabuzda	Mildred K. Teass
Mary T. Gilfedder	Martha A. Van Wye

ENSIGNS

Marie C. Bringgold	Martha G. McKelley
Eleanor M. Lux	Mary C. Seaton

ADDITIONAL NOMINATIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be Lieutenant Colonels with rank from July 1, 1948

Lt. Col. Francis Nicholas Miller, O41791, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erwin Orlo Gibson, O29899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

To be Majors with rank from July 1, 1948

Maj. Roy Hesten Steele, O41847, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hiram Brown White, O41849, United States Army.

×Maj. Theodore Douglas Kern, O51209, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Peter Thomson, O51211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Richard Reagon, O29533, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Carl Kait, O29532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Adolph Kretlow, O39708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Brasted, O41854, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Nicholas Smith, O39709, United States Army.

×Capt. Harold Sinclair Hayward, O51213, United States Army.

Maj. David Wainewright Bowman, O39711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lehman Jerome Lewis, O29537, United States Army.

Lt. Col. William Ray Robinette, O29539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Laverne Clarke, O41856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wallace Harvey Dawson, Jr., O39712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerard Beekman Crook, O39713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karl Robinson, O41857, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Sawyer Willard, O29541, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wallace Higgins, Jr., O29542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Fisk Rogers, O29544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Clarence T. Foust, O41860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Eugene Thomas Adler, O29549, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Earl Gambrill, O39716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Clair Knapp, O38684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Ralph Wallace White, O39717, United States Army.

Capt. Carlton Vermont Bingham, O39718, United States Army.

Maj. James O. Younts, Jr., O29552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Wilson Reed, O29553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harley Arnold Lanning, O39720, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Gordon McTavish Johnson, O29406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Allen Kallis, O38687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Francis Victory, O41869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harwood Sterling Nichols, Jr., O51219, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Lawrence Nolan, O38689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Erwell Mackintosh, O51221, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Wood, Jr., O29563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Kenneth Eakin, O51222, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Alexander Eugene Lancaster, O41875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lowe Herman Herndon, O51223, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Clyde Aylmer Houltry, O51224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Mervin Emil Mansager, O41876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Taylor Goodley, O29566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reed Muriel Titus, O41879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Norman Michael Wagner, O51225, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Lloyd Whitman, O29569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Arthur Hagerty, O41883, United States Army.

Maj. Walter Harold Murray, O38693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ray Joseph Cox, O29571, United States Army.

Maj. George Joseph Schill, O51229, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Joseph Brophy, O39723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Hupman Drake, O41887, United States Army.

Maj. Wyatt Garner Batton, O38696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dana Turner Merrick, O51231, United States Army.

Maj. Arthur Paul Carter, O29580, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vernon Milton Blum, O39728, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Gaspare Frank Blunda, O18405, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Deane Gough, O18413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Maurice Brown, O18453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Bryant Cooper, Jr., O18469, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Harris Isbell, Jr., O18474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Roger Urban, O18490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Rosser Patterson, O18491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edwin Dietz, O18500, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Maynard Norwood Levenick, O18514, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Mackay Read, O18527, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Hamilton Hogan, O18551, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Francis Reidy, O18557, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Winston Candler, O18562, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Ambrose Herman, O18563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Terrence Robert Joseph Hickey, O18567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Knox Armstrong, O18578, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harry George Roller, O18597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ernest Clyde Peters, O18603, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Daniel Turner Workizer, O18608, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Maloney, Jr., O18610, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Moorman Cheal, O18613, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James Mahoney, O18616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dexter Lowry, O17628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harry Richard Davis, O41894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Harper Kilpatrick, O41895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Alfred Watkins, O51237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leonard Wilton Winget, O41896, United States Army.

Maj. Frank Forest Wilkins, O39731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Burton Tufte, O39732, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred William Ludecke, O41898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Walter Hall, O38698, United States Army.

×Maj. Herbert Frederick Lindal, O51243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Edwin Jordan, O41910, United States Army.

Maj. William Taylor McAninch, O29601, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis Alexander, O41912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Franklin Lewis, O41915, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Daland Webb, O41916, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Winthrop McRell, O29606, United States Army.

Maj. Ernest Corwin Seaman, O29607, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. John William Mac Leod, O41919, United States Army.

Maj. Henry Lemle Phillips, O51249, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Lorrain Wood, O51250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Duvall, O41921, United States Army.

Maj. Leon Deane Marsh, O39739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carroll Henry Harrison, O51252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj Ben Milton Young, O51255, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Paul Fahringer, O41930, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Francis John Goatley, O51256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gerald Allison Sams, O41931, United States Army.

Maj. Francis Eugene Houghton, O39742, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Otto Schellberg, O39743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Edward Case, O51260, United States Army.

Maj. Laurence Wheeler Lougee, O41933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Adam Mount, O41934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Elmer Andrew Kell, Jr., O38699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Lee Taylor, O41939, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Todd Yule, O29627, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Arthur Meek, O51261, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward McHugh, O39745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harold Edwin Sprague, O41940, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Ernest Moyers, O41938, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence McAllistor Knapp, O41942, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Michael Keane, O38702, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Joseph Field, O29630, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Denver Paxson, O29633, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Norman Cogswell, O41945, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Mitchell DeBardeleben, O51266, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cornelius Michael Reing, O29637, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Sherlock Garner, O29640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Marion Hurst, O41947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas A. Weadock, O39748, United States Army.

×Maj. Frederick Beasley Alexander, Jr., O41949, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Joseph Brascher, O39749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lynn Smith Waters, O41950, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eli Edward White, O41951, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Owen Picknell, O41952, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lloyd Atwood, O39750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Owen Brown, O39751, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willie Nussum Thomas, O29644, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oscar Theodore Hammerness, O39752, United States Army.

Maj. Robert Gwynne Humphrey, O29646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Frank Thelen, O29649, United States Army.

Maj. Lawson Edmond Hahn, O29650, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Marvin Antrim Saxton, O51275, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Lee Johnson Rutz, 51276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Eugene Chappell, O41968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ernest Chisolm Watson, O29652, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Venson Dixon, O51277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Lafayette Bryson, O41969, United States Army.

Maj. Svend Wright Nielsen, O39753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Carter Todd, O41972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Delphine Delmas Rasco, O41973, United States Army.

Maj. John Earl Norman, O51279, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vasco Laub, O41975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Pyueng Son Pyuen, O41976, United States Army.

Capt. Charles William Nussbaum, O51281, United States Army.

Maj. George William Dorn, O41979, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Brown Derrickson, Jr., O51282, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Harold Tuft Perkins, O51284 Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Henry Hatfield, O39755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Lowenstern, O51285, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kurt Norman Heyne, O39756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles Davis, O41981, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Kenneth Llewellyn Leiby, O51286, United States Army.

Maj. Max Oboler, O51287, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Raymond Fields, O51288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Anderson Norton, O41984, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Lobdell Percy Brown, O39757, United States Army.

Capt. Jeff Clay 3d, O29667, United States Army.

Lt. Col. King David Colson, Jr., O29668, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Lovell Sipes, O41989, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Francis Duke Crinkley, O29669, United States Army.

×Maj. Aldean Aaron Eakin, O41994, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin James Handwerker, O29671, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Thomas Mulvanity, O29674, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Lee Koup, O41999, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Percy Harold Laming, O42000, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stewart Henry Legendre, O42004, United States Army.

Maj. Robert Beasley Moore, O51294, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elvyn Ambrose Robb, O42006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Carlton Taylor, O39761, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Alfred Conway Knight, O29684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Burton Albin, O51296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Nelson Reed O51297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wendell Mark Broadus, O29690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Lanier Barclay, O29691, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Voiers, O39763, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin William Baron, O42012, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Harold Lee Taylor, O29694, United States Army.

Capt. C. A. Holmes Eubanks, O42014, United States Army.

Maj. John Ascalon Elterich, O29696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Edward Ceasar White, O39766, United States Army.

Maj. James Sevier Killough, O29697, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Forney Hurst Ingram, O29698, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Julius Peterson, O29881, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Clair Haycraft, O29704, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Alvin Stephens, O39768, United States Army.

×Capt. Donald Oran Markham, O29705, United States Army.

Maj. Vernon Morgan Budge, O42017, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Richard Nicholas Borgfeldt, O42019, United States Army.

×Capt. Joseph Sharove, O42021, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Charles Willis Wilmore, O29706, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lee Llewellyn Dymock, O29708, United States Army.

×Maj. Horace Napoleon Elkins, Jr., O39770, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Prescott Pike, O42023, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Rudolph Fox, O42024, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Ewing Johnson, O51309, United States Army.

Maj. Luie William Mayfield, O42025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Walter Cooley, O39773, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Joseph Pollard, O42029, United States Army.

Maj. Julian Earle Weisler, O42028, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mandel Nathaniel Goldstein, O29711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frederick Joseph LePenske, Jr., O39774, United States Army.

Maj. Joseph Anthony Petrolino, O29712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Anthony Carson, O42030, United States Army.

Capt. Charles William Hutchins, O29714, United States Army.

Maj. Henry Smith Newhall, O29717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence George Hubbart, O29718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Horace Spicer, O29719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnathon Thomas Kaigler, O29721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Ulys Maxey, O51314, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carey Alexander Clark, O51315, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Miles Coeyman, O51316, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Anthony Nebel, O42040, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Francis Lancer, O51317, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Marquis House, Jr., O29729, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Arthur Albert Fiedler, O38719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Madison Brooks, O29736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Shircliffe Hoult, O42047, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Harry Ritts, O38720, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Wilfred Hutchinson, O29744, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Henry Larson, O42048, United States Army.

×Maj. Edward Lane Gibson, O42049, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Raymond Herrmann, O39779, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Patterson Kline, O39780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Calvin Huber, O42052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Abbott Edward Dodge, O51326, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Howard Cunningham, O51325, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Arthur Evans, O42060, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marcus Edward Cooper, O51327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Wesley Campbell, O29755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward James Murphy, Jr., O42061, United States Army.

Maj. Eugene Goliday Hite, O29756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Max Webster Hazlehurst, O38723, United States Army.

Maj. Walter Herbert Parsons, Jr., O39782, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Ruthven Smith, Jr., O18661, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thore Fritjof Bengtson, O18670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Menoher, O18690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Vibert Doyle, O18712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Allen Rude, O18732, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Parks Goodwin, O18733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Abner Meeks, O18735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Aaron Meyer Lazar, O18738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Folkes Moore, O18781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Bernard Thielen, O18782, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl Laurance Scherer, O18784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Russell Huber, O18797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerard Charles Cowan, O18807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Kenneth Edward Tiffany, O18822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Vines Johnston, Jr., O18836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sewell Marion Brumby, O18846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Deisher, O18852, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William George Davidson, Jr., O18862, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Celistine Quartier, O18879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Bartlett Babcock, O18887, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Elwood Means, O18901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Randall Everman, O18910, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Wesley McKnight, O29760, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Doe, O42066, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Veon Maurice McConnell, O51333, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Barclay Thurston Hesler, O42068, United States Army.

Maj. Irving Wilson Brooks, O39783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Lawrence Benton, O39784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Myrlen Radcliffe, O39787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Otto Jefferson, O29766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew William Hamilton 3d, O29767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Michael Theodore Metz, O42071, United States Army.

Maj. Andrew Donald Kane, O42073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Danhouse Martz, Jr., O29769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Francis McAneny, O42075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Rennie Sanderson, O42076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathan Sanborn Mathewson, O29771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Herbert Herman Rasche, O51339, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Munson Elliott, Jr., O51340, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Alva Lawrence Ritchie, O39788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Amos Hawes, O42077, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Adams Edwin Rackes, O42079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Yenne Earl Snider, O51341, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Francis Gibbons, O38724, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Rolfe Archibald, O29776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Knapp Franks, O51343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. David Armitage, O42079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Wellford Taylor, O38725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles John Timmes, O29777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Franklin Gaffney, O51345, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Michael Mendell, O42082, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Richard Crank, O51346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herber Carlton Leney, O39789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orval James Baldwin, O39790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Bell Butler, O29783, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Ray King Bannister, O29784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John George Wagner, O51348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alan Beresford Todd, O42088, United States Army.

Maj. Loveaire Ackley Hedges, O29786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cameron Forrest Woods, O42089, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Weldon Lester Slisher, O29787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Alford Laforge, O51349, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Alton Hough, O42090, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Grant Waite, O30358, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Vinson Wyss, O29788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tom Bryson Hembree, O29769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Preston Tuggle, Jr., O42093, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Willis Clarke, O29792, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Myron Fish, Jr., O29793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hans Wilhelm Helm, O29794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alfred Maria Koster, O29796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roland Dale Graves, O29795, United States Army.

Lt. Col. William Albert Warner, O39791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Grant Bent, Jr., O29797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Russell Whitehead, O42095, United States Army.

×Maj. Winslow Randall Willis, O51352, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Thomas Hazlett, O39792, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert H. Cole, O29798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Herrward Mauz, O29799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Irvine Sanders, O42096, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Grant Learnard, Jr., O29801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Virgil Guisleman, O39793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Greenlief Smith, Jr., O29804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Richard Boyles, O29803, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Robert Raymond Judson, O39794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clifford Lyman Sawyer, O51355, United States Army.

Maj. Kenan McLendon Rand, O39795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Monroe Brown, O29806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Lindley Pickett, O42099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Martin Sassé, O29807, United States Army.

×Capt. William Ralph Thomas, O51356, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Robert Raymond Robertson, O51357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Lauren Elmer Hannah, O51358, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Louis Buttner, O42100, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Maxwell, O39796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Richard Hill, O42101, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ira Winfield Hart, O29808, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Ray Joseph Laux, O42102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alwyn Vincent Larkin, O29809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Orville Rupp, O42103, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Oliver Irvin, O42104, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irvin Louis Allen, O29810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Truman Snowden, O29811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lewis Bivens, O42105, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Leo Sievers, O29814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Charles Parsons, O29816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Timothy Howard McKenzie, O39797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lester W. Kale, O29815, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Loren Elmer Gaither, O42109, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Arthur Klinetop, O39798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Ernest Newcomb, O38727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Forrest Vinyard Diehl, O51361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Emery Baya, O29817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pierre Augustine Kieff, O39799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Ruebush Andrews, O51362, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elmer Robinson Higgins, O38755, United States Army.

Maj. Paul Andrew Conlin, O42111, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter William Gerken, O42113, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Ellsworth Stoever, O42114, United States Army.

Maj. Edgar Lee Grider, O42112, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ludwig Schulz, O42115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard John Conran, O29820, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.)

Capt. Wiley Burton Davis, O29822, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Elmer Louis Littell, O29823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Voorhies Nicholas, O51363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Kim Atkinson, O29826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Theodore Edson, O29827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hays Holmes, Jr., O29828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank William Herberth, Jr., O29829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Murray, O29833, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Charles Jones, O42119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Miguel Joseph Pomar, O42120, United States Army.

Capt. Lowell Hugh Powers, O42123, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Seymour Walter Wurfel, O29835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Joseph Ingeman, O42124, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Clifton Creighton, Jr., O29836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erquiet Taylor, O29838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clinton William Janes, O38730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floy William McGinn, O42127, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Francis La Piana, O51365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Sumner Standley, Jr., O29840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Wortendycke Beggs, O39802, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilfred Felix Menegus, O42128, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilburn Lesca Strickland, O29839, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Thomas Simpson, O29841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Linwood Bush, O29843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Arnold Gerhard Eger, O29842, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Andrew Ralph Lolli, O29844, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Vernon Hart, O38732, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Lee Williams, O30082, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Malcolm Townsend Powell, O51368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Patrick Gibbons, O39804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Mackentyre Thames, Jr., O29846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Amos Byron Churchill, O29847, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hill Greene, O42130, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Arny, Jr., O51369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Eugene Pickett, O42131, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur LeRoy Baker, O39805, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Lydon Briggs Cole, O29848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Howard Frank Bogner, O51370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Smith, Jr., O29850, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Herman Meinert, O29851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Howard Bates, O39806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Askins, Jr., O29852, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick James Cooke, O29853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harry Fredrick Kirkpatrick, Jr., O39807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Holmes Hoffman Bevington, O42133, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Temple Johnson, O29856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Burns, O38733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lorraine Lynnhaven Manly, O51373, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gardner Baker Gross, O29859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Lee Andrick, O42134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Harry Davidson, Jr., O39808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Timothy Chapman, O29860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Humphrey Tomlinson, Jr., O38734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Evander Francis Kelly, Jr., O51377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Parmelee Babcock, O39809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edgar Wilson, O29863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kirk Buchak, O29864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Silas Rosswell Langlois, O29865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Melvin Lundberg, O42136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Silas Benjamin Dishman, O29052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Alexander Dasche, O39810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Fred Joe Gosiger, O29867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Edward Conn, O29868, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Richard Dwyer, O42138, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Neal Anderson, O51379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry C. Brindle, O51380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. William Robinson Heard, O39811, United States Army.
Maj. Homer Littlefield Davis, Jr., O29869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Edward Daniel Fitzgerald, O29870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.)
Lt. Col. William Maxwell Rodgers, O39812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Blair Eliot Henderson, O39813, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Edwin Samuel Winsper, O39814, United States Army.
Capt. Charles Lacy Ringgold, O30115, United States Army.
Capt. Darrell Leonard Reed, O39815, United States Army.
Maj. Franz Heiberger Ross, O29871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Newell Skaggs, O39816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Louis Benjamin Besbeck, O42142, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. James Marshall Sprake, O29672, United States Army.
×Lt. Col. James Willard Pumpelly, O51384, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. David Glenn Rees, O39817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Gustin Hall Smith, O29877, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Russell Decatur Fagin, O42145, United States Army.
Maj Edwin Hart Druley, O29876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Frank Strother Ison, O39819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Joseph Anthony Sivigny, O51385, United States Army.
Maj. William Francis LaFarge, Jr., O42147, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Robert Weir-Mitchell Weir, O42150, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Theodore Hadrick Ebbert, O29885, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Royal Leonard Leidy, O29886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Kermit James Silverwood, O42153, United States Army.
Lt. Col. John Henry Lattin, O29887, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Oscar Melville Bisant, Jr., O51387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Howard Sidney Levie, O38735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Howard Loomis, O29889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Braxton Eugene Small, O42156, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Chester Harold Meek, O29890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Edward Heltzel, O29891, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Oscar Jackson Magee, O42158, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lyndon William Merry, O51391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Dwight Thornton Hamersley, O42159, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Quentin Samuel Quigley, O29894, Army of the United States (captain, U S. Army).
Lt. Col. Teddy Hollis Sanford, O29893, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Joseph Rupel Walton, O39821, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Thomas Richardson Palmerlee, O29895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Victor B. Fox, O29896, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Wenzel David Roth, O51392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Stephen Bodner, O51393, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Robert Gibson Davis, O51394, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Robert Roland Creighton, O42161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Schaeffer Mansfield, O29898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Herman Richard Siemers, O42162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Harllee Royall O'Neal, O42163, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Otto Fischer, O29901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Conrad Hildebrant, O29902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lloyd Milton Reiser, O39823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jean Paul LaCour, O39822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Earl Stewart Bessmer, O39824, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Raymond Keasey, O38736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Beverly Taylor, O29903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Otto Peterson, O29904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jackson Knight Judy, O39825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col James Abner Richardson 3d, O29906, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Capt. Marion Claude Miller, O51396, United States Army.
×Capt. Harry Bauer Sames, O42167, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Dane Oatman Sprankle, O42169, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Gordon O'Brien, O42171, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eldon Alfred Koerner, O42172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fred Wilbur Greene, O38737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Humphrey Johnson, Jr., O29908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Major Ayars, O42173, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Byron Martin Shipley, O39827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Mattison Albert Darragh, O42174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Henry Conk, O29909, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Alexander George Eagle, O29910, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harley Derrell Brown, O29911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Joseph Hannon, O42175, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Knox Bell, O29912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Sidney Dig Frampton, O42176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. John Patrick McKenna, O42179, United States Army.
Capt. Wesley Earl Farmer, O51398, United States Army.
×Maj. Paul Anthony Shaw, O42181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Rudolph George Winckler, O51399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. John Elvin Johnson, O39828, United States Army.
×Lt. Col. Cecil Malcolm MacGregor, O42182, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alfred Earl Stevens, O29916, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Douglas Osborne Toft, O42183, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roland Haddaway del Mar, O29917, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army)
Maj. John Eugene Londahl, O39829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Victor Johnson, O39831, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Wright Roberts, O39830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Roy Edward Goode, O29921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Albert Havens Jackman, O51402, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Lee Coleman, O38738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt John Hamilton Gibson, O29923, United States Army.
Maj. Charles Allen Leavitt, O51403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Wilfred Gustafson, O51404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack Farnell Hudson, O42184, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Orlando Adam Scott, O42187, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Reid Dorman, Jr., O51406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Arthur Luther, O38740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Weston Locke Blanchard, O29925, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt.. Col. Slaftcho Katsarsky, O39832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robinson Baird Rider, O51408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Albert Mark Smith 2d, O29927, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Lee Henry Morrison, O51409, United States Army.
Maj. Sherburne Jackson Heliker, O29928, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Levern Bates, O29929, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. James Glen Black, O39833, United States Army.
Capt. George Samuel Haviland, O42189, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Frazer Woodruff Rodman, O38741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Leonard Kerr, O42191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Heron McNary, O38742, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edward Jackson Grant, O38743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Harwood Taylor, O29931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Perl Dunn, O51413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Maxwell Birge Fogarty, O42193, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Benjamin Chesson, Jr., O51414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Edwin Bisbort, O29934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Lewis Peyton, O29935, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Leroy Icke, O42195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Lewis Plahte, O29936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Arthur McAleer, O42196, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Seymour Austin Potter, Jr., O29937, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Albert Fanning, O29939, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Ashworth Robblee, O42198, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Ralph Bonner Garretson, O39835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lowrey Robert Moore, O29941, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Beecher Reed, O30193, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Albertson Bradley, O39836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William James Whitehead, O39837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Gordon Gealta, O38744, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Gustav Kiel, O42199, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tom Watson Sills, O29949, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Thomas Evans, O29950, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James Sutton, O29951, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Albert Martin, O51419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orman Goodyear Charles, O29954, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dudley Peterman, O29955, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James Watson, O29730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Courtney Shewbridge, Jr., O38745, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Harold Andrew Cassell, O29956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Alden Norell, O39838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Anthony Devine, O42202, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Howard Raftery, O39839, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest LeeRoy Ritchie, O29957, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Harvey Sibbald, O29958, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Johnson Henderson, O42203, United States Army.

Capt. Harry Jarvis Engel, O39840, United States Army.

Capt. John Joseph Sullivan, Jr., O29961, United States Army.

Maj. John Joseph Agoa, O42205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clayton Wallace Wells, O29962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frank Henry Preston, Jr., O42206, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Lawrence Norfray, O51423, United States Army.

Maj. Harold Ralph Yeager, O29567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Peter West, O29964, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Angelo Michael Ricciardelli, O42208, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edwin Rust, O29965, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Scott Cain, O42210, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Prentiss Bishop Reed, Jr., O39841, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Malcolm Wesley Courser, O42211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hans Godfrey Jepson, O29966, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Gregory Lux, O42212, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Kenneth Johnson, O42213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Paul Burns, O51426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Francis Adams, O29968, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Delmer Pearl Anderson, O29969, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Argyle Phillips Jones, O39842, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Guy Vinton Miller, O42215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Franklin Riley Patterson, O38746, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Frederick Miller Sperry, O51427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmer Arthur Edge, Jr., O38747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marcus William Heskett, O42218, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Reed Turman, O42217, United States Army

Capt. John Joseph Dalton, O42219, United States Army.

Lt. Col. James Noel Brewer, O42220, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Philip Thomson, O29974, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Herman Bittner, O42221, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Zinn Traeger, O51429, United States Army.

Maj. Claude Elbert Ray, O51430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Fay Kenyon Green, O29976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Raphael Dunlap, O29975, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

×Maj. Arnold Boogher, O39843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward Stannah, O29977, United States Army.

Maj. Fred LeRoy Eaker, O42223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Charles Baker, O29979, United States Army.

Capt. Paul Patrick Byrne, O51433, United States Army.

Capt. Jack Reeves Murphy, O51431, United States Army.

Maj. Frank Kellers, O51432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Phil Dicks, O29982, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Valentine Motte Barnes, Jr., O51434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Hensley Fulton, O29984, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Leroy Lewis, O42224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Dulaney Lee O'Roark, O29986, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Earle Nelson, O51435, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. John Francis Reed, O51436, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Armand Fulton, O42225, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Anthony Cain, O29988, United States Army.

Capt. Rafael Montilla, O51437, United States Army.

Maj. Ernest Warner Posse, O29989, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter August Kneyse, O42227, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Harold Bach, O42228, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Wesley Doverspike, O42229, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Curtis Theodore Ricketts, O51438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Frederick Linthwaite, O29990, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Kenneth E. Fields, O18957, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wood Beeler, O18958, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duncan Hallock, O18960, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alfred Dodd Starbird, O18961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Douglas Matheson, O18962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Davis Meyer, O18963, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alden Kingsland Sibley, O18964, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, O18968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Campbell Tripp, O18972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward George Herb, O18973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Jonas Ely, O18974, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Honeycutt, O18975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Allen Harris, O18976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Gardner Shinkle, O18979, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hoy D. Davis, Jr., O18982, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alvin Charles Welling, O18983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Charles Davis, O18985, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellsworth Barricklow Downing, O18986, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Amrine Turner, O18987, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Warren Gray, O18988, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Sherman Henry, O18989, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Orin Blandford, O18990, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Adonis Downing, Jr., O18991, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy Cecil Lothrop, O18992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Crain Leslie, O18993, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col John Edward Watters, O18994, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Francis Joseph McMorrow, O18995, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Golding Dunn, O18996, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dabney Ray Corum, O19001, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lauren Whitford Merriam, O19002, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert George Sparrow, O19003, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wolcott Meals, O19005, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter August Jensen, O19006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Bodeau, O19008, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Marion Humphries, O19012, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Denton Armitage, O19014, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore John Conway, O19015, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Elton LaDue, O19017, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Daniel, O19019, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Arthur Dahlen, O19020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Lane, O19021, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ira Whitehead Cory, O19025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William York Frentzel, O19026, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Edward Otto, O19030, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lamar Cecil Ratcliffe, O19034, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Chapman, O19035, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Lawlor, O19036, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Alfred McCrary, O19037, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Parker, Jr., O19038, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Haskell Kibler, Jr., O19039, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris Oswald Edwards, O19041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Zeller, O19043, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beall Franklin, O19046, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Gordon Bartlett, O19047, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Paul Nelson Gillon, O19048, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Rudolf Walters, O19050, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Thorndike Ashworth, O19052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bruce Logan, O19053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lafar Lipscomb, Jr., O19054, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Sheldon Tubbs, O19056, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Henry Kaesser, Jr., O19057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Charles Plapp, O19059, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Joseph Henry O'Malley, O19061, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Hobart Chapman, Jr., O19064, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick William Guiney, Jr., O19066, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Thorlin, O19067, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Harris Shepardson, O19068, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William George Fritz, O19069, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Worman Hain, O19072, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Goyer Patterson, O19073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Lucken Jones, O19074, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Edward Maston, O19075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ethan Allen Chapman, O19076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oren Eugene Hurlbut, O19077, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Warren White, O19079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Park, Jr., O19080, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverly DeWitt Jones, O19081, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Hadley Richardson, Jr., O19082, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Roosevelt Brindley, O19087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marcus Tague, O19090, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Leon Van Way, O19093, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Chase, O19095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. David Virgil Adamson, O19096, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Ferris, O19097, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Penn Thompson, O19098, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Roland Kinderman, O19099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neil Merton Wallace, O19101, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Paul Whelihan, O19102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marshall Woodruff Frame, O19103, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robin George Speiser, O19104, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James Given, O19105, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Avery John Cooper, Jr., O19107, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Ogden Fuqua, O19109, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hardin Leonard Olson, O19110, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cam Longley, Jr., O19112, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Benton Neely, O19114, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Henshaw Pope, O19115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Warren Stilwell, Jr., O19117, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Robert Cyr, O19119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Wilson Tyson, O19120, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Menzie Pittman, O19121, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Allen Carver, O19122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph O'Connor, O19125, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Rushmore Gretser, O19126, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sherburne Whipple, Jr., O19130, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edgar Collins Doleman, O19131, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyril Joseph Letzelter, O19132, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Light Hine, O19134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Wallace Rudolph, O19135, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Abell Cleveland, Jr., O19136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Powers, 3d, O19137, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joshua Robert Messersmith, O19139, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Tripp Evans, Jr., O19140, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Martin Cahill, O19141, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Ryan, O19142, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Skinner, O19144, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Anthony Frank Kleitz, Jr., O19145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Thomas Carroll, O19146, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard John Meyer, O19147, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Randolph Whiting Fletter, O19148, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Harlow Miles, Jr., O19151, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Humbert Joseph Versace, O19152, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Guest Smith, O19154, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Baumer, O19155, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Pugh Pearson, Jr., O19157, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Jacob Macherey, O19158, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Alspaugh, O19159, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Lorenzo Roberson, O19161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Edward Bastion, Jr., O19162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.

Lt. Col. Thomas Herbert Beck, O19164, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Evans Kaiser, O19165, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Thomas Harris, O19166, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gardner Wellington Porter, O19167, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry William Sweeting, Jr., O19168, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyrus Abda Dolph 3d, O19170, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Lindsay Richey, O19172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Bowes Evans, O19174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Andrew Fleckenstein, O19175, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Franklin Gibney Rothwell, O19176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Fant Damon, Jr., O19179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Clay Bridgewater, O19182, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ernest Mikell Clarke, O19183, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Orr Boswell O19188, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Parker Gibbs, O19189, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maddrey Allen Solomon, O19194, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lyle William Bernard, O19195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shelby Francis Williams, O19196, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jean Evans Engler, O19198, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Abner Huntsberry, O19200, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Donald Stephenson, O19201, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Graver Gilbert, O19202, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Laurence Elder, O19203, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Cameron Cubbison, Jr., O19204, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Amaury Manuel Gandia, O19205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Harrold Bayne, O19207, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gwinn Ulm Porter, O19210, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Robert Zierath, O19211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hulburt Douglas, O19212, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Darnell, Jr., O19213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Brice Crawford, O19215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Coleman 3d, O19216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Wiltse Sellers, O19217, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Gibb, O19222, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Kemp Markle, Jr., O19223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Talbot 3d, O19226, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Ellsworth Leydecker, O19227, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin Andrew Miller, O19228, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris King Henderson, O19230, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel O'Reilly, O19233, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Ralston Fredendall, Jr., O19235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edson Schull, O19236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royal Reynolds, Jr., O19238, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Graydon Casper Essman, O19242, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Franklin Akers, Jr., O19243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col Claude Leslie Bowen, Jr., O19244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duff Walker Sudduth, O19245, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Wagstaff, Jr., O19246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Rhoden Pritchard, O19248, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett Gallagher, O19250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Edward Gee, O19251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alston Grimes, O19252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Otto Hartel, O19254, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Walter Parr, Jr., O19255, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Roberts Calhoun, O19256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edson Duncan Raff, O19261, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Braddock Degavre, O19262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Agin Bailey, O19264, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Newman Scoville, O19267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Field Due, O19268, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Demosthenes Clainos, O19269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Schmeizer, O19270, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Thomas Jellett, O19273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Remus, O19275, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Harrell, O19276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Allen Risden, O19278, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Nelson Lonning, O19281, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Moore Blanchard, Jr., O19282, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Wilson Quinn, O19283, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charner Weaver Powell, O19284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Pearce Bellican, O19285, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Spalding Ehlen, O19286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Tallant Kilday, O19288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Roberts Kimmell, Jr., O19291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Vernard Thompson, O19292, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wilkinson Rayburn, O19295, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emmanuel Salvador Cepeda, O19297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kimball Clay Smith, O29882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Harper Rogers, O29992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj William James Marquette, O42231, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gus Hugh Montgomery, 29993, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Colella Evans, O42233, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Melvin Delos Losey, O42235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alanson Tyler Leland, O42236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Albert Sidney Britt, Jr., O42237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ernest Harrison, O29991, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duff Green, Jr., O42239, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Harper Pryor, O29996, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Lewis Seeger, O29997, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Franklin Decker, O29999, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Luther Wilkin, Jr., O39847, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melville Hulbert Griffith, O39846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wilbur Barker 2d, O30001, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hughe Doyle Coleman, O39848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marvin Arrington Middlebrooks, O51440, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Wallace Jay Nichols, O30003, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Curren, Jr., O38749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Mary Woestenburg, O30004, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Taylor Miller, O30006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Anthony McGuire, O51443, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Bohrer Thrift, O39849, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kurt Ladislaus Walitschek, O42241, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Michael Peter Georges, O42242, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Edwin Le Page Beauchamp, O51444, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Seney Ballagh, O30009, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Porter Snooks, Jr., O30011, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Michael Noonan, O42243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Cornelius Kelleher, O38750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harland Stuart, O42244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel David Mack, Jr., O30015, United States Army.

Maj. Elbridge Leroy Brubaker, O51445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Penaat, O29598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Eugene Jackson Carson, O51446, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Reginald Conklin Miller, O26375, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Marshall Pitzer, O26378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Alexandre Guimond, O26379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Wesley Booth, O26382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Charles Buser, O42246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adrian Leonard Hoebeke, O19334, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry von Kolnitz, O30018, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Truden, O42248, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Cantey, O30019, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Soares, O30020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry John Stark, O51448, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Snelson Neill, O51447, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. George Glover Lewis, O42250, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Angelo Domenic Bollero, O39853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Jacob Berkowitz, O39854, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Maguire, O42251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Taft Stump, O30023, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William James Evans, O30025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ambelten Mangles Ahrens, O30026, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Louis Rehmann, O30027, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Ripley Lodge, O42252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hamilton Davin, O42253, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luigi Francis Claps, O39855, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Wesley Darrah, O30029, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Victor Smith, O30030, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harry Van Dine, O30032, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Calvin Lambert, O30033, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Augustus Wingo, O51451, United States Army.

Maj. Anthony Gaul Merritt, O42255, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ralph Yancey, O42256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Conners, O30034, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Kabrich, O39856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Reeves Maddox, O30036, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Andrew Williams, O42257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Irving Haumerson Eales, O38751, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Jennings Pritchard, O42258, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Alton Dresser, O30037, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Presley Horton, O42259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Weldon William Cox, O51453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Edward Spitzer, O30039, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Harry W. Cooper, O42261, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Norton, Jr., O42262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eual Wister Culbertson, O42263, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charlie Lemon Young, O51455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Frederick Clark, O30040, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Conrad Mullen, O51456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Rambo Dale, O39857, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Earle Echols, O42265, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rhoman Edward Clem, O51457, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Cesario Granzin, O30041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Holley Johnson, O30042, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Julius Theodore Dargusch, O51459, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harold Dicks, O30043, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Edwards, O42267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Moore Markley, O38752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Augustus Weaver, O30044, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmore Patrick Moore, O51460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Marshall Richardson, O42269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gail Addison Eaton, O42268, United States Army.

Lt. Col. David Arnold Mathewson, Jr., O38753, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

Capt. Brookman Renninger Painter, O38754, United States Army.

Maj. Terrance Marshall Longacre, O30047, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Troth, O42270, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Oliver Rishoi, O51462, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jay Theodore Glen, O29953, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Robert Glen, O30049, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Garland Guthrie, O30050, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Forrest Hall Forcum, O51464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt Eugene Louis Lash, O42272, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Albert Morse Johnson, O39858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Regis Whitlo Luke, O39859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dave John Cook, O30051, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Shaw Sabine, O39860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Donald DeMarr, O42273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Chapman Coleman, Jr., O30053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Stanley Llewellyn Stewart, O42274, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin George Tieman, Jr., O30303, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neil Frederick Hein, O51467, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Gilbert Spinney, O30054, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Heck, O51469, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Frank Laron Street, O30055, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Werlen Franklin Cheney, O42276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ray William Whitson, O30056, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Aubrey Ranney, O39863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey James Yost, O42277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Boynton Lininger, O30059, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Orsen Branch, O42279, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Fuller Allen, O30060, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Otto Frederick Sonneman, Jr., O42280, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Asbury Haines Jackson, O29629, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifton Frank Nooncaster, O30061, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burdwell Hoyt Shipe, O30065, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Mitchell Franklin, O39864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Milton LaFayette Johnson, O42284, United States Army.

×Maj. Halbert Jennings Slagle, O39865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Edward Painter, O56813, United States Army.

Maj. Albert Tyra Stafford, O39866, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ivan Orville Walt, O42286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Aries Henry Miller, O42287, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Franklin Metcalf, O42288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Roger Elsbree Higgins, O39867, United States Army.
Lt. Colonel Edwin William Grenelle, O38757, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Griffith Johnson, O38756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. James Jenkins Butler, O30068, United States Army.
Capt. Theodore Leslie Chenault, O30069, United States Army.
Maj. Clifford Cecil Hines, O42289, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harold Hatch Haines, O39868, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Frederick Mathias Schellhammer, O42291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Winston Lewis Field, O39869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wayne Hardman, O30072, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Curtiss Welt Oakes, O51471, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Cecil Hamilton Bolton, O39870, United States Army.
Lt. Col. George Wayne Coffman, Jr., O42293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry John Hampton, O30073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Arthur Hamilton, O42294, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Leonard Amoroso, O30076, United States Army).
Lt. Col. William Anderson Smith, O30079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Lee Dake Chilson, O39871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Gilbert Proctor Dubia, O39872, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Auspitz, Jr., O30081, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Samuel Hardy Duerson, O30084, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Clifton Howell, Jr., O30085, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Patterson Streetman, O30086, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eric Robert Osborne, O42299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Adam Watts Meetze, O30087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Gaston Graham Fornes, O30088, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Clayton Hanson, O39873, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Alvin Bergmann, O42300, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.
×Capt. Donald Peter Rinque, O39874, United States Army.
Capt. James Roy Miller, O51472, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Marvin Leroy Tjostem, O30089, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Watson Sylvester, O51473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Monas Nathan Squires, O38753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Edward Frick, O42303, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Clarence Philip Hendricks, O42302, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arvine Walter McElroy, O30093, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Clarence Edwin Routh, O39875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas Martin McGrail, O39876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leon David Gladding, O30095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond Edward Daehler, O42304, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Chester Harley Anderson, O30096, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ervin Daniel Karl Hoehne, O39878, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Merwin Bishop Forbes, O30097, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Raymond Leo Orton, O42306, United States Army.
Lt. Col. William Henry Billings, O30098, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Richard Stacus Tennant, O51474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Truman Harry Kern, O42309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Robert Earl Dorsey, O30100, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Paul Powhida, O51475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Charles Elwood Voorhees, O30101, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Edmund Hawley Jones, O30102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Henry Pochyla, O30103, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Theodore August Rathje, O42311, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Nelson Isaac Decker, O30105, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Marvin Henry Snyder, O30106, United States Army.
×Capt. Victor Morgan Ryan, O42312, United States Army.
×Maj. Robert Edwin Hisle, O51476, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Evert Spencer Thomas, Jr., O30107, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Howard Willoughby, O30108, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Glenn Leonard Clinebell, O30109, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Millard Shaw, O42313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clark Webber, O30111, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arthur Terry Bill, O30112, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Arnold David Blair, O51477, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Samuel Hastings Wrightson, O39879, United States Army.
Maj. Lewis Gabriel Villere, O42520, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Arthur Briggs, O42315, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Jackson Woolley, O51478, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Pasquale Pietro Maiorano, O42316, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dana Emerson Smith, O38759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Stanley Archer Young, O51479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Donald Kenneth Hughes, O38708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Llewellyn Corey, O56814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Merle Leroy Mennie, O39880, United States Army.
Lt. Col. Frank John Culley, O30117, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Abner Stanley, O30118, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Russell Reifsnyder, O39881, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Martin Bradley, Jr., O42318, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Lester Lewis, O30119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph James Griffin, O39882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Vincent Usera, O39883, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ramon Antonio Sandin, O39884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Mervin C. Bowers, O42319, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Don Snowden Mathews, O30121, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John David George, O30122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Arthur Augustus Weinland, O30123, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gustaf Adolph Engstrom, O30124, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Russell Hawkins Horton, O30125, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gines Perez, O30126, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Perry Henderson, O51483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Cornelius James Rinker, O30129, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Harry Donald Kamy, O42321, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Merle John Senn, O42322, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John James Shoemaker, O30133, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Byron Edward Williams, O30134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Edward Langley White, O39885, United States Army.
×Capt. Vernon Hammonds, O51486, United States Army.
Lt. Col. William Harold McCreary, O42324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Alexander Thomas McElroy, O30135, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Hartley Fuller Dame, O51487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lee Huse Pray, O39886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Andrew Seitz, O30137, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).
Capt. John Kershaw Lee, Jr., O30136, United States Army.
Lt. Col. James Ansel Gaston, O30138, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Larry James O'Neil, O38761, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Glenn E. Nida, O30140, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Donald Angus Sanders, O51489, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Capt. Curtis Moultry Banks, O30143, United States Army.

Maj. George Quincy Bass, O39888, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fitzhugh Horton Chandler, O42328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Le Roy Fincher, O30145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Marshall Johnson, O42329, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Richard Blankenship, O42330, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Andrew Hunt, O39889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William James, O30146, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emil Albert Lucke, O42331, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Frank Mallalieu, O42333, United States Army.

Maj. John Rodgers Clifton, O30148, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Saenz, O38762, U. S. Army.

Maj. John Jay Jewett, O39890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Arthur Minot, O42335, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hubert Paul Coleman, O42336, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William M. Campbell, O42337, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emanuel Martin Robertson, O30149, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Graham Hanley, O30150, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald MacGlashan MacWillie, O30152, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Painter Osborne, O30151, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Bradley Smith, O51491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Courtland Forrest Brittain, O42341, United States Army.

Capt. Eugene Edward Miller, O30156, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Shelly Prusher Myers, Jr., O30157, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stewart Hood Knowlton, O30159, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Arthur Shaw, O42343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Terry DeJarnette, O42344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Russell Spillman, O42345, United States Army.

Maj. Jack Oliver Cromwell, O42346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Woodard Smiley, O30160, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Alexander Mowery, O51492, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Stephens Neel, O51493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mason French Goodloe, O30161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lund Foster Hood, O39892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William Bender, O30162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Chester Bucher, O51494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugo George Goetz, Jr., O39894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. James Ernest Akans, O39893, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Merwin Howard Smith, O42349, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Harvey Harrelson, O42350, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Edward Wellendorf, O29538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Bradley Roelofs, O38764, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Doyle Nutt, O30164, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Richards Hubbard, Jr., O30165, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Stuart Meredith Cox, O39896, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Coward, O51495, United States Army.

Lt. Col. John Thomas O'Neill, O30166, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Joseph McGowan, O42353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Theodore Grenier, O30167, United States Army.

Capt. Lewis Henry Keyes, O38765, United States Army.

Maj. Guy Anthony Orsino, O30168, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John McDonald, O30169, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Hawley Hayden, O42356, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dudley Clark Breckenridge, O39897, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Forrest Phillips, O30170, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Richard Nagel, O30171, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Luther Harper, O51497, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gus Spiece Zinnecker, O42357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Stanley Bochnowski, O51498, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Thomas Kent, Jr., O30172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erman Milford Newman, O30173, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Massingale, O51499, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Thomas Wadsworth Eddington, O30174, United States Army.

Maj. Lawrence Carrithers Threlkeld, O51501, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest August Benser, O42360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Sheets Hoff, O38766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frank Day, Jr., O51502, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Homer Edwin Long, O30176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Ray Ewing, O42362, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Victor Blaser, O42364, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Byron Feindel, Jr., O30177, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bertram Howard Johnson, O51503, United States Army.

×Maj. Robert Louis Roper, O42365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Co. Roy Alexander Murray, Jr., O42366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ralph Turner, O39899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Edward Williamson, O30178, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rubert Daniel Chapman, O42367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilton George Gaefe, O30179, United States Army.

Capt. Robert McFarland Mouk, O42368, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Lawrence Lewis Boyd, O30180, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Ludman Stevens, O51506, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Elmer Brown, Jr., O39900, Army of the United States (captain, U S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Ernst Messner, O30181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Charles Alexander, Jr., O39901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elverson Earl Baker, O30183, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Christ Petros, O30184, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Roy Ridlehuber, O39902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nelson Swartz, O39903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Martin Ernst, O42371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Embree Ensign Reynolds, O51507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Tabor Martin, O30188, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon William Rice, O30189, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merrill LeRoy Tribe, O42374, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Martin Hurst, O30191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Dominic Limoncelli, O42375, United States Army.

Maj. James Bernard McNally, O30192, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Major George Edward Crane, O42377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Ervin Huneycutt, O29946, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Major Townsend* Canfield Anderson, O30195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas Brogan, O30194, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Captain Buie Hess, O42379, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Robert Luther Ford, O38767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Murthas Jones, O30197, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Leonard Reed, O42380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Marx Stiebel, O30198, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Manfred Jacques Haas, O30200, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Gustive Schepp, O42382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Blanchard Jeffery, O30201, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Lewis LeVerl Flamm, O42384, United States Army.

Maj. Oscar Glenn Goodhand, Jr., O51511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Winfield Mize, O30204, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Gordon Harton, O42385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Cooper Bush, O30205, United States Army.

Maj. Harlan William Hendrick, O30208, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Webb, O30207, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Edmund Trail, O30206, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Fredrick Ryan, O30213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Roy Taylor, O42387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Johnston Preston, Jr., O42388, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Albert McEachern, O39907, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Willard Caughron, O51513, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clayton Parry, O39908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald George Dow, O42389, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clewis Clayton Moffett, O39909, United States Army.

Lt. Col. George Francis Moynahan, Jr., O30210, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lennart Yngve Ohlsson, O30211, United States Army.

Capt. John Patrick McGovern, O42391, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Blaire Aloysius Froehle, O42392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clair M. Worthy, O39911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Troy Alton Barker, O42394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harper Brown Cowles, O51515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Levin, O39912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Edward Baker, O42395, United States Army.

Lt. Col. John Raymond Riley, O38768, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thornton Eugene Jones, O30214, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert B. Evans, O30215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John McBride, O30216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Osmyn Arsene Vining, O42398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seaborn Hawes Mosely, O42399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dallas Buford Pack, O51517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Boyce, O42402, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Lee Johnson, O30219, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Warren Karl Pratt, O51519, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Paul Ernest Bellamy, O30220, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Cad Luna, O42403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Aubrey Locke, O29967, United States Army.

Capt. Danna Lee Lane, O51520, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. James Edward Harper, Jr., O42404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. William John Murphy, O30222, United States Army.

Capt. Kenneth Grant Harrison, O51522, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Thomas Marvin Larner, O30223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sam James Rasor, O38769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Stock Himes, O30224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maskell Edward Brown, O39914, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Walden Phillips, O42407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Anthony Sabatelli, O51525, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Kelly Blair, O51526, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lewis Willey, O42408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vancel Ritson Beck, O30233, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Lincoln Nelson, O30232, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Paul Curtin, O30231, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Noble DeVaney, O38770, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Louis Ryan, Jr., O30234, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph McNamara, O51528, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Veeder Miller, O30235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Augustus Deagle, O30237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Freebairn Jackson, O51529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Constantine Vardas, O30236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Dale Malen, O42410, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Ernest Courtland Parks, Jr., O30238, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon Oscar Pond, O42412, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Renwick Seymour, O38772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Douglas Cornell, O51531, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George William Barry, O39916, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Hudson Vail, O51533, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Garfield Wobbeking, O42417, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Franklin True, O38773, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charlie Emmett Ashburn Morgan, O51535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverly Matthews Leigh, Jr., O39917, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold John Pearson, O42418, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Louis Hart, O30241, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Frederick Kuster, O42419, United States Army.

Maj. Frederick George Ward, O39918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Vincent Holly, O42420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Michael Clisson, O30243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Tank, O19350, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas DeForth Rogers, O19351, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Erlenkotter, O19354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Staunton Lindsley Brown, O19356, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Moser Sieg, O19357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Julian Tate, O19359, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Burton Blodgett Bruce, O19360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Leon Andrews, O19363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Jackson Renfroe, Jr., O19364, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joslin Himes, O19365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beauchamp Miller, O19366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Fell, O19368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Rea Revie, O19369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ochsenschlager Killian, O19370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Heber Lipscomb, O19371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Walsh, O19372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin Wortham Betts, O19373, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Page Buehler, O19374, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seymour Irving Gilman, O19377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Butler Warren, O19380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilford Edward Harry Voehl, O19382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jonathan Owen Seaman, O19385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kermit LeVelle Davis, O19386, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellis Oakes Davis, O19387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Julius Jablonsky, O19390, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Urquhart Pullen Williams, O19391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Samuel Peca, O19392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Ringo Moorman, O19394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Oscar Baker, O19396, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hicks Anderson, O19398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Severin Richard Beyma, O19399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Frelinghuysen Hoffman, O19403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Miles Birkett Chatfield, O19404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry White, Jr., O19407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mathew Valois Pothier, O19410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Sylvester Piram, O19411, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Adams, O19412, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Almon White Manlove, O19413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John DuVal Stevens, O19414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Yale Harold Wolfe, O19415, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Farnsworth Smoller, O19416, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Craig Smyser, O19417, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Kemble, Jr., O19418, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Richardson Hester, O19419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gersen Leo Kushner, O19420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Edward Weber, Jr., O19421, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Charles Davall, O19425, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Delbert Womack, O19426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Gardner Baker, O19427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ronald LeVerne Martin, O19428, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wadsworth Hill, O19430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Oliver Vars, O19432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry William Ebel, O19434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Belmont Routh, O19437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lee Carl Miller, O19438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Travis Ludwell Petty, O19439, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Peter James Kopcsak, O19440, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Griffith Fingenour, O19441, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Scott Penn, Jr., O19442, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Willoughby Moorman, O19444, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Lake Sanders, O19445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merlin Louis DeGuire, O19446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander James Stuart, Jr., O19447, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Percy Thomas Hennigar, O19450, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Riffel Kenerick, O19452, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Lee McKee, O19453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Howard Garrett Fuller, O19190, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stacy William Gooch, O19455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clark Lynn, Jr., O19456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo William Henry Shaughnessey, O19458, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Jenkins Hubbard, O19459, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Knox Yarbrough, Jr., O19460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Free Surratt, O19461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Morris Howard, O19464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gordon Graham Warner, O19466, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Patterson Mossman, O19469, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carl Bahr, O19470, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Carter Norvell, O19471, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Walker Darrah, Jr., O19473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hawkins Adams, O19474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Glover McLennan, O19475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Franklin, Jr., O19476, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Gilmore Bilbo, Jr., O19477, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stilson Hilton Smith, Jr., O19480, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Alonzo Cunin, O19481, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Eugene Wood, O19483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frederic Carson Cook, O19484, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Elmer Fellenz, O19485, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Percival Stanley Brown, O19487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Clary Foote, O19488, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bernadou Elliott, Jr., O19490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Winn, O19491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Henry Heyne, O19493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Evans Lardin, O19494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Herbert Wood, O19498, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dana Watterson Johnston, Jr., O19506, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Murray Cheston 3d, O19507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Edward Still, O19510, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Guldlin Simenson, O19511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Caufield, O19515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Snee, O19516, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dudley Wilmeth, O19519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Lester Hillyard, O19524, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hutcheson Craig, O19526, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Doak McKinney, O19529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Johnson, O19534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carson Kyser, O19535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dixon Lawlor, O19536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Russell William Volckmann, O19537, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Linscott Durfee, O19538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hallett Daniel Edson, O19541, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Rusteberg, O19542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl Trueheart Gould, O19544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harold Webb Browning, O19545, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Hadley Andrae, O19546, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Frederick Northam, O19547, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lowe Eatman, O19548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Berchman Stanley, O19549, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Brown, O19552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathaniel Plummer Ward, 3d, O19553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Buchanan Wells, O19554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Adams McPheron, O19555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Hogan Hayes, O19556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Conly Brookhart, O19562, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Messmore O'Connell, O19563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Walker Jenna, O19564, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerhard Leroy Bolland, O19565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Bentley Kern, O19566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Alfred Walsh, Jr., O19567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Horner Gerhart, O19569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Andrew McCrary, O19570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John George Benner, O19571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Travis Tabor Brown, O19574, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Gantt Hickman, O19575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alexander Cunningham, 3d, O19579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Meade Julian Dugas, O19582, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Almon O'Neil, O19583, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emory Alexander Lewis, O19584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Mullen, Jr., O19586, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hammond Waugh, Jr., O19587, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Neilson, O19588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Hector McKinnon, O19590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dennis John McMahon, O19592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James O'Hara, O19593, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nabors Tyson, O19594, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Buchanan Richardson, Jr., O19596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion George Stewart, Jr., O30244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Shirley Guy Blencoe, O30245, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harry Reynolds, O39919, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Clark Wilson, O30248, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Henry Naughton, O51536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John O'Connell, O42422, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clark Graham Campbell, O38774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Ferdinand Schmidt, O42423, United States Army.

Capt. William Henry Ward, Jr., O51537, United States Army.

Lt. Col. John Valleau Rathbone, Jr., O42424, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Page Harrison Slaughter, O30250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frederick Stein, O51538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Edgar Yanka, O30252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Howard Gregory Ford, O38775, United States Army.

Lt. Col. James Grady Hattox, O30253, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Fillmore, O30254, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hal Peter Andersen, O39920, United States Army.

Maj. Robert Hamilton Scott, O30255, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Eugene Foster, O30256, United States Army.

Maj. Marzelle Freeman Boyd, O39921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald King Gifford, O51539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Barney McGary, O51540, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Walter Finn, O30257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Patrick Joyce, Jr., O42426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Roy Falke, O51542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Paul Ireland, O51543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Thomas Trial, O30259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ford Elliott Allcorn, O51544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Bishop Crossman, O42428, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Franklin Morris Fliniau, O30263, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neal Woodrow Harper, O30262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col., Harlow Engle Allen, O39922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Robert Richmond, O30265, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robley Dunglison Evens, O39924, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Clark Harvey, O38776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Francis Escude, O30519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bascomb Miller, O30266, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Henry Burd, O42434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Norby, O51548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Myron Alley, O30268, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Owen Thomas McClosky, O30269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Kilbourne Eggleston, Jr., O30271, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth William Gillespie, O30273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Earle Fillmore Mitchell, O30272, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Walter Edwards, O30274, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard John Grondona, O42439, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Roscoe Brickles, O30278, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Jay Banigan, O42443, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Devon Jackson, O51555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wentworth Hamilton Taylor, Jr., O30280, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Christopher Jesse, O42446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Godbey, O30281, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Miller Davis, O30282, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Montgomery Arnold, O30283, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Lewis De Haas, O30284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robin Brem Gardner, O38777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic Donald Ray, O51558, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Dill Raney, O30285, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jacob Richard Hershey, O30286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Stuart Wilkes, O30288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ferdinand Vering, O30289, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Goddard Foster, O30291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Charles Bass, O30292, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thaddeus William Drobek, O42453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Martin Nawrocky, O30293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Oscar Rooney, O42454, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Henry Watson, O42458, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Kreigh Moody, O38778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Faries Pindar, O42463, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Archibald Douglass, O30296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilfred Knobeloch, O42464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claudius Albert Beall, Jr., O39931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sanford Joseph Butler, O30297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Henry, O30299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Robert Sievers, O30298, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philo Milton Baumgartner, O38780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Pongonis, O30301, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Arthur Miner, O39933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Anthony Stahl, O39934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Pinkerton Litz, O30304, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Holman Don Hoover, O30305, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Buckley Melody, O38782, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Emmett Rochford, O30307, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry Edwards, O30309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Walter Andrew Taylor, O51566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lee Ferguson, O30046, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Foley, O42474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Patrick Miller, O42475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Donald Peterson, O30311, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Louis Davids, O33783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur John Cornelson, O51567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Edgar Willis, O30313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max James Roadruck, O42479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward McMaken, O30318, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Parker Barnett, O38784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Major Harry William Berry, O42480, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin William Saurel, O42482, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Frank Blackmon, O51569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edgar Allen Noel, O51570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis M. Etherton, O39940, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Tilden McDowell, O30321, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Devitt Edmunds, O30323, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Delio Perez, O30324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Eugene Stevenson, O38785, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emery Douglas Middleton, O30329, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Douglas Hand, O30328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Rhea, O30327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Jogl, O30330, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willice Edgar Groves, O30075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Maguire, O30332, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Bennett Laugerman, O30333, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Floyd Pegran, O42487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Edward Steck, O42490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Edward Sullo, O42491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Wilson, O42494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lynn Hubert Webb, O39946, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Charles Gill, O42495, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilton Briggs Moats, O30336, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dasher Shearouse, O30337, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Wiltrakis, O51575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emery Erwin Hyde, O51576, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo George Woerner, O30341, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Gustav Thomas, O30344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Donald Hoisington, O30348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manlius Rupert Stewart, O42503, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Paul William Albert, O42507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Taplin Scott, O30351, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Drexel Morgan, O42508, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Emil Lange, O30353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis William Anderson, O30354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Curtis Chedister, O30355, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Deaderick Willoughby, O38787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Maurice E. Webb, O30357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Walter Bidwell, O29508, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Alexander Wilson, O30359, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Sage Hahn, O56815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John D'Alessandro, O42510, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Helmer Halliden, O30360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrell Glenn Hall, O51580, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale D. Dixon, O38788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Honald Noel Maidt, O42513, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Robbins, O42512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Conrad Howard, O42515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nyles Wesley Baltzer, O51581, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilber Alexander Stevens, O30365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Bowen Potter, O30366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Homer Stephens, O30367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Wagner, O42518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Matthew Flint, O42519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Lindsay Hall, O51584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert William Lockridge, O42524, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Frederick Zinser, O30370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Preston Miller Motes, O30372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Calvin Neely, O30374, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Peter Carberry, O38789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Verner Burke, O38790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Carl Fell, O30379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Alexander Cawifield, O30378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edgar Mickel, O38793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Helmer August Holmstrom, O30382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilton Louis Sanders, O38794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Hert, O39952, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clair Edwin Towne, O30385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Barney Oldfield, O42532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas McKee, O30383, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Scott Hays, O42534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Wesley Gontrum, O51596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ted James Madden, O42537, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Glenn Neely, O42538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Gordon Brown, O42539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Murray Adams Little, O39956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Glenn Lang, O51600, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynn Wilson Pine, O30392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Edward Burns, O30394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Peters, O39961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Carl Garrison, O30144, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morton Albert Rubin, O39962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Milton Hamilton, O30398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas John Trainor, O51604, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl McClellan Poston, O30400, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Frith Bienvenu, O30401, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Eugene Byrns, O51606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Robert Barricklow, O56816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Garnett Steffey, O30404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clinton Adolph Waggoner, O42552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Alexander Persell, O51608, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Hermann Dahmlow, O30406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Chandler Dodenhoff, O30407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mario De Maio, O30399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leniel Edward McDonald, O30408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Mudgett, O30409, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edwin Jennings, O39964, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Clifford Peterson, O42555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Ivor Jones, O30410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Duncan Goodall, O30411, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Levis Chalmers Wiggins, O42556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Russell Powell, O30414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Herbert Mahoney, O51613, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward William Quinlan, O51617, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond George Trampe, O42561, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Walter Brugger, O39966, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Bolling Seay, O30420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Jefferson Hornaday, O30423, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Balthasar Steiner, O51622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Edwin Johnston, O30424, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arent Orvil Wiken, O30426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Archie Cheatham, O30427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Shelley, O42571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Cornelius Culbreth, O30429, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Chester Malcolm Stratton, O30431, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nathan McQuade Quinn, O42574, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kennard Smith Vandergrift, O42575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Edward McClish, O30432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Coates, O30433, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wilkens Burnett, O42578, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Floyd Eason, O30435, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Henry Overby, O30437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Hudson Newton, O42579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Colvin, O30434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Albert Hauck, O30436, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Prokop, Jr., O38797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dick Andrew King, O30438, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Morgan Barnes Heasley, O30175, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Tracy Gerard, O30445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Roy George DeVecchio, O42584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Richard Bech, O42585, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur von Molt DeLoach, O30449, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Joe Dyekman, O30455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Emmanuel Fernandez, O30454, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alex Earl McKenzie, O39967, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wilkes May, O39968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jefferson Rueben Cronk, O30461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Wilson Johnston, O30462, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Rossing, O42593, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Leland Motz, O42596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward McClam Foxworth, O42598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Andres Troy, O42597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Grant W. Mason, O30738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Allen Darden, Jr., O42599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Condon, O39972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Hugh Moore, O42602, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Charles Nauman, O30467, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry McCann, Jr., O30468, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Lucien Fortin, O42605, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Edwin Skelly, O30473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Kimball, O42607, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jacob Fargo Wagner, O30475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Brocks, Jr., O38801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Blaine Frastus Anderson, O39976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Graham, O39977, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Alexander Shadrick Turner, O51632, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Wendell Caron, O30479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Barton Emmons, O39979, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Samuel Mathes, O30481, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Justin William Stoll, O30483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Jerome Newman, O51635, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph T. Mozley, O42611, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Lyle Barnett, O30489, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bert Kirkman Whaley, O42612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James George Basbas, O42354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Stevens Hardiman, O30492, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver O. Dixon, O30494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Roberts, O30493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herrick Franklin Bearce, O30498, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Francis Lovell, O42616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jenkins Badger, O39981, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Ballentine, O39983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Frederick Hansen, O42618, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Lawrence Weinerth, O42620, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Byron Baker, O30239, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Slaughter Carpenter, O42622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Garlen Randolph Bryant, O30507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Holbrook, O51646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Vernon Lester Lewis, O42628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Rudolph Brannan, O42629, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Drake Bristor, O19710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Abeel Phelan, O19711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Aaron Evan Harris, O19712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Hamilton Gregg, O19713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Campbell Wallace, O19715, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Houston Frye, Jr., O19716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Caran Gee, O19717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Allen Elliget, O19719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Calhoun Zeigler, O19720, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Joseph Pickard, O19723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otto Jacob Rohde, O19725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Somers Buist Dick, O19726, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Winston Lapsley, O19727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James DeVore Lang, O19728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Jephthiah Jeffus, O19730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Lewis Hille, Jr., O19731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Lathrop Throckmorton, O19732, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Ruhlen, O19733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelius DeWitt Willcox Lang, O19734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Richards Parker, O19735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Carl Haug, O19736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Sutton Growdon, O19737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Duffy, O19738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Sylvester Everett, O19739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Watkins Miller, O19740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Salvatore Andrew Armogida, O19741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Paulding Grieves, O19742, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Tage Birger Johnson, O19743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Alexander Osmanski, O19745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Sanders Waterman, O19746, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Benjamin Hall, Jr., O19747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Langfitt Bowditch Wilby, O19748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dudley Cole, Jr., O19749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Raymond Wilkins, O19750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry James Lewis, O19751, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Albert Symroski, O19753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Chaffee Thayer, O19754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Yeates Adams, O19755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Jacob Lemley, Jr., O19756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duncan Sinclair, O19757, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Geoffrey Dixon Ellerson, O19759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray Allen Pillivant, O19761, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellery Willis Niles, O19763, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Rigby Glass, O19765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Stafford Eckhardt, O19766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvin Dolliver Robbins, O19769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sidney George Spring, O19770, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Stephen Bechtold, O19771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seth Lathrop Weld, Jr., O19772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Clare Rumsey, O19774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel John Murphy, O19776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Bidgood, O19777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Albert Simpson, O19778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh McClellan Exton, O19780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Durward Ellsworth Breakefield, O19781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sanford Welsh Horstman, O19783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col Kelso Gordon Clow, O19784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harry Herndon Critz, O19786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Porter van Ormer, O19787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Kraus, O19789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Irwin Curtis, O19790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Charles Moore, O19791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Alexis Gloriod, O19793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Nathaniel Macon Martin, O19794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Salathiel Fred Cummings, Jr., O19796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col James Martin Worthington, O19797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Michael Donohue, O19798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clarence McDonald, Jr., O19799, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Waters Keating, O19800, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Halford Robert Greenlee, Jr., O19801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Robert St. John, O19805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Frederick Brown, O19806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard George Root, O19807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles McLean Peeke, O19810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Boyd Firehock, O19812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Milton Lawrence Rosen, O19814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Mobley Kimbrough, Jr., O19816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ralph Wright, Jr., O19817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Barnwell Harden, Jr., O19818, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Moseley Harris, O19819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Luke Frink, Jr., O19821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer John Gibson, O19822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julius Desmond Stanton, O19823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Bryde, O19825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Washington Woodyard, Jr., O19826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Gilbert Fries, O19827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Rich Hale, O19828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Leonard, Jr., O19829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Frank Skells, O19830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seneca Wilbur Foote, O19833, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Willoughby Totten, O19834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Henry Walter, O19836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Curtis Wells, Jr., O19838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Melroy Miner, O19839, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Nevin Howell, O19840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hamilton Austin Twitchell, O19843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alfred Ashman, O19846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dyce Alger, O19848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., O19849, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ewing Chase Johnson, O19851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Johnstone Murdoch, Jr., O19853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pennock Hoyt Wollaston, O19854, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Theodore Isham, O19856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Mark McGoldrick, O19857, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Alfrey, O19859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Rieber Russ, O19860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Dilley, O19861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Charles Orth, Jr., O19863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Duncan Gillis, O19864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Autrey Joseph Maroun, O19865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Clay Taylor, O19867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Cobb Stancook, O19870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Brown Morgan, O19871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Henry Wiechmann, O19874, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Foster Rhoades, O19875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Robert Oglesby, O19877, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Calvin Stapleton, O19878, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Vincent Martz, O19879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Arvid Skinrood, O19882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Noel Maurice Cox, O19883, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Crook Anderson, O19884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hart Caughey, O19885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Edward Schlanser, O19886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Thomas Cherry, Jr., O19888, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Joseph Treacy, Jr., O19892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reuben Henry Tucker 3d, O19894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Genier Proctor, O19895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Hardic Walker, O19898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clair Beverly Mitchell, O19899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Williamson, O19900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Duzzette Farnsworth, Jr., O19904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Price Mock, O19906, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Allen Beall, Jr., O19907, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wythe Gleaves Rich, O19910, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald William Bernier, O19911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Bower, O19912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Harvey Foreman, O19913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floyd Garfield Pratt, O19915, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Cole, O19917, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward William Sawyer, O19918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bradford Means, O19920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Gibson Sherrard, Jr., O19922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Boyle, O19924, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Disbrow Cocheu, O19925, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin White Heckemeyer, O19930, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nassieb George Bassitt, O19931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Rawles Bowyer, O19934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John James Davis, O19935, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Basil Edwards, O19936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Eugene Tucker, O19938, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Kirk duMoulin, O19943, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Edward Bare, Jr., O19944, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul James Bryer, O19947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burnis Mayo Kelly, O19950, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lester Lewes Wheeler, O19951, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carmon Ambrose Rogers, O19952, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Batch Smith, O19953, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marcus Samuel Griffin, O19954, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Hayden Agnew, O19956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Leroy Thomas, O19958, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Lynn Hawkins, O19960, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eric Per Ramee, O19961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Hood Ferris, O19962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Madison Jones, O19965, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Louis McGehee, O19969, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Graham Barnwell, Jr., O19589, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Albert Riemenschneider, O19970, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Pierce O'Neal, Jr., O19971, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Place Hill, Jr., O19972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melville Brown Coburn, O19973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Bonesteel Stone, O19976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Osborn Lashley, O19982, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Robert Clarkin, O19983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Pope Blackshear, O19934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George August Meidling, O42664, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Lucas Austin, O38805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Henry Elges, Jr., O30511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Orth Beckner, O30512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland James Halada, O42635, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip MacGregor Judson, O30516, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Olin Hoffman, O30517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon Flores Punsalan, O42639, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hamilton Colwell, O42640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Humphrey Price, O30518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Clinton Whicher, O39986, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard William Bowden, O42642, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Loring Driscoll, O30525, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Elbert Von Kaenel, O30527, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Joseph O'Connor, O51654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Nason Walker, Jr., O51655, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Chesley Harris, O30529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Allen Gross, O30528, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Porter Grant, O42646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Wilhelm Reisner, O51656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Frederick Ellis, O51657, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Knight Britton, O30532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul James Ritchie, O38808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Luther Elman Johnson, O30535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Millard G. Bowen, Jr., O30536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orval Calvin Thompson, O30539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Hull Mapes, O30538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neal Wallace Lovsnes, O30540, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Wilson, O30542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Schermerhorn Markham, O20073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floyd Edward Gidinsky, O30543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Vernon Munson, O42654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Merle Garretson, O38809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Nicholas Nahas, O39990, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Sackton, O30553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Alvin Pace, O30552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sture Alexander Ansel, O30554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Heinrich Gary Schumann, O39991, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lowell Traxler Bondshu, O51670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Fox Astrella, O42656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pat M. Stevens, 3d, O30557, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Hewitt, O30558, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Ivy Davis, O42658, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Wyttenbach Ewbank, Jr., O30474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Smith, O30559, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merlin Oscar Tryon, O38810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Hamilton Miller, O39992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert French Evans, O42662, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rellie Weldon Adams, O42663, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Merriweather Smith, O39993, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Leslie Calhoun, O42664, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Byrd Gall, O30563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Benson Alexander, O30565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ramon Carl Dougan, O30566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erdie Otis Lansford, O30569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Lucian Ward, O38811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Fenton McFeely, O38812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harry Schnee Messec, O51682, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Colle A. Quinn, O30571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bennett Goodwin, O30573, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Whitwell Bowman, O38813, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles MacKinnon Ackley, O39997, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Morgan Johnson, O30577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Armel Dyer, O42674, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Entricen Townsend, O30578, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Lewis Schaefer, O39999, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fay Edward Joseph Carey, O38814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Everett Holman, O38815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arland Eugene Bigelow, O51687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Barton McMath, Jr., O42678, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas Stevens, O38816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irwin Thomas Shaw, O42379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Russell Gilbert, O51689, Army of the United States (captair, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guinn Burch Goodrich, O42680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Wenzel Correll, O30582, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Bieri, O42682, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gus Edward Lehmann, O40001, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Gerson Haskell, O30588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Wells Vance, O51693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lamoreaux Warfield, O30590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Neal Clark, O42690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Herman Bosbyshell, O30596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Maxwell McClain, O42693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Brown Richardson, O30597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. LeRoy Beatty Woodbury, Jr., O30598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Winston Butscher, O30599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harrison Hines Finlayson, O42697, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin Ashenfelder, O40008, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lawrence MacKusick, O42695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Albert Deason, O30601, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Spencer Simcox, O30602, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Paul Mulrooney, O42699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Raymond Walter Burkett, O30603, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Elhannon White, O42700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gilbert Turner, O31414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roberts Homer Billingsley, O30608, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Law Poole, Jr., O30606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Eugene Michael Lill, O40011, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Paul Flanagan, O30609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Giles Henry Gere, O51707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Murphy Murray, O30610, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adrian Johansson, O51710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milburn Neil Huston, O30612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Lassetter, Jr., O51714, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Donald McPhail, O30613, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph Raber, O30614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Larned Eastmond, O40013, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Armington Baldry, O30615, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Cornelius Taylor, O30616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Eugene Pons, O30621, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lennard Charles Sorensen, O42710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Myron Lawrence Williams, O30622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Miles Albert Kinley, O51718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Massie Throckmorton, O42711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Edward Kendall, O30623, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Wesley Philpot, O30627, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Warren Horton, O30626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Yates Farrell, O30628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Richard Guehring, O51723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edgar Baker, O42714, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman William Dammer, O30634, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Douglas Edgar, O30635, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Warren Schroder, O30637, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Keith Olson, O30640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Charles Brinsmead, O42715, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph Matkovcik, O30641, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Cogswell Higley, O38821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irving William Finberg, O42716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William John Scott, O42718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Warwick King, O30646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Earl Sheen, O40015, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Halsell Reynolds, O42721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry William Meinecke, O42722, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Bill Bassett Hunkapiller, O40016, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Allen Rawley, O30648, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ambrose Thomas McGuckian, O42725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orvie Palmer Anderson, O42727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fredolin William Kuhn, O51734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Radam, O51736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Byron Gregory, O51737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Winston Langley, O30649, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dillard Land, O30650, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Raymond Cupello, O38822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stafford Ashley Cooper, O42730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Oliver Fudge, O30652, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Franklin Wells, O30654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Lee Freshwater, O51739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Harrison Dixon, O42733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Graham Roy Evans, O30656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Isadore Benjamin Burdick, O42735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Allen Miller, O40018, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Blair O'Connor, O51740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Frederick Kuenning, O42739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Steven Malevich, O30660, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas William Donnell, O30663, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Donald Carnes, O30666, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Cliff Hudgins, Jr., O38824, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Carrol Settle, O30665, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Keith Thomas O'Keefe, O30669, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Aloysius Muth, O30670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond LaVerne Blust, O30671, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Farnum, O42743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Otis Wyatt, O40020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Donald Rogers, O30676, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Bernard Markey, O38826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Clifton Pennington, O42749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. LeRoy Ernest Frazier, O30678, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Bert de Melker, O30679, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bob Haynes Glover, O30680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Fred Deakyne Bendler, Jr., O30681, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Philip Joseph Galanti, O30684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Edward Hagerty, O30685, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Bailey Tibbs, O30688, Army of the United State: (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lindley Ogden, O30689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Willard Britten, O38828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Fabritius, O40021, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Rensselaer Sanford, O38827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Chesley Barton, O38829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Crawford Farmer, O30691, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Fredrick Durbin, O51748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Donovan McCormick, O42765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Berkeley Bush, O30692, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Josephi Helms, O30694, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Hora McLauchlin, Jr., O51752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Glenn Carroll Hess, O51753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ritchie Garrison, O30696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry William Bues, Jr., O42772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Lobit, O30699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hamilton Reger, O30700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Edwin Lee, O42775, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Allen Thomas Stanwix-Hay, O51759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Sidney Redfield, O30704, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marcus Webb Adams, O40025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Louis Ziegler, O30707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rolla Darby Pollock, O38832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ewell Grant, O42778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George MacElwain Barker, O30708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. B. J. Leon Hirshorn, O51762, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Terry King, O30713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Emil Myers, O51765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marter Denton Middleton, O51767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Preston Vincent Phelps, O40026, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Arthur Tolve, O40027, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Weston Arthur McCormac, O30716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Frederick Field, O42784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Percy Davidson, O42785, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Hector, O30717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adrianus Johannus Van Oosten, O40028, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marsh Patrick Stockton, O51769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Harold Moore, O30721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Fella Hill, O38835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Vincent Douglas, O42786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Laughlin, O30723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Henry Hauschultz, O42789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Edward Robb, O42790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shelby Linwood Gillette, O30727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bruce Layton, O30729, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Josef Albert Prall, O51772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Connerat, Jr., O30730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Robert O'Brien, O40032, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Wulfe Kuehler, O30731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kermit Harry Glenn McCoy, O51776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Hughes, O30733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Oliver Olson, O30734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gottfried Gramzow, O30735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Cooke, O30736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Russell Miller, O30737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Abraham Walk, O42796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Ernest Kehke, O42797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Vasserot Merle, Jr., O51778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Bankus, O42799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Lathrop Paddock, Jr., O30740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Lloyd Williams, O42800, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alph Hamberg, O30741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.)

Lt. Col. Ralph Harvey Elliott, O30744, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Garton Buck, O30745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Fred Arfman, O42802, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Adolph Traeger, O30746, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald McBurney Curtis, O38837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Merton Barnum, O51780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Earl Dykes, O51781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Otto Max Boerner, O30747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Kaighin Watts, O30752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Marshall Slayden, O30754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Clifton Conine, O30203, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Webster Wilder, Jr., O51784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Georg Wilhelm Finke, O40037, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wheeler Godfrey Merriam, O30759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert James O'Donnell, O51786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Cassels Jeffrey, O30763, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul LeGrand Jolley, O30764, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Alford, O30765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richmond F. Thweatt, O30766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Harold Birch, O42816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Richard Lutz, O30767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Adolf Hoherz, O42819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Pickett Smith, O30772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Mayo Ogilvie, Jr., O30773, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Waldemar Johnson, O42821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Brown Franks, O40041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Marvin Brown, O30777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Bernard Heyer, O40042, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Franklin Sutherland, O30779, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Melvin Hunt, O30782, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Benjamin Gullion, O42826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward William Fitzgerald, O30495, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene S. Tarr, O42327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Oscar William Fulton, O30784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Charles Hunter, O40045, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Elbert Dupree, O40044, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Franklin Keist, O38843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Wythe Munford Peyton, Jr., O42830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Mellette Johnson, O51797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royden Arnold Konopaska, O30787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Benjamin Page, O40046, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Wendell Swanson, O30788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jennings Seigler, Jr., O30789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Church Clark, Jr., O42834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Clapper, Jr., O42835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Albert Salet, O30790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Van Fleet, O51801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Welbec Parsons, O30793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Poats Littlejohn, O42837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Lawrence Leidenheimer, O30795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford LeRoy Woodliff, O30796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Myron Abraham Funk, O30798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Wilbur Otto, O30799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clifton Davie, O40050, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burton Keeney Philips, O40048, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Russell Summers, O42841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Waters, O20114, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Dickson King, O20115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond John Harvey, O20116, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Palmer, Jr., O20117, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Reeves Shuler, O20118, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Dean McCarty, O20119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Herbert Kerkering, O20120, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pierre Victor Kieffer, Jr., O20122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Karl Theodore Klock, Jr., O20123, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Milton Jacoby, O20125, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Alexander Falks, O20129, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Ervan White, Jr., O20130, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Meding Dorland, O20132, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jay Hayes, 3d, O20134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Henry Holterman, O20135, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Alexander Finley, O20136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Mellard Connor, Jr., O20137, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Jacob Katz, O20138, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wright Hiatt, O20139, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Kramer, O20140, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Allen Morris, O20141, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Elliott Smith, O20142, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Hall Thompson, Jr., O20143, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Milne, O20144, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Benjamin Lampert, O20147, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Reginald Joseph Beauregard Page, O20149, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Edward Laurion, O20150, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Bernard Bess, O20151, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Albert Cozart, O20152, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Andrew Davis Chaffin, Jr., O20153, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Nott Beard, O20154, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Kelly, O20156, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Walsh Holderness, O20157, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Emmett Goodwin, O20158, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Paul Francis Oswald, O20160, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Eldon Spann, Jr., O20162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Foster LeRoy Furphy, O20163, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Pinkney Persons, Jr., O20167, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adam Stephen Buynoski, O20169, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel McElheny, O20170, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Kenneth Einar Madsen, O20171, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Van Valkenburg Sutherland, O20173, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thea Lewis Lipscomb, O20174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oren Swain, O20176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David McCoach, 3d, O20177, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Kessler, O20178, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Edgar Mikkelsen, O20179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Kinard, Jr., O20180, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Everett Lockhart, O20181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maxwell Morrison Kallman, O20182, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Richard Ganns, O20184, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett George Hahney, O20185, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Frederick Cordes, Jr., O20186, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Matthew Burnett, O20187, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Woodrow Hiester, O20191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Dudley Hartman, Jr., O20192, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Selwyn Dyson Smith, Jr., O20194, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Lemuel Cato, O20195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Walter Romlein, O20197, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Aldrich Davis, O20198, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Alexander Grove, O20200, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Barry Yost, O20201, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce Partridge, O20204, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Worthington Williams, O20205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmer Charles Landry, O20208, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eldred George Robbins, Jr., O20211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard McCrum Snyder, Jr., O20213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orville Newton Stokes, O20215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Edward Landrum, Jr., O20216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Davis Torrey, Jr., O20217, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Raymond Prince, O20219, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Gilbert Grothaus, O20221, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ned Taylor Norris, O20222, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Childs Westmoreland, O20223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Earl Barlow, O20224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Francis Dawalt, O20226, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Merritt Warfield, O20229, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Copeland Shea, O20231, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

×Lt. Col. Harold Roy Low, O20234, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverley Evans Powell, O20237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Read Bodine, O20238, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Franklin Holton, O20241, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ridgeway Pancoast Smith, Jr., O20243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hall Safford, O20244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Clare Dunn, O20245, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Victor Clifton, Jr., O20246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Maben Griffith, O20250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Langdon Andrew Jackson, Jr., O20251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joshua Asher Finkel, O20253, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry David Lind, O20256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Paul Christensen, O20257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Edward Gooding, O20258, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Carl LaVerne Rickenbaugh, O20259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Charles Haneke, A20263, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Tillman Willis, O20264, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Karl William Schwering, O20265, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Lee Crawford, O20266, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert George Fergusson, O20267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward McCabe, O20269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Jakle, O20270, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Walker Breaks, O20273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Harold Gaston, Jr., O20276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Wheaton Cole, Jr., O20277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Rainier Weaver, O20278, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Arnold Heintges, O20281, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Harold Daly, O20284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Daniel Mohlere, O20286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Meany, O20287, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Woods Garland, Jr., O20288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ned Butler Broyles, O20289, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Randolph Charles Dickens, O20290, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Willford Grubbs, O20291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Livingood Walker, Jr., O20293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Weldon Childs, O20294, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Chiles, O20295, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Creighton Williams Abrams, Jr., O20296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Gregory Beggs, O20297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Thomas Ryder, O20298, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Sievers, O20299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Latham Crandell, Jr., O20306, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Worthington Cooke, O20307, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. McPherson LeMoyne, O20309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lawrence John Ellert, O20311, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Wilkins Ripple, O20312, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett O'Brien, Jr., O20313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Sheffield Greene, O20314, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thurman Wesley Morris, O20315, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Clyde Lafayette Layne, O20317, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jesse Cyrus Drain, Jr., O20318, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Marvin Williams, O20319, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin Glenwood Fisher, O20324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Lee Simpson, O20325, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Leeds Peck, O20327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hersey Michaelis, O20328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Rogers Sibert, O20329, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Michael Illig, O20330, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Henry Kreitzer Benson, Jr., O20331, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis Curran, O20338, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Burnham Milliken, O20340, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Allen Clinton Miller 2d, O20342, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Renwick Hughes, O20343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Franklin McManus, O20346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Trout, O20347, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Horace Tiffany, O20348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Austin Sikes, O20353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Wallace Noake, O20357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Lincoln Edwards, O20359, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Otto Turnage, Jr., O20360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas James Lawlor, O20361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Pelham Yarborough, O20362, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Aloysius Elliott McCormick, Jr., O20363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Billingslea, O20367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin Evans, Jr., O20368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Billy Leer, O20370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Matthew Lynch, O20377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Manly Pack, O20378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Janof, O20382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Nicolson, O30804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Stanton Palmer, O30806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Price Jones, Jr., O30807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Lawrence Atkins, O30809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James McCauslin Moynahan, O42848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Arthur Claffee, O30810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Carroll James Williams, O30811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Davidson Alexander 3d, O40052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burkitt Ameral Reynolds, O30814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Waters Regar, O40053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick Howard Devine, O31975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Alexander Paterick, O42853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Morgan, O30251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Adam Arnold, Jr., O30815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Eugene Deering Billings, O30816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Michael Scott, O30822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Otto Gerot, O30818, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Barkin, O51809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Ernest Doran, O38892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Alderson Blair, O42858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Vernon Porter, O31328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sylvester Alvin Hal', O40057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Argyle Campbell, O42861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Sam Frederick Fleming, O42863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Lawrence Slob, O42867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Asa Calvin Black, O38894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bolick Albert Saholsky, O31331, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Breckenridge Coffin, O38895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Arthur James McBride, O42870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emett Robert White, O31334, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Mostyn Williams, O31337, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allan Benedict Rochford, O42876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ridley Spark, O51812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Lewis Adams, O31339, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Arno Lorenz, O30534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Ernest Schoenfeld, O31342, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Louis Siegel, O42879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Frank Walker, O31344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Isaac Francis Bonifay, O40061, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Warren McCarthy, Jr., O40062, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Joseph Julian, O51814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Welch Hill, Jr., O31348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burton Edward Miles, O42886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Vincent Shea, O40063, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce Tomlinson, O31354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Emil Lofstrand, O42889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Waldo Wilburn Montgomery, O42890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Moore, O31355, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Roy Dyer, O40065, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Horace Bruce Frederick, O42891, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Wyburd Furrell, O42894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Wyatt Rawlings, Jr., O42895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harry A. Hall, Jr., O51819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Gordon Belser, Jr., O42897, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Danahy Albro, O31360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Finis Garrett Johnson, O40067, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Platt Boyd, Jr., O40068, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob William Bealke, Jr., O31365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ray Mason Bagley, O42902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roger Hargreaves Williams, O40069, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Rollin Harvey Smith, O31367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Thornton Walker, O31368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Aaron Jenkins, O31369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Cecil Williams, O31372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Kilburn Schiffman, O31375, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Vernon Pickell, O31376, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Bland West, O31378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Nathaniel Ramsey Hoskot, O31379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Bernard Jones, O42919, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Webster Marcy, O31380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reuben Star, O42920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lee Witt, O31382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Stover, O31381, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin James Withers, O42921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Cyril Albert Millson, O42922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Dunn, O31385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Draper Easton, Jr., O51822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin William Kernkamp, O42923, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Julian Powers Fox, Jr., O51823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Furman Walbridge Marshall, O42925, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roger Hunt Hemion, O40075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Frank Whitton, Jr., O51825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas William Akins, O40076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Omer Siegmond Dews, O40079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Paul Sampson, O42926, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Holmes Harrison, O31396, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clay Orville Collier, O42928, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Ezra Cuttino, O31397, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Albert Dunphy, O31398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Adam Anson, O31400, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Edwin Sommers, O31405, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Melvin Carter, O31406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel Hines, O38900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curry Ned Vaughan, O31407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carroll Martin Covington, O40083, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Yates Allen, O31412, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Ernest Lyman, O38903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Kuhn, O31419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Mitchell Marr, O31420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Andrew Woodbury, O42943, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Downing Temple, O51834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Weisberg, O40085, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bradford Butler, Jr., O31425, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lyman Peter Marden, Jr., O40086, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Allen Ashley Futral, O42948, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ara Guy Lindley, O31427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Jesse Reichel, O40087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dured Ellsworth Townsend, O31430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Magnusson, O31432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seymour Blair Satterwhite, O31431, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ford Edwin Pratt, O31433, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Leonard Whitney, O31435, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Livermore Whitten, O42954, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Allen Shurm, O31436, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Levin Bruce Cottingham, O42955, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon Fort, O31437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Serle Blodgett, Jr., O31438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Russell Springer, O30624, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Homer Cornelius Blake, O42959, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Sutton, O42961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norbert Charles Miller, O38905, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gratian Michael Yatsevitch, O31442, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Albert Hall, O40089, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Barney Johnson, O42963, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Hayden Arp, O31445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Louis Crownover, O42968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Milton Orton, O51844, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard George Robinson, Jr., O31448, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Joseph Martineau, O42971, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clair Hall Thurston, O31453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Frances Quinn, O31454, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Frank Hill, O42973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Major Aldon Mellroy Hoffman, O42975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Roland Philip Carlson, O31456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Walton, O31459, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Francis Nowe, O31460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Dyson Crawford Sweger, O31461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard William Keyes, O31467, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Richard Smoak, O31463, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Henry Milford Freidinger, O42983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Arthur Goshorn, O31465, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Darien Duncan, O31466, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Harold Shell, O31472, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Loren Emerson Bishop, O40091, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Austin Stricklen, Jr., O31473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eugene Mimms Lee, O31474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph Ambrus Thornton, O31818, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Duval Smith Adams, O42997, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Silas Gassett, O31481, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Herbert Hiram Champlin, O30661, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Carter Quinlin, O51860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Norman Merod Schroeder, O43002, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Brennan Egan, O43003, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Norman Arnold Anderson, O31483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Daniel Comm, O31484, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Wiley King, O51864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edmund Herman Lang, O43006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Mabry Griffin Miller, O31486, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Clifford Gilbert O40095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Claude Harvey Matchette, O31490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Major Joseph Ron Lamar, O43014, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph LeRoy Dickie, O31493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Robert Swarm, O43018, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Herbert August Jordan, O38795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack Allen Clark, O31496, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Waldemar Alexander Solf, O40145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Wesley Roberts, Jr., O40154, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilmot Thomas Baughn, O40155, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joe Arthur Clema, O43020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ellis Dillon Blake, O43023, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Samuel Angus Bethune, O31502, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Glover Steiner Johns, Jr., O31501, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Edward McArdle, O30695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Robert Clark, O31506, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Clarence Lee, O43030, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Clifton Dalrymple, O31509, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Lincoln McMackin, O31511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Corydon Blake, O51875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Gerald Edmond Feidt, O31513, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Albert Geddes, O31512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Vincent Camden Frisby, O20543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edmonde Bernard Kelly, O20544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Perry Jones, Jr., O20546, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt Col. Willard Paul McCrone, O20548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Aldo Hector Bagnulo, O20550, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Francis James Loomis, O20551, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Henry Dillon, O20552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jackson Graham, O20553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Christian Hanburger, O20554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Walter Sloat, O20556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Karl Fred Eklund, O20557, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Howard James Lowe, O20558, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Edward Leonhard, O20559, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Nels Redling, O31516, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Joseph Lagasse, O31517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Franklin Knapper Eberhard, O40161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin Hess Burba, O31518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Joseph McLeod, O43036, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Benjamin Mangold, O31522, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robin Gloor Montgomery, O31525, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Austin Thetford, O38913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Armond Ulrich, O31527, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jeff F. Hollis, O31528, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Royal Earle McShea, O51881, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Edward Duda, O43041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Richard Frederick Jeffers, O40165, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Harry Scordas, O38914, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Allyn Ord, O31532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Emerson Francis Hurley, O31533, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Joseph John Peot, O31536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Benjamin Rudisill Bush, O40166, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Edward McShane, O51884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Wilson Grant, O31539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Denzil Laval Baker, O43052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Donald Eister, O38915, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl Robert Yost, O31542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Fredric Rader, O31543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Marion Alexander Cromartie, O43057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Daniel Fitzhugh Shepherd, O43060, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Waldemar Martin Mueller, O31553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Payne, O31554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Lawrence Prahl, O31555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lawrence Pierce Jacobs, O31556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edwin William Weissman, O31559, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Francis Lambert, O38919, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roy Udell Clay, O43072, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Linwood Griffin, Jr., O4 074, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Cecil Harold Davidson, O31560, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Frederick Nelson, O43073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Perry Benjamin Priest, O31562, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William Henry Considine, O40172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Raciene Mason, O31563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick William Richards, O31565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leonidas George Gavalas, O31569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Arnold Clifford Gilliam, O31570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Barry Foster Phillips, O51893, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Sydney Emil Sacerdote, O38920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald D. Shepherd, O31571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Leverett Sanford, Jr., O31572, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Haviland Arthur Neil Connolly, O31575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Louis Gershenau, O31577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Melville Gold, O40179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Frederick Julian Owens, O43087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harvey Earl Sheppard, O43086, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Frankel, O40178, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Milton Robert Blum, O31695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ernest Lee Janes, O31587, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Franklin Earl Scott, O51898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl Edward Bledsoe, O31592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Carl Willis Bartling, O43091, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Thomas Adair, O51901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Donald Vincent Smart, O31597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Dent Leroy Lay, O40181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Nicholas William Willis, O43099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Seaton Franswell McDaniel, O43098, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Henry Ashton Crosby, O43102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Barney Driggs White, O31606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Phillips Brown, Jr., O38922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Earle Bennett Butler, O43106, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Leonard Humphrey, O31609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Nesen Brownson, O43108, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ralph Hunter Smith, Jr., O31614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lewis Frederick Shull, O43277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lauren Arden Arn, O43290, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jean Paul Sams, O43293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Rafael Cleveland, O31618, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Carl Anton Cuphaver, O43296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Christopher Dalia, O43297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Olin Page Holt, O43298, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Alton Sturm, O40185, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Solon Moncrief, Jr., O31623, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur William Oberbeck, O20569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Bennett Parker, O20571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick James Clarke, O20572, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Eugene Joseph Stann, O20573, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fred Earl Ressegieu, O20575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Francis Mitchim, O20577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Bayer Strandberg, O20579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Moses McAfee, Jr., O20580, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Stanley Kuna, O20581, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Julian Vincent Sollohub, O20584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Charles Boes Hines, O20585, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Chandler Spaulding, O20588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Peter Clarke Hyzer, O20589, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Stephen Barko, O20590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Hamilton William Fish, O20592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ellis Edmund Wilhoyt, Jr., O20593, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Lewis Register, O20594, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Leigh Cole Fairbank, Jr., O20595, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Manning Cromelin, O20597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Horace Lewis, O20598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Otto Diercks, O20599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Tice Griffin, O20600, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Giles Lincoln Evans, Jr., O20603, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jay Alan Abercrombie, O20604, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Douglass Phillip Quandt, O20605, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Brockenbrough Randolph Hines, O20606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Robert Francis Seedlock, O20609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Gamble Schermerhorn, O20610, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Stanley Palmer, O20611, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Houghton Ross Hallock, O20612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Noel Houk Ellis, O20614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack West Chapman, O20616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Henry Walker, O20617, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. George Joseph Murray, Jr., O20619, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Carlin Hamlin Whitesell, Jr., O20620, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alexander Day Surles, Jr., O20622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Robert Carl Miller, O20625, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Walter Cinn DeBill, O20626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Donald Wilt Shive, O20628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Perry Huston Eubank, O20630, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. John Graham Zierdt, O20632, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Raymond William Rumph, O20634, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Henry Mershon Spengler, O20636, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Elwyn Norman Kirsten, O20637, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Milton Harvey Clark, O20638, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edgar John Ingmire, O20639, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Horace Greeley Davisson, O20650, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Armitt Scott, Jr., O20652, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. William George Easton, O20656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col George Franklin Leist, O20657, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Martin Cone, O20658, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Morris Lee, O20661, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Haynes Reeves, Jr., O20665, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Emmette Young Burton, Jr., O20672 Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Vernon Underwood, Jr., O20679, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Chester Lee Johnson, O20681, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Stuart O'Malley, Jr., O20682 Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. James Nixon Peale, Jr., O20684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Wise Bailey, O20687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edgar Major Teeter, O20688, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Daniel Allen Richards, O20689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, O20690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Harrison Wilson, Jr., O20693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. David Bearse Nye, O20695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Thomas McGarey Metz, O20696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Thomas Denman Neier, O20698, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley John Cherubin, O20700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Meyer Arendt Edwards, Jr., O20702, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Clyde Gildart, O20703, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Fred Pierce Campbell, O20704, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Early Norvell, O20706, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Stumpf, O20707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Brady Mitchell, O20713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lukas Ernest Hoska, Jr., O20717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Marion Postlethwait, C20718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Battle Malone Barksdale, O20719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Levering Green, O20720, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ludger Chabot, O20721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Luis Fernando Mercado, O20724, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Maurice Stegmaier, O20725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Woodrow Wilson Stromberg, O20728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Everett Marr, Jr., O20729, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Cashemere Russell, O20730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Cecil Himes, O20731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Harper Hodges, Jr., O20733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, O20734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Clem Conway, O20735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Laurence Powers, O20736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Coy Lyman Curtis, O20737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Shields George, O20740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Lawrence Lindquist, O20748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Peter Major, O20750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hincks Montgomery, Jr., O20754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Johnson, O20756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. LeRoy Lutes, Jr., O20757, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Heber Van Volkenburgh, Jr., O20758, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Maryan Maliszewski, O20759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Samuel Brierley, O20760, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Robert Meyer, O20762, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Oscar Gordon Kreiser, O20765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Walter Elkins, O20766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Whitelaw Browning, O20767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James John Cosgrove, O20768, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Besson, O20771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Ferris Pearsall, Jr., O20774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Stanley Warren Connelly, O20775, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kelsie Loomis Reaves, O20777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin Taylor, O20779, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Hertel Lafiamme, O20781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Kelton Seymour Davis, O20786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Parker Calvert, O20794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maxwell Awyn Tincher, O20793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Clagett, O20799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll David Wood, O20803, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Delano Brant, O20804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delk McCorkle Oden, O20805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Alexander McGee, Jr., O20806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Dawes McKinley, O20807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Ralls Lawson, O20808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Winfield Lee Martin, O20809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Allen Dodds, O20815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Kelley Benjamin Lemmon, Jr., O20816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elery Martin Zehner, O20820, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Bidwell Sloan, O20821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Kirkham Amos, O20822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Olen John Seaman, Jr., O20825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Jarvis Tolson 3d, O20826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Huff Van Vliet, Jr., O20828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Walter Richardson, O20830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Howard Skeldon, O20831, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold McDonald Brown, O20832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wilson Duncan, O20834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Noel Ambrose Manard, O20835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ephraim Foster Graham, Jr., O20838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Barrett Travis, O20840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Millard Simmons, O20841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Talmage Kimbrell, O20851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Norrington Smalley, O20853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eads Graham Hardaway, O20855, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Brackett McClellan Chase, O20856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Ray Harrison, O20858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Fleming Polk, O20859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Powers Connor, O20860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Blauvelt, O20861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ted Franklin Douthitt, O31626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Loose Miller, O43302, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Vincent Johnston, O43313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Popowski, Jr., O31633, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Joseph O'Rourke, O32923, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Montague Blight, O40191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Howard Saylors, O31638, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Clarke Ashby, Jr., O43320, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Vincent McLaughlin, O31639, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor A. Ishoy, O31640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William McGrath, O43322, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Thompson Newton, O20865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Clinton Clayman, O20866, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Warren Sisson, Jr., O20867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Greene Hammond, O20868, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Russel Groves, O20869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Whitsett van de Velde, O20870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur George Christensen, O20871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Laurence Clifford Brown, O20876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Andrew Enemark, O20879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merten Kenneth Helmstead, O20880, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon John de Penne Rouge, O20882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Sherbourne McCrea, O20884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Frederick Thompson, O20885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon Nelson, O20886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Unsworth Allen, O20889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Byron William Ladd, O20890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Washington, O20894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Robert Etzler, O20895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Steve Archie Chappuis, O20899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Bolton Kennedy, O20900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Brownbridge Simpson, O20902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Thomas Boleyn, O20903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fredrick William Nagle, O20904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jabus Willie Rawls, Jr., O20906, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Leslie Coan, O20908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Francis Kent, O20909, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Willis Paddock, O20913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Horace Edward Alphin, O43324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Frederick Haberman, O40193, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Keith Orton Dicken, O43327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Peters, O31646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Frederick Dyer, O43328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Earl Lester Edwards, O31647, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Ralph Pierce, O43332, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer K. Curtis, O51918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Edward Grant, O31653, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Patton Brooks, Jr., O31654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norvell Riley Stark, O31335, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Aubrey Knox, O51921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Matile Griswold, O31660, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Randolph Hinson, O51922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Van Dyke Murphy, Jr., O31663, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bisbing, O31665, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Edward Minor, O31668, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Gallagher, O31669, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris Edgar Galusha, O43345, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Dutee Wilcox, Jr., O43347, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elias Carter Townsend, O31680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Kenneth Gaynor, O43354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Robert Short, O31685, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl Conner, O31686, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin J. Briggs, O43363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert John Check, O51936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Forbes Jenks, O31691, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Yancey Talbott, Sr., O31684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl George Lutz, O43366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Parrish McWhorter, O31692, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Benjamin Blank, O43368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James McDonnell, Jr., O31693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Walter Franklin Diesem, O43372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. McClure Hudelson, O43371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Homer Hewins Bowman, O31700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jules Emmable Gonseth, Jr., O40211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Ferguson Schneider, O31708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Mann Hayccck, O31712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Hennigan Tyler, O31711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wallace Grote, O31717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Austin James Montgomery, O51942, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlton Wallace Nelson, O43381, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Brooksie Kemp, O43382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Jay Redding, Jr., O43385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Edward Shelton, O51944, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Hurst Prather, O31722, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Alfred Manning, O43386, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William George Van Allen, O20931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Cortland Adams, O20933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lavonne Edwin Cox, O20934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles V. Ruzek, Jr., O20937, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Holmes Fielding Troutman, O20938, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Hamilton Van Atta, O20939, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Cottrell Rowland, Jr., O20940, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Smedile, O20942, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Allan Morrison, O20945, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Andrew Allgair, O20947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Samuel Pierce, Jr., O38928, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Edward Roth, O43387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Dean Holm, O20948, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Forrest Wilson Duff, O43391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alphonse Joseph Sockoloskie, O51945, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Rowan, O31727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dudley Randolph Berwick, O51946, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Forest Locke, O31728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Henry Lanphier, O20949, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Carlysle Speedie, O31730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Elmo Peddicord, Jr., O43397, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wiles Pervier, O31736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Riley Alexander Graham, O43404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Charles McNamara, O31738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Stephen Saunders, O31737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Durham, O31739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Busby Hudiburg, O31741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Ogle McGillin, O31743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Churchill Dunbar, O43408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Eric Hall, O31747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Frederick Plank, O43410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Carl Henry Bronn, O31748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Calvin Francis Finn, O43413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Cullin Sandlin, O31752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Selmer John Espelund, O43416, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Cecil Dinsmore, Jr., O10225, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry George Thomas, O31756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lance Ernest Booth, Jr., O31755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Martin, C42947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army)

Maj. John Stanley Taylor, Jr., O31765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Hoadley Dempsey, O31766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William John Parsons, O40228, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Francis McCay Clark, O38931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Edwin Whitmore, O52122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Henry Lappe Walton, O31777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Cyril Parker, O31778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Koletty, O40230, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Augustus Theodore Terry, Jr., O31781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Greg J. Brown, O31783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Randall Haywood Bryant, O31785, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Christ Angel, O31789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willis George Ethel, O31786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Bednarek, O38932, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Howard Gordon Smigelow, O31791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Oliver William Schantz, O31795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hughes Lanier Ash, O31799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Melvin Morley Kernan, O40236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Roland Virgin Tiede, O31801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Marshall Kenderdine, O43446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Alexander Gresham Fraser, Jr., O31805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Albert Lawrence Thornton, O31806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald MacGrain, O38933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dowling Tanner, O52132, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Francis Gagne, O43452, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Clarence Edwin Reid, O31809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James O'Biern Milliott, O40240, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cameron Knox, O31815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Will Dan Joslin, O31816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Herman Lorenzo Purkhiser, O31819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Wiley Sellers, O31821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Nash Ody Thompson, O31822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Herbert Wishart, O38935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Gergely Gregory, Jr., O31828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Warren Holmberg, O38937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest William Fischer, O31829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Bannon, Jr., O31830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Barlow, O31835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Charles Holland, O31840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew John Bartosik, O52145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wallace Page, O40247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Campbell Robertson, O31845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wesley Brooks Edwards, O31848, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clayton Williams, O52146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Carleton Edward Fisher, O31852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward McWilliams 3d, O31853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Anthony Ucherek, O31854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John George Hoffman, Jr., O31856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Lafayette Burchell, O40251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel Hickey, O52152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Willard Elliott, O31863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Elmer Loudenslager, O52155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jeff George Ray, O31865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Arthur McKee, O31867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. LeRoy Clancy Hill, O31874, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Javier Buldain, O43495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Nelson Beck, O40258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Kenneth Eagle Jurgens, O43496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmore Grenville Lawton, O38941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Edward Craig, O31879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chalmers Hilliard Armstrong, Jr., O31877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee May, O40260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alvin Lee Newbury, O38942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Atwell O'Reilly, Jr., O31881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell R. Reed, O52162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred James Reese, O31884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elisha Orrin Peckham, O31885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alexander Craig, O43505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Curtis Prentice, O31888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Linton Mushen, O43508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Edmund Harrison, O31892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Joseph McWade, O43512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelius Cuthbert Albaugh, Jr., O40268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Donald Klous, O31899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar LeRoy Arnold, O31902, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Steven Zimmerman, O38946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl C. Turner, O31909, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Ryan Rodgers, O43529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Paul Baerman, O40273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mervin Sterling Waters, O43533, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Maurice Alexander Belisle, O52175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allan Stanley Hirsch, O38947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Louis Coates, O31912, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mitchell Abraham Mabardy, O31913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur James Downey, O31914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Nolan Turner, O31921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Conroy Stewart, O43541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Cargill Erickson, O52177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Fenn Quist, O52178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Thompson Hancock, O31923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Niles Denniston, O43552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Martin Minion, Jr., O31601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Doane Willets, O40281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Ransom Roderick, O31941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Morgan Prosser, Jr., O31945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland John Meeker, O52185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Patrick Burk, O43569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Hannibal Martin, O31958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Carlson, O43577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Robert Jannarone, O21053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew John Altenhofen, O21054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Willard Bixby, O21056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Desloge Brown, O21057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Burney Chubbuck, O21058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander John Frolich, O21059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Eugene Kelsey, O21061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Worrell Love, O21062, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Allen Orr, O21064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Giles Stilwell, O21065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Thompson, O21067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Linn Lewis, O21069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Glazier Williams, O21071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Howard Anderson, O21072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Gregory Wickham, O21073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Stoddard Crocker, Jr., O21074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Clinton Harvey, Jr., O21076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Ward Smith, Jr., O21078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Alan Langford, O21079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Alfred Bailey, O21083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Joseph Kasper, O21084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Paul Barschdorf, O21085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Martin Elmore, Jr., O21086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Woodworth Jenkins, O12087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Gray O'Connor, O21088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Edward Lotz, Jr., O21090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., O21092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Mason Hogan, O21094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Nelson Moorman, O21095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Rhodes Russell, O21097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Trevor Nevitt Dupuy, O21098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dallas Fernald Haynes, O21103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Iver Arthur Peterson, O21105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Welby Beverley, O21107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Roland Bennett Anderson, O21108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred John D'Arezzo, O21109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Wade Norris, O21110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Lt. Col. John Fouché Brownlow, Jr., O21111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burton Robert Brown, O21113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Charles Lough, O21118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William McGregor Lynn, Jr., O21120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col Joseph Conigliaro Conell, O21121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Blake, Jr., O21122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvar Bertil Sundin, O21128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Edward Michelet, O21131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ted Irving Sawyer, O21133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jesse Fuller Thomas, O21135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Robert Bailey, Jr., O21136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tracy Bovard Harrington, O21137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Lockwood Webb, O21138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Joseph Weinnig, O21139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Canning Davis, O21141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Philip Yeager Browning, O21142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Harland Swenson, O21143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Lester Tittle, O21144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hollis Vail, Jr., O21145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Burnett Harrison, O21147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvin Lee Burke, O21148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Corbett, O21150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Anthony Sussmann, O21165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arpad Arthur Kopcsak, O21167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Charles Nickerson, Jr., O21170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Simon Rudel Sinnreich, O21173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Joseph Long, O21175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, O21177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gallon Myers McHaney, O21179 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Lee Grubb, O21180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Stanton McKee, O21181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Taylor, Jr., C21184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Emmett Ekman, O21190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jaroslav Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Nevin Howell, O21194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Charles Fremont Tillson 3d, O21196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Albert Bassett, O21202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lorenzo Dow Adams, O21203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Loyd Jackson, O21207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Charles Damon, O21208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harlan Keith Holman, O21211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Elmer Ellsworth Hallinger, O21212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Wallace Hayes, O21214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merton Singer, O21215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Lee Clarke, O21216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jefferson Johnson Irvin, O21217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Rhyne, O21219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Chilton Works, O21221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Gillivan, O21225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Little Haley 3d, O21226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Gray Duncan 3d, O21227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Johnson, Jr., O21228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carl Erlenbusch, O21230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Emmet Strange, O21231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Davis Offer, O21233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Henry Patrick, O21235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Adolph Sundlof, O21236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Lynch, O21237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Douglas Hulse, O21238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Earle Beck, O21239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Patrick Wansboro, O21241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Laskowsky, O21243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rollin Benedict Durbin, O21244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Benedict Missal, Jr., O21247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Warren Rand Williams, Jr., O21250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Milton Finn, O21252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Joseph Sweeney, O21254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Charles Brown, O21256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roberts Sherwood Demitz, O21259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., O21260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Milton Izenour, O21263, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Walker Thackeray, O21265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Walson, O21267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Mrazek, O21268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Dickson Miller, O21270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Augustine Broberg, O21272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Owen Byars, Jr., O21273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Stephen Kujawski, O21276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Nelson Sibley, O21277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mark Francis Brennan, O21279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Arthur Machen, Jr., O21284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Sternberg, O21286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Allen Jones, Jr., O21287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederic Charles Teich, Jr., O21288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Carl Thomas, O21289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas English, O21296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Alexander Norris, Jr., O21299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Henrie Hartline, O21301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Maxwell Murray, O21303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Eliason Boyt, O21304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Wallace Siren, O21306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Leaning Ashworth, O21308, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Thomas Hannum, Jr., O21316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hodson Rhine, O21317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Henry Lahti, O21322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Birdsey Lee Learman, O21324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Corley, O21325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Ewing, O21326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Eugene Henderson, O21327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clark Jackson, Jr., O21329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Conyers Fite 2d, O21331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andy Archer Lipscomb, O21333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Kent Schmidt, O21335, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Cornell Abert, O21337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ward Sanford Ryan, O21339, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Artman, O21342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Rapp Zohrlaut, O21344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Gibson Sherrard, O21345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Edward Hartman, O21346, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Chalgren, Jr., O21349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frost Staples, O31967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Elliott Fonger, O31969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Stinnie Huff, O43583, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elliott Burwell Cheston, O31976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Oliver, O43586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Lafayette Nash, O43587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Perkins Pope, O31981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Kenneth McCormick, O31982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Hilary Gomes, O21353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Vincent Roddy, O21356, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Perry Elmer Conant, O21357, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Bruce Bissell, O21360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Amos George Johnson, O21363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carolus Adams Brown, O21364, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Raymond Peers, O21366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Ernest Walker, O21368, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Morgan Summers, O21369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifton Ferdinand von Kann, O21371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Laverne Arthur Parks, O21372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Peter Hagen, O21373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Murray Elroy Sparks, O21374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Albert Armstrong, O21375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank George White, O21378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Theodore Sauser, O21379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elwin Thomas Knight, O21380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Gill Springer, O21382, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gregory Leo Higgins, O21385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aaron Alexander Abston, O21391, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Winfred Alban Ross, O21395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Bernard Burket, O21398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Harold Stangle, O21406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Meredith Ernest Allen, O21408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Emerson Babcock, O21413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Burhyte Wilmot Corey, Jr., O21415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rollie Neel Blancett, O21416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Benjamin Schweizer, O21418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alfred Matthew Eschbach, O21419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Kenneth Howell, O21421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Brennan Stelzenmuller, O21422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmer Kersey Benson, Jr., O21423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Ellsworth Skinner, O21425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Myron Ellsworth Page, Jr., O21426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Judson Woodring Wark, O21428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edmund Mortimer Fry, Jr., O21431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry George Woodbury, Jr., O21432, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Chipman Holley, O21433, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Wright Bennett, O21434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Herbert Evans Brown, O21437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Claude Potter, Jr., O21439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Ellison, Jr., O21440, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Milner, O21441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Russell Rorabaugh, O21445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henderson Beddow, O21446, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Carpenter Paules, O21447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Andrew Vaiden Inge, O21448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

To be captains with rank from July 1, 1948

Capt. Andrew Adolphe Aines, O43463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Hayward Sevier, O43464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Simon Albert Stricklen, O52136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Martin Ruemmele, O31824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Anderson Hudson, O52137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Raymond Kemm, O52139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Homer Jerome Victory, O31826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertram Junior Ellis, O40244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matt William Werve, O31832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Turner Wright Gilman, O31831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Clirehugh, O31833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Estill Stanley Thurston, O43469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Johnson Meade, O31834, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Ira Arterburn Palr., O40245, United States Army.

Maj. Christopher Berry Cushing, Jr., O31836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Edward Septfonds, Jr., O31837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Henry Joseph Phillips, O31839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Melford Palmer Fritsvold, O43473, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Leffers, Jr., O31843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Covert Troutman, O31841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie M. Gross, O38938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wesley Gough, O43474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Joseph Stephens, O31844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Arthur Gray, O38939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis James Pallister, O43476, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Coy Wilson Baldwin, O31924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Victor Wendell White, O43479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Clinton Gadeken Merrill, O31849, United States Army.

Maj. Bernard Joseph Scherer, O52147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Harrison Rousseau, Jr., O52148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Bissell Whaley, O52150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Ernest Michael Bozak, O43486, United States Army.

Capt. Francis Donald Linse, O31858, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Myron Douglas Smith, O31860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Pachomski, O40252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert William Berendt, O31861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj Raymond Thomas Caraballo, O31862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Asa Miller, O52154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Davitt, O43490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harris Joaquin North, O52158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Elmer Rownd, O31868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Clifford Gustav Folen, O40255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Capt. Benjamin Ives LaFlare, O52159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice Glynn Powell, O40259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Gerald Allen, O31878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Floyd Hermann Buch, O43500, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward Raynesford Warner McCabe, Jr., O40262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Hall, O31882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph O'Connor, O52160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Henry Bauer, O43502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony Jackson Race, O52163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Browne Leggette, O43503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Paul Mathew Koerner, O40263, United States Army.

Maj. Taylor Elliott Carney, Jr., O40264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carmen Aldo Rossi, O52165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dovre Christian Jensen, O52166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Leo Drennen, Jr., O31890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Orval Quincy Matteson, O43509, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Whitman Young, O31891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Joseph King, O40265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Graves Salisbury, O43510, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Maxe Huston, O38943, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Reynold Atlas, O31894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis duRest van de Velde, O31895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Louis Salonick, O40266, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Bernard Richmond, O43519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Reginald Campbell, Jr., O40267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Marion Brown, Jr., O31897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lee DuBose, O38945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Hupalo, O40269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Rolfe Hill, O31898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Thaddus Leland Black, O31900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Lehman Bartholomew, O43524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Homer Alton Stuverud, O43523, United States Army.

Maj. William Harry Pople, O43525, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Beverly Wilder, O40271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Boyd Emory, O31903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Maj. Eugene Sites, O43526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Sherman Stacy, O31905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Wallace Humphreys, O31910, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Richard Lewis Bettien, O43528, United States Army.

Maj. Richard Clarke St. John, O43530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Roy Underwood, O31911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Leslie Firm Palmer, O43531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jackson Ralph Burns, O40274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Lord Harrison, O40275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Ferdinand Knoll, O43535, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Ridge Emery, O40276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Helge Nelson, O31916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Jereslaw Owen, O43536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Lincoln Spaulding, O31915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Logan Harrigan, O43538, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Joseph Aerni, O31920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lowell Gideon Moore, O43539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Taylor Coker Tyler Hayes, O43542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Albert Robbins, O43543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Norman Maurice Walker, O31925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Robert Morris Wygant, O31926, United States Army.

Capt. John Scott Robinson, O38948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Thomas Dennis, O43547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Loui Peter Mueller, O52181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew William Ritchey, O31934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Clayton Young, O31935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Joe Elbert Childers, O31936, United States Army.

Capt. Stockbridge Howland Barker, O36949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John DeWitt Phillips, Jr., O31937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Francis VanGundy, O31938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Martin Joseph Waters, Jr., O31939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Hope Kederich, Jr., O43556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marshall William Baker, O43558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Alexander, O40280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Gideon Johnson, Jr., O43557, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen Olaf Tonstad, O43560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Danby Northrop, O40282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Cullis, O31942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Melvin Oscar Miller, O40283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Compton Ball, O52184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Jacob Frederick Polifka O31943, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Charles Becker, O31944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Stanley Kenneth Carlson, O52534, United States Army.

Capt. Howard Fulton Goldsmith, Jr., O31946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Arthur Hicks, O31948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Coughlin, O40284, Army of the United States, (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Franklin Yuill, O43571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edward Gardner, O38951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Albert Emanuel Holtz, O40285, United States Army.

Maj. Marshall Woodrow Myers, O52188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Nicohlus Brandt, O31955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Andrew Barry Crook Nicholls, O31957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Louis Springer, O31961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas MacConnell 3d, O40286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy West Lonsinger, O52192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Inglis, O31964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Wilson Van Doorn Ledley, O43579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Tapp, Strawbridge O40287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Frederick Isaacson, O31965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Milton, Vinson, Jr., O31990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Glade, O21181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Terry Craig, O21248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Carusone, O21295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Nicholas Guletsky, O21309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Thomas Riordan, O21318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Winthrop White, O21319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harlan Chambers, O21323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Starr Wright, Jr., O21328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Salvatore Campanella, O21348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Paul Stanley Lindberg, O52194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertil Vernon Jones, O31968, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Orven Donald Moore, O43581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nicholas Joseph Sloane, O43582, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Maurice Majors, O31971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Crome Shuler, Jr., O31970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Maynard Doerflinger, O31972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Luther Gragg Strange, O40288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Joseph Edward Noble, Jr., O31973, United States Army.

Maj. John William Fueg, O40289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ray Marion Lee, O31974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morris Elmer Sorenson, O31977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. William Edward Watts, O40291, United States Army.

Maj. Russell Leroy Norgordt, O43589, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Zacharia Houston, Jr., O31979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. David Brownell Jodrey, O43590, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Joseph McDonough, O43591, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Frederick Jost, O40292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Ellis Deshon, O21362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Samuel McGraw Swearingen, O21381, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Jefferson Hodges, Jr., O21401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Stanley Byrne, O21404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ernest Veale, O21435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nendel Anderson, O21436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry Bradbury Hackett, O21443, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Zitzer, O21444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Carpenter Fields, Jr., O43592, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Commerford, Jr., O40293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Earl Crump, Jr., O31983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).

Capt. Felder Lavett Fair, O31984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Elza Waller, O40294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Herbert Steele Long, Jr., O31985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Harold William Wheeler, O31986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Adams Alley, Jr., O52203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Leckie, O40296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Wesley Roe, O52205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Haig Jackson, O52204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis William Pflanz, Jr., O43600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Howard Nelson, Jr., O31992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Gordon Gorski, O31993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Melville Bowman, Jr., O43601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Burns Noland, O43603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Stanley Tyler, O43602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Allen Bucha, O31996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Stephen Gerety, O43605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Henry Koreman, O38953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Edwin Daniel, Jr., O38954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. John Edward MacDonough, O52208, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Milton Irving Wallace, O21467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Luther Blue, O31997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Carter, O38955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Francis Schiltz, O38956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Arnold Bieri, O40298, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Foreman Wood, O32001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Bryant Slimp, O43608, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jackson Stuart Lawrence, Jr., O32003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Stacy Capers, Jr., O32004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William Ackert, O32005, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lee Trout, O43610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Tinsley Dodge, O21468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Samuel Casto, O32007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ted Joseph Palik, O43611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Kendal Whitehead, O43612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Luther Regan, Jr., O32008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Scott McMillin, O32010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Herbert Nelson Ostrom, O43614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Eugene Woodrow, O32011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Owen Waite Owens, O38958, United States Army.

Capt. John Justice Beeson 3d, O32013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charles Spencer Campbell, O43615, United States Army.

Maj. Oscar Stegall, Jr., O32014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick West Hawksworth, O43619, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earle McDaniel Clarke, O32015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Louis Haberstroh, O52210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Mortimer Robert Staley, O43620, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Joseph Francis Ryneska, O32017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wesley Herbert Burr, O32019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Bruce Benjamin Caulder, O43626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gardner Alston Williams, O40301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Irvin Casterline, O43628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rudolph Charlemagne Koerner, Jr., O52211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dalton Walker Lain, O40302, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Herbert Bearss, O32020, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Moses Cookson, O32021, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Edward Gerber, O32023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Joseph McCool, O32024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Jordan Brown, O38959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Wallace Creel Wardner, O52212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Willard Jones, Jr., O43631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Joseph Macken, O40304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. James Hugh Keefe, O43634, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Paul Shirley Hicks, O32028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Andrew Rice, O43635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Cloake Small, O52214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Augustus Perry, O32030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Henry Slover, O43638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Hill Campbell, O32031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Leon J. Fishkin, O52215, United States Army.

Maj. Leland Earle Anderson, O52216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karl Josef Wicker, O32033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilford Lloyd Willey, O38961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wellington Snoad, O32034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. John Wilbur Baumgartner, O43642, United States Army.

Capt. Henry Howard Marsden, Jr., O43643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kay Kipling Cowan, O52217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Herbert Gregg, O32037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Clarence Paul Ehrhardt, O43644, United States Army.

Maj. James Damian Donlon, Jr., O32039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Runyan Linvill, O40305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Peter Ketcham, Jr. O38963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas St. John Arnold, O32040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Sigman White, O32041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Dobley Fleming O32042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Cornelius Spiedel, Jr., O32044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Clayton Bane Lyle, Jr., O40306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Burk, O32043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dan Christie Kingman, O32045, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lionel Edward Scott, O32046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward G. Edwards, O32048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Emery Veatch, O32047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack David Wolfson, O40307, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Neil Marshall, O52221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jewett Agusta Dix, O32049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Harvey Houser, O32050, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Edward Dueker, O32051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Daugherty, O52222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Victor Lesneski, O32053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Preston Donald, O52223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Weldon Winston Wilson, O32054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Freeman Francis Gage, Jr., O32055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Merritt William Briggs, O38964, United States Army.

Capt. John Campbell, Jr., O43649, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Leonard Pridgen, Jr., O38965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert LeRoy Staver, O43650, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. William Leon Adams, Jr., O43651, United States Army.

Capt. Philip Charles Hess, O32059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ayres William Stoddard, O43652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick Brown, O43653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ford Murray Beardsley, O40311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Earl Wills, O32060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Sion Cook, Jr., O43655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jack Priestley Napier, O43657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Walter Flint, O43656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Peter VanCourt, O38966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Frederick Benjamin, O32062, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Willis Everett Kooken, O43658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Ellsworth Keough, O43659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Harvey Williams, O38967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Saffold, O43660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Noble Allwine, O43661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Gustavus Stotlar, O43662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Orr Graham, Jr., O32064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Garrett Sutton, Jr., O43663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charles Carroll Roder, O43664, United States Army.

Maj. Lawrence Alfred Martin, O43665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lee Wallace, O32065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Philip Murphy, O52226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Robideaux, O32066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Gordon Kinney, O32067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Joseph Kiely, Jr., O32069, Army of the Untied States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Cecil Ball, O32070, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Morehead Hargrave, O32071, Army of the United States (first leutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Abram Jameson, Jr., O32072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Keith Herbert Houlson, O52229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Otto Rudolph Koch, Jr., O32074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edgar Wales, 3d, O40315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Eugene John Hollerbach, O32076, United States Army.

Maj. Ralph Lawrence Norling, O32112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Wright Williams, O32077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Milliff, O40316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Gerlach Sory, O43670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Grant Lavell, O32080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Edward Rose, O32079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hughes Alfred Carnes, O43674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Donald Mitchell, O31625, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Aaron Underwood Trimble, O43675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chase Rawson Teaboldt, O32082, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Henry Morrison Owen, Jr., O32083, United States Army.

Maj. Don Osvold Currier, O40318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Palmer Johnson, O43677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ollie James Allen, O32085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hobert Wayne Sharp, O43678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Beeman Mullinix, O32086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Randolph Archer, O38968, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Herring Sharpe, O43682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Harry Anthony Slad, O32088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Bert Outlaw, O32089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry Arthur Munro, O32090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harry Atkinson Greer, O43685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Fletcher Rolph, O32091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Joseph Attaway, O40321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wood Calvert, O52232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Sam Francis, O52233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Elman Leighton, Jr., O43688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nicholas Dunlap, O32094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Frank Albert, O32097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carlton Stack, O32098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Gradon Reynolds, O32099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Curtis Payne, O32101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Boyd Claypool, O43693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Elmer Allen, O32103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Barrell, O32104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Audemard Beplat, O43694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Thomas Kellett, O40323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Benjamin Murphy Goetz, O43696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Laverne Woods Graff, O52239, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Warren Raymond Johnson, O43697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Howard Clarence Parker, O32108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John David Sapp, O32109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Daniel Haskins, O32110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Dean Harris, O32111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Jarrold, 043699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Carlisle, O40324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank Adrian Bogart, O40325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Ignatius Klein, O32113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Snead Blocker, O32118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maynard Byron Weaver, O32120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Everette Johnson, O43704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Joseph Convery, Jr., O52244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Wilson Corder, O43706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Angster, O32124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Albert Brinkerhoff, O43708, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Gordon Drouillard, O32125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Oren Dean Chapman, O40328, United States Army.

Maj. Lawrence Arver Twomey, O32126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon Frederick Lavoie, O32127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Shannon Delos Brown, O52247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Freeland Allyn Daubin, Jr., O43709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Wilbur Smith, O32128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Anthony Eckstein, O40331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Francis Wilson, O38971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Luke Hustead, Jr., O43711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Lauriston Harding, O32134, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Sheldon Scott, O43712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Millard Glen Gray, O32137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royal Ector Phillips, O32136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Ramon Francis D'Elosua, O43713, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Allen Rankin, O32140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Shepherd Fromer, O32141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Lewis Whipple, O43714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Thomason Ayres, Jr., O43715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Evans, O32142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Jackson Gillespie, O32143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Calhoun Hooker, O43717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Durwin White, O40332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Wesley Boyer, O32145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charley Walker Haynes, O43719, United States Army.

Maj. Arnold Peter Murr, O43720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irwin Allen Edwards, O32149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Bennett Wild, O40333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertil Bernhard Sandell, O32153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Edward Michaels, O38972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Lloyd Osborne, O32154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank von Phul Williams, O40334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Palsrok, O43722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Moseley Bachelor, O43723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward August Seifert, O52253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Evers Jacobs, O52256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Nathan Hanks Hixson, O52254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ellis Harry Mist, O52255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Henry Levine, O32155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Murray Brannon, O32156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Aaron Hoard, Jr., O43729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Daniel Drake, O32158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Philip Lyke, O43731, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Dooley, O32159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William May Myers, O32160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Sailor Bowers, O38973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Duncan Conley, O52260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Alexander Johnston Rankin, O32166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Ellis Lawrence, O52261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harle Grady Bailey, Jr., O32167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Law, O32169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Julian Boyles, O32168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Edward Fives, O32170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Michael Witter, O32172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Duncan Aboosh, O32171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Drazen, O40336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Mathew Cromwell, O32176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrell H. Burnett, O32177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Jorge Jose Lluy, O56598, United States Army.

Capt. Fountain Fox Beattie, Jr., O52265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Alexander Galt, O43743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hendric Byrd, Jr., O52267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett Sullivan, O43745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Emerson Perry, O38974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph George Belon, O43746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Julian Louis Hogan, O32178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Ronan, O43750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Campbell, O32180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carroll Broadus Hodges, O43751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edward Feliz, O43752, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Cella, O52269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Simon Kostanski, O43755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Patrick James Brennan, O43756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Gabriel Katin, O43758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Francis Register, Jr., O43757, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamine Marvin Brothers, O32185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Barney Golden, O40337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emmett Gilliam Scott, O43760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cornell Dent Booth, O52271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lucian Capers Croft, O32189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Austin, O32191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Wilbur Wendt, O32190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Warren Black, O32192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Harvey Lane, O40338, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Warner Reagan, O38975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Howard Gibbs, O43764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Victor Bruni, O32195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Francis Flynn, O43765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lee Stahler, O32197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis William O'Brien, O32196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Fred Ax, O32198, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. John Charles Kulp, Jr., O43768, U. S. Army.

Lt. Col. Charles Bless Boswell, O38976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Preston Lerner, O32199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederic Morris Cramer, O52273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Clement Hatchell, O32200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arlo Willis Mitchell, O43772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Miller Heiser, Jr., O43773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Middleton Rutledge, O32201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Arthur Dalton von Rohr, O43774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifton Allen Peters, O32202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Stone Livermore, O32203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Crouch, Jr., O43777, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Theodore Guenther, O32206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Kenneth Long, O43778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Werner Holtz, O32209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Monroe Johnson, O52276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Bernard Tenhagen, O43785, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Donaldson, Jr., O32721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Kenneth Hutson, O32212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Capt. Maxim James Dowd, O32210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George McCutchen, O40341, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Mervyn Wilson, O38978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bennett Scott, O32213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Tyrus Raymond Ambron, O32215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Haberer, Jr., O52278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Keith Saxe, O43790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. James Paul Clark, O40343, United States Army.

Capt. Park Trammell Jenkins, O32218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howard Miller, O32220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Atticus Thrasher, O32733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice James Reynolds, O43793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Eugene BeLieu, O32223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Kenneth Walker, O32225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Ephriam Downard, O32224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Middleton Thompson, O43794, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellis Vandenberg, O38979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Holder Crawford, Jr., O32229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Aloysius Graham, Jr., O32231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellwood Frederick Hanson, O52281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leslie Maurice Payne, O43797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glen Ercil Daugherty, O38980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerome Sydney Jefferds, O52283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herman Heinrick Von Benge, O32237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Elias Frederic Liakos, O32238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. McLean Hampton, O32239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William David Mouchet, O43802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Myron McClure, O32241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynn Dillon Fargo, O32242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dan Earl Riggs, O52285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Logsdon Albert, O40344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thurston Tyler Paul, Jr., O32243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alfred Stanford, O43808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Everett Moore, O32244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Webster Holmes, O32247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Griswold Grandin, O32248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Walker Tomlin, Jr., O32249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Ray Wilcox, O32251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Raymond Huston, O43812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Dean George, O43815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Homer Clair Hinckley, O52289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Alonzo Chamblin, O32255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Charles Pertl, O40349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Watkin Reese, O43818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Cleland Osborne, O43819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Boice O'Hara, O31887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kenneth McWilliams, O32257, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Henry Pierre, Jr., O32258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reuben Nathan Salada, O32261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Ben McKenzie, O32264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris John Naudts, O32265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Carroll Case, Jr., O43824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Williams, O40352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bill Woodrow Paden, O52291, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Edward Berri Armstrong, O32267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Robert Pershall, O43825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis James Smith, Jr., O43826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil Lawrence Mosheim, O32272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Egbert Bruehl, O32270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Gnau, O43828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Leon Kelly, Jr., O52292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thorvald Jorgen Guerdrum, O43829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curtis Everett Healton, O32275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Young Canon, O43830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Thomas Hennessey, O32274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Harry Huppert, Jr., O32277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Gray Patterson, O32278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. George Edward Albert, O32279, United States Army.

Maj. Charles Henderson Hollis, O38981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Martin Holmes Colley, O38982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Patrick Scholl, Jr., O32281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Cordrey Pardue, O40354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Anthony Emil Papa, O52294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Ellis Nestlerode, Jr., O32282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Frederick Balkman, O32285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Samuel Heywood Oakley, O43841, United States Army.

Maj. Robert Ellis Butts, O32286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Thomas Pullen, Jr., O52296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Burnett Price, O43842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eric Armand Rundquist, O43843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Claude Bartholet, O43845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Cummings Motter, O32288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Douglas Hoskins, Jr., O43846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Melvin Arthur, O32290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Conrad Olia Mannes, Jr., O32293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stockton Donald Bruns, O32292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert David Hand, O32294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eric Ray Edgerton, O43850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burton Staley Andrews, O43849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Sharp Bary, O32296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Emil Davidson, Jr., O32295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pierre Donald Boy, O32297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allan Louis Bogardus, O43853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hugh Wikoff, O32301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Samuel Ryan, O32300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl George Witte, O32303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Justus Crawford Kennedy, O43856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Franklin Schoonover, O32304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Secord Smith, O32305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Roy Cheek, O32306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roman Irodian Ulans, O52302, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Byron Saul Smith, O43860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Ralph Robert Kenigson, O52303, United States Army.

Lt. Col. John Joseph Hayes, O32309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Lunsford Wyatt, O32310, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Joseph Eldon Hanks, O43866, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Paul Richard Jeffrey, O40358, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Innes, O43867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hotenel James Huff, O43868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lee Redman, Jr., O32311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertram Isaac Nash, O40361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Loyd Cone, O40362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl George Peacock, O43873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Thomas Seaburn, O32314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Leland Pence, O43875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Jack Lawrence Weigand, O32315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Stanton Niccolls, O32317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Michael Paul Gierlak, O40363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Ian Frederick Turner, O32318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thomas Specht, Jr., O32321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Cowley Jones, O32320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Daniel Nestor Black, O52309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William McCaw Hughes, O32322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Claire Kreighbaum, O43883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Prindle Bartow, O52310, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard William Martens, O32324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Frederick Pille, O52311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Emil Holt, O32326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Hamor Hamlin, O52312, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gordon Ulysses Tapper, Jr., O52314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Darce Ronald Knight, O43887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Henry Sweet, O38984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Van Nostrand Grace, O40365, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Vivian Kling, O40366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Hugh Rowe O'Farrell, O43888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stuart Frederick Brady, O32329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Rodman Drake, O43894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert James Jackson, Jr., O38986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Talbert Iredell Martin, O43893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Richard Kinnicutt Brown, O32333, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Kenneth Elmer Eckland, O32334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Hugh Francis Queenin, O40367, United States Army.

Maj. Paul Hugh Mize, O32335, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burrell Curry Hassett, Jr., O38987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Thomas Hillis, O40369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Michael Mullen, O43896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Ray Ware, O52317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth William Wallace, O32338, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Laverne Etka, O43898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Wellington Fox, Jr., O52318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Hustler Blair, 3d, O44388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Willits Crowell, O52319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Woodrow Way, O32341, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Joseph Bird, O32343, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Lee Tate, O38988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles John Kronke, Jr., O40371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald August Lake, O43901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Francis Zeoli, O32345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Clarence Frederickson, O32347, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bradfoot Lyle, O32348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Thomas Fry, O43904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Watson Carter, Jr., O32349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Leon Wilson, O32350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Morris Solomon, O32351, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Albert Schmidt, O52322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Spencer Skillman, O38989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mahlon D. Hickman, O32355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wilbur Casey, O32356, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sherman Dell Cosgrove, O38990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Orlando Lee Greening, O43906, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred William Kellner, O32358, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harmon Henry Seale, O32360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John White Yow, O32361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Irving Seekins, O32362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chesley Folsom Durgin, O32363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Sylvanus La Mee, 3d, O32364, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salvador Francis Taranto, O40372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Raymond Steckla, O32366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale Martin Garvey, O43910, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Stanley Nelson, O52325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Challen Clowes, O32367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Francis Dudley, O40374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lachlan Maclean Sinclair, O32369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Glen Wilson, O32370, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Vinyard Christianson, O43913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Juskalian, O32371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Isaac Hoppenstein, O32373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Sterling Champ Bush, O43914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Craig Dameron, O32376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Walter Dziuban, O21738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, Jr., O21739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Albert Funzig, Jr., O21741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Duncan Wolfe, O21743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Wilmot Ruet McCutchen, O21744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Kirby-Smith, O21745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Elting Coates, Jr., O21746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Reed Fraser, O21747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Edgar McCollam, O21748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jay Phelps Dawley, O21750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Montgomery Lee Webster, O21751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Marsden Duke, O21753, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Woodrow William Wilson, O21755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Medusky, O21756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Mason Matheson, O21757, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lewis Cantrell, O21758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Farrell, O21759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Riis Ploger, O21760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Donald Richardson, O21761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Lloyd Winegar, O21764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Paraska, O21765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Johnson Wells, O21766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Riel Stanton Crandall, O21767, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Thomas Bradley, O21768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Sidney Taylor Martin, O21772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward John Gallagher, O21775, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Evans Brinker, O21776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Pavick, O21780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence LeRoy Beckedorff, O21781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis Cassidy, O21783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert William Studer, O21786, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lawton Collins, Jr., O21788, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ladislaus Casimir Maslowski, O21789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Eugene Showalter, O21794, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hyde Camp, O21798, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Joseph Minahan, Jr., O21799, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Mabry Williams, O21801, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Irvin Muir, Jr., O21802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Wald, O21804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Harry Kurth, O21807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Penn Haffa, O21809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Walter Allen, Jr., O21810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Belmont Stuart Evans, Jr., O21811, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter MacRae Vann, O21812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Charles Dolle, O21813, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Martin Royce, O21814, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Schrader, Jr., O21818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Peterson Winton, Jr., O21819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Richardson Reeves, O21820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ray, O21821, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward McCleave Dannemiller, O21822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Fenton Rollins, O21823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Godfrey Urban, O21825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas James Bartley Shanley, O21828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jasper Jackson Wilson, O21829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry McNeil Myers, O21835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carroll William Dietz, O21836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dalton Byrne, O21837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Mortimer Crawford, O21840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Albert Hinternhoff, O21844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles McNeal Mount, Jr., O21849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Gustavus Gilbert, O21850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Dobson, O21851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Livingston Nelson Taylor, Jr., O21853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hasket Lynch Conner, Jr., O21855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard deForest Cleverly, O21862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Putnam Scroggs, O21863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Leon Yarnall, O21864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Kummer Norris, O21865, Army of the United States (first leutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Young Nanney, O21866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joel Furman Thomason, O21867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James McMenamin Shepherd, O21868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Anthony Janowski, O21869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Howard Keller, O21871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling Russell Johnson, O21873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ulrich Georg Gibbons, O21874, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Barton George Lane, Jr., O21876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Wright Caldwell, O21877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Wayne Reed, O21878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Christopher Charles Coyne, O21879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael John Krisman, O21880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin George Megica, O21881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles David Thomas Lennhoff, O21882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Norman Hunsbedt, O21883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Keith Maughan Hull, O21885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles David Kepple, O21886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Millar Geary, O21887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic William Boye, Jr., O21891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Leroy Robinette, O21892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Chessman Beere, O21893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph John Hanchin, O21895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Vernon Tuttle, Jr., O21896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Campbell Bane, O21897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Kosier Newcomer, Jr., O21898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Watt, O21901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Herbert Price, Jr., O21903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Irving Coffey, O21904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Ray Brownfield, Jr., O21905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Herbert Wohlfeil, O21907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Thomas Holt, O21908, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Jordan, O21911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clark George, O21913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Badger Goodwin, O21914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Randall Seaver, O21916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hulen Dee Wendorf, O21919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Frederick Roberts, O21920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Turner Bowie, O21921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Whitehead West 3d, O21922, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Davis McFerren, O21923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roger Merrill Lilly, O21924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Jay Henry, O21928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon Johnson, O21929, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Lee Shepard, Jr., O21931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Sykes Billups, Jr., O21932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Hill, Jr., O21933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benton Raymond Duckworth 2d, O21934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Pickett, O21938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Chester Chapman, O21939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Boiler Maxwell 2d, O21942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Max Cochran, O21945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seth Foster Hudgins, O21947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Boyle, O21953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles James Hackett, O21954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Heinz Weisemann, O21956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lincoln A. Simon, O21961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Gifford, O21964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Alexander McChristian, O21966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Albert Trahan, O21967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Buford Davidson, Jr., O21969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vester Melvin Shultz, O21974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marshall Wallach, O21977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Casper Clough, Jr., O21979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, O21980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Mull Crawford, O21983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wiley Burge Wisdom, Jr., O21985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Max Simpson, O21986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Martin Higgins, Jr., O21987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Andrew Nolan, Jr., O21988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, Jr., O21990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Thomas Mildren, O21992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Lentz, 2d, O21993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Traywick McConnell, O21996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Ellsworth Wood, O21998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Dean Poinier, O21999, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Thomas Smith, O22001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Schellman, O22002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salvatore Joseph Mancuso, O22006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joel Terry Walker, O22007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Moorhouse Coleman, O22008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Joseph Belardi, O22009, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Willis Walker, O22011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick David Mulcahy, O22015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Mulford Van Harlingen, Jr., O22016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Howard Bertolet St. Clair, O22017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Busby Miller, O22018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry de Metropolis, O22021, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Stephen Charles Farris, O22022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Langley Patrick Medinnis, O22023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Keith Boles, Jr., O22025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Matt Combes Cavendish Bristol, Jr., O22027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lyle Everett Peterson, O22033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Wright Allen, Jr., O22034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Howard Vincent Cooperider, O22035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Comerford Smith, O22038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Charles Wickboldt, O22047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Manning Kirby, O22048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Geoffrey Lavell, O22049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James McConnell, O22052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fidelis David Newcomb, O22056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Walker Davis 3d, O22059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Riley Bess, O22060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Paul Smith, O22063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Franklin Hull, O22067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Olav Herstad, O22068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Neary Davis, O22070, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Osburn Dickerson, O22071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Goodhue Kail, O22072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Patricio Lasché, O22073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Carter Stone, Jr., O22075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James LeRoy Rogers, O22076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Malcolm Frank Gilchrist, Jr., O22077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John William Jaycox, O22078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beirne Spragins, O22080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard George Teeters, O22081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. DeWitt Nalley Hall, O22083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Raymond Odom, O22086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward MacDonald Serrem, O22090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Chapman Williams, Jr., O22091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles George Fredericks, O22092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Herbert Grant, O22093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Robert Larsen, O22094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Barclay Carvey, O22095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Kelley, Jr., O22097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. William Calvin Banning, O22098, U. S. Army.

Lt. Col. William Montgomery Preston, O22099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Leland Lampert, Jr., O22100, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frank Goodwin Forrest, O22101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shields Warren, Jr., O22103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Holloman Barnett, O22104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Thomas Lowe Schwenk, O22106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ned Woods Glenn, O22107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Moushegian, O22109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henderson Patterson, Jr., O22110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bradford Smith, O22113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Kopf Rippert, O22115, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Elliot Rager, O22116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wesley Florance, Jr., O22119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert William Page, Jr., O22120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Lansing Scott, O22121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Eric Olson, O22125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Terry Sutton, Jr., O22128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wilmarth Kouns, O22129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Griswold Barber, O22130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Allen Matter, O22132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earle Livingstone Lerette, O22133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Tucker Clifford, O22135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmet McMahon, O22137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Anderson Roosa, O22138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Pennell, O22139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Lawrason Murray, Jr., O22140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Jackson Fling, O22144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Frederick Brockman, O22147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Lore Miller, 2d, O22149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Everett Reynolds, O22151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Richard Harrison, Jr., O22152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick Aiden Kelly, O22154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl August Buechner, Jr., O22155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Peter Mial, O22157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Law McCrorey, Jr., O22158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Laurence Boylan, O22162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robison Reilly, O22163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Reeson Looney, O22164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edgar William Schroeder, O22166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Wilson Collins, O22169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Charles Chapla, O22170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Josiah Scott Kurtz, O22171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Levin Lane Lee, O22172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Watson McClellan, O22173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. David Samuel Dillard, O22175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Meyer, O22179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Constant August Troiano, O22180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lindsay Coates Herkness, Jr., O22181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Deimel Green, O22182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles John Parsons, Jr., O22183, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Herbert Hale, O22184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Kelly, O22185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Earl Mitchell, Jr., O52328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lem Morris Kelly, O32378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John James Petro, Jr., O32380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glendale Draper Gallaher, O43925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hugh Bedford, Jr., O43926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Crawford Dean Lyons, O43924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Batlin, O43927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bill James Tutin, O32381, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Sexton Simmerman, O40376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Terrell Shaver, O43928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Adams Laing, O43929, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hallie Augustus Matlock, O40377, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Oscar Witherspoon, Jr., O40378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis John Aebischer, O32384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Allard Helfert, O32385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Josiah Borden Miller, O32386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clifford Rountree, O32387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey Seymour Browne, 3d, O38992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee S. Kaufman, O32388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Bell Erb, O40379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Robert Tam, O43933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Rufus Shepherd, O40380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Becker, O32392, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Joseph Scannon, O32393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Mario John Zecca, O32396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oliver Jacob Helmuth, O32395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beryl Leon Boyce, O32400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Eli Delnore, O32398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delbert Leonard Bjork, O32399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sterling Henry Abernathy, O32401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Swarts Devore, Jr., O32404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thornton Edgar Pfaff, O32405, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Wilson Jacks, Jr., O32407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. C. W. McConnell, O40381, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Jack Alloyse Requarth, O22189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walden Francis Woodward, O22190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Carpenter Dewey, O22191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert William Frink, O22192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Merril Hoover, O22193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Joseph Genetti, O22194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Edward Hassenfelt, O22195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Richard Luczak, O22196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Robert Donaldson, O22198, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Harley Lumry, O22199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Gorn, O22200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Dowe Vieman, O22201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Francis Slaughter, O22202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kurt Gustav Radtke, O22203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Pettingell Samson, O22204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Alphonse Hussey, O22205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Murphy Williams, O22206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Gool Pavey, O22207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mylo LeRoy Heen, O22208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Myers, O22209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Enos Wood, Jr., O22210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Richard Christofk, O22212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Irving Pray, O22214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Ahee, O22215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Hamilton Ragsdale, O22217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Balish, O22218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Kenneth Marshall, O22219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Murray Dean Dougan, O22221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Newton Shigley, O22222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Reeves, O22223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Earl Lay, O22224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Thomas Schooley, O22225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Martin Bachman, O22226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Edward Miller, O22227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Allen Sharrer, O22229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Franklin Bishop, O22231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Hector Cross, O22232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Farris Ludeman, O22233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Taylor Beelman, O22235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard George Jewett, O22236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Albert Swatta, O22237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glen S. Waterman, O22239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Calvin Oliver Smith, O22240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Jones Merrill, O22241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jesse Price Moorefield, O22244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Gunnard Carlson, O22246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Fleetwood Crocker, O32410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harlan Moore Freeman, O32409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Landon Greaud Cox, O32413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edmund Victor Harnstrom, O32414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Chester Emmett Canine, O43949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Kendall Harrold, O32417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon August Miller, O40386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Gray, O40387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Louis Lossen, O32420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil Delbert Sasse, O32421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lee Kinson, O43955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carl August Peterson, O52344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ripley Bruce, Jr., O32423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. James Dee Gallagher, O43958, United States Army.

×Capt. George Leslie Morelock, Jr., O43960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Abraham, O32427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Urban Edward Rohr, O38996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Calvin Siddell Hannum, O32428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles George Micheau, O32429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

1st Lt. Crawford Henry Lydle, Jr., O52349, U. S. Army.

Capt. David Carl Turner, O43965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Don Leigh Husman, O32431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Joseph Petrilli, O32433, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William John Penly, O22300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Leonard Erickson, O32434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Barnes Marshall, O52350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Norman Hale, O43938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lloyd Jorgenson, O32436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Edwin Fisher, O32435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Baum, O38997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Wendell Reynolds, O43969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Amel Lavaine Cox, O43971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Ainsworth Hamilton, O52352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Washington Johnson, O52351, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas McKnight, O32439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Richard Koshko, Jr., O43974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Preston Dawson, Jr., O38998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

1st Lt. Robert William Wildey, O52353, U. S. Army.

Lt. Col. Ralph Eugene Hood, O32443, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ross Young, O39001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Luther Wenbert Murphy, O43979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Andrew Reid Duvall, Jr., O32444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Bernard Sellers, O43981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Newman Smith, O32449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Theodore Hays Wineman, O52354, United States Army.

Maj. Max McCord, O52355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Walter McWhinney, O32450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Simms, O32451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Evans Ackner, O32452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Melvin Layman, Jr., O32455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morris Dantzker, O43992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Pierce Reeves, Jr., O43996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Ashton Ross, O39003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lon Devere Marlowe, Jr., O32459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Kenneth Doyle, O44000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Herman Dickey 3d, O44001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arden Isaiah Lewis, O43360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lee Richardson, O44002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Parker Warner, O32462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Walter Taylor, O32465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Myron Gray, O44007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Franklin Giles, O56899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Harold Kyckelhahn, O32467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Charles Wilkins, O44009, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Arnold Rodgers, O44010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edwin Arthur, O32468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bevelle Taliaferro Brown, O32469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elwyn James Fonk, O44015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Dallas Burns, O32472, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Jackson Rushing, O40391, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Edward Babcock, O44018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lionel Friedman, O32474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edgar Seth Sanders, O52359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Vinning Clark, O40393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Glazier Piland, O52360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Edward Eitt, O32477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Raymond Russell, O32478, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederick Louis Schumm, O32479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Keith, Jr., O32482, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Merle Fondren, O32481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Nelson Jean, O22632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Denwood Thomte, O22633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Sewanee Baskin, O22634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Otto Johnson, O22635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Gordon Ratliff, O22637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Sylvan Preston Lay, O22638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ira Bertram Richards, Jr., O22639, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Allen Dees, O22641, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald William Coons, O22642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Charles McCrum, O22643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Reeve Bruyere, 3d, O22644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Dunlap Hill, O22645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lemuel Edwin Pope, O22646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vladimir Bohdan Kovac, O22647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Wheeler Downey, Jr., O22649, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Parrish McQuail, O22651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Lee Copley, O22652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Johnson Grant Lemmon, O22653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Ehlert Rex Rawie, O22654, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Sterling Charles Holmes, O22655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Hastings, O22658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Snow, O22659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willys Hicks Pearson, O22660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Ezra Shoemaker, O22661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Robert Moore, Jr., O22662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Latta Mann, O22663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col William Overton Gall, O22664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Heasty, Jr., O22665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Avery W. Masters, O22666, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Louis Thorkelson, O22667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Longwell Foster, O22669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Frederick Beaty, O22672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Hasselback, Jr., O22673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Burns Barry, Jr., O22674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Buck White, O22675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Franklin Kent, O22676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Logan Irby, O22678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Clay Holloway, Jr., O22679, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morgan Garrott Roseborough, O22681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Cantrell, O22682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dorsey Elwood McCrory, O22683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Dayle Balliett, O22684, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aleck Francis MacDonald, O22685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Grady Ford Rials, O44022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Christy, O44023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Norman Ewing Cole, O32484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Gerald Lucey, O44025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis Kaiser, O52323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Frederick MacLeod, O44026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Cross Gee, O44027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Whittick, O32487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude William White, O44029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Elmer Rousek, Jr., O44030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Schaeffer Bare, O32488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Norman Ward, Jr., O32491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harrison John Merritt, O32492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. William John Besser, O44039, United States Army.

Capt. Earl Willard Ralf, O44037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Christopher Worth Chaney, O32496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Brubaker, Jr., O32497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Edward Hall, Jr., O32330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John MacLean, O44042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Royce Lester Eaves, O32499, United States Army.

Maj. John Temple Heston, O52371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Denton Callaway, O32502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford John Van Sickle, O32505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Page Hudson Brownfield, O40395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Lewis Norwood, O44048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Halland William Hankel, O44049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Thomas Behnken, Jr., O44052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Getty Fairchild, O40396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linden Kinder Cannon, Jr., O32509, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Allison Shaw, O32511, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Arthur Williams, O32513, Army of the United States, (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Winston Landes, O40397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lewis Brooks, Jr., O44054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Greene Risley, O32516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Getchell Maynard, O32515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harauld Dean Langham, O32518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Cannon Bradford, O32519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Winford Leonard, O44053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Victor Scott Kendall, Jr., O32521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Virgil Glenn Brown, O40398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis James Wadle, O44059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Herbert Rankin, O32522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Erik William Jordahn, O44060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wesleigh Molloy, O32526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edwin Carruth, O44064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles E. Surber, O32528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brian Odell Montgomery, O32529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Hodges, O44065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Newhall Page, O32530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Dean Dickson, O32531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Earle Tardy, O32532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Stuart Werngren, O39006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gordon Bennett, O40400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Aloise Luszki, O44013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Paul Killman, O32538, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Whitfield, O32537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Girard Di Meo, O44074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Reid Raber, O44076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Calvin Featherston, O44075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Warren Moon, O32540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ross Putnam Frasher, O40401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glenn Arthur Welde, O40402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Aloysius Sullivan, O44080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Francis Byron Mills, O32544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Keagle Buck, O32545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rodney Douglas Brown, O32547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Michael Miletich, O32546, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frank Lester Lear, O39007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Benjamin McGrath, O32548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Conn, O32550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Wayne Engelland, O32551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thad Sam Oliver, Jr., O32553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tony Francis Perpich, O32552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lilbourne Wayne Sherrod, O40403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Theron Strickland, O44085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cleo Vernon Hadley, O44086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Raymond Brice, O32557, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jack Victor Doriot, O52386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Albert Laliberte, O32558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Philip Heller, O52389, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harold Wayne Gaines, O32559, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hudson Christie Hill, O32560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Kenneth Charles Johnson, O44090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernst Fredrich Liebmann, O44091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Oswald Miller, O40404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Raymond Bernard Graeves, Jr., O32563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Baker Hallums, O32564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. C. Craig Cannon, O39008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Albert Walsworth, O32565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Francis Smith, O40406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Laurence Edmund Chloupek, O44094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Martin Trauger, O44095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Terrell Dunn, O32612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Seely Hutchinson, Jr., O32611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Melvin Thompson, O44098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Collyer Smith, O32572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Byron Gordon, O32573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Pickering Nichols, O40407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Leonard Lerner, O44103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Shelton E. Lollis, O32575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clyde Morton, O39010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roger Whiting, O32577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel David Wilder, O44104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Judson Hyde, O44109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×First Lt. James Gordon Russell, O32580, United States Army.

Capt. Paul Kinnison, O32581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Stuart Crossman, O32583, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Craig Beechley, O44115, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Franklin Melvin, O32585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Army).

Maj. Clem Garrison Hailey, O40409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. LaMar Arthur DeSpain, O32587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. James Franklin Carney, O52396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Gilbert Raff, O32588, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Frank McPherson Bullard, O44121, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bill Buerkle, O52399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Harry Daubert, O32593, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Bartley Axum, O52400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Broderick Huntley, O22714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elbert Mack Sleeker, O22716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Emil Barker, O22717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elbert Emerson Stickels, O22718, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Alan MacGregor, O22719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dean Edgar Painter, O22720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Lee Pitney, O22721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Walter Stephenson, Jr., O22722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Shacter, O22724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Hubbard Strong, O22725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Wilhoit Stulting, O22726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick Boisseau Watson, O22727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel McCord Hollis, O22728, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Charles Mautz, O22729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Nelson Eddy, O22730, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Arnold Kreidberg, O22733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lucius Walton, O22734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Belton O'Connell, O22735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wright Williams, O22736, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilson Maxwell Hawkins, O22737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Armistead Robison Harper, O22738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene John White, O22739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Xavier Bradley, O22740, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ellison Hart, O22742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thornton Jones, O32595, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paull Alonzo Bane, Jr., O32596, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Sylvester Jones, O52403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ogene Pitts, O44126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lyndon Peter Kramer, O40413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Asher Stone, O40414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank John Wasson, Jr., O39011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Winston Anson Jones, O32602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gerald Woodrow Gray, O44130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herald Heyman Smith, O32603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Elliott Renaud, O44131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mildridge Frazier Vaughn, O40415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Franklin Edward Duda, O52407, United States Army.

Maj. John Thomas Lorenz, O52408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Anton Barten, O32605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Monroe Marlow, O32606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Francis Hamele, O32610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alfred Knute Clark, O32608, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Martin Davis, O52410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Osborn Cooper, O44135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Foxx, O40418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Cecil Fralish, O32668, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Grover Chester Richards, Jr., O44139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wallace McKee Kendrick, O32615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Guy Luckett Campbell, O32616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Michael Phillip Elcano, O44142, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Selby McKay Frank, O32620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Jenkins Halsey, Jr., O32619, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Davis Sydnor, Jr., O32618, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Harold Duckworth, O32621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Arthur Allen, Jr., O32622, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frank Taylor, O44143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Edwin Thomas Rhatigan, O52412, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Mitchell Dill, O32626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Christian Neumann, Jr., O44145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence William Drye, O52413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Silas Rice, O32628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Halsted Graham, O40420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Gaines Stark, O40421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byron Escar Cowart, O52415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Lee Harllee, O44146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Blake Stark, O32633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Myron Laithwaite Brewer, O32495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Allen Marshall, O52416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jim Alva Campbell, O52417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lorenzo Albino Mella, Jr., O52418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elba Walter Bowen, O32634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Victor Emile Morissette, O44149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roderick Dermott Eason, O52420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Tommins Adler, O32635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Howard Dunning, O52421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Southward Robbins, O32636, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hiram Madison Merritt, O32638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Timothy Augustus Moran, O32640, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel William Rachal, O44159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Merrill Farmer, O44158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Samuel Hilton, O32643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×First Lt. Nat Giambelluca, O44161, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Morris Bailey Montgomery, O44162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Elmer Bates, O32644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Barclay Wolff, O32645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Tom Walker Barnett, O44164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Eugene Long, O40422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Mark, O32647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Franklin Marshall, O32648, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Rutledge Greer, Jr., O32651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Frederick Ottinger, O39012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Clancy Cassaday, O32653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Simpson Keisler, O32657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Fairfax Bayard, O44169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Minot Boyd Dodson, O32660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Giles Houghton Kidd, O32659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Lovell Hooper, O32662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Joseph McIntyre, Jr., O44171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Ramey Keller, O33248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hayden John Price, O39013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. LaRue Henry Ritter, O40424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Buckley, O52429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Robert Duffy, O52428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Miller Hartman, Jr., O44177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Farren, O32670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Martin Gettys, O44181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Milton Dillender, Jr., O32671, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carmon Lavon Clay, O32673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frank Goodwin Hubbard, O52430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. John William Hughes, Jr., O32676, United States Army.

Capt. Emile Joseph Bussolati, O32677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Wayne Sunderlin, O32678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Heinrich, O39014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew Richard Joseph Giuffre, O40425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Daniel Wise, Jr., O32682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edwin Kirk, O32681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harold McCord, O32683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Legare Jenkins, Jr., O32684, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Weaver Henderson Gaines, O32686, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

×Capt. Nathan Guelzow Schmidt, O44188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S Army).

Capt. Marshell Garrett McBee, O39015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Bruce Jeffress, O44190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Gilbert Moran, O52434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Herber, O32689, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adolph Joseph Gondek, O44196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Richard Radzwich, O32691, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Henry Murphy, O44201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Garcia Lundy, O32692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merle Lee Goodrich, O32693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Willett Wood, O44203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Henry Birch, O32696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Baker Clark, O32695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raleigh Osborn Worrell, O32697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas William Alvey, O32698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Lyle, O32700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Douglas Patterson, O32702, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Storey McMillan, O32703, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Welsh, O32706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry John Roberts, O44208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Lawrence Steinbacher, O32709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Hugh Alden Hurt, O44210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Felix Edward Tharpe, O32204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charis Roger Sparra, O32712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Otis Ross, O52442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hays Hammond, Jr., O44213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clifford Freeman, O44214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Elmer Godfrey, O52444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Charles Kingsley, O32717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Jack Hill Carter, O52445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Lawrence Yerby, O32719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard German Murdock, O44221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Barton Ormsbee Baker, O44222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Gerard James Grogan, O40429, United States Army.

Maj. Clifford Hayes Ruffner, Jr., O39017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milford Walter Wood, O32723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Lewis Lucas, O40249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Edward Carter, O40430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Benjamin Ross, Jr., O32724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur William Ries, O44226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Byron Owen, O32725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Eric Blumensaadt, O32727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leon Herbert Rainville, C32726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Murray Parker, O39018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Jonas Alvin Vilhauer, O32732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cyrus Reyon Shockey, O44234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Kenneth Edison Pell, O40432, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Talton Woodrow Long, O32735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Willis Elmo Smitherman, O52455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Wendell Wright Gaffney, O44235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Orville Emil Bloch, O32736, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lyles Snyder, O52456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Charles Wall, O32738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Alfred Joseph Montrone, O32737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Ford Hoffman, O44240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ronald Watson, O52459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hal Hardenbergh, O32740, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Harry Verner Helm, O32743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Flagg Murray, Jr., O32744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Richard Riddle, O32745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Benjamin Beckham, O32747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Dexheimer, O32749, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Maj. Lee George Kays, O32750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oakley McCurdy Lamb, O32751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Chase Gleason, O44245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Graham Buhmann, O32748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Irvin Norris, O44246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Bernhardt Schuppener, O52465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Judson Spencer, O44248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Slifer Leidy, O32755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Walcott Watson, O32756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julius Willie Levy, O52466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Hantzes, O52467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Willhite Hannah, O32760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Edgar Stuart, O52468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Wright, O32765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Thomson Guth, O32768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Wells Johnson, O44258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oliver Glen Stutzman, O32771, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert William Hartung, O44261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Aubrey Wolfe, O44262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Ariel Swope, O32774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Leonard Dunn, O40437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Clayburn Tipton, O32777, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence August Mette, Jr., O32776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Ewing Foster, O52471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic N. Oettinger, Jr., O32782, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Preston Stockwell, O40438, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Laurence Alvin Johnson, O33361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Edward Harper, O32783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Andre Harry Nelson, O44271, United States Army.

Maj. Chester Herman Johnson, O44273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Hunt, O32789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marshall Bigelow Allen, O44275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Craig, O52479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John William Engl, O44278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Robert Harold Ward, O44280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy Clifford Emery, Jr., O52481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Nelson Axtell, O44281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvis Morrow Howell, O32797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Curtis Allan, O32798, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Frederick Cook, Jr., O32801, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Edward Twyon, O32805, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Samuel Dillon, O32807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carlyle Hegsted Shurtleff, O44288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Gordon Elwood McQuain, O40441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Taft Benson, O52484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Norman Davis, O32808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick Francis Cassidy, O32809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Ernest Meisell, O32812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Chester Herman Hancock, O44292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Thomas Wiley, Jr., O40442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Asa Glass, Jr., O44293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Henry Dawson, O39023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bristow Sanford Hopper, O32815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Sanders, O44296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clark Vincent Telquist, O40443, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kermit Herbert Rosenberg, O52487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Russell O'Grady, O40444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Wilson, O32820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Albert Henry Woodman, O32822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Witus Thybony, O39024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Prior, O44304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Smith McElhenny, O39025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Eddison Wade, O32824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Garland May, O32825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Henry Harrison Hewitt, O32827, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Elmore Dalness, O44310, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Newton Lingenfelter, O32829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Stack Hastings, O32830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Martin Ruck, O33049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Samuel Stoneback, O44316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Leo Davis, O44317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Beverly Risque, O40446, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

1st Lt. William Donald Canfield, O44318, United States Army.

Maj. Fred Louis Eistrup, O44319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Wilson White, O40448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elwood Dale McSherry, O44322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

1st Lt. Larry Gene McPherson, O52498, United States Army.

Maj. Eben Randolph Jones, O32836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allen Law Morrison, O32837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Wellman Duvall, O32842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Ryno Yourtee, Jr., O44329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank Alexander Penn, O32843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter John Hewitt, O44332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Anthony Henry Ortenzi, O33383, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Goldsmith Thompson, O32844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Lyle Eugene Hershey, O52502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Rains White, O32847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Yarnell Kimball, O32849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd Dayton Colvin, O32853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Duane David Davis, O39026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe McAdoo Willis, O32854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Frederick Langland, O52505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Einar Watten, O44342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Kenneth Bunney, O52507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. David Hugh Darlington, O33440, United States Army.

×Lt. Col. Otho Tindall Winstead, O44345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Aubrey Sanford, O32857, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harlan Veatch Logsdon, O44347, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lawrence Dean, Jr., O32860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. William George Barry, O40452, United States Army.

Maj. Harold Gross Stover, O32845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Lewis Lillyman, O32861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Everett Osthues, O52512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Tyler Gilbert, O44348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Jackson Chatham, O52513, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alexander Anthony Zaresky, O44353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Victor Allen Davis, O40453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charles Elwood Conway, O44354, United States Army.

Maj. Leroy French Clark, Jr., O32863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beverly Thomas Richardson, O32864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lewis Charles Spinney, O44357, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Walker Felton Nolan, O52516, United States Army.

Capt. Russell Carl Krueger, O32865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Emmett McKay Lewis, O32866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Thomas Avery, Jr., O32867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Reed Behnke, O32869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Gordon Evans, O52521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Paul Blakely, O32870, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allan Lee Swaim, O32871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Preston Wintrode Wyand, O44363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward Cook, Jr., O32876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ray Frederick Coyle, Jr., O52523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leopold Frederick Hofinger, O44368, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Hoover, O44370, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Armour Stewart Armstrong, O44372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Denton Hickman, O44374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Carl Edwin Strauss, O44375, United States Army.

Maj. Joe Melvin Dietzel, O32881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Christopher Raymond Keegan, O44383, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Tuttle Barnaby, Jr., O44385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lee Baker, O40456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Trevor Eifler Williams, O32883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Willie Lee Tate, O32885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Kruse Kolster, O32886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Archie James Griggs, O44389, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Evert Cecil Way, O32888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Emil Schulten, Jr., O40457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floyd Harrison Long, Jr., O32889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reino Oscar Lehtonen, O52532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aaron Ellsworth Blewett, O32893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Julius Rozamus, O32892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Boothe, Jr., O52533, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Rigel, O32894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Leroy Hicks, O52535, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allan Langdon Leonard, Jr., O32698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Truett Blacklock, O32899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wallace Aux, O44399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arley Leroy Outland, O44400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harlos V. Hatter, O32901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Harrington Griffith, O44403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Henry Franklin Prysi, O32904, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Ernest Von Pawel, O52541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Max Zaumeyer, O32906, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edward Hudson, O44410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roosevelt Thomas Plummer, O44412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Lee Huffaker, O32911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Frederick Hooper, O39028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Ernest Beda, O32916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Martin Scott, Jr., O52544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Evans McHenry, O52545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Edward Murray, O44421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Joseph Flanigan, O44422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Lawrence Cormier, O32923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Clayton McLaughlin, O44423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Kenneth Nelson, O44426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Stewart, O32925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles Prunty, O32924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Clifton Brown, O22888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

×Lt. Col. Alan Edward Gee, O22889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Lt. Col. John William Burfening, O22891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Lt. Col. John Anthony Graf, Jr., O22892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bellows Hazeltine, Jr., O22896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Erway Dunham, Jr., O22897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Francis Dixon, Jr., O22899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ashod Michael Ahmajan, O22900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Joseph Fuller, O22901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Francis O'Neil, O22902, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Gordon Forbes, O22903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Richard Peterson, O22904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Stuart Parker, O22907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Harold Goodrich, O22911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Aiken Flanders, O22912, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Thomas Podufaly, O22913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Leroy Jacobs, O22915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clayton Allen Rust, O22916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Wilson Penney, O22917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Duvall Quaid, O22919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Maurice Clock, O22920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carter Pfeil, O22921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Richard Sullivan, O22923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Landon Haseman, O22925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Free, O22926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Gaylord Cook, O22927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Eugene Gunster, Jr., O22928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Hobart Krauss, O22932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thaddeus Michael Nosek, O22934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Joseph Legere, Jr., O22937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oval Hale Robinson, O22938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul David Phillips, O22939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Harvey Banks, O22940, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Harvey Roedy, O22941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Carmin Noble, O22942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Morris Rogers, O22943, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Bunyan Corbly, Jr., O22944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Lovell Elliott, O22945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Dixon Arnold, O22946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cuyler Llewellyn Clark, Jr., O22947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerhard Evans Brown, O22948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Minahan, O22949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Regis Shanahan, O22950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Pershing Strauss, O22951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Irving Dice, O22952, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edmund Harrison, Jr., O22953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Urey Woodson Alexander, O22954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Payne Francisco, O22955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow Maurice Smith, O22960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Roger Guy, O22961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ray Williams, O22962, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Montgomery Moore, O22963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wendell John Coats, O22964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Ferrell Winton, Jr., O22966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Bernard Ambrose Ferry, O22967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Jacob Yeager, O22969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Mayo, Jr., O22970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Renola, O22971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence William Clapsaddle, Jr., O22972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morris Loeb Shoss, O22973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Moore Brewer, O22975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth McRae Lemley, O22976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Harvey Spengler, O22977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Leroy Shoemaker, Jr., O22978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Nils Martin Bengtson, O22979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Hamilton Kyle, O22981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Barron Chandler, Jr., O22982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Titus Vanderhoef, O22984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Silvasy, O22985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Haldeman Baumer, O22987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Marti Benson, O22991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Augustine Miley, Jr., O22993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Wendt, Jr., O22995, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Talmage Marsh, Jr., O22996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rolland Woodrow Hamelin, O22997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Edward Gushurst, O22998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Raymond Weir Millican, O23000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Vivian Bennett, O23001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Allen Cunningham, Jr., O23003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Woodrow Wilson Vaughan, O23004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Willard Walters, Jr., O23006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Daniel Carnahan, O23007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Merrick Patten, O23008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Fate, O23010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Kirkbride Taylor, O23011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Fahey Black, O23012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robinson Riley Norris, O23014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Harrison Mullin, O23015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burdett Eugene Haessly, O23016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Huntington Monroe, Jr., O23017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj Hobart Burnside Pillsbury, O23019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Louis Hoffmann, O23023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Manley Calbraith Perry, O23024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Jacob Beiser, O23025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Boyle Stewart, O23028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Simonton Brice, Jr., O23029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Henderson Scott, Jr., O23030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Joseph Crown, O23031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett DeWitt Light, O23033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Alexander Shaunesey, Jr., O23036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Andrew O'Brien, O23037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Woodfin Hobson, Jr., O23038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerry Spears Addington, O23041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Milton Orman, O23046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otis Maxwell Ulm, O23047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Henry Hendrickson, O23048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dennis Ladislaus Barton, O23049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Griffith Baker, O23051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Levin Belt, O23053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Thompson Simpson, Jr., O23054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Fellenz, O23055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John MacNair Wright, Jr., O23057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Campbell Cassibry, O23058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Loring Clay, O23059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Paulick, O23060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Jerome Delaney, O23067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Roscoe Kintner, O23068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wendell Burley Sell, O23069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frank Armand de Latour, Jr., O23073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Bowman Hargis, Jr., O23076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Langworthy Beaudry, O23077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Kieser Britt, O23078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Elroy Tyler, O23079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Hobbs Fraser, O23080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Carroll Haggard, O23081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Herbert Rosen, O23082, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donovan Paul Yeuell, Jr., O23083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stewart Lawrence McKenney, O23084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edison Albert Lynn, Jr., O23085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertil Andrew Johnson, O23086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alan Phillip Thayer, O23087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Pidgeon, O23089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic Watson Oseth, O23090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jordan Joseph Wilderman, O23092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Harold Nelson, O23093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Stevens Harnett, O23094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Frederick Kreitzer, O23096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Aber, O23097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Martin Strock, O23099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Hume Woodward, O23102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Thorne Tuck, O23104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Osmund Alfred Leahy, O23106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Butler Bonham, O23107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Anthony Lotozo, O23109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Alexander Aubrey, O23110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul S. Cullen, O23111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Frederick Gordon, O23112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Kenney, O23114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edmund Collins, O23116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Francis Bavaro, O23117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Frederick Horton, O23118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Olin Lee Bell, O23119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Mead Bowlby, Jr., O23120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Scott Montgomery Case, O23121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Edward Kramer, O23122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rowland Herman Renwanz, O23123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wilbourne Milner, O23124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Schuyler Hardin, O23126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jules David Yates, O23127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sanford Patrick England, O23129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Goodnow Stoddard, Jr., O23130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Maedler, O23132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip John Moore, 3d, O23135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ronald Maurice Kolda, O23136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Scott Greene, Jr., O23137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Jefferson Turner, Jr., O23138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salvo Rizza, O23139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert McLean, O23140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Deber Townsend, O23141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Herold Wohner, O23142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wing Fook Jung, O23144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Corwin Chamberlain, O23145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelius Arthur Murphy, O23146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Michael Rooney, O23147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Thomas Hennessy, O23143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Zahrobsky, O23149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Anthony O'Brien, Jr., O23152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Christie Emery, O23153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delbert Earle Munson, O23156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roderick Wetherill, O23158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Arthur Robert Barry, O23160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bryce Frederic Denno, O23161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Russell Dodderidge, O23164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Leo Clement, O23167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dan Porter Briggs, O23169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Ford Prioleau Fuller, Jr., O23170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Lionel Bierman, O23175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas O'Keefe, O23176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel McClure Goodwin, O23177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carroll Cameron, O23178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace James Hackett, O23179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Barbour Byrne, O23181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lester Frank Schockner, O23182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Lt. Col. John Dibble, Jr., O23183, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Henry Bates, O23184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Ami Stella, O23185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Bert Lane, O23187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Eugene Farthing, Jr., O23189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Bell Chandler, O23189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George John Bayerle, Jr., O23192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Park Richards, O23194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kerr Roberts, Jr., O23195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Hans Mueller, O23196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Balthis, Jr., O23199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland George Cagwin, O23200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Henry Muller, O23201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Silvio Emil Gasperini, Jr., O23203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harmon Porter Rimmer, O23204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James David Loewus, O23205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Fielding Lewis, O23206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Rockwell Crocker, O23207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Myers Kasper, O23210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Meszar, O23211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Thomas Cassidy, O23213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lee Watson Fritter, O23217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Orville McDonald, O23218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sanford Harvey Webster, O23222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Frederick Williams, Jr., O23224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Deming Lucas, Jr., O23225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Washington England, Jr., O23226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis O'Donnell, O23228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Anthony Schmaltz, O23229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gilford Dalton Green, O23231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Chittenden Mandell, O23234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emory Sherwood Adams, Jr., O23235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Gordon Malone, O23237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Ware Mabee, O23241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Florian John Erspamer, O23242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Eugene Oglesby, O23244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Theodore Biswanger, Jr., O23245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bidwell Moore, O23248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thaddeus Philip Floryan, O23249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Dale Epley, O23250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Webster Hough, O23251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony Lewis Paul Wermuth, O23252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Donald Budz, Jr., O23253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Talman Watrous, Jr., O23254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Durward Henry Galbreath, O23255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jodie Gibson Stewart, Jr., O23256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Eben French Swift, O23258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Weisman Davis, O23259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Neville Mackin, 3d, O23260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Alexander Shagrin, O23261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Gonzaga Mendez, Jr., O23262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Joseph Gildart, O23264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sidney Vincent Bingham, Jr., O23269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Bernard Morrissey, O23270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mark Clair Baugher Klunk, O23273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Victor George Conley, O23276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Merrill Gleszer, O23278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Lee Mastran, O23279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Drummond Swank, O23281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Norman Holm, O23282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Sorg Reinecke, Jr., O23284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Edward Miner, O23285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Raleigh, O23287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Dunphy Fitzpatrick, O23288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Julian Aaron Cook, O23290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Thomas Larkin, O23293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Page Egerton Smith, O23294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Force Daniels, O23295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William White Saunders, O23296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Henry Harley Arnold, Jr., O23299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Hatfield Merchant, O23301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Moffet Freudendorf, O23303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Joseph Manzolillo, O23304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj Benjamin Franklin Delamater 3d, O23305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Jack Borden, O23306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Robert Cibotti, Jr., O23309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Thomas Devlin, O23314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Newlin Ross, O23315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Landon Albert Witt, O23317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bertram Coontz, O23319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton David Lederman, O23320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Grinnell White, O23326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Jennings Floyd, O23328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Kuziv, Jr., O23330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Bennett, O23331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Cicero Fogle, O44428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Douglas Gorrie Alexander, O32927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Burrell Hewette, O44430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Rasmus Anderson, O40461, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Beals Scudder, O36179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Francis Morand, O32930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Joseph Bee, O44437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Acton Kirk, Jr., O44442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Meade Parker, Jr., O32936, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burkhardt Marshall Senn, O62560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ivan George Phillips, O32941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Winston Lewis Olson, O32940, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Reeves Garton, O32945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Paul D'Arezzo, O23333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Freund, O23334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hilton Densley, O32946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Helmuth Simmons, 039029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Camden Page Fortney, Jr., O32949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce Braid, O32950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard James, O40463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles Rohan, O32954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Courtney Heald, O44454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Neil Potter Whitney, O32955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Neil Sands, O32957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick William Baum, O23385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Herbert Batte, O23401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Walter Wright Lange, O23402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Stanley Griffith, Jr., O23403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Washburn Bruneau, O23404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Cook Tredennick, O23405, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Conrad Miller, O23406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Hall Livingston, O23408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hunter LeGear Stockton, O23409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jene Earl Mills, O23410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow Bryan Sigley, O23411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Pratt Alexander Warren, O23412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Randall King, O23413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Gray Platt, O23414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Harness, O23415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Denisevich, O23416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Archie Hatten, O23417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Gilbert Warren Curl, O23418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Lincoln Brassel, O23420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Lester Ramme, O23421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Cobb Benjamin, O23422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Blair Green, O23423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harlan Bull, O23424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Burbank Webster, Jr., O23425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emerson Wallace Grant, O23427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Blatchford Robinson, O23428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clifford Ellwood Lippincott, O23429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Dana Young, O23430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Francis Carter, O23431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Kethley Gillmore, O23432, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyril Dean Sterner, O23434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Walton Walker, O23435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Alvin Kersting, O23436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Walker Sample, O23437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Benjamin Grant Taylor, Jr., O23438, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Richard Irvine Manning, O23439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Addis Emmet Moseley, Jr., O23441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Sheridan Eldridge, O23442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Misha Nicholas Kadick, O23444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Storey Sandiland, O23445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Houghton Collart, O23447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Scandrett, O23448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrel Gee Costello, O23449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bergen Brokaw Hovell, O23450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Henry Symbol, O23452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Samuel Daley, Jr., O23453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Howard Ressijac, O23454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jack Finney Lane, O23456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Mix Gilbert, O23457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas O'Connor Blakeney, O23458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Jackson Natzel, O23459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Hammond Walker, Jr., O23460, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otto Bismarck Cloudt, Jr., O23462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Diedrich Hansen, O23468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emil Paul Eschenburg, O23469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Arn, O23470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Cone Mahoney, Jr., O23486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Chester Goers, O23487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. David William Iunghuhn, O23488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Darrel Cavness, O23489, Army og the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Bennett Johnson, O23490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Parker Ewan Connor, Jr., O23491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Pancratius Fagan, O23496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Unverferth, O23499, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Paul Edward Alban, O23500, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Metcalf, O23501, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl William Edwards, O23502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bert Perrin, O23503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Thomas Shelby, O23504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Henry Lorenz, Jr., O23505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Christopher Wilkinson, Jr., O23512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arden Charles Brill, O23514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Washington Shivers, Jr., O23515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Clyde Stump, O23516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Cecil Evans, Jr., O23517, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Ernest Rice, O23518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Fogg Twombly 3d, O23519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tom Spencer Phair, O23520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Toxell Olin Mason, O23522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Franklin Mynderse, O23523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merle Reed Preble, O23524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Hall, O23525, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Alexander Schendel, Jr., O23526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Charles Durgan, O23527, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Albert Hansen, O23528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thompson Horner, Jr., O23530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Milton Hightower 3d, O23531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hal Dale McCown, O23532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh William McClary, O23533, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Marion Brumfiel, O23534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Henry John Richter, O23536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin O'Connor, Jr., O23539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Harold Lahlum, O23541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Condit Ingalls, O23542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vallard Cassius Smith, O23543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Pershing Brown, O23544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Clark Manson, O23545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Claire Tillson, O23546, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nye Maguet Scofield, O23547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Greenwood, Jr., O23548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Law Bryan, O23549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Melvin Desmond Clark, O23550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Howard Bayer, O23551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Marvin Kinzer, O23552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Brinkley Ramsey, O23553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Donham Higgins, O23554, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Zim E. Lawhon, O23555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bradford Rosson, O23556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elgin Gilbert Radcliff, O23558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Somer Shapland, O23560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Harry Pell, O23561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Alexander Edens, O23563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Vincent Wilson, O23564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irvin Albert Johnson, O40464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Newell Barber, O52568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Charles Smith, O44457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Kenneth Smith, O32959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Farrar Bristol, O44459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Wayne Mather, O44458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Raymond Budge, O52569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Clifford Melius, O44464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Pearson, O44466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bernhard Randle, O52570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Riley, O40465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Osborne Romeo Rumph, O40466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ledford Lain, O32967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Davis Preston, Jr., O32969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl J. Brown, O39031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Allen Poe McCarthy, Jr., O32970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Gleason Cornett, O32972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Robert Hansen, O52571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Alexander Higgins, O40468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lashlie Utley, O32977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Delbert Lewis Jellum, O44478, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman I. Zimmerman, O52576, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Warren Sisco, O52579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max Hobart Gerard, O32982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Albert Newlin, O32983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Colmer Whitting, O44487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Adrain Michaelis, O44486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Neal Tudor, O39032, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harrison Crowe, O32986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Clark Bingham, Jr., O40471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Vincent Schafbuch, O32990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Morris Scott, Jr., O44501, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. LaVere Henry Strom, O32995, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Hawley Matthews, O32997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leland Henry Langbein, O40473, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Alexander Finlay Berol, O33000, United States Army.

Capt. Jack Schwartzman, O40475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alva Thomas McDaniel, O44521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Andrew Young, Jr., O44524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Robert Guice Kimball, O52599, United States Army.

Maj. William Gamble McIlhiney, O33005, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Clarence Aylesworth, O23614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Dickerson, O23615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Earl Treadway, O23617, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Entwistle Burton, O44526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ben Warner Legare, O39034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tracy James Hardman, O33007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Andrew Roberts, O33008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Lester Alphonso Kearney, O33010, United States Army.

Capt. Robert Hyatt Malone, O33014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ray Goodman Lawrence, O52606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Neil Mackay Matzger, O44539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Carlisle Griffin, O33018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gilbert Martin, O39035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rieder William Schell, O33021, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Roger Harris, O44544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Ballard Porter, O40477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Clifford Pittman, O33022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Reinoldi, O52610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Kenneth Addison, O44547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Robert David Branagan, O33024, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Robert Branson Cobb, O33025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Mayer Wilson, Jr., O33026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clements Blackwell, O40478, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Elmer Pederson, O40479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Marion Conover, Jr., O33029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Patrick Mullarkey, O33030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Eugene Scherer, O33032, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charles John Larsen, O44558, United States Army.

Maj. Walter Henry Clifford, O33033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bernard Benjamin Beck, O40481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Brice Pace, O33035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Walter Lang, O33084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Howard Hanson, O52615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Herberts Bykerk, O33038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vincent Edward Osborne, O33039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene C. Oates, Jr., O44576, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Edwin Cooper Gibson, O44578, United States Army.

Capt. Marcello Worthington Bordley, Jr., O44580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Armand Leo Bellavance, O40484, United States Army.

First Lt. James Dickson Polley 3d, O39086, United States Army.

Capt. Norman Elwood Petty, O33041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Burrows, O23621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hector Carrie, Jr., O33043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Pratt Mason, O44587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold William Athan, O52624, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph James Delaney, O33048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Throckmorton Ghent, O52626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Leon Leva, O52627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anders Olof Wiklund, O44597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Thomas Ryan, O52629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Donald Allen, O52630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Arthur Wooten, Jr., O44599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Capt. Roger Orrsin King, O44600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Vincent Fahey, O33054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Stern Quick, O44602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Calone Bieri, O33055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Alfred Collins, O40486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Fred Brown Mitchell, O52633, United States Army.

Maj. Richard Roberts Prewitt, O44603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward John Cullinan, O44604, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Tillman Hunt, Jr., O33057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Adams Hall, O44605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wah Geung Chin, O33058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Blackburn Stephens, O33060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Driver, O52637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ernest Ward Smith, O33064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Garland Rawlings, O33065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Clifford Wood, Jr., O52640, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Francis Roberts, Jr., O44612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Webster, O33071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Peter Parker, O40487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Golden Bogle, O52642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Goulding Marriott, O33072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carl Frederick Byers, O52643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Thornton Boyle, O33074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karlton Warmbrod, O33077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Gerald Irwin, O40490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lieutenant John Sumstad, O52646, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Robert James Rosa, O33078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thro Haslam, O33079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter John Todd, O40491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Russell Morris, O44626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Louis D'Amelio, O44627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Blades, O33082, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Davis Skipper, O33083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Edwin Niffenegger, O33084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Foster Ball, O39039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank John Kent, O33087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ira Waugaman, Jr., O33086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Holt Green, O33085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alton Randolph Taylor, O33092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Edward Billingsley, O44631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arlin John Kehe, O33094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Strother Branch, O40494, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Henry Merriam, O33095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Percy Leahy, O33097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Thomas Reitz, O33096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dwight Bennett Dickson, O33099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Franklin Clymer, Jr., O40495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Clair Ritze, O44634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Mucha, O44636, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Leon Daman, O40496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fletcher Smith, O44638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred F. White, O33776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Parks Bowden, O33104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Wilson Brotherton, O52658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Gerard Downey, O33106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. William Joseph Flahaven, O40497, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Lewis Robert Adams, O39042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John MacKellar Ansley, O39041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Palmer Hill, O33108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Fletcher, O33111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Harold Schwab, O44646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Alley Thompson, Jr., O33113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Wilbur Manning, O33114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynell William Green, O52665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edwin Dressler, O44653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Emmet Kennington, O23623, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Trabue, O23625, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Love Latta, Jr., O23627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bangs Corbett, O23628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Martin, O23629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Kenneth Warren, Jr., O23630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Barwick Strahan, O23631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Greenwood Thomas, O23632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Michael Delaney, O23633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Marion Smith, O23634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Samuel Wanner, O33116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Babington Macaulay, O32549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lewis Oliver, O33118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nicholas Edward Sloan, O33117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Robert Smith, Jr., O33119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Gilkey Gunning, O52669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold George Creyts, O44662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harris Toney Mitchell, O52670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Capt. Wilbur Oscar Miller, Jr., O33126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Alfred Rasmussen, O40502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Napier Butchart, O44664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Randlett Irving, O33127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Aloysius Murphy, O44667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Merithew Freeman, O40503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Roger McLean, O33136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Hopkins, Jr., O40504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Harold Hughett, O44674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Patterson Dailey, O52682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Nicholas Zarpas, O40505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frank Lobdell Brown, O40506 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Herbert Austin Johnson, Jr., O33140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joseph Higgins, Jr., O33141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Henry Scanlon, O33142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edwin Englehardt, O33143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Dan Adams, O33147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Chandler Fairbanks, 3d, O33145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Boulton Bainbridge Miller, O33148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Eugene Moore, O33149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Frederick Dietrich, O39043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Russell Blair, O33150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant), U. S. Army).

First Lt. Curtis Clarence Batson, O33152, United States Army.

Capt. Herbert Ulieao Sieben, O33153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Woolfolk, 3d, O52687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Kinney Welch, O33155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Benjamin Gray Moore, O33158, United States Army.

Maj. Robert Jacques DeMers, O33159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Denmark C. Jensen, O44694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Norman Edward Meyer, O40511, United States Army.

Capt. Raymond James Wardrop, O44698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur William Delaney, O44697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Edward Bobo, Jr., O33164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herman Carlyle Park, O33163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donal Irvin Medley, O33165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Milton Adolph Pullman, O33166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Carl Johnstone, O44702, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karl Amos Zipf, O39044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Judson Locke, O40512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Edward Tistadt, O44706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Lundberg, Jr., O33170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Francis Smith, O33169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Smalley Greene, O40514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jefferson Melvin Fairley, O52699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Hoover Calahan, O40515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. John Heard Carter, O33174, United States Army.

Maj. Wyatte Gristie Trainer, O40516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jesse Foss Wheeler, Jr., O44719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Walston Scarburgh, O44723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank August Sandholm, O33178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Pearson Buckley Yeager, O33176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Schafer, O39045, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Frederick Cook, O44727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Keith Lincoln Ware, O33181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wesley McAlhany, O40517, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Eugene Goldoni, O33182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Ware Youngman, O33183, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Levene John Weigel, O33187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Jordan Strait, Jr., O44735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Thomas White, O52708, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Howard Walton, O44746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Van Lear Hawes, O52711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Argyle Williams, O44750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Allen Hutchinson, O33200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Everett Porteous, O33203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Kenji Hino, O44753, United States Army.

Maj. Edwin Joseph Gravel, O33206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byrd Sergent, O52717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Nicholas Schoming, O44755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edmond Reichmuth, Jr., O33209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×First Lt. John Florea Austin, O33208, United States Army.

Maj. John Edwin Bowman, O33211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Richard Duddy, O33214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charles Robert Obermeyer, O44759, United States Army.

Capt. Andrew Harold Prudhomme, O33213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Eugene David Manary, O33216, United States Army.

Capt. Joseph Moorman Gardner, O40522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Boyd Lightfoot Brown, O33215, United States Army.

First Lt. Bobby Boyd Larsen, O52722, United States Army.

Maj. David Warren Wright, Jr., O33217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Uel Wilford French, O33218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Guy, O33219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred William Scott, O44765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Craig Anderson, O44768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivey Oscar Drewry, Jr., O33224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Arthur White, O40524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Howard Norvi Zeigler, Jr., O44773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. John Turner Merrill, O23225, United States Army.

Maj. Edwin Murel Sayre, O33220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Willard Andrew Muir, O44774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Duncan Shi, Jr., O33230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Clare Sherrets, O44781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eber Hilliard Thomas, Jr., O44780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Leroy Clancy, O52733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Flake, O40526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Neelian Omar Nelson, O33234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce McRae, O33236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lemuel Chafin Downs, O40527, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Noel Dahlstrom, O33238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Edward DeKemper, O33240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Robert Creel, Jr., O33241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Hamilton Hilliard, O33246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Clarke Archer, O44792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur William Ritchings, O52739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Murray Edward Manley, O52740, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Warren Pruden Davis, O33245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Powell Venable, O33247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Eugene Brewer, O52741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Respess Arnold, O32664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cesides Victor Barberis, O33249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Hiser, O44795, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Anthony Ingerski, O40531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Herbert Sablitz, O40532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Thomas Masao Kobayashi, O52745, United States Army.

Maj. Lanier Dunn Buford, O39046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Spartan Ferrari, O44810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Donald Crow, O52746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edison Eugene Yates, O39047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Dodge Servis, O52747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gillis Metcalfe, O52749, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Charles Costabile, O44814, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony Joseph Wilkowski, Jr., O52748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Harris Wiltamuth, O44817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gerard Conery Adams, O44819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Chester Allan Richardson, O33259, United States Army.

Capt. John Gregory Sisak, O52751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack David Smith, O33260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Owen Davidson, O33262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David McVicker Kyle, O33263, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Frank Freeman, O44823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gilbert Charles Russi, O33264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Page Jones, Jr., O44826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major John Loyd Wilson, Jr., O33268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lehman Holson Johnson, Jr., O44831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlyle Fredrick McDannel, O33271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Harbert, O44833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Edward Nelson, O52756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arlo Albert Miller, O44835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Waldo Jones, O40530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Thomas Hanna, O52758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Gibson Williams, O44841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Charles Ulrich, O44842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hartsell Hamilton Northington, O33275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Chandler Conroy, O33276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Vail Converse, O39050, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Pryse Alcorn, O44844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Dale Nielson, O33280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Conway Lyman Ellers, O39051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Francis Bradshaw, O44846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn David Walker, O33282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Perry Ewing, O33284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Clinton Tarkenton, Jr., O33283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Stanley Joseph Paciorek, O33285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Sylvester Donnell, O33295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles McGuire, O33293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Washington Simon Kuhn, Jr., O44862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Carroll Kelly, O44863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel Wayne Lawson, O33298, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rufus James Cleghorn, O52767, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glenn Marvin Vinquist, O44867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Tracy, O44869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alford Clifford Shellum, O33299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Duda, O52768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Webster Prewitt, O33301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Bickley Stevens, O44872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Bernard Zohn, O52769, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Robert Julian Meeker, O33304, United States Army.

Maj. John Wakeley Patchin, O40537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert William McCartney, O39052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Maitbie Alexander, O33305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sterling Evans Purnell, O44875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Raymond Cay Nelson, O52775, United States Army.

Maj. Paul Albert Troup, Jr., O33306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lewis Duckwall, O39053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Rodney Dean, O44877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benedict Andrew Karnosky, O44878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert David Harback, O44880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Franklin Andrew Werner, O33307, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Donald O'Connor Vaught, O33308, United States Army.

Capt. Howard Gustave Schade, O33311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Julius Holmes, O33317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Davis Pryor, Jr., O33316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Postford Arthur Loiselle, O33321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McCoy Goodman, O33323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Bernie Francis Morgan, O44899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Thomas Neumann, O39054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Luther Gates, O40539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Beauchamp, O44907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Alexander Riegle, O33325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Charles Troescher, O39055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Hubert Jerome Arsenault, O44917, United States Army.

Capt. Jonathan Monroe Kight, O44919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Allan Preston Nesbitt, O52782, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Walter Ryan, O33328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph King, Jr., O33329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Collin Bushway, O33330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gail Bruce Lee, O33332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×First Lt. Joe Slaughter Webb, O52787, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Thomas Jackson Bowen, O33333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Robert Gooding, O33334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Andrew Cumbie, O40542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Harrison Costigan, O33336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Wade Hampton Arrington, O40543, United States Army.

First Lt. Philip Henry Bramble, O33341, United States Army.

Capt. Charles Lowell Sims, O33345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Marion Elmer McDaniel, O33346, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jim Hillery McCoy, O52796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Alexander Vitarius, O40544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Paul Flynn, O33350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Stuart Joseph Palos, O52797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd Albert Ramsey, O33352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Delmar Leavengood, O44938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Waugh Keyser, O33355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Webb Foster, O52802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Joseph Corley, O33360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Edward William Quinlan, Jr., O33359, United States Army.

×First Lt. Merle Edison Hamner, O52805, United States Army.

Capt. Edward Benjamin Krainik, O33367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Carl Girtman, Jr., O44951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Patrick William Harrington, O33372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wesley Duke, O33373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Kyle Terry, O33375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dominick Charles Dennis, O44953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Roger Longacre, Jr., O33378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. J. Elmore Swenson, O33380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Henry Heldreth, O33382, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Frank Garbacz, O40548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kemuel Kenyon Blacker, O44956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vern Eskil Johnson, O44959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wallace Murdock Hanes, O33384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Felix Claborne Sharp, Jr., O39057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howell Barrett Thompson, O33385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Elwin Coulter, O33386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Holton Eugene Blomgren, O44964, United States Army.

Maj. James William Johnson, O33387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Raymond Cole, O33392, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Flint, O44970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Alvin Gottlieb, O44972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Gage Cogswell, O33393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wesley Oliver Moberg, O44973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claire Stillwell Curtis, O33394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Phillip John Linn, O33395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Bernard Bennett, O44977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arlo Reed Gill, O44983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl C. Edmondson, O44982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harvey Robinson, O44984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Joseph Corbin, O33399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Angelo Enrico Pilla, O44989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hamilton Smoot Rebentisch, O44991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William McKinney Mantz, O33403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Henry Blohm, O44994, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ottis Audrey Davis, Sr., O40553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Milton Denny, O33406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Nathan Martasin, O44997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Charles Felton, O39058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Franklin Coffey, Jr., O44998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Ferris Lieblich, O33409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Walter Raleigh Evans Coleman, O52823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dale Howard Shick, O33412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Ford, Jr., O33411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Sidney Dodds Hilton, O33413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Hamilton Schuler, O33414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren George Duemmel, O45004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gerald Bethune Little, O40554, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin Hancock, O45013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Sayle Smith, O33424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice Albert Rogers, O40555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Wilbur Collins, O33425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Frank Massoglia, O52831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan William Johnson, O33426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray Ralph Liedike, O39060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Robert Harlan Palmatary, O45026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Capt. Anthony Joseph Vinci, O45029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gibson Cooper, O33430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Burner, O33434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Burton Seeley, O33436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edgar Sleadd Waugh, O33439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Richard Edward Eggleton, Jr., O52844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Trevett Williams, O52845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Cecil Floyd Hunnicutt, O33442, United States Army.

Capt. Claude Hathaway Stewart, O33441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peyton Royston Lucas, O33445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Robert Murphy, O52847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Joseph Hejna, O45033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Grant Freeman, O33450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank Butler Greer, O33447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ferris Adam Kercher, O33456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Albert Reynolds, O52852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Eugene Davidoff, O33460, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Joseph Cooke, O45043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Alvin Curtis, O33462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Hubert Tirey, O33464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Max Richard Machnicke, O33465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Atwood Herod, O52859, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Morris Allen Lent, O33469, United States Army.

Capt. Jack Rawson Melton, O33470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Zais, O33471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnnie Derrick Duffie, O33474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Newell Jenkins, O40561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. James Daniel Anders, O33475, United States Army.

Capt. Paul Bernard Schaefer, O40562, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Richard Aguglia, O33477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elon Lee Hiller, O45059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Douglas Davis Peairs, O33479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Savilla, O40563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Martin Kamp, Jr., O33482, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj Vincent Farnsworth Goodsell, O33483, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Max Verlyn Kirkbride, O33485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Nelson Simmons, Jr., O39063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Ralph Edward Konkol, O52868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mills Brown, O33487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert William Jones, O33488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Heinz Peter Rand, O33490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Whitson Kane, O33492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duane Wright Ackerson, O45068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Otis Doane, O33493, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry George Mathos, O45077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Monsey Thomas Gresham, Jr., O45076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Boyd Shemwell, O44395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Henry Landers, Jr., O39064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Chilton Holbrook, O33501, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Killian, O33502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Theodore Frederick Schweitzer, C52875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Smith Riddick, Jr., O40570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Hain Mengel, 2d, O33504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Jacob Howard, O33508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Homer Humphrey Hammond, O33507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clair Gillespie Henline, O45087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×First Lt. Merton Smith Coe, O52876, United States Army.

Capt. Arnold William Alexander, O45039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Oscar Franson, Jr., O39065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rocco Francis Meconi, O33516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Edwards Mecredy, Jr., O45091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Norman Lunsford, Jr., O33518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Clark Standish, O39066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Luther Denlinger, O33519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Z. Helber, O45094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Jefferson Hatch, O45096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Hugh Agnew, O45102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Conrad Rudolph Underdahl, O33523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilbert Denning Meeks, O45109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alex Noble Nelson, O33528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Llewellyn Sobke, O33529, United States Army.

Capt. Edward Brian Detchemendy, O45117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Harold George Lee, O52885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Raymond Ebbs, O45116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Walrath Burns, O52887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Judson Force Moody, O23685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Parker Yates, O23686, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Clifford Hodges Lee, Jr., O23688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Lloyd Powell, Jr., O23689, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Roy Oswalt, Jr., O23690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Jensen, O23692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Ira Schnittke, O23693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Paul Carlson, O23694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Charles Gribble, Jr., O23695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Wheaton Chapman, Jr., O23696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sears Yates Coker, O23697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Warren Clark, O23698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Austin Gerig, Jr., O23701, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Skiles Kelley, O23703, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Wyman Ramee, O23704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jess Paul Unger, O23706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Schilling, O23707, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Schremp, O23709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Field Michel, O23710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Delaney, O23711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy Harold Goddard, O23714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Mack Tarbox, O23715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Kenneth Wade Kennedy, O23716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lynn Cyrus Lee, O23717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Strain, O23719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Graham Waitt, O23720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Campbell Clendening, O23721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Henry Carroll, O23722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Van Horn Ellis, Jr., O23724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Charles Besancon, O23725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Meriwether Ramey, O23726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Miles Linton, O23728, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Sealey Kramer, O23729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harrington Willson Cochran, Jr., O23731, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick John Baker, O23732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ingram Gurfein, O23734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Stanley Grygiel, O23737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Philip Seneff, Jr., O23738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Webb VanHoy, Jr., O23739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mills Carson Hatfield, O23741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Leon Rowny, O23744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Herbert Richardson, Jr., O23748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Edward Mather, O23749, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Walter Samz, O23750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Leo Smith, O23751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Dorsey Maynard, O23754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Holmes Camp, O23758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burnside Elijah Huffman, Jr., O23759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Denis Blundell Grace, O23760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James William Roy, O23762, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Burtchaell, O23764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Edward Kuzell, O23766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James William Stigers, O23767, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Thomas Murray, O23768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Allan George Woodrow Johnson, O23769, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard John Rastetter, O23770 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Thaddeus Kosiorek, O23772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Lawrence Slocum, O23773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Roy J. Clinton, O23774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Bradley Ledford, Jr., O23775, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Millikin, Jr., O23781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Vaughan Elsberry, O23783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Andrew McCulloch, Jr., O23786, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Pressly Scott, O23787, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Hyman Bodzin, O23788, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Gabriel Gauvreau, O23789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Harleston deSaussure, Jr., O23790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Leroy McMillan, O23791, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Alfred Lee, O23792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Jeunet Whitaker, O23793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Malcolm Corwin Johnson, O23794, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter James Woolwine, Jr., O23795, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Robert Salisbury, O23797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank Pleasants Stainback, Jr., O23801, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Gabriel Redmon, O23802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Geldermann, O23803, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Bissland Moore, O23804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. George Roopen Adjemian, O23806, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Mortimer Buell Birdseye, Jr., O23807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max Campbell Tyler, O23809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wallace Michael Lauterbach, O23810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gregg LaRoix McKee, O23811, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Clinton Stanford, O23812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Stanley Reilly, O23813, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Stevens Neumeister, O23815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gerard Healy, O23816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul George Skowronek, O23822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Russell Reed, O23824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duward Lowery Crow, O23825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Panke, O23831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Duncan Brown, Jr., O23832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jonathan Edwards Adams, Jr., O23833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Arthur Cannon, Jr., O23835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Franklin Foster, Jr., O23837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Fletcher, O23839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William McIntyre, O23841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Frank Star, O23843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lawrence Theisen, O23846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Benjamin Manley, Jr., O23847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Knighton Harris, O23848, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Oscar Green 3d, O23850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Longstreet Lawson, O23852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Eugene Clifford, O23853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Waggener Couch, O23855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Moore Christensen, Jr., O23856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Maj. Walter Francis Molesky, O23857, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Norton, O23858, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Cooper, O23860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Potter Campbell, Jr., O23861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Malcolm Graham Troup, O23862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Charles Tonetti, O23864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Joseph Canella, O23865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Chester Day, O23866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tom Depher Collison, O23868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Lippincott Knowlton, O23869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lyman Saunders Faulkner, O23870, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lloyd Meyer, O23871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Vivans Greene, O23872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Bertron Magruder, O23874, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew Clarence Harrison, O23875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul von Santen Liles, O23876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Miroslav Frank Moucha, O23877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morton McDonald Jones, Jr., O23879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Patrick Ahern, O23881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jacob Heffner Towers, O23883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Henry King, O23884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Cnarles Henzl, O23885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Horace Maynard Brown, Jr., O23886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Joseph Lenihan Greene, O23887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Windsor Temple Anderson, O23891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Putnam Detwiler, O23892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Fuller McKinley, Jr., O23893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Morris Hoge, Jr., O23894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Frank Aliotta, O23895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Lanigan, O23896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Leighton Atteberry, Jr., O23899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Hunter Woodward, O23900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harley Truman Marsh, Jr., O23901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Winston Curley, O23904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William Cooper, O23905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Auburon Paul Hauser, O23908, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Evarts Clark, O23911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin McCaffery, Jr., O23912, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Boswell, Jr., O23913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Guthrie Miller, O23914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Patrick Henry Tansey, Jr., O23915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward McElroy, O23917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harold Alexander Tidmarsh, O23918, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Coakley, O23919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Huff Edger, O23921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Channing Borman, O23922, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Paul Johnson, O23926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Cornelius Fitzpatrick, O23927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew Gordon Harper, Jr., O23928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Leonard Robinson, O23929, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Jacob Hoebeke, O23930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Abbott Hume, O23931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Bibb Pickett, Jr., O23932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Berry Kercheval, O23933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merritt Lambert Hewitt, O23934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Gray, Jr., O23935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gibson Niles, O23938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Moody Elmo Layfield, Jr., O23939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reynolds Robert Keleher, O23941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Raine Laney, Jr., O23942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Maj. Dick Stanley Von Schrilitz, O23944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Ray Thomas, O23947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Manly Busbee, Jr., O23950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wendell Pollitt Knowles, O23953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Felix John Gerace, O23954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Peter Kirkbride Dilts, O23955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Thomas Gleason, O23956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Irving Stern, O23957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Howard Ellis, O23958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Benton Howze, O23960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Faye Roton, O23961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Coles Barney, Jr., O23963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Boynton Buttery, O23966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Leon Arthur Briggs, O23967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linton Sinclair Boatwright, O23968, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Tuck Brown, O23969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Willoughby Garrett, O23971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Augustus Purdy, O23973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harold Gurnee, Jr., O23974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Victor Woodrow Campana, O23975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Carl McIntyre, O23976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Dooley Vaughan, O23978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Crawford Root, Jr., O23979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Mar Levy, Jr., O23980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Wilson Sharkey, O23981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Charles Kisiel, O23984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Walter Raleigh Mullane, O23987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Ward Maxwell, O23988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edgar Pigue, O23990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maynard George Moyer, O23991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richardson, O23993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Courtenay O'Connell, O23994, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nelson Paul Monson, O23996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Freemont Danforth, O23997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas James Cleary, Jr., O23998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peer de Silva, O24000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Niles Rising, Jr., O24002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Daniel Fowler, O24003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Llewellyn Flanders, Jr., O24006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Frank Muzyk, O24010, Army of the United States (first lieutanant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ellis Rossell, Jr., O24011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Daniel Salinas, O24012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Lyons Driscoll, O24018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Richard Kemp, O24019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Franklin Poff, O24020, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Alvord Spiller, O24023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Mercer Presley Longino, O24024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph McGrane, Jr., O24027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harwell Leon Adams, O24028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leroy Pierce Collins, Jr., O24031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Angelo Augustine Laudani, O24033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Toombs Dixon, O24035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Albert Samuel Dalby, O24036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Eugene Deyo, O24037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Paul Forsyth, O24038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Breed Deane, O24040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Lawrence Felchlin, O24041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanton Claude Hutson, O24042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Martin Andrew Shadday, O24043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Vincent Brown, O24044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Wilmer Bailey, O24045, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Rayford Sykes, O24046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Henry Zott, Jr., O24048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bradish Johnson Smith, O24049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Kellogg Plume, Jr., O24054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Hardy Barrow, O24055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Reed Upton, O24063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wetherby Graham, O24064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Bernarr Celmer, O24066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Schuyler Tanous, O24067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bernard Keagy, O24072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Joseph Myers, Jr., O24073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clinton Earl Male, O24078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Doyle Pratt, O24079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl K. Buchanan, O24080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wilson Callaway, O24081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lawrence Kaiser, O24085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Hollenback Welles, O24086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas McDaniel, O24088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Holroyd Linnell, O24089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Capt. Roy George Hendrickson, O24093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Benedict Zarembo, O24094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Vincent D'Esposito, O24095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clare Hibbs Armstrong, Jr., O24098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard James O'Neill, O33536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Knox White, O24102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Gerard McBride, O33539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sydney Fletcher Frazier, O33540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Alfred Coulter, O33541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Miller, O33542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred F. Lash, O40574, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Wilson Williams, O45122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Eugene McArthur, O52892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Raymond Donald Pearsall, O33548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Berry Galbreaith, O33549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Charles Wood Audet, O52899, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Walter Garrison Hopkins, Jr., O33551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Matthew Rankin Collins, Jr., O33550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Luther Griffin Jones, Jr., O40575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Carlton Brown, O32556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roger Willard Spigelmoyer, O52903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ambrose Claibourn Arthur, O52904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Noel Ritter, O33558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Victor Thieme, O33561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Wallace Peyton, Jr., O45138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic Francis Ahlgren, O33566, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Copeland O'Byrne, O52910, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lewis Gillette Wetherell, O45147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harry Kendall Bagshaw, O24068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Alexander Lell, O33577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Archie Stanley Walker, O52915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Glenn Smith Finley, Jr., O24117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Wendell Constance, O24118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Erwin Drewes, O24122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Collins Bagg, O24132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Willard Guest, O24133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Broudy, O24134, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Lowery Amell, Jr., O24136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allan Gardner Pixton, O24137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ruane McGuire, O24138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles McDonald Parkin, Jr., O24150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Keith Philip Fabianich, O24151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alexis Michael Gagarine, O24153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harland Glen Wood, O24154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Carl Sparrow, O24155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur McMurrough Murphy, O24156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Heck, O24157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albin Felix Irzyk, O24158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard James Darnell, O24159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lewis Warner Fogg 3d, O24160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Lowell Chambers Scott, O24161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Leon Urban, O24163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Eldon Phelps, O24165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Morris Cowan Stout, O24166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glen Carl Long, O24170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Ethelbert Cowan, O24171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Allan Pierce, Jr., O24172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jeff William Boucher, O24173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Elbert Gowell, O24174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Miller Hustead 2d, O24175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Zebulon LaFayette Strickland, Jr., O24176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilburt James Irwin, O24179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Arnold Martin, O24180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas John Sharpe, O24181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Vandiver Langston, O24182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reuben Eugene Wheelis, O24184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Herbert Savage, O24186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rawlins Murrell Colquitt, Jr., O24189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Tennesson, Jr., O24190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd LeRoy Hanes, O24191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj Jules Maurice DuParc, O24192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Bernard Pohlman, Jr., O24193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Francis Kosmacki, O24194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Alexander Clayton, O24196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Boyd Bullock, O24198, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Paxton, O24199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Earl Walters, O24200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Kermit Brunsvold, O24201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Sutherland, Jr., O24202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Arthur Benner, O24203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin LaHatte, O24206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Kelly Thomson, O24207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Donald Ward, O24208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Ira Taylor, O24209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Vaughn Beck, O24210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Henry Bigger, O24212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Victor Sanden, O24213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Lester Ballard, Jr., O24215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Henry Janz, O24217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Selden Holcombe, O24218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burt Lunney Mitchell, Jr., O24219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Frederick Cathrae, O24220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Van Middleworth, O24226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Penquite Mulcahy, O24227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Hugo Almquist, Jr., O24228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Logan Schutz, O24229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen Beall Knight, O24231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Price Tucker, O24232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Freeman, O24234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Neville Sloan, Jr., O24235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Peach Rollins, Jr., O24237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gordon B. Cauble, O24239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Wendell Gunn, O24241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Elwood Kennedy, O24242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William E. Feeman, O24243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Haley, O24244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Robert Charles Barthle, O24246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Theodore McQuaide, O24247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burton Bryant Chandler, O24250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Bernard Jennings, O24251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otho Eugene Holmes, O24252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Loring Douglass, O24254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Bond Jones, O24255, Army of the of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maxwell Bryant Thurmond, O24256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byron Mark Kirkpatrick, O24257, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albro Lefils Parsons, Jr., O24259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Samusson, Jr., O24260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj William Barker Wootton, Jr., O24261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robertson Desobry, O24262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hubert Walter Gillespie, Jr., O24264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Louis DuBois, O24265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Becker, O24267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Frederick Ostner, O24271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Toma David Harris, Jr., O24273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Blaine Wells, O24275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lindsay Disharoon, Jr., O24277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Michener Wilson, O24280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Taylor Newman, O24281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Eugene Watson, Jr., O24283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Dean Dunlop, O24284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Gorrell Kearfott Miller, Jr., O24285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Douglas Mitchell, O24286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Warren Adcock, O24287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Madison Atkins, O52916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Paul Berger, O33579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Dean Holle, O33580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Cowles West, Jr., O45153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Rhodes Hall, O40578, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Franklin Wright, Jr., O40580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Francis Vogel, O33585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Wesley Strunk, O40581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Michael Holland, O45157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Everett Wandel, O45160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Vivian Harris, O33595, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph William Bergman, O45174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Douglas Gardiner, O45175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lee Erickson, O33597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Brice Smith, O45178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norval Milner Locke, O33601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rolf Erling Mickelson, O45184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Gordon John Hartzler, O33603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Bennett Mechling, O24333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Roper, O33605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Allen Webb, Jr., O40585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin George Schuck, O33606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Oscar Manasco, O33608, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Horton, O33609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Frederick Olliver, O40586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Tate Poffenberger, O45197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Pauly Field, O45196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Bright Jaccard, O45195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jurgen George Pohly, O52934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Arthur Minton, O45199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Morgan Alexander Brakonecke, O33616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brice James Martin, O33620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Donnell Van de Voort, O39071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Robert Patrick, O45212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Jacob Halper, O39072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Champlain Shaw, O33626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Thomas Krampitz, O33630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eldon Woerner Schmid, O33627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Layton Carlos Tyner, O33640, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Lewis Wells, O33641, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Blount, O45217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Dominick Klunder, O52947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Robertson Ward, O33646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marion Karl Bandley, O45222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winant Sidle, O33651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Robert Redden, O33657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Julius Lind, O45230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Darrell Barton, O33663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Jack Wayne Duke, O33662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Harris Gardner, O33665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Joseph Lacey, Jr., O33668, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Charles Francis Austin, O45239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Neil Geiger Stewart, O33670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. French Greig Lewis, O33676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Albert Scott Madding, O33680, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Gaspard Wall, O33023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Maxwell Conover, O33685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Henderson Andrews, O33688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marlyn Edward Mohr, O45256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Presbury Patterson, O33687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Worthy Millard Cunningham, O45258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thompson McCrea Colkitt, O33690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederick Walter Coykendall, O33694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Leon Todd, O33696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Dare Gray, O40596, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alden Peverley Shipley, O33699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ancher Emil Christensen, Jr., O45271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Cleveland Hicks, Jr., O40598, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Julius Albert Sakas, O33709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Eugene Walters, O33710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Truman Holt Setliffe, O24350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Dowling Hiers, O33715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Shannon Tabb, O33721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Elmer Booth Lagerman, O52980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Reese Bierer, O33722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Wise Riley, Jr., O33658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Mayse Nash, O33727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic Emile Hansard, O45303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Troy Edwin Whiting, O33729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. J. T. Smyrl, O33732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Dunwody Blackburn, O33734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Menon Walker Whitsitt, O31384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Edwin Taylor, O45316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Carlton Weyand, O33736, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Farr, O33737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Jerome Anderson, O33741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Robert Lewitz, O45325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Thomas Prendergast, O45327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Donald Prendergast O40599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Theodore Schrader, O33747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Leo Rush, O39076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John James Carroll, O52996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Kent Harris, O40600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Hubert Cox, O33751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Arthur Warren, O45337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Eli Bozeman, O45339, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Shirley Norman Black, O39078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Muir, Jr., O33754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Thomas Joseph, O33756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Merton Wendle, O33764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Hallowell Holcombe, O45349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Worth Marlow Curtiss, O53005, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Paul Balkman, O33766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Temple Quick, O53006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Alexander Bailey, Jr., O40602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Petersen, O33771, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nelson Whitney Tobey, O33778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Wesley Dalton Harris, O45371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. LeRoy Charles Brown, O33782, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Penson, O33787, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John George Montgomery, O33788, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Forbes Antrim, O33793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Donald Richardson, O46380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Pearce Yeuens, O40605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elliott Taylor Katherman, O53023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Denton Carl Rountree, O33797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Donald Iseman, O33798, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Dyson, O33799, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Lerch Ditamore, O33800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Kazmir Wojcik, O33802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. LeRoy David Brummitt, O44087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Joseph Gavin, O33807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Thomas Caprino, O33808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Edward Muggelberg, O33812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Grover Marks, Jr., O45395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Hollister Scott-Smith, Jr., O33817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Allen Wilson, O33818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Caldwell Knox, O45402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Merwin Hinman, O33822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manford Ray Murphy, O45403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Franklin Roberts, O33825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chris McCullough, O40611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Joseph Parziale, O33829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Edward Dougherty, O53037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl William Kappel, O33833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Alexander Kane, Jr., O34140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ragsdale Howton, O40613, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joshua LeRoy Holley, Jr., O40612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Norval Isom Sommers, Jr., O40614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellis LeRoy, O33835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Parkhurst Cloud Hough, O33836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Edward Davis, Jr., O53041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Alois Neibert, O45411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Henry Stein, O33837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Balis Dexter, O33838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent White Rasper, O40615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Otto Fischer, O45412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Brakebill, Jr., O33840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William George Skinner, Jr., O53044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Louis Garay, O45416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow Wilson Morse, O53048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bob Eugene Edwards, O33844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Wellington Campbell, O33151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Herbert Karstedt, O33849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arnold Mandigo Bloss, O45424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Arthur Mackenzie, O40618, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Kirk Hamilton, O45425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Madison Tolliver, O33856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas Webster, O33858, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Copenhaver Webb, O40620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Matthias Frassrand, O40621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Byrne, O45436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Arsene Peter Bonifas, O45437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Francis Philp, O53061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Herbert Lundy Garris, O33872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roderick Joseph MacEachen, O53064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wythe Parks Brookes, O45447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Cohee Blossom, Jr., O45451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Alexander Todd, O33878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clark Richard McCauley, O40623, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gregg Newhall Jennings, O45454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Wayne Davis, O33698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Davis, O33886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hoyt Edward White, O33889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Maxey Silvey, O33887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Theodore Kramers, O33890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Bogner, O33892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Kennedy Smith, Jr., O45463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald George McNamara, O39085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Martin Lawson, O45475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dan Ralph Davis, O40629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Franklin Moffitt, Jr., O40630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilbur John Lage, O33911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lamar Asbury Welch, O24391, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ernest Conine, O24393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Jones Williams, O24394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edmund Hand, O24395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Verle Douglas Miller, O24396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Henry Stone, O24397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Meyer Lipton, O24398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lucien Fairfax Keller, O24399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James DeLuca, O24400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Carlton Reddington, O24401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Julian Maline, O24402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Farwell Mitchell, O24405, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Norman Cameron, O24408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gene Richard Welch, O24409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Charles Liggett, O24410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Dorsey Hulsey, O24411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Clifford Healy, O24412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hunter Marion Brumfield, O24413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irvin Marshall Rice, O24414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Mace Gonseth, O24417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Marcel Cummins, O24418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude Esmond Bailey, Jr., O24420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Parsons Clark, Jr., O24423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Waldorf Barnes, O24425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Xavier Leary, O24427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Almon Louis Hugins, Jr., O24428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tom Billie Strother, O24429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Numsen Lucke, O24430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Calvin Aldrich Heath, O24431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Clark Storey, O24433, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Webster Hodges, O24437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Corson Landrum Hilton, Jr., O24438, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Vincent Maixner, O24439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Oliver Gordon, O24440, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emery Ellis Bellonby, O24441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Phillip Haines Baker, O24442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robert Tuck, O24444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Abbott Lucey, O24446, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Carl Maldonado, O24447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Byron Mowbray, O24450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Leslie Bereuter, O24451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Carl William Plitt, O24452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Arthur Martin, O24453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter John Rankin, O24455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Leo Dooley, O24456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Elliott Arthur, Jr., O24457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Thomas Mehalko, O24458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wiley Freeman Shaver, Jr., O24459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Craig Boyce, Jr., O24460, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Frank Sills, O24463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Glen Ferguson, O24464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Niels Marius Dahl, O24466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Francis Munster, O24467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wayne Harold Lee, O24469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joshua Logan, O24470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fredrick Kenneth Hughes, O24471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Leonard James Goodsell, O24472, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Owen Becker, O24473, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Walter Erickson, O24474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Michael Williamson, O24476, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Albert Gile, O24477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Szabo, O24480, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harrison Zimmerman, O24481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Francis Dunn, O24482, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Olcott Foster, Jr., O24483, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Nicholas Wellems, O24484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert McDonald Shannon, Jr., O24486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Easton Nelson, O24487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vitaly Kovalevsky, O24488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Buford Patton, O24489, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Beal Kelly, O24490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Milton Davis, Jr., O24491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Eugene Burrell, O24492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Sweeney, Jr., O24494, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Leroy Miller, Jr., O24495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Arthur Ford, O24497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Maurice Johnson, O24498, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Alva Ogle, O24500, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clinton Fort Matthews, O24503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Fairfield Carr, O24504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Howard Schofield, O24505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Thomas Larson, O24506, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Peden Croninger, O24507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry John Muller, Jr., O24508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George I. Forsythe, O24510, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Forbes, O24511, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Francis Driscoll, O24512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Leonard Peavy, O24514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Charles McInnis, Jr., O24516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maynard Clayton Raney, O24517, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Arthur Hebbeler, O24518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Elmer Simmons, O24521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Jennings, Jr., O24522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Louis Ruwet, O24524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Myron Thorne Johnston, O24525, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Louie Coleman, O24527, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Millman Morrill, O24528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Frederick Lawson, O24529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Hugh Porter Stubbs, Jr., O24530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Schmierer, O24531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Ovid Hamilton, O24532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Maurice Clavelle Holden, O24534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Thielens Peeples, O24537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul V. Hannah, O24539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Friedman, O24540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Melvin Charlton, Jr., O24543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Morrison Allen, Jr., O24550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Woodrow Cozad, O24552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Herbert De Chow, O24553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McAdams, O24555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William Carter, O24556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Furman Spencer, O24559, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Walter Sedr, O24561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Palmer Boyer, Jr., O24563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dayton Willis Eddy, O24565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gilliland Renfro, O24567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Viron Edward Bird, O24568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Martin Kane, O24569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kearns Muller, O24570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Grover Holland, Jr., O24573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jose Antonio Andino, O24575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Koepcke, Jr., O24581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jack Helm Remele, O24585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Elwood Kimball, O24586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward McBride, O24587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arden Wirth Dow, O24591, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Martin Volheim, O24593, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Walter Harvey, Jr., O24598, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Hammer, O24599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Lee Cary, O24600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clare Norton Lyke, O24601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allen William Rodeheffer, O24602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas James Camp, Jr., O24603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Raymond Graham, O24605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Campbell Williams, O24609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Raymond Cross, O24610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Rorbach Fisk, O24614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ben Lamar Anderson, O24616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Orwin Clark Talbott, O24617, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Woodburn Matheny, Jr., O24619, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Mayer Hamilton, O24621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elbridge Lee Snapp, O24622, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Charles Miller, O24623, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Killilae, O25017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richard Burkhart, O25018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Joseph Richardson, O25019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Curtis Jeffries, Jr., O25020, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale Taylor Elliott, O25022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Freese Kernan, O25023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Herbert Brown, O25024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Clement Moran, O25027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Elmer Pershing Curtis, O25028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrel Leon Syron, O25034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Johnson, Jr., O25035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Mai. James Max Snyder, O25036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Brittain Kreutzer, O25037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Joseph Stillman, O25038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Hull Verheul, O25039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irving Heymont, O25040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orville Kenneth Knight, O25043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Harold Vernon Mackey, O25046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Rhodes Thompson, O25047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Arthur Bird, O25048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerry Marion Wimberley, O25049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Blakely Todd, O25051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harry Mobley, O25053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Dulaney Schutz, O25054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Parker Osborne Stuart, O25055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Pershing Traylor, O25060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joseph Daly, O25061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Overton Golladay, O25062, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reuben Wallis Mundy, O25063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Will Gillespie Atwood, Jr., O25067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Weamer Elder, O25068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Harry Bowen, O25069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Marshall Woods, O25071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Leroy Ramsey, O25072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Wilbur Best, Jr., O25074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Apthorp Gould Fuller, 2d, O25075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Edgar Nossaman, O25079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Roger Jerald Culhane, O25083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leroy Cosby Land, O25084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bradford Lee Smith, O25086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl William Schaad, O25087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Karl Heinrich Zornig, O25089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Fred Poppenburg, O25090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jesse Charles Crumbley, Jr., O25091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Ralph Bayard Sessoms, Jr., O25092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert James Welsh, O25096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil William Delu, O25097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Durrenberger, O25099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Latimer Whittle MacMillan, Jr., O25100, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Hall Woods, O25101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Francis Tyrrell, Jr., O25102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Neil Grove, O25104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Ellis Cox, O25105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leroy Buckman Wilson, O25106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. George Franklin Charlton, O25107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Reid, O25108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William McKinley Shepard, O25110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Murchison Grusky Locksley, O25111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Alfred Higgins, O25112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Edgar Rayle, Jr., O25113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Charles Hughes, O25114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Stephen Rice, O25119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Stuart Cumings, O25120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bernard Via, O25121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Flynn, Jr., O25122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Reginald Eklund, O25123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gaynor William Hathaway, O25124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Wilson Starkey, O25126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Moyer Delos Harris, O25129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Philip Leber, O25130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Philip Geise, O25131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Lindsay Koob, Jr., O25132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Earl Simons, O25136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Thomas Harvie, O25138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Raymond Laverne Hoff, O25140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edwin Pinard, O25172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Elmer Gould, O25174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Leo Kolb, O25184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cleveland Charles MacLane, Jr., O25185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Henry Dale Weston, O25186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Frederick Crecelius, O25187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donal Royce Pepke, O25188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Yates McCachern, O25190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edwin Allison Nichols, O25192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Benedict Cullison, O25193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Paul Burns, O25194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Casper Wittmann, O25195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Athel Bangert, O25202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Hume Lucas, Jr., O25204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lewis William Leeney, O25206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edward Doherty, O25212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Ames Moon 2d, O25214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walton Orville Threadgill, O25215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Joseph Ptak, O25216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Clendenen Davis, O25218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Condy, O25220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Carr, O25222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Leonard Anderson, O25223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edmondston Coffin, O25234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gerald Michael Dailey, O25249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Allen Carroll, O25250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Cline Irby, O25251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Edgar Thompson, O25252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Simeon Moore, O25253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Boyd Lee Branson, O25254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William McCaffrey, O25256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Charles Craig, O25262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Armand Goers, O25265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Bansley Falks, O25266, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Samuel Beatty, Jr., O25268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr., O25269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clinton Taber, O25270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Brent Vivian, O25272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ray Spurrier, O25273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Paul Arthur Nilsson, O25274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Wyman Healy, O25275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Albert Whitehorne 3d, O25277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Potvin Barry, O25283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Berry, O25284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Hancock Hay, Jr., O25290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Scott Pollard, Jr., O25291, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andy Walter Pribnow, O25292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Hilton Cantrell, O25295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Webster Morris, O25297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Jay Holliman, O25298, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Lawrence Sullivan, Jr., O25299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Wright MacFeeters, O25300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Adellon Franck Hanson, O25301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert H. Schulz, O25303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Wightman Sanders, Jr., O25305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Barton Lamond, O25309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Thornton George, Jr., O25319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Pierce Gillespie, O25320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William FitzGerald Brand, Jr., O25323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Paul Hamill, O25324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerome Bailey York, O25327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Dalrymple, O25329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Bayless Mitman, Jr., O25330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Douglas Yelverton Ostrom, Jr., O25331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Fannon Sullivan, O25332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Michael Smolensky, O25333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duane Seaman Cason, O25334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Floyd Lester Johnson, O25336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Emerson Vandervort, Jr., O25337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Bernard Ellis, O25338, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Haakon Lindjord, O25340, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edmund Dwan 2d, O25354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Gibbons, Jr., O25355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Norton Hathaway, O25366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Alexander Simpson, O25368, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Jack St. Clair, O25369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Nathaniel Acuff, Jr., O40637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy O'Neil De Young, Jr., O33925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Jean Palizza, O33924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jacob Lewis Riley, Jr., O53161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Sidney Benson, O33954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carleton Preer, Jr., O45567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Marcus Sanders, O33923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Willis Grady, O33940, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cornelius Wesley Coghill, Jr., O33928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merrill Grover Hatch, O33918, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Roscoe Smith, Jr., O33922, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Frederick Kreager, O33919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Blakefield, O33927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Paul Alfred Feyereisen, O39089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Lavin, O45613, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald White Glenn, O33931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Howard Neill, O33930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Connor, Jr., O33933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lewis Culp, O45508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Joseph Miller, O45642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Aloysius Boulger, O33935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beverly Norton Skardon, O33939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Ainsworth Clark, Jr., O33937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Garrett Leroy Hill, O33941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Herbert Birdsong, Jr., O33945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Elihue Ball, O33944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ritchie Herbert Clarke, O35173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dwight David Bonham, O33949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Terrill Barco, Jr., O33938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Dale Leon Vincent, O33948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Lamar Sallee, O33951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilfred Francis Farrell, O33950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leonard Carlton Turner, O33952, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Alfred Edwin Coffey, O53220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Francis Stephen Kelly, O45513, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Wayne Townsley, O33953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Elwood Glassen, O33932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Francis Hughes, Jr., O33956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilson Sifford, O33920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Kent Shaffer, O40639, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Snedecor Maxwell, O53163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Edward Rice, O45730, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Connor, O33960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Coxe Covington, Jr., O53151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Allison Morgan, Jr., O45520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred DeMasse Clarke, Jr., O45673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Thorwald Netterblad, Jr., O33971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William B. Askren, O45507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S Army).

Maj. Elmer Pearce Fleming, Jr., O33975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jackson Evert Shirley, O33977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jess Edward Newland, O45793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Leland Hankins, O35190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Evans Hoffmeister, O33942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Victor Manson Wallace, O53124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ross Franklin Powell, O33980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Joe Seitz, O33979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Van Scoten Lanterman, O33983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Dozier Crosby, O33981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Burg Dyer, O53095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick James Bailey, Jr., O33982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James William Cocke, O35168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Milton Joel Mastalir, O33992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John George Georgelas, O33978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Glenn Pierce Elliott, O40658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Louis Brown O33987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Jones Pierce, O33989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Faust, O40641, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Cropper Williams, O33974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Spencer Penrose Edwards, Jr., O33990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Joseph Gendron, O45776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kary Cadmus Emerson, O33991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Stanley Lancey, O33997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Otto Reed, O53102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Rudolph Corey, O34006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Clark Taynton, O34007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Judson Bestor, O33972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Herbert William Bennett, O45675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Warren Love, O34026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emitt Cleveland Witt, Jr., O34027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling Kenwood Eisiminger, O40651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Leo Schreiber, O34043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Brown Sewell, O45491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Snow Griffin, O53096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lawrence Woodard, O34031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Henry Hislop, O34034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Gerald Sullivan, O39097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Olinto Mark Barsanti, O34037 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Kenneth Chenault, O45678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ashley Anthony Blinn, O35322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George James Heil, Jr., O39109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Marvin Smith, O34041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Triplett, Jr., O34030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Joseph Nawn, O53200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Patrick Downing, O33917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Riley Chapman, O40711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Hamman Smith, Jr., O34044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Willard Elder, Jr., O34033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin William Flora, O34083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Christopher Mataxis, O34035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Rhinehart Washington, O34042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Pitts, Jr., O34036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Grant Ellsworth Jones, O40649, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Willis Davis, O34046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William John Yamber, O40656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Preston Baldwin Cannady, O34101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ovid Morgan, O34049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Owen Jones, O34059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Joseph Kron, O45622, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Joseph Lang, O40705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harold Harper, O40735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edgar Charles Wood, O34051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Sam Efnor, Jr., O34054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lafayette Mabry, Jr., O34047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Pershing Muir, O39105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Beverly Boyle, Jr., O34090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Charles Guerin, O34052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Hamlet Cooper, O45975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Francis Unger, O34056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rex Russel Sage, O34061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Lee Farrar, O34053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Archey Dean, O46007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Asa Parker Gray, Jr., O34096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Joseph Raffaeli, O53170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Victor Bottomly, Jr., O34071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Charles Ohl, O34078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Elwood Murphy, O34080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Anderson Smith, Jr., O34031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward Lowndes Davis, Jr., O34079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Gale Peabody, O39098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hayward Hubbard, O34111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale Douglas Hogoboom, Jr., O34085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Danield Thornton Chapman, O34086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Levant Strong, O34088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edwin Webb, O34092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellis Earl Pickering, O53113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Allen Loop, O45735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Emmett McGraw, O39107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Marine Carpenter, O34098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Cole Jeffries, O34093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnny Mac Rice, O34094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Joseph Munch, O45546, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harley Lester Moore, Jr., O40729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linus Patrick Ward, O53191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Lester Inman, O34102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Harold Ray Kent, O34103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Cary Allen, O34104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norvel Harold Barnhart, O34105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Jacob Weber, Jr., O53319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lynnwood Murat Johnson, Jr., O35199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Coleman Parker, O34123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Worth Williams, O34107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Hill Stewart 3d, O35205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Madison Farnell, O34108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Wilbur Chapman, O40704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Hugh Emert Howard, O45529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Jack Girard, O34110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ira Cornelius Redfern, Jr., O34109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Don Davis, O45687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Augustus Edwards, Jr., O34116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rafael Negron, O34115, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ronald William Van Orne, O40725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Walter James Davies, O53328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay William Herrington, O34121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reinhold Carl Riede, O45810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Charles Glover, O34122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dantes Alto York, O45549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Thomson Pillsbury, O34125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Julian Caldwell Propst, O45943, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Lawson Ransone, O34142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Crosby Park Miller, O34151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Whitaker Alexander, O34143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brilsford Pease Flint, Jr., O34146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard George Ciccolella, O34117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Charles Bryan, O34150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Harold Felter, O53216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Blanding Jones, O34152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Louis Rall, O40632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Jones Davis, Jr., O34154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Francis Hollingsworth, O34155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John William Irving, O53276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nathan Anderson Roane, Jr., O34156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Neal Charles Galloway, O34158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Verde Weaver Bennett, O34157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Long, O34180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee L. Stewart, O34184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Nagel Stanford, O35182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Henry Wallace Witcover, O45522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Barton Pratt, O34186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Phillip Howe, O45555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Speaks, O34196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Leverne Jenkins, O45935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Lee Treadwell, O53121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl McQuillis Cooper, O34191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Coke Whitworth, Jr., O35231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Hilary Eugene DuVal, O53137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Jones Adams, O34197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Wilson McGregor, O39096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Walburn Zarger, O45568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Owen Murphy, O34193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Scott Saunders, O34205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard LaVerne Cornutt, O45992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Randolph Dudley, O45497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Paul West, O34208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Robert Bush, O53342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellis Snetzer, O35458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Miller Boggs, O34087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Paul Ludwikosky, O34228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Elliott Lang, O45628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Sidney Andrew, Jr., O34235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil Victor Benard Edmond, O34234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ottis Mazel Plant, O40714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Hermanson Courtney, O35196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joy Kaufman Vallery, O34241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Louis Schaf, Jr., O45860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Freeman Harris, Jr., O34242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Harland Walker, Jr., O34243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Raymond Dunn, O34084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Robert Borns, O34245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dan Kistler Dukes, Jr., O34283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Marvin Callahan, O34055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Oxley Quirey, O39102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aubrey Parkerson Nathan, O34270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Bowden Street, O34272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Dewitt Gattis, O34269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Earl Whetstone, O53212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ray Lynch, Jr., O34268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Scarborough Hughes, O34271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Gordon Morris, O45665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sammie Newell Homan, O34279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce DesBrisay Jones, O34238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Marvin Browning, O35220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Stuart Terrell, Jr., O53118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Royal Dickson, O34091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Smith Lawrence, O34286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Louis Mueller, O34292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Weldon Emanual Laiche, O34295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Walter Heatwole, O35215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herron Nichols Maples, O45920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Lewis Smith, O33515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Thomas Smith, O34320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emro Joseph Quashnock, O34321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Hezekia Jacob Ross, Jr., O34112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj James Edwin McDowell, O40674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Scott Housman, O53308, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Barton Jones, O34239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Howard Davis, O34325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Elmer Kjeldsen, O34326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Austin Grinnell, O53260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morrell Ray Sexton, O34057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Frazier, Jr., O39094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack LeRoy Marinelli, O34331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Walter Green, O34332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Allen Eicher, O40665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Clinton Lindley, O45614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Henry Schweiter, O34334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Grant Chesley, O53265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Alexander McWatters, O34336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Delbert Leroy Bristol, O34340, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerry French Dunn, O34342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Leonard, O34124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mont Sandels Johnston, O53169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carl Roth, O39095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Larson, O45964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Norvell McVeigh Walker, O34375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Christian Hansen, O34333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Gifford Carson, O53255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Graham Edward Schmidt, O34348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Earl McBride, Jr., O34347, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Chester Biggs, O45688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Donald Kight, O56904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gloyd Shettle, O40706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Edward Denby, O34192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Donnelly, Jr., O34359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Ernest Creek, O39099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tobias Raphael Philbin, Jr., O34406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carroll Wayne Andresen, O34388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marvin Leo Lindmark, O34393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Hiram Darwin, O33779, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow John Steichen, O34392, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Emmett Vollendorff, O34398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Wilbert White, O32250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clifton Henry Chamberlain, Jr., O56907) Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Paul DeCamara, O34399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph John Prusaitis, O34402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thurmond Gordon, O34397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Luther Seale Crawford, O34297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Calvin Cross, O39092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Terrance Charles Fitzgerald, O45700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Woodrow Wild, O39142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Thomas Mixon, O34281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris James Lucree, O33401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Ralph Gates, O53457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wesley Charles Franklin, O45565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Moser Winder, O34420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Delmar Lewis Oaks, Jr., O34419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Regnault Fausset, O34421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Woods Bengel, O34423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Ira Fernandes, O53129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Clement Burn, O34426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Parlier Hinkley, O40675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Lawrence Havel, O53180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Eugene Porter, O34480, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Paul Alexander, jr., O34481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward LeRoy Nicely, O53251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Edward Roberts, O35232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellis Warner Williamson, O34484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Melvin Cock, O34294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest LeRoy Perry, O53324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Patrick Sweeney, O34485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Peter Louis DalPonte, O34486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Henry Gerfen, O53165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Delaney McDowell, O35204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Lynton Dalton, O34488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Jackson Hawkins, Jr., O45759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gust Edwin Olson, O46079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Edwin Garrett, O35307, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joachin Joseph Speciale, O45946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Edward McKinney, O39090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Edwin Divine, O45523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic Calvin Thompson, O35255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cader Cothren Terrell, O34555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vern Louis Joseph, O53375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lysle Iver Abbott, O34559, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hodo Boykin, O45838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Hubert Lester Nolan, O39111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winfred Clayton Naselroad, O35259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Guysbert Bogart Vroom, Jr., O46019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William David Brodbeck, O34565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Woodrow Wilson Marriott, O33486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Britton Mayo, O46024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Hunter McCorkle, O45837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Albert Harris, O53117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Adelbert Dale Boggs, O34569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Clark Rubottom, O35286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Langendorf, O45551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj Marcus Lindley Parsons, O45699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jay Dee Vanderpool, O34570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Alan Rogers, O24572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Lloyd Harper, O35272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Tobias Burke, O34575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Rocky Ross, O34278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Frederick Via, O34635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Chesley, Jr., O53264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Harvey Featherston, O34339, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Willard Adelbert Smith, O34637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dean Warren Barnes, O40745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Leonard DeNoya, O53352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Dee Pickard, O34639, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack G. Hines, O46117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major George Bernie Jordan, O34644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj Leo Clifford Cooksley, O34571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Deason, O35323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Irving Resseguie, O53240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Dickerson, O34189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Jack Miller Duncan, O34647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Archie Tom Madsen, O45806, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Kenneth Robert Lindner, O34650, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj Floyd David Williams, O39139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Levens Metcalf, Jr., O53179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Worth Linn, O34653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Reeves Howell, Jr., O46248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Teir, O40701, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Roy Little, O53090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Billy Harland Kerr, O34655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnnie Clites Brink, O34658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Newton, O40742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Rhodes Kugler, O34663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donn Warrington Yoder, O34664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jean Lindley Wood, O34660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harley Neivell Miller, O53155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Louis Cornelius DeGooyer, O45562, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earle Warren Aldrich, O34667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Malone Hall, O40692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Austin Joseph McDermott, Jr., O40754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Joseph Carney, O34672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Martin Piper, O34674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter John Angers, Jr., O34677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Leon Geer, O34675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robertson Kent, O34678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jim Dan Keirsey, O34681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Cecil Caryl Helena, O53271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Esko Davis, O39136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Lawrence Keeth, O34687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald William Bunte, O39122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Calvert Snoddy, Jr., O34690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Art Harvey Davis, O34693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Martin Flynn, O39133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Franklin Harrison, O46168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Joseph Waszak, O35415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Arthur Hicks, Jr., O53246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Burns Crayton, O34682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ralph Richmond, O46217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Nelson, O34692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clovis Dee Heard, O34680, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Fred Dennis Chesnut, O45795, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Nelson Harris, O46059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Houck Spencer, O34719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Donald McLanachan, O46037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Spann, O34695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Hawthorne Armor, Jr., O45590, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

×Capt. James John Cortez, O53277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Lynn Balthis, O34705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Holt Hitchcock, O34708, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Cooper, Swearingen, O34711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Jordan Fee, O34705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Joseph Hoffman, O34709 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Lt. Col. Arndt Lewis Mueller, O34700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Eugene DePuy, O34710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Paul Arntz, O39126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Newton Stewart, O34712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Clayton Norvin Gompf, O34716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Gilchrist, O45818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edgar Hiatt, O34717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Mair Muller, O34715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Harold Gold, O34862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Randolph Thomas, Jr., O45667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles LaForrester Cudlipp, O35265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Beverly Matthews, O34721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Chambers Bird, O35264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Felton Hatcher Moore, O34724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Walter Urban, O34722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Joseph Morgan, O35260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Michael Kessler, O34723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Anthony Richeson, O34725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Philip Zeigler, O34726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Quentin Roosevelt Hardage, O35276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Boswell Ayres, O34732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Leroy Gunn, O34734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Howell Moore, O34735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Alexander Murray, Jr., O34739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Keith Merrill Schmedemann, O34742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Clark Maling, O34745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Foster Franklin Flegeal, O39118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Key Walker, Jr., O34744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Keith Angwin, O34741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Joseph Vidlak, O46142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Glenn Morris Harvey, O46210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Welch Stone, Jr., O40712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Franklin Herrington, O34756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Brad Wilson, O35162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Manly Seaton, O34760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Glenn Appel, O40700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harold Francis Buerschinger, O46015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Alexander Noseck, O45645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Louis Packman, O34761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ray Clinton Lewis, O53181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Hayes, O53437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Russell Meacham, O53374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winston Earl Wallace, O34766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis Hart, Jr., O45792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Blodgett Avery, O45706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harold Bingham, O34828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert John Ryan, O40631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erling Jerome Foss, O39127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Ray Harry Hurst, O45720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Cassin Langley, O40691, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Abb Chrietzberg, O34838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gibson Reynolds Finley, O34837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John William Oswalt, O46071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilfred Christian Becker, O34839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederic Harold Palmblad, O34845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Mahan Brooks, O53449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Rex Golston, Jr., O40657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Edward Maness, O39135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Webster Downer, O34854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Elliott Moran, O39103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howard Elder, Jr., O53453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Bowlby, O45718, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Robert Bauch, O34401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Edward Nolan, O53275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Leroy Victor Pearson, O34869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Frierson Burgess, Jr., O35280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack George Condon, O45542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles John Rahaeuser, O34873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Eggleston Eastlake, Jr., O34879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gerald Hugh Shea, O34882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Serlo Isenson, O34884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Johnson Grimsley, O39119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Rex Harry White, Jr., O45595, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marcus Lundy Powell, Jr., O34558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Powell Alexander Fraser, O34889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Mahlon Brown, O39120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Beverly Money Read, O46180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Burr Johnstone Randall, Jr., O35611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Stanley Barrett, O34939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mark Joseph Gill, O45784, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Monroe Kemp, O39146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Rodney Middleton Covert, O45998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Franz, O53425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Earl Holmes, O46227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin I. Donley, O34887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Captain Louis Alfred Shuford, O45876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Harold Craze, O53279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Warren Cobb, O45651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Sheldon Harley Wheeler, O34949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Edward Parker, O34951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Elmer Westervelt, O45723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Anderson McIntosh, Jr., O45816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Hamilton Franklin, O35175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Marion Burney, O34956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl William Gustafson, O45560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Stewart Stafford, O34556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James William Lane, O53091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Edward Griest, O34573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Lynn Nungesser, O53150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Joseph Neary, O34964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irvin Francis Carpenter, O39112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Sylvester Conaty, Jr., O34965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Leroy Morgan, O45796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas Carter France, Jr., O34967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Irvine Furman Belser, Jr., O53122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hudson Rupert Hurst, O53242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winston George Whall, O34970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Leonard Sexton, O45778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Gordon Fowler, O53218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Eberhart Griscti, O34666, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Magnus Leo Smith, O40698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

×Maj. John Harold Harden, O34977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Douglas Haig Patterson, O34979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Taylor Agee, O45709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Henri Frederik Frank, O46187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Vinson Milano, O46052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Andrew Fisher, O53311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward John Kloos, O53291, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Hanitch Johnson, O46097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nicholas Samuel Strider, O45589, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. D. L. Benton, Jr., O35022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irving Darris Warden, O53379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Richard Couch, O53462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Randall Harris Wise, O53315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Mitchell Smith, Jr., O40724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George James Holly, Jr., O46075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aley Leonard Smith, O35044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Franklyn Jenkins, O53168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Lee Burke, O35047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Thomas Bernard, O45997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Peter Hidalgo, O35049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Roger Carpenter, O53450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Arch Van Sandt, O40762, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Mann, Jr., O40652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Francis Pope, O40672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Benjamin Silman, O35048 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Howard Mehaffie, O40761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Elden Sharp, O35046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bryant Pridgen, O53197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Phipps, Jr., O39087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Norman Fairbanks, O40747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Castle, O35299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Lee Hall, O46208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claudius Miller Easley, Jr., O35056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Kebbe Anderson, O35057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Leo Henry Eberhardt, O53435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Michael Puetz, O34654, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Montgomery Graham, Jr., O53182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William McKinley Copley, Jr., O39114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph DeWight Kooken, O34743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Lee Smith, O34746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Herman Henderson, Jr., O45534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Perry Michael, O40669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Allen Ward, O34415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Kent Millar, Jr., O53428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Helmuth Otto Froeschle, O35070, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lee Waters, O34720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Walter Markey, O35143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Harold Greeley, O35144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Guy Humphrey Drewry, Jr., O35274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Edwin Howell, O39149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Lee Newell, O35145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul LaVern McCrillis, O45768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Stuart King, O35147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Merritt, O46220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Edward Marfing, O34713, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Robert Franks, O53431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugo Wagner Heffelfinger, O46143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Hazen Purkitt, O35152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Yancey Henry Knowles, O35153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lawrence Roy Ligon, O35154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Sampson Wiley, Jr., O45927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Crane, O46186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip George Walker, O46287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond LaVerne Latimer, O34833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Granville Attaway Sharpe, O34986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Henry Homburg, Jr., O35159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Adams Smoak, O46267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel LaFayette Reid, O35160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Beatty Meanor, Jr., O34981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Cameron Johnson, O34950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Gundlach, O35163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Dixon Tummons, O46124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Emery Branigin, O53419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bill Gene Smith, O53387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bruce Smith, O46241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Olaf Gunnir Miller, O53184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Gildee, Jr., O35303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellsworth Cundiff, O34847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Bautz, Jr., O34750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vernon Wilbur Morgan, O45837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Antonio Villarreal Reyes, O35292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Isaac Williams, O34960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Arthur Dwight, O35305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Charles Beaumont, O35059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claire Benjamin Penzkofer, O46282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lloyd Osgard, O35315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Howard Chadwick Blazzard, O35453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Matthew Hart, O24635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Seigfried Henry Spillner, O35300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Ray Dingeman, O53463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerry M. Sage, O35326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nelson Crawford, O35353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Washington Coss Carter, O35390, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Pemberton Frazier, O46344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Edward Williams, O35386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Brown Thompson, O36635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Donovan Ziler, O35412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harley Williard Ladd, O53512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Wilson Dean, Jr., O35420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Thomas Knowles, O35418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Harwell Barfield, O35425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Walton Greer, O35426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Russell Solomon Bieber, O35424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Haskell Lee, O35428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Sims, O35435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Randall Smith, O35445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Daniel Kennedy, Jr., O35444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Ben Wilson Perry, O35447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence William Jones, O45646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Albert Shaw, O35451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Wilbur Cook, O35454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Edward Quigley, O46420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Ike Looney, O40776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Leigh Fallwell, O35463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alan A. Sawyer, O35464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Sabolyk, O35475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Newton Jack Heuberger, O35476, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Lee Meggs, O35474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Randolph Lacy Jones, O35477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Percy Franklin Lisk, Jr., O53540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cary Andrew Kennedy, Jr., O40779, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McEachron Gaustad, O39164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Herschel Henry Hutsinpiller, O35487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hollis Dakin, O40780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Gage Kline, O46466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joyce Bailey James, O53547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Feller Parr, O35524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Fred Clarke, Jr., O46484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ottis Quimby, Jr., O35534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hoyt Leslie Fulmer, Jr., O35535, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Robert Rotz, O46505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Reed Van Dusen, Jr., O35538, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joffre Haig Boston, O35537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Staten Browning, Jr., O35536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Pickering Waters, Jr., O35543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Joseph Cronin, O35545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lester Earl Barlow, O35544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph McCabe, Jr., O39167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel McLaughlin, O46520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard McGowan Lee, O35551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Londy Bailey, O35552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Herbert Roberts, O35553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Malcolm Kullmar, O35555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Winfield Scott Williams, O40789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Solomon Lowe, O35561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Leverne Doupe, O35562, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James Thomas, O35564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Robert Ulrich, O35566, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Richard Kennedy, O46534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Arthur Godding, O40790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Paul Keleher, O35568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William McEvoy, O35570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Woodson Barnett, Jr., O46540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Paul Robinson Sheffield, O35569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Bartley Kitchens, Jr., O40791, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edgar Ray Jackson, Jr., O46542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen Edward Woodruff, Jr., O36172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Carroll Kendrick, O46545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hutchinson O'Connell, O35575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Edward Leeper, O46552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Geyer Jones, O24576, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Knut Harold Raudstein, O53611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Madison Ramsey, O53610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Jennings Wagstaff, O35585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Vincient Roberts, O35584, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Peter Mahon, O40792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert James MacDonald, O39172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Dreiss, O35589, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hal LeRoy Schroeder, O25297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Junior Newton Cox, O46561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Henry Hoye, O46570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oren Clifford Wingfield, O39173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fariss Hardin, O35600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Billie McKemie, O46573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arnold Alvord Berglund, O35599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Russell Cornwell Geist, Jr., O46585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Gettings, Jr., O46600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Lloyd Raines, O35621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Foster Barto Watson, O35665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Sammet, Jr., O35624, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John DeHart Foulk, O35629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marshall Milford Motes, O46627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Benjamin McDivitt, O53661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Ulin Overall 3d, O46630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Walter Vail, O35647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Alden Burke, O46646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Binkley Williams, O35669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Eyre Redheffer, O35672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Elmer Holmgrain, O46656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Charles Aycock, O46664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Darrell Bowen, O46668, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Edwin Harris, O46675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert John Daniels, O53682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Franklin Bradley Simmons, Jr., O53683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Basil Wilcox Henderson, O46671, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Don Carlos Faith, Jr., O46673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter William Mirras, O53684, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Kennedy Bennett, O35691, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marvin Minter Parr, O53681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Sam Floyd Warren, O34289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ed Vardo Hendren, Jr., O46682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Gussie, O35697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frederick Gay, O40804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Wilford Dennis Gower, O35699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Swaim, O46685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Chester McAdams, O39177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Smith Coleman, O35710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Earl Durham, O35709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wesley Jarrell Simmons, O35713, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Chason Walker, O35719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Febrey Arnold, O46714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Harry Cowles, O35735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lockhart Horn, Jr., O53717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Roger Barclay, O46727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harris Whitton Hollis, O53724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Emerson Ford, O35741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wayland Jones, Jr., O35763, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Fredric Dean, O35768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Delard Goudreau, O46744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Wallace Moore, O53733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Morris Zimmerman, O53738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Anthony Robbins, O35780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Charles Crawford, O35784, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marion Steele Bell, O35787, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brooks Ogden Norman, O35793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Daniel McNally, O35796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Curtis Bone, O35792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Clark DeReus, O35790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Gordon Owens, O39181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilburn Elihue Grant, O35789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elden Cornelius Campbell, O40817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Maj. Charles Lenier Anderson, O35797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Carl Schrader, O40820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Adolph Herman Phillips, O35888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Killip, O40823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick McEvoy, O46774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Walter Emil Stielau, O35815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Lee Waddell, Jr., O25371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Dougherty, O35817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Bayard Hansen, O35819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Augustine Dever, O40827, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Minor Stewart, O46789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elvin Vernon Vestal, O40828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome William Schrader, O35821, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Freeman Beaver, O46800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cud Thomas Baird 3d, O46804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Bigart, O35831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Waldron John Winter, O35832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Stephan Lekson, O35837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmond Ragland Urquhart, O40831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harold Cook White, O46808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manford Milton Canary, O35841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wylie Ben Walters, O35840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Forrest Boomer, O35846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl William Kruger, O35845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lloyd George Smith, O38024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Rathbone Mumma, O46819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Zakel, Jr., O35849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Francis Andrew Seitzer, O46818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Wilson Hemingway, O35854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joel Phillip Holcomb, O46829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence William Patten, O35859, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert James Bennett, O46832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred George Steiner, O35860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Durning Harlan, O35861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Arthur Gleason, Jr., O35882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Woodrow Reed, O35884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward John Chrysler, O53809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Donald Denchfield, O35886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Raymond Elliott, O40837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Earl Holzbach, Jr., O46861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard LaVerne Nispel, O53810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vincent Henry Ellis, O53814, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Theodore Macek, O46866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Jessie Ellison, O40846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Oliver Herman Bruce, O46926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Lewis Long, O46931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Morrison Click, O39183, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Dale Reid, O35712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jeremiah Bryant Monk, Jr., O46946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Herman Parthum, Jr., O35939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ardery Campbell, O25400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kermit Reginald Mason, O46951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louie Neil Rodgers, O35941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Tyron Earl Tisdale, O46953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Jackson Allen, O46952, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Oeland Denham, O35948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Radford Donald Hyde, O35949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Earl Roberts, O46969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Brandon Brantwood Trussell, Jr., O39190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Isaac Edward Whisnant, O46983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Henry Hill, Jr., O39191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Robert Poole, O35959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Alvah McKean, O35958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Paul Tallon, Jr., O35965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Norfleet Chavis, O39193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Stanley Staiger, O53879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Walton Fickessen, O35973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Truett Cooper, O35983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard John Titley, O35982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bryan Cowan, O40850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vocqsal Doss Wood, Jr., O47003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Walter MacIndoe, O25407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Dods Beard, O47010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin Johnston, O35987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Edward Milotta, O35989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Davis Morgan, Jr., O47012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Locke Lyons, O35997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Don Rue Hickman, O35996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward Purcell Ludington, O47015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Esler Whitmore, O35993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hugh Wear, O47014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marlin Watson Camp, O35999, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Truman Alexander Hopkins, O36057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Laurence Sylvester Browne, O47086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Braddock Babbs, O39203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Eugene Adams, O39202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Tomlinson Eichnor, O53927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Davis Bush, O47101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S Army).

Maj. Carl Peter Keiser, Jr., O36066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William James Harris, O47105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Ellsworth Dunlap, O40862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Martin Wright, O53931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Albert Broadus Dillard, Jr., O53930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Morton Young, Jr., O47107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Cecil Vogelsang, O36078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lester DeWayne Royalty, O36081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Washington Putnam, Jr., O39206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Trampe Loesing, O36090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Hart Hottenroth, O24645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Henry Hayes, O24646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Preston Halsell, O24647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Ellsworth Cumpston, O24650, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Edward Hesselbacher, Jr., O24651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Paul Young, O24652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bryan Newman 3d, O24654, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Reiley Finney, O24655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irving Rock Obenchain, Jr., O24658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Willard Vogel, O24661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Winthrop Barnes, O24663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ward Watkin, Jr., O24664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Joseph Hamerly, O24665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Ambrose Martell, O24666, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Paul Koisch, O24669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Arthur Raymond, O24670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerrold Duster Snow, O24671, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph John Schmidt, Jr., O24672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eric Castlereigh Orme, O24673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Robert Cerar, O24674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Dumond Wilder, Jr., O24676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip George Krueger, O24677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Tuttle Hamilton, Jr., O24678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Miles Lowell Wachendorf, O24679, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Peyton Tabb, Jr., O24680, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Charles Roecker, Jr., O24681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Edgar Rosell, Jr., O24682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Clement Mattina, O24683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mahlon Eugene Gates, O24685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Louis Hennessy, O24690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Alley Barnes, O24694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Army).

Maj. Seymour Rubenstein, O24695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmond Harrison Leavey, Jr., O24698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Francis Eugene Voegel, O24699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Leland Weeks, O24700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Preston Sheffey 3d, O24701, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Baker, O24704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Raymond Eisenschmidt, Jr., O24706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Wayne Leonard Bart, O24707, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rosario Pietro Bonasso, O24714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Matthew Rienzi, O24715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Fred Shutrump 2d, O24718, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rollin Thomas Steinmetz, Jr., O24720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Russell Kraft, Jr., O24726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Patrick Murphy, O24729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lawrence Lambert, O24731, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Garrard Foster, O24732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Garth Stevens, O24735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Davis Terry, O24739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Walter Fritz, O24744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Corley, Jr., O24746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army)

Maj. John Randle Watson, O24748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Alfred Vivian, O24751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Henry Riedel, Jr., O24756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Eldon Buchanan, O24759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George R. Allin, Jr., O24760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Lahm, O24761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard John Pasciak, O24765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Raybourn O'Neal, O24772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Matthew John Redlinger, Jr., O24775, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Hilary Connolly, Jr., O24783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Dean Short, O24789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel John Dilworth, O24790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Rogers Seip, O24792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Allan Rickman, O24796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Hubbard Hays, O24797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Windsor Rice, O24800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Horatio Clagett, Jr., O24803, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Lee Lewis, O24809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Severino Martinez, Jr., O24811, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Short, O24812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Carpenter, Jr., O24816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Kenneth Charbonneau, Jr., O24817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Dennis Sitterson, Jr., O24818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Joseph Roberts, O24820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Nicholas Thompson, O24823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mark Howard Terrel, O24826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Russell Deane, Jr., O24835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Boone Bartholomees, O24839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Harmeling, Jr., O24843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Stanley Geiger, Jr., O24845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Peter Iuliucci, O24848, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Henry Ivey, O24849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Harvey Tarver, O24851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Alfred Wyman, O24854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Hilton Offley, Jr., O24871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Marmaduke Grimshaw, O24872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel William Koster, Jr., O24873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linwood Fogg Jordan, O24879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Crosson, Jr., O24880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ulysses Grant Jones, Jr., O24882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Houston Townsend, O24890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Dale Crittenberger, Jr., O24893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Haley Caruthers, Jr., C24696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Dean Hennessee, O24897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Edward Hunter, O24898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas Cunningham Murray, O24899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richard Pendergrast, O24905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel Beck Stephens, O24913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Griffin Clapp, Jr., O24914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert MacDougall Bringham, O24925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Hall Marks, Jr., O24935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Butner Clay, O24937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Alfred Divers, O24945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Talbot Russell, O24947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Fuller Davis, Jr., O24948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wolcott Ryder, Jr., O24951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Burnett Spilman, O24955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Edward Halpin, O24957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry William Urrutia, O24966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Ray Rogers, O24967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edgar Shedd 3d, O24971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Virgil Morey, O24975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lawrence Eckert, O24976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Richard Miles, Jr., O24979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donnelly Paul Bolton, O24982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charlie Calhoun Coleman, O24987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Simmons Timothy, O24992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Edward Seifert, O24993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Boyd Freeze Walker, O24998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Aileo, O25000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Doan Rehkopf, O25004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert George Brugh, Jr., O25009, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Denis Crowley, Jr., O25016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Walter Anderson, O25383, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Earl Parsons, Jr., O36095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Neil Hickok, O36096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Pedro Roxas Flor Cruz, C47122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Vincent Silvis, O36098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Christian Beachler, O36099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Schudt, O53939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Andrew Meads, Jr., O36108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Andrew Wiley, O47130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Rowland Bethea, O47132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude Arther Hays, O47134, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Augustine Kerley, O47139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald William Homann, O25382, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Orville Theodore Lowe, O36111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Marshall Whitenton, O36114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Albert Guenthner, O47146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ignatius Ciraldo, O36117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Thomas Falls, O47145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Barr Nixdorff, O40867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald King Stevens, O36118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hughes Hard, O36120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Pershing Bane, O36121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathaniel Andrew Gage, Jr., O47155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Blount Harding, Jr., O53958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Adams Wilson, O36129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Leslie Crawley, Jr., O53963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Bartley Cagle, Jr., O36131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Thomas Paul, O36142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Felix Wilhm, O47170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Lane Gude, O36138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Simuel Henderson, O25412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Reece Sedberry, Jr., O25415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Alexander Duke, O40873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Artha Darby Williams, Jr., O40871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Harding Stutler, O36148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Heacock McBride, O47172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Richard Miller, O53967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Jean Dennis, O36151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ivan King, O36153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wilbur Gilman, O25394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Raisey Stevens 3d, O39215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Bailey Jones, O36168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Wayne Lyon, O36169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Leo Farrell, Jr., O36160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Eschman Curran, Jr., O36163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max Adams Morris, O25379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Verne Church, O36171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Clifton Honea, Jr., O36175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Clayton Butsch, O47199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Woodrow Kogstad, O36176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Andrew Guntharp, O36178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Griffith Hays, Jr., O25390, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Leroy Harrison, O25373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Andrew Spencer, O36076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Lorenzo Leech, Jr., O25386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Benjamin Thomas, O25411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Carter Fuson, O36184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Evans-Smith, O53988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Mitchell Hill, O36185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis Ahern, O36187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Henry Hamilton McKee, O36190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles John Anderson, O25376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Berrisford Harlan Walker, O36195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Forrest Richardson, O36193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carroll Fordyce, O53996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Paul Testa, O40877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dow Seigel Grones, O47225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Marion Seignious, O47226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Theodore Lunger, O25388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Wendel, Jr., O36220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Eugene Williams, Jr., O36227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. James Dewey Ramsey, O36228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Derwood Cann, Jr., O36230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eric Roland Mills, Jr., O47272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Virgil Parker Foster, Jr., O36229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Patrick Barry Ward, O36239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harold Kenneth Reynolds, O39218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Earle Pinckney, O47275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kimball Russ Richmond, O47281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hall Breaden McElree, O36252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salve Hugo Matheson, O36253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dallas Andrew Pilliod, O36257, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Linwood Arthur Carleton, O36260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Newton Levick, O47292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Leslie Field, Jr., O40890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Lawson Johnson, O36285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Vitold Weiss, O36287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Clifford Neve, O40893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Norman Whitley, O47359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edwin Mead, O36314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Cyril Dorn, O36316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant), U. S. Army).

Maj. William Treloar Russell, O25410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Campbell, O47367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Harold Paul Baker, O40895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Gregory Gust, O36330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Louis Klingenhagen, O39223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Franklin Young, O36327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clyde Hudgins Baden, Jr., O36333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Joseph Nemethy, O36332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Edmund Neidner, O47381, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard George Foelsch, O36337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Niram LeRoy Sauls, O47386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Elton David Vaughan, O47395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Charles Golladay, O40897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Elwood Shiflet, O47394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James William Gunn, O40896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Basile, O40900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Stanley Kimmitt, O36343, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Dowell Capshaw, Jr., O36345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Jermiah O'Leary, O36344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Bee McFadden, Jr., O54083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Gelling, O36353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sumner Freedland, O47401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Young, O36350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marshall Bragg Garth, O36357, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Cunningham, O36361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Charles Young, O36262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Attison Luttrell, O36363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Petruzel, O36364, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Cleveland Armentrout, O47412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Harry Patterson, O54094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Edward Condon, O36373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Anthony McCloskey, O36372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Molloy Clark Vaughn, Jr., O25393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morgan Agustus Whitfield, O36389, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Daniel Webber, Jr., O36393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Calvin Pinson, O36408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Edwin Temple, O47459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Murphy, O36776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert L. Duncan, O39230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Eugene Napper, O36416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Urban Schmidt, O36425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Gayle Whitsitt McFadden, O54125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Dan Anthony Mobley, O54145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rufus Eugene Hallmark, O47516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herald Bud Gallinger, O36481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Pershing Brubaker, O36484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Edward Cavanaugh, Jr., O36485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Curtis Franklin, O47521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Briggs Lathrop, O36492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oats A. Pynes, Jr., O36491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Leary Peterson, O36496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Capt. Charles Irvan Olsen, O47541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Albert McMahon, O54182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Pickford Clarke, Jr., O36505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wayne Elbert Ligon, O36510, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kroner Eney, O36514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carl Crisson, O36520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Hillsman Underwood, O36541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Prescott Kean, Jr., O40927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Merrill Brizzard, O54027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Darrell George Wood, O54196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Orr Jackson, O47577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cornelius John Shaffer, O47584, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Boehmer, O36550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

First Lt. Leslie Davis Smith, O33042, United States Army.

Maj. Jerome Belsky, O40932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Francis Rey, O47633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jesse Lee Morrow, Jr., O36564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Edwards, O54229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Whitson Marr, O36567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Restani, O36568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore William Peterson, O47644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Howard Chapin, O47651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Carlton Bender, O47706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Oscar Ernest Schlamersdorf, O39248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eldridge Clair Dudley, O54260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Alexander Pashley, Jr., O40942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward O'Neal Logan, O36610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Henry Herndon, O36636, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Regner, O25395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Saunders Parkins, Jr., O47716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ross Bond, O36618, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Elza Reafleng, O36620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Spencer Webster, O36621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Charles Finneran, O36643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jasper Stuart Moore, O47770, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Ransom Olcott, O54292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Beall Harvey, O47778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Joseph DeAngelis, O39252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John David Hill, O25401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh King Boyd, O36658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Fredrick Robens, O36665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Ernest Lester Knoll, O54304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Scott Torgeson, O25421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Laney Gordon, O36662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carroll McFalls, Jr., O47800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Michael Hudak, O47803, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howell Mathias, O47844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Frederick Monsarrat, O36698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Eugene Gibb, O47853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Council Braxton, O36703, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Howard Irvine, O36705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawson William Magruder, Jr., O36711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Richard Burdick, O36760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eldon Robert Davis, O36771, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Anthony Abrignani, O40966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Warren Johnson, O36315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Randolph Mathews, Jr., O47934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Adrain Raichlen, O54419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Scanlan, O47971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Louis Corrado, O54417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alvin Clendenning Metcalfe, O36809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James Sutton, O36816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Paul Biggio, Jr., O36821, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wiliam Edward Potts, O54461, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Hugh McGovern, O36851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herman Lamar West, O48031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Donald McQuinn, O48053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Franklin Parkins, O36855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byrne Allen Evans, O36859, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Paul Bernard McCain, O48072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Tetley Omenhiser, Jr., O54485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Leon Baldwin, O36864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Forrest Ithamar Rettgers, O36414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice Waldo Dunn, O40985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Garcia Uglade, O36354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Ernest Milloy, O35289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oswald C. Smith, O54531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward Pieklik, O36842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Reiley Guthrie, O36240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edward Maertens, O48227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laddie L. Stahl, O36988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Crawford Sheldon, O48236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Grady Francis Lilly, O36990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward O'Leary, O37002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Kirk Singlaub, O37040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Allen Knowlton, O25436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. DeWitt Clinton Armstrong 3d, O25441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Anthony Rebh, O25444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Ambler Camm, O25448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas King Blue, O25453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Roscoe Ellis, O25455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McClure, Jr., O25456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Creel Marshall, O25467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Johnson Talbott, O25468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrie Hewitt Richards, O25458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Emmanuel Saari, O25470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cecil George Young, Jr., O25472, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Love Starnes, Jr., O25475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Guthrie Hillman, O25477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emmett Robinson Reynolds, O25489, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Stuart MacVeigh, O25496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter William Hogrefe, O25518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Foster Stephens, O25539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Nickel, O25553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stewart Canfield Meyer, O25530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Paul Edward Andrepont, O25570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lawrence Philip Bischoff, Jr., O25571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Gray Wheelock 3d, O25572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Lyndon Wilkes, Jr., O25575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. McGlachlin Hatch, O25578, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vasco John Fenili, O25579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merle Landry Carey, O25586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Lukacs Toth, O25587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Jacob Luther, Jr., O25597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Eugene Wilbourn, O25606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Robert Michael, O25609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edward Kelleher, O25611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Mease, Jr., O25614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Alden Hine, Jr., O25617, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Benjamin Hollis, Jr., O25651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Maude Davenport, Jr., O25656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman David Greenberg, O25695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Kamell Maertens, O25693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Michael Flanagan, Jr., O25710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Alvin Wirt, O25725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hamlin Schofield, Jr., O25754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Daniel Moore, O25760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Wilson Brown, O25769, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hiram Pietsch, Jr., O25773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elvy Benton Roberts, O25781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Boone Seegers, O25789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Everett Edward Lowry, Jr., O25799, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Henderson Farnsworth, O25800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Arthur Mesereau, O25822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carlton Clyde Thornblom, O33750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

NOTE.—All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 6, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. H. Lambdin, pastor of St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father, which art in Heaven, we bow in quiet reverence before Thee today as we turn our minds to thoughts of highest levels. We desire to draw closer to Thee that we might hear Thy voice giving us encouragement and wise counsel as we begin our activities in this day's session.

Our minds get disturbed and confused with many problems, hard-to-solve problems, and with many responsibilities, difficult and trying ones to our way of thinking; yet, O God, we know we can come to Thee for that extra strength which we feel we need in the turmoil of these confusing times.

We know that if we will but trust Thee, Thou wilt see us through successfully, even through the hard places which seem to grow more numerous from day to day.

We ask Thy blessing on us all; and on all the peoples of our Nation whom we seek to serve, honestly and with appreciation of their confidence in us. May we strive to do our part to bring about a real peace on earth, with good will toward men of all nations, and may we help to establish good feeling and brotherly kindness in the earth. We pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one on the OPA and related matters and in the other on the subject of money for school buildings.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

COMPARATIVE INDEXES—COST OF LIVING AND WAGES, 1945–48

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have heard much stress laid upon the consumer price index of 170.5. That is only part of the story. From the figures furnished me this morning by the Department of Labor, we find that while costs have risen, the average weekly earning index of manufacturing workers, based on the same period 1935–39, has risen even more, to 230.9. That is 60 points more than the cost-of-living index.

There follows a table setting out by quarters beginning January 1, 1945, the cost-of-living index and the increase in earnings:

	Consumers' price index for moderate-income families in large cities, 1945–48	Gross average weekly earnings of manufacturing production workers, 1945–48
1935–39	100.0	100.0
1945:		
First quarter	126.9	211.5
Second quarter	128.1	207.4
Third quarter	129.3	190.4
Fourth quarter	129.3	182.8
1946:		
First quarter	129.6	184.2
Second quarter	131.7	191.3
Third quarter	144.1	198.9
Fourth quarter	152.2	205.9
1947:		
First quarter	153.2	211.2
Second quarter	156.0	216.0
July	158.4	218.5
August	160.3	219.3
September	163.8	225.1
October	163.8	227.7
November	164.9	228.8
December	167.0	235.0
1948:		
January	168.8	232.2
February	167.5	230.8
March	166.9	232.2
April	169.3	230.6
May	170.5	230.9

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, using middle month of each quarter for consumers' price index figures.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; living costs have risen, but so have earnings. Both sides of the story should be told so the public may be fully advised.

DISMANTLING OF INDUSTRIAL PLANTS IN GERMANY

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on December 5 last, I called the attention of the House, and I might say in particular our Committee on Foreign Affairs, to the fact that plants were being sold and dismantled in Germany, and at the same time we were shipping material to Europe to replace like plants.

Such action is not only downright foolish and a terrific waste of our tax moneys, but is so unrealistic that it appears to be part of a gigantic plan to keep our production down and prices high.

For over 2 years now almost weekly the Department of Commerce Office of International Trade circulars, described as Reparations News, have listed well over 2,000 German plants already dismantled or to be dismantled and offered for sale in the United States for reparations. I would like to call attention to the fact that there are at this time held by the War Assets Administration in their New York office four turbogenerators. Inquiries from American business regarding the purchase of these generators for use by American industry here in America are met with the bald statement that they will not be sold to American industry but are going to be turned over to ECA for shipment to Germany.

Why? Is it because there are no turbogenerators available in Germany? Just so the facts may be shown, I want to give you just a few plants which are listed by the Allied Reparations Commission as including turbogenerators:

Paraxol plant, Lippoldsberg, Germany.

Hastedt steam power plant, serial No. A/S/183, Bremen, Germany.

Grosskraftwerk Mannheim, A., G., serial No. A/S/177, Mannheim-Neckarau, Germany.

H. Soehne Lavis, serial No. A/S/130, Offenbach, Germany.

G. m. b. H. Anorgana, serial No. A/S/86, Gendorf, Germany.

Toeging, serial No. A/S/87, Muhldorf, Germany.

These are just a few of the plants which actually have power-generating equipment available. Any one of you by checking Reparations News I mentioned earlier can verify the foregoing facts for yourself.

Is it not time that this kind of foolishness be brought to an end? There certainly is no sense in ripping out this equipment over there and then having ECA give them new equipment with our dollars to replace it. Certainly, here is a specific case for the watchdog committee to get to work on.

MELROSE, MASS., A DEBT-FREE CITY

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, with city tax rates going higher and in some instances by appalling increases and with so many people complaining of the high cost of living when they ought to be concerned with the high cost of government, I am sure my colleagues will agree with me that it is refreshing to be reminded of an instance where hard-headed, common sense, businesslike fiscal management pays off to the great satisfaction of the citizens affected.

Last Monday morning it was my pleasure and pride to join the other former mayors of my home city of Melrose in accepting the invitation of Mayor Thomas L. Thistle to meet him in the city hall to commemorate the paying off of the last remaining item of city indebtedness.

Thus this city of 28,000 becomes the only debt-free city in Massachusetts and perhaps the only one in the eastern part of the United States.

The following story of this noteworthy event is from the Christian Science Monitor of August 2, 1948:

INDEBTEDNESS DISPOSED OF BY MELROSE

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

MELROSE, MASS.—A traditional Yankee pay-as-you-go policy paid off rich dividends in this city today as the municipal government achieved a completely debt-free status.

Down at the Merchants National Bank in Boston, $12,000 in bonds was paid off today by city officials, thus wiping all bonded indebtedness off the city books—and at a time when debts in most other communities are rising sharply.

MAYOR GIVES CREDIT

Mayor Thomas L. Thistle said that Melrose was the only debt-free city in Massachusetts today and very likely in all of New England and much of the eastern coast.

He said that some western cities where oil has been discovered—practically under the city hall—are debt free.

Credit for the unusual balanced-book status of the municipal government goes not to one man alone, Mayor Thistle emphasized. He attributed the accomplishment to a lot of shrewd mayors, several of them from down Maine, most of them with successful private businesses, who came in here to serve in the mayor's office as a public service.

FORMER MAYORS GATHER

The festive occasion—and even paying off municipal debts can be festive—was observed in the mayor's office as several of the former mayors gathered to talk over old times.

First of the mayors to arrive this morning for the get-together was Charles H. Adams, who served in the mayor's office from 1915–20. Representative ANGIER L. GOODWIN (Republican), of Massachusetts, who was up from Washington for a short week end, also came in for a few minutes' chat with the several mayors. He served as the city's executive here in 1921 and 1922. The Representative left for Washington by plane for the special session of Congress after greeting his colleagues here.

WARTIME OFFICIAL ON HAND

Another of the distinguished Melrose mayors at the meeting today was Carl A. Raymond, a former State budget commissioner, who served as mayor from 1942–47, during the war period when a considerable amount of debt was paid off.

Also present was former Mayor Robert A. Perkins, who served the longest of any of the mayors present—a 10-year period from 1931–41.

Albert M. Tibbetts, who was mayor from 1925–30, was not able to be present.

Achieving the debt-free status has not left Melrose's municipal coffers entirely bare, it was made clear. While retiring debt at a fast rate, the city also accumulated during the war a $350,000 rehabilitation fund which is now being used for construction of sewers and street and building repairs.

MONEY FOR SCHOOL

"In addition, we also have $300,000 accumulated for the building of a new primary school," Mayor Thistle said. "It's all set aside and we will begin construction as soon as we get the appropriate plans."

Mayor Thistle, who described the pay-as-you-go policy as paying for current operating expenses out of current income, said that "a lot of cities camouflage such policies, but we don't. It's the real thing in Melrose."

"Good government and good shrewd Yankee common sense over a period of 50 years are really responsible for the debt-free position of our city today," the mayor said.

COMMUNITY OF 28,000

He added that no bond issues of any consequence were anticipated in the next year or so, although some capital construction may be necessary in another year or so, for which borrowing might be necessary.

Melrose is a 28,000-person community, almost strictly residential, with only a few small factories, has very little tax-free property, and is compactly fitted into a 4.9-mile-square area. It has fewer than 300 city employees and has a strong mayor-type city charter.

DECLARATION OF RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time during the day for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (S. J. Res. 239) to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report and ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 403 of title IV of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is amended by striking out the words "January 2, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "March 1, 1949."

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICINE CREEK DAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like first to bring to the Congress several thousands of "thank you's," then I want to invite the Members to a party—Nebraska style.

Almost 10 years ago I made a speech on the floor of this House, telling the Congress of the flood problems in the Republican River Valley in Nebraska. I described to the Members the disastrous flood which took the lives of more than 100 people and destroyed millions of dollars of property.

Nearly every year which followed, the sturdy people of that valley suffered from floods. Ironically enough, they also suffered from drought. They needed protection from floods; they had to have water for agriculture.

Only last year in the thriving little city of Cambridge, Nebr., 13 people lost their lives in the frightening floods of one of the Republican River tributaries. At that time we made an appeal to the Congress to move up the schedule of the Bureau of Reclamation for the erection of a dam on Medicine Creek just out of Cambridge. This Congress responded to that request and granted funds to start this flood control work.

On Tuesday, August 10, that dam will be dedicated. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Republican Valley are grateful to the Government of the United States, and particularly to the Eightieth Congress for the consideration shown and action taken in this very urgent problem.

In behalf of the people of the Republican Valley, the Republican Valley Conservation Association, the committee in charge and my colleagues from Nebraska, I wish to extend to every Member of this Congress an invitation to come out to Cambridge, Nebr., next week to meet the fine people of my district and to see this Federal project. When Nebraskans have something to celebrate, they do it generously, and the Medicine Creek Dam dedication is one of the most celebration-worthy events in the history of our State.

In the months that lie ahead the Congress will be hearing more about the Republican Valley. On July 22 of this year the Medicine Creek was again at flood stage and almost reached a point where great disaster would have occurred. More work and more money are yet needed to finish the job now undertaken.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MATHEWS and Mr. ELLIS asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the testimony given by Mr. Paul Porter before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the subject of the President's inflation program.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address given by H. Stewart Potter at the opening of Soldier Memorial Field at Halifax, Pa.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GOFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boise Statesman.

Mr. JAVITS and Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, the first on the sale of the State Department art project, and to include figures received from the War Assets Administration as to the actual cash received, and in the second to include a portion of his testimony given yesterday morning before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, August 9, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMEN ARE CITIZENS FIRST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, we are all citizens first and Congressmen second. We shall be going home in a few days. Whether or not the Congress is right or wrong in adjourning, history and the electorate will decide. But let us not fool ourselves as citizens. With food and apparel prices double what they were in 1939, very little will have been done to deal with the high cost of living by legislation. The Congress is taking a very serious, and I think unnecessary, chance on the automatic operation of economic forces to bring prices down, by not adopting legislation for selective controls and allocations; but that is apparently the decision.

Mr. Speaker, there is always the possibility that this special session will be succeeded by yet another one. When we go home, let us at least remember the fundamentals and review with our constituents—workers, management, and farmers—where the real trouble lies. Everybody is getting his—that is understandable but true. Corporate profits are fabulous, farm income is fabulous; we have had three rounds of wage increases and it looks as though we may be up for a fourth round. The greatest corrective of inflation would be to stop the wage-price spiral by agreements among management, workers, and farmers—founded on industrial statesmanship. If that is too much to hope for it will take legislative action—and far more drastic than the palliatives proposed—to save the country from a depression so much worse than that of the thirties as to threaten to shatter our whole society.

If we are to go home, let us at least think it over.

THE HIGH COST OF BREAD AND MEAT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the two most important items in the average person's diet are bread and meat. They are both sold on a free market and the price of wheat and the cost of animals on the hoof determine to a large extent the ultimate cost to the consumer. With a greater supply of wheat and of beef cattle the price of bread and meat would

go down. But what do we find the administration doing?

On July 24 the United States Department of Agriculture put out a release or bulletin recommending that our wheat acreage for next year be decreased by 8 percent, and beef cattle breeding herds be reduced by 517,000 breeders. This means a drastic reduction in our food supply for next year, if the farmers follow such a program. In other words, our administration is officially trying to decrease production of both wheat and meat at the very moment when it is yelling about high food prices.

Mr. Speaker, the cattle population of the Nation has decreased from 82,000,000 to 75,000,000 during the last 5 years, a decrease of 7,000,000, in the face of an expanding population. Today we have something like 15,000,000 more mouths to feed than we had 10 years ago, not to say anything about the European millions that we are feeding. Yet in the face of these figures the Department of Agriculture recommends a further reduction of one-half million breeding cattle.

Why does the Department of Agriculture try to create scarcities, thereby increasing prices, when the President is urging Congress to control inflation and to roll back prices to the 1937 level? This is only one sample of the conflicting and chaotic actions of the present administration.

CONTRAST THE COMMUNIST INFLUENCE IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WITH NEW YORK STATE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the charge has frequently been made here on this floor, that there are more Communists in the State of New York than anywhere else. No doubt that is correct. Figures tend to bear out such an assertion. The latest figures available from the Legislative Reference Service disclose that 44 percent, almost half, of the Communist vote in the United States was cast in the State of New York.

Despite this fact, the contrast between Communist infiltration in the Federal Government and in the New York State government is noteworthy. Apparently, the Communists find the air of Washington more to their liking than Albany.

The President complained yesterday that the shocking disclosures now being made are undermining public confidence in the Government. You are mistaken, Mr. President. The American people have not lost confidence in our great Government, but rather in those who are running it.

Governor Dewey and the Republican administration of New York State do not subscribe to the policy of publicly condemning communism, but privately courting the support of those who follow the Communist line.

In November, the voters will have the opportunity to decide which course they prefer. The issue is clear. There is no doubt what the verdict will be.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by the president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include editorials.

THE THREAT OF COMMUNISM

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, throughout our land, millions of conscientious Americans are worried, deeply worried, about the infiltration of Communists into American institutions and Government. I now speak to you about communism and those who spread its propaganda and carry out its subversive program in the United States.

On the occasion of another great crisis in our history, Patrick Henry said:

> This is no time for ceremony. The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country.

The question of communism is today a matter of awful moment to the American people. We can no longer afford the luxury of ignorance or complacency.

There is a lesson for the American people in Biblical history. You recall that the people described by the Bible in Sodom and Gomorrah were eating and drinking and making merriment when sudden destruction came upon them. The people of the United States today stand in danger of that very fate.

I have been attending hearings now being conducted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and, as a result, I am convinced that America today faces the threat of destruction by communism, from within as well as from without. Fortunately, events during recent weeks have served to dramatize the clear and immediate menace of Communist infiltration in the United States.

During this past week, the Communist Party of the United States held its fourteenth annual national convention in New York City. This was the second Communist convention within a month. The previous convention was held in Philadelphia under the name of the Progressive Party.

The Communist Party's convention in New York was merely an echo of the Wallace convention in Philadelphia. Henry Wallace deserved and he received the endorsement of the Communists and the blessings of "good old Joe" Stalin.

Let us reflect a moment. During the progress of each of these conventions 12 top leaders of the Communist Party of the United States were under indictment in New York on charges of conspiring to overthrow the Government of the United States by force. And in the Nation's capital, coincident with that political circus called a special session, former Soviet espionage agents revealed to the Congress a sordid record of treachery by Communist agents and sympathizers in our own Federal Government.

Thus we see an almost unbelievable spectacle—avowed enemies of our Nation abusing the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and action. These Communists who screamed so loud in Philadelphia and New York are accepting the protection of the very constitutional guaranties that they aim to abolish. Let us ask ourselves this question, and answer it fairly: Can anyone, Communist or otherwise, accept protection of constitutional guaranties and claim, or be permitted, the right to advocate the overthrow of our Government by force, the right to destroy our system and our liberties? The Southern States, during the War Between the States, did not attempt this; they seceded and adopted another constitution. They refused to become traitors. The American Colonies also declared their independence of England before embarking upon the American Revolution.

No one can endeavor to destroy his government and continue to accept its protection without becoming a traitor. Any American who subscribes to the Communist theory of overthrow by force and violence becomes a traitor to his Nation. And any American who gives the Communist Party his support and sympathy in word or in deed is in effect giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States. No person can hold a membership card in the Communist Party and remain a loyal American. Listen to the words of the head of the Communist Party in America, now under indictment for subversive activity. William Z. Foster said:

> The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag. That is the Red flag. * * * The Red flag is the flag of the revolutionary class, and we are part of the revolutionary class, and all capitalist flags are flags of the capitalist class, and we owe no allegiance to them.

This is the same man who today seeks sanctuary behind the Constitution of the United States in order to indulge in treasonable utterances and actions against the Government of the United States.

The indictments in New York serve as a warning to the American people that communism is a real peril to the democracy of this Nation. Hundreds of foreign agents, most of them Reds, are operating in this country and have infiltrated into important positions in our Federal Government. The Communist Party announced in 1945 that it had severed its connections with Moscow, but the recent indictments may be expected to reveal that the party is just as obedient as ever to Soviet Russia and that its political activities in the United States are only a false front.

As necessary as it is to expose these 12 leaders as the heart of the Communist conspiracy, it is equally essential that we expose all those members who operate secretly in labor, government, and other agencies. With the ever-present danger of war, we are fostering a great national tragedy—another Pearl Har-

bor—when we permit Communists, in and out of our Government, to formulate plans for sabotage. We must also determine to what extent the United Nations has been used as a gateway into this country by Communist espionage agents from Russia and other foreign nations.

The American people owe a profound debt of gratitude to our Department of Justice for bringing indictment against the leaders of the most dangerous gang in America today. Also deserving a word of commendation is the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which has gone courageously ahead with its task of smoking the Red rats out of their holes. Any organization that is primarily loyal to a foreign power which is constantly professing hostility toward America deserves exposure. It is now a matter of positive proof that the Communist Party has been and is now engaged in secret and conspiratorial activities within our borders. It is the height of folly for a free government to tolerate movements which are directed toward the violent destruction of democracy.

If such a movement were weak and ineffectual, it might be safely ignored. But the Communist Party is neither weak nor ineffectual. The fact that the Communist Party in the United States claims only 100,000 members should not lull us into a sense of complacency. J. Edgar Hoover has stated:

> I would not be concerned if we were dealing with only 100,000 Communists. The Communists themselves boast that for every party member there are 10 others ready to do the party's work. These include their satellites, their fellow travelers, and their so-called progressive and phony liberal allies. They have maneuvered themselves into positions where a few Communists control the destinies of hundreds.

This fact is apparent from the recent convention of the so-called Progressive Party. The Communists and fellow travelers who dominated the Progressive Party Convention at Philadelphia succeeded in writing a complete Soviet platform, with its undisguised appeasement policy toward Soviet Russia. The foreign policy of the new party might easily have been written in Moscow by Stalin himself. It commits us to get out of Berlin with our troops, out of Europe with our dollars, and let the Soviet Union take over the Old World.

In its domestic program, the Progressive Party platform promises all things to all men, but its chief emphasis is on regimenting the American people and socializing American industry. It is significant that the secretary of the platform committee at the Wallace convention was former CIO General Counsel Lee Pressman, who has been named as one of the leaders of the Communist espionage ring in Washington. Mr. Pressman remained in the CIO until it became evident that the rank and file of the workers were ready to throw off the Communist shackles. Pressman jumped right into the third party movement and took with him hundreds of Communists and fellow travelers. When the Communists set out to gain control of an organization, they do not worry about numerical strength. In fact, they boast publicly that an organization with only 5 percent Communist membership is effectively in their control.

The important point to remember is that the Communists do not need to have a majority in order to rule. Communism achieves and maintains its power through greed, bribery, intimidation, and terror; through hatred, envy, jealousy, and through lying, misleading propaganda, based on the theory that the end justifies the means. Thus, under communism, the mass of the people become completely subservient to the dictatorship of the power-drunk few, as we have seen so clearly around this grief-stricken world.

We must concede, of course, that there are many members of the new party who are not Communists, who are indeed opponents to Communists. With them, the Progressive Party is intended as a means of obtaining new legislation, along the lines provided for in the Constitution. But that is not the purpose of the Communists who control the Progressive Party. Their purpose is to use that party as an instrument of revolution. This fact should be borne in mind by Americans interested in the Wallace movement. They should not permit themselves to be deceived by the Communists. By associating themselves with this movement they become mere tools of the Kremlin.

Communism is opposed to every ideal that America stands for. It is opposed to family life as it exists among religious people. It is opposed to religion in any form. It openly advocates the destruction of religion. It is opposed to freedom of speech and the press. It is opposed to the right of trial by jury. It stands for the confiscation of property. It is opposed to personal liberty in every form. It is pledged to foment class and racial antagonism. Here in the South it is the object of the Communist Party to create racial violence under the hypocritical guise of civil rights.

The time has come to deal forcefully with foreign agents and home-grown traitors. If America is to remain strong and free, we must protect ourselves from the enemy within our gates. America stands today as the sole sentinel of freedom of the individual, the sole champion of freedom of speech and press, the sole land of individual opportunity. America stands alone in a world that is being engulfed by Godless and tyrannical communism that enslaves the body and the soul of men. It is our solemn responsibility to resist the Soviet Union's insatiable lust for world domination. We are a tolerant people, but we can no longer tolerate treachery in the land of the free.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including, in addition to my own remarks, a letter I received from a woman in my district, pleading with me and all of the Members of Congress to do something to make it possible for her to get food and clothing for herself, her three children, and her 80-year-old grandparent, whom she has to support.

This woman works in a mill 40 hours a week at 60 cents an hour. On this $24 a week, she has to support her three children and her grandparent. In order to try to make ends meet, she has to do family washings at night, and has to do the cooking for her family. But let her letter speak for her—for her family—and for the millions of people similarly situated all over America. It is a touching and dramatic appeal to all of us. As this woman says, an increase of 5 or 10 cents an hour would help. How can we afford to adjourn without acting upon the bill which proposes to increase the minimum wage to 75 cents per hour? And how can we fail to do something effective to control prices?

MARIETTA, GA., *August 3, 1948.*

Mr. HENDERSON LANHAM.

DEAR SIR: Will you please, Mr. LANHAM, see what you can do not only for my benefit, but thousands in the same predicament?

I am a widow with three children, ages 6, 8½ and 11 years, and my 80-year-old grandparent to support.

I work in a mill 40 hours a week at 60 cents an hour, which gives me but $24, and have to do family washes nights to make ends meet.

The children are not fed enough of what they should have. I cannot afford meat, milk, and few vegetables. We use canned goods. Oh, if you can be of help in getting a higher wage it would help us and others so much. People who are even getting $50 and $75 a week I hear complain; but, sir, 5 or 10 cents an hour more would be a godsend in my case.

With clothes, food, rent $30 a month and other expenses, it takes more than I can earn. I have even gone without rather than hear the children say, "I'm hungry mama," before I tuck them in bed.

Please, kind sir, do all you gentlemen can to help me and others. God will reward you for it, I know.

With winter so near and coal to buy, and school clothes for the children, it must come off our table or appeal to welfare.

Thank you all so much.

A worried mother,

MRS. CLARA STEWART.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by him last night.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Americans for Democratic Action, Baltimore branch.

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUILDINGS FOR MILITARY RESERVES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a measure to provide national defense buildings for the use of the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States.

The armory construction program, by which States and communities have provided facilities for the National Guard is well known to the public. Of less general public knowledge is the Naval Reserve armory program under which the Federal Government provides training facilities for naval units.

These are insufficient to meet the needs for the expanded Reserve of the present day. It is not possible for the local communities to pay the cost of additional armory construction needed for guard and Army Reserve activities. There is an added weakness of costly inefficiency in the present program, in that it encourages the construction of armories for the different services side by side in the same town.

The National Guard has long since outgrown its historic function as a State force. Other Reserve units are entirely Federal in scope. In consequence my bill proposes to relieve State and local communities of the expense of armory construction.

It is my belief that a common armory can be shared by all Reserve components in a community and by the recruiting officers of the various services. Generally but 1 night's training is required of a Reserve unit each week. This will permit common use of the drill floor. Separate offices and supply rooms should be provided for the separate Reserve components. Use as a community center during other periods will increase its value and popularize Reserve activities.

The Reserve, under the American system, is the most practical and inexpensive way of providing a backlog of trained men for defense in the event of a national emergency. One of the greatest remaining draw-backs to a strong Reserve is the lack of armories for training and study. The cost of a program of armory constructoin as outlined here would total at least half a billion dollars, but armories are long lived, and their construction would be extended over a period of years.

I realize that there is no likelihood of action on my proposal in this session, but I feel that it is sufficiently important to call it to the attention of the Congress and the public. I plan to reintroduce it at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances; in one, to include a statement from the Illinois Bankers Association giving their viewpoints against the bill passed yesterday; in another, to include a statement by the Midwest Manufacturers' Association pleading in behalf of small-business men.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON] may be granted leave of absence for today and tomorrow on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may proceed for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today, after the expiration of any other special orders that may have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ON JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, before the Taft-Hartley Act, A. F. of L. unions were free to fight each other or fight with the CIO or vice versa. So far as the Wagner Act was concerned, the public was apparently expected to wait until one union licked the other. If at the end of that time the employer was still in business, production was to be resumed.

A particularly violent and drawn-out jurisdictional dispute waged in the Hollywood studios for approximately 2 years. This dispute concerned two A. F. of L. unions, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners and the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Motion Picture Machine Operators. The fight—and it was that—was over the question of who should do the carpenter work in the Hollywood studios. A member of the carpenters' union involved in this dispute testified before Congress when the Taft-Hartley Act was being considered, as follows:

> Gentlemen, it has been proven that Congress is the only place that we can go now to get relief, because there is an absolute stalemate. The executive council of the American Federation of Labor is unable to this day and has been unable to this day to enforce its own decision.

What the Taft-Hartley Act does: Section 10 (k) provides that in jurisdictional disputes between locals of an international union or between different unions, the NLRB shall hear and determine the dispute, unless within 10 days the parties to such dispute submit satisfactory evidence that they have voluntarily adjusted the dispute. The decision of the Board is enforceable by the Federal courts.

The practical result is that in many cases the parties themselves are amicably settling these disputes.

For example, the building and construction industry for many years was plagued with these disputes and stoppages arising out of them. However, on May 1, 1948, as a direct result of the Taft-Hartley Act, and under the guidance of the general counsel of the Labor Board, an agreement was signed by the building trades department of the American Federation of Labor and various contractors' associations throughout the country setting up a board called the National Joint Board for the Settlement of Jurisdictional Disputes in the Building and Construction Industry. This board, as its name implies, was established for the settlement of jurisdictional disputes in that industry.

To date the Board has had approximately 45 disputes referred to it for decision. All its decisions have been honored and in no case have work stoppages continued while a dispute was pending before the Board or after settlement of the dispute. In a few cases work stoppages had taken place before the disputes were referred to the Board, but these stoppages ended as soon as the Board took jurisdiction.

A case that took place in Minnesota late last fall, a few months after the act became effective, further illustrates the effectiveness of section 10 (k). The Northern States Power Co., which supplies St. Paul with gas, was converting to natural gas. The company had a contract with IBEW, but the conversion required the hiring of additional, temporary employees. The pipefitters and plumbers demanded the work and IBEW insisted on its contract for all employees. It was submitted to William Green, president of the A. F. of L., who ruled in favor of IBEW, but the two craft unions would not recognize his decision. Minnesota has a jurisdictional strike law and the Governor appointed an arbitrator who after a long investigation decided in favor of IBEW. The crafts did not think any more of his decision than they did of Mr. Green's. The work could not be started—winter was approaching and the artificial gas would be supplied only for a short time. The Governor appointed a fact-finding commission, which again came to the same decision. The State went to court to enforce the arbitrator's award and was met with an injunction obtained by the union. Finally, the company filed a charge with NLRB. Attorneys for the Labor Board were sent to Minnesota with authority to obtain a Federal court injunction and in 3 days the case was settled with the company free to hire whom it chose and the unions free to attempt to secure their membership.

Figures compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that jurisdictional strikes have declined since the act took effect.

Work stoppages caused by jurisdictional disputes in all industry

	Number of stoppages	Number of workers involved	Man-days idle
First half of 1947	35	6,320	586,000
Second half of 1947	27	2,840	72,000

Thus, during the first 6 months after the pasage of the Taft-Hartley Act, the number of man-days lost because of jurisdictional disputes was approximately one-eighth of the number lost during the last 6 months before the passage of the act. Of the 15,000 workers reported by BLS to be on strike in the building and construction industry in June of 1948, none were reported to be out because of jurisdictional controversies.

In short, the Taft-Hartley law has teeth in it to stop these jurisdictional strikes. But the teeth have not been used often; instead, their very presence has led parties to adjust these disputes themselves, peacefully and with a minimum loss of production. The building trades are to be congratulated for their cooperation in stopping jurisdictional disputes.

THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS AND THE FARMER

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the constructive agricultural program enacted by the Eightieth Congress should be widely acclaimed and strongly supported by the farmers of America. Following is a list of major accomplishments taken by this Congress in each of several fields that are of concern to the farmers of the Nation and to the consumers who depend upon them for food and produce.

SOIL CONSERVATION

The Eightieth Congress has been thoroughly aware of the necessity for real soil conservation in the United States. Early in the first session, hearings on a long-range agricultural policy were started by both the House and Senate, and one of the first conclusions reached by those committees was that soil conservation must be the keystone and No. 1 objective of any sound, long-range agricultural policy.

Before the war, erosion was making heavy inroads on our soil and during the war we further seriously depleted our agricultural lands in attempting to feed the people of the world. The need to repair the damage is obvious, and the Eightieth Congress has met this need by appropriating more than half a billion dollars for soil-conservation activities for American farms.

I am happy to report to my constituents that I was successful in obtaining authorization and funds for many deserving flood-control projects in the Seventh Indiana Congressional District during the Eightieth Congress, which will materially aid in combating soil erosion in the affected areas.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

The Eightieth Congress has provided more generously for rural electrification than any other Congress in history. I should like to point out that this commendable program of furnishing electricity to our farmers is carried on without any burden upon the American taxpayer. The Government actually borrows the money that is loaned to the Rural Electrification Administration and pays interest thereon. That money, in turn, is loaned by REA to the various cooperatives who pay the Government an interest rate slightly above the rate the Government pays. Therefore, any contention that the program is subsidized by the taxpayer is incorrect.

During this Congress, $800,000,000 in loan authorizations has been provided for the extension of REA electric lines, and as the result of these generous appropriations, electricity was extended to 400,000 farm homes during the past fiscal year. This is more than double the record in any prewar year, and an even greater number of farm homes are scheduled to receive electricity during the 1949 fiscal year.

We Congressmen representing agriculture sections of the country believe that the program of the REA is one of the most important features incorporated in the Department of Agriculture. Electric service has brought comfort and pleasure to our farmers besides providing a more efficient method for them to perform their duties. This fine program must go on without interruption until electricity is made available to every farm in America.

LONG-RANGE PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Of vital concern to both farmers and consumers was the enactment by the Eightieth Congress of farm price-support legislation geared not only to the present emergency demand for food exports but to the long-range welfare of both consumers and producers.

The price-support bill passed by Congress combines the temporary incentives necessary to secure all-out farm production through the 1949 crop year with a long-range price support program for future years designed to provide an abundance of agricultural products for American consumers and to protect both producers and consumers against unstabilized agricultural prices. The program for supporting the price of leading agricultural products on a 90 percent of parity basis has been extended for 2 years. Beginning January 1, 1950, the provisions of the long-range price-support program will go into effect. These include a general revision of the parity formula to take into consideration the shifting costs of agricultural production, changes in the pattern of consumption, and other factors.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

One of the outstanding long-range contributions to agricultural stability was adoption by the Eightieth Congress of a permanent charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Because of its permanent status, the Corporation will provide a continuity of action in support of the farm economy that has not been possible under programs operating merely on a year-to-year basis.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

One of the most dreaded of all animal diseases—foot-and-mouth disease—has been reported raging in Mexico since late in 1946, and has threatened to spread to the United States. Its spread to this country would have caused billions of dollars of loss to livestock farmers, the halting of interstate shipments of livestock, packing plants would be forced to suspend operations, and, perhaps most important of all, breeding stock probably would become infected with the disease resulting in a shortage of meat for years to come.

The Eightieth Congress took prompt action to combat the disease by granting permission for the Department of Agriculture to work with the Mexican Government in an all-out effort to stop its spread, and the Congress appropriated adequate funds to carry out the work in Mexico. Funds have also been provided to strengthen the patrol on the Mexico-United States border, and the establishment of a laboratory to engage in research on foot-and-mouth disease has been authorized.

PROTECTION AGAINST PESTS AND DISEASES

Diseases of plants and animals, that are a threat to both farmers and consumers, have been promptly attacked by this Congress. Authority and ample appropriations were provided for fighting—in addition to the foot-and-mouth disease—for the eradication of cattle grubs, the new threat of the golden nematode disease in potatoes and tomatoes, for added safeguards against the importation of pests and diseases of shrubs and small plants, and for concerted action against pests and diseases in our forests.

RURAL ROADS

Realizing the necessity of good farm-to-market roads for modern motorized farming, the greatest rural road-building program ever undertaken cooperatively by the Federal and State Governments is scheduled for the next 3 years under legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress.

SUGAR

When the Eightieth Congress convened, sugar was still rationed in the United States. One of the first acts of the House Committee on Agriculture was to appoint a special subcommittee to survey the sugar situation. That committee found that there was an adequate supply of sugar to meet domestic needs. It recommended the immediate liberalization of both household and industrialist rations and their removal if supplies turned out to be as adequate as they appeared from the committee's survey.

The committee also recommended that the Secretary of Agriculture take every step possible to secure more abundant sugar production in the United States and its Territories during 1947 and 1948. Specifically, it suggested that acreage quotas should continue to be suspended and that no restriction whatever should be placed upon domestic production during those years.

Following the recommendation of the committee, sugar rationing to household

users was discontinued, and allocations to industrial users were dropped a few months later.

A Sugar Act was passed by the Eightieth Congress to assure consumers an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable prices, and to assure American farmers producing sugar that they will have an equitable share of the American market.

SHORTAGES

The postwar period has revealed a great and serious shortage of farm equipment and other items that are essential to the farmer in his work. Congressional committees through investigations have brought some measure of relief to farmers in their demand for farm machinery, fertilizer, and so forth. For instance, investigations have disclosed that shipments of farm machinery to Europe under the relief program were not based on practical surveys of the quantity of machinery which was actually needed. As a result, farm machinery scheduled for export was reduced about 25 percent.

I have taken a personal stand of consistently opposing exports of fertilizer, farm machinery, trucks, and all supplies in short demand, badly needed by the farmer.

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

The Eightieth Congress increased funds above those requested by the President for the school-lunch program. Thereby, the program which provides balanced meals for our hungry and undernourished school children, and an outlet for surplus farm supplies, may be extended.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments I have listed above are by no means a complete record of the Eightieth Congress with relation to agriculture. There are many, many more outstanding phases of the program that will add to the welfare of farm families and the improvement of farm living conditions. For example, the Eightieth Congress has revised and set up the crop-insurance program on a sound long-range basis; improvements have been made in the administration and operation of marketing agreements and in laws relating to farm labor, the national forests, the tenant-purchase program, and other fields of agriculture. Of particular importance to the farmer should be the fact that both Agriculture Committees in Congress have had extended and comprehensive hearings on a long-range program which have given individual farmers in every part of the country an opportunity to personally testify and present his views as to the kind of a program that should be adopted for agriculture. No Congress in history has been better informed of the farmers' wants in a long-range program and the information advanced by the farmers themselves will continue to guide the Congress in future consideration of farm legislation and policy.

Since my congressional district is largely an agricultural district, I am personally very much interested in agriculture. As a member of the Republican Food Study Committee, I have taken great interest and followed very closely the work of our Agriculture Committees. Needless to say, I have aggressively supported the sound program these committees in Congress have offered the American farmer.

Mr. Speaker, it has always been my conviction that prosperity begins on the farm. Unless the farmers are prosperous, industry cannot be prosperous, labor cannot be prosperous, nobody can be prosperous. This Nation and the entire world are looking to the American farmer for necessities of life—food, raw materials for clothing, shelter, fuel, and so forth—which will ultimately assure health, happiness, and everlasting world peace. I shall continue to actively and earnestly work for all proposals that would benefit the American farmer and do my very best to serve him in Congress.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Truman said in his speech of acceptance that the Eightieth Congress had taken social-security benefits away from 750,000 persons. Other New Dealers have made similar statements.

This is just not true.

The facts are these: The social-security law intended that employees and employers should each pay 1 percent of the employees' pay into a fund for the benefit of the employees, to be collected by the Treasury and administered by the Social Security Board.

The Board had of its own volition paid benefits to a number of persons who had not been considered as employees by their employers and who had not paid anything into the fund. In 1947 the Supreme Court decided that in order for a person to be entitled to social-security protection he must be an employee. Following this decision, the Treasury and the Social Security Board, now known as the Federal Security Agency, proceeded to issue a new regulation by which the Agency could exercise wide discretion as to who was to be considered an employee.

In order to prevent the enforcement of this regulation, the Eightieth Congress passed House Joint Resolution 296 which the President vetoed and which was promptly passed over his veto.

House Joint Resolution 296 states in specific language who shall be entitled to draw social-security benefits and prevents the Federal Security Agency from allowing benefits to persons who have not contributed to the fund. This resolution does not take social-security benefits from a single person. It even provides that those who had been illegally on the rolls should be permitted to stay on since many of them were aged persons.

The Eightieth Congress went further. This House passed a bill which would have given social-security protection to an additional 3,500,000 persons. This bill is pending in the Senate. The Eightieth Congress also passed a social-security bill increasing pensions of the aged, the blind, and dependent children to the extent of $184,000,000 per year.

So I repeat that the Eightieth Congress did not take social-security benefits from 750,000 persons. It only prevented the Federal Security Agency from usurping the functions of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD covering social-security protection.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances.

OUTLOOK FOR FUEL OIL

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been continuing its study of the condition of this country's fuel oil supply. Hearings have been held throughout the regular session and during the 2 weeks following the adjournment in June. The committee has received evidence from competent witnesses, from within the petroleum industry and from the departments of the Federal Government concerned with the problem. In view of the experiences of last winter the committee and its staff have made a determined effort to obtain the latest authentic information as to the possibility of any fuel shortage in the months ahead and particularly during the fall and winter heating season. The committee's schedule calls for a continuous study of this matter during the recess and it will make every effort to do everything within its power to prevent a recurrence of the conditions which prevailed in this country last winter.

Therefore, I think you will understand how concerned the members of this committee would be in connection with any prediction from an official source that another crisis is probable in terms of this country's fuel-oil supply. Yet, it was reported yesterday afternoon that during his press conference, the President stated that the Secretary of the Interior was preparing to submit a program dealing with the proper distribution of coal and heating oils and other fuels. The report of this conference also stated that a reporter then asked the President if he thought, in the absence of controls on fuel, that it would be possible to avert another crisis in the East this winter, and the President flatly said he did not.

I can assure you that every witness before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has testified that conditions as to the petroleum supply for the fall and winter are better than was the case last year. It is true that most of the witnesses expressed caution that the supply situation was still tight but certainly none of them predicted any anticipated crisis.

I think the record should be made clear and I want to report for your informa-

tion and use certain excerpts from testimony before the committee the latter part of last June. Mr. Howard W. Page, executive assistant to the president of the Standard Oil Co., New Jersey, said:

Our estimates indicate that there will not be any over-all oil shortage during the coming year, barring war, disaster, or serious strikes. We do not think, however, that all instances of localized spot shortages can be avoided. Elimination of spot shortages can be achieved only when supply capacity and working stocks are appreciably higher in relation to demand than can be reasonably expected during the coming year.

Our definition of a spot shortage is a shortage which can be corrected promptly when it occurs. Spot shortages are annoying, they cause some inconvenience, but they are not symptoms of any over-all crisis. * * * However, if average supplies merely equal demand over the coming 9 months, local spot shortages should be infrequent and quickly corrected. Recent experience indicates that such balance can be achieved. There is even a possibility that average supplies will exceed the demand.

Mr. Max Ball, Director of the Oil and Gas Division, Department of the Interior, testified:

Assuming that the winter is no worse than the last winter was as to weather, that we have continued consumer conservation, at least as complete as we had last winter, and that we have no strikes in the oil business and no coal or railroad strikes, that we have no unexpected increases in military demand beyond those which the military has already foreshadowed, that the system of State coordinators is continued in operation through the winter and that, particularly, the voluntary plan under Public Law 395 on which we are now working is put into effect, then there will be little individual consumer hardship for want of oil.

There will still be some consumer hardship and considerable amount of industrial hardship for want of gas, particularly in the Middle West.

If too many of these things fail or go wrong, then there will be consumer hardship for want of oil, and even more hardship than I have indicated for want of gas.

You will recall that last winter one of the greatest sources of difficulty arose from the shortage of transportation. A committee of the National Petroleum Council recently reported that due to new construction the United States will have sufficient oil tankers to meet the demands for at least this coming year. Land transportation has also improved. There is one major pipe line in the Midwest now in operation and another is scheduled for completion in the near future. In this connection, I would like to submit a question by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] and the reply of Mr. Ball.

Mr. O'HARA. What is your general over-all prognosis for the coming winter, assuming that we have as severe a winter as we had last winter in the Middle West?

Mr. BALL. If we have as severe a winter as last year and if we can continue to have consumer conservation, I think that in the Middle West the situation will not be quite as tight, as far as supply is concerned, as it was last year. * * * There are two new big pipe lines into the Middle West from the Southwest. That is going to help materially not only in furnishing additional crude to the refineries in the Middle West, but of course that translated into production means that the available supply is going to be greater in the Middle West; and that is going to cut down on the need for tank cars.

There does appear to be a greater concern as to the availability of kerosene than as to other types of heating oil, but Mr. Ball testified that the country was far better prepared to meet the problem of local shortages because of the activities of all concerned. Mr. Ball further recommended the reactivation of the State fuel coordinators system which was so effective in many of our States last winter.

May I quote another brief excerpt from Mr. Ball's testimony in which he, too, emphasized the necessity of immediate approval of the voluntary agreement plan by the Attorney General.

Mr. HESELTON. Then we have no change, relatively speaking, in our situation; although we have more oil, we have more demand?

Mr. BALL. Yes.

Mr. HESELTON. And consequently we are no better off than we were last June?

Mr. BALL. I think we are better off, chiefly in this respect: of course, we are better off with respect to gasoline, but as to fuel oil, next winter I think our chief betterment is in better preparation, that is assuming this voluntary plan is to go into effect and be implemented.

In that connection, it is a source of concern to many of us that final approval of this plan has not yet been given at the top level of the executive department.

Therefore, so far as our prospects as to fuel oil are concerned, it is difficult in the extreme to understand why the President should make such an alarming statement as he did yesterday afternoon. Certainly the people living in the East expect the most careful and conscientious kind of efforts on the part of representatives in their Government to prevent a recurrence of last winter's conditions. But I submit that the prospect of solving this problem is not advanced by what appears to have been a petulant political comment.

Let me deal briefly with this comment so far as coal is concerned. This morning's newspaper carried a dispatch headlining the decision of the Department of Commerce to abolish the coal export quota system on September first.

The newspaper account is as follows:

Because of improved world coal supplies, Secretary of Commerce Sawyer yesterday announced the dropping of the coal export quota system as of September 1.

Prospects are favorable, Sawyer said, that United States mines will be able to produce in coming months enough coal of all types for both domestic and foreign customers, particularly since overseas demand for American coal has greatly declined.

Although the tonnage allocations to foreign countries will be suspended at the end of this month, export licenses will be required for foreign shipment for the time being, the Secretary said.

However, he promised that as soon as the supply prospects for fall and winter heating are better established, the Department will study the possibility of eliminating coal export controls entirely.

I cannot reconcile the statement of the President with the statement of Secretary of Commerce Sawyer. I do not know what the President meant. I strongly suspect that he does not know. But certainly, instead of making an extemporaneous and alarming prophecy, it is his solemn duty to state fully any facts upon which he bases any such conclusion and to make immediately any further recommendations, if there are such, other than those which have been already submitted by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce.

Finally, in the interest of both accuracy and the full record, I wish to quote a portion of the full statement made by the Secretary of Commerce on August 4 before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency as to coal and petroleum. It is as follows:

COAL

Coal is the major source of energy for the world. The devastation accompanying the war greatly reduced the output of coal in Europe, and the United States Government has committed itself to supply the maximum amount of coal that it can afford to ship. Thus, rather than restricting the shipment of coal from this country, export controls on coal have operated to increase exports and direct them to areas of most urgent need.

The first quarter of 1948 witnessed an easing in the pressure of European demand on United States coal supplies. This development was due primarily to three factors: a relatively mild winter resulting in an improved stock position in Europe; increased coal production in Europe, and the reduced buying power of European countries. Output in the United Kingdom, Poland, and western Germany—which accounts for four-fifths of the combined production in Poland and western Europe—increased markedly during 1947, reaching 109,000,000 metric tons in the fourth quarter, compared with 95,000,000 in the corresponding period of 1946. Supplies in the importing countries of western Europe likewise increased substantially, approaching prewar levels for the group as a whole in the latter half of 1947.

Despite the rising trend of European coal production, exports from the United States are expected to play a vital role in the European recovery for some time. To meet the easing of demand, however, export controls were relaxed in recent months, and all ports were released from the country-by-country allocation system. Limitations have been retained on the total number of cargoes which can be cleared through the various ports, in order to prevent concentration of demand which would burden certain ports or coal supply areas.

PETROLEUM

The general petroleum situation has eased considerably since the severe shortages encountered last winter. Gasoline supply has been adequate to meet the sharply increased demands of summer driving, and no shortages of gasoline are anticipated, with the possible exception of spot shortages.

The improved petroleum situation has resulted from sharply increased output. Crude oil production reached an estimated 5,500,000 barrels a day in the second quarter of 1948, a 10-percent increase over the same period in 1947. Since gasoline, kerosene, and the light fuel oils are produced at about the same point in the refining process, the percentage of gasoline produced from a given amount of crude oil may be increased or decreased, with decrease or increase in the amount of light heating oils produced. Despite the decrease in the relative proportion of gasoline derived from crude during the past winter, total crude runs were so great that gasoline stocks rose sharply during the winter. Stocks of gasoline at the end of June of this year were about 15 percent above last year. Since consumption has increased by about 10 percent, however, the stock increase in relation to consumption has been slight.

Heating oil inventories have also risen, though at a less rapid rate than gasoline. Since demand for heating oils is largely a

function of the weather, only tentative forecasts can be made at the present time concerning the situation this coming winter, but the outlook for heating oils appears somewhat better than last year. Installation of oil burners has fallen off sharply because of heating oil price rises; the rate of installation during the first 4 months of 1948 was about 50 percent of the rate during the corresponding period of last year. If the weather is as severe as last year, the supply-requirements balance will be approximately the same, but the Nation is much better organized to handle the situation. If the winter is relatively mild, it is not expected that there will be any shortage of heating oils.

The operation of export controls has followed closely the changes in the supply situation. Since there were severe local shortages of heating oils during the winter, export quotas were sharply reduced during the first quarter of 1948. Exports of crude petroleum during this period represented less than 2 percent of total supply, compared with almost 6 percent prewar, and exports of the major refined products were reduced even more sharply. Despite the urgent requirements of other nations, exports of kerosene and gas oil and distillate were severely curtailed.

With the easing of demand for heating oils in the spring months, export quotas were increased for all products in the second quarter. Since demand for petroleum is continuing to rise, the Department of Commerce has adopted a very cautious policy in setting quotas. As a result, exports during the second quarter, while above the extremely low level of the first quarter, were substantially below exports during the second quarter of 1947.

As the United States is producing almost two-thirds of the world's petroleum output with less than one-third of the known reserves—and probably considerably less than one-third of the reserves still to be discovered—it is clear that the United States will become increasingly dependent upon foreign sources of crude oil. It is even more essential that the dependence of Europe and other areas upon the Western Hemisphere for petroleum supplies be reduced. At the present time, the Western Hemisphere is supplying roughly 75 to 80 percent of western Europe's import requirements, and the Middle East 20 to 25 percent. With the expansion of projects now under way in the Middle East, it is expected that these proportions will be reversed. Until this happens, it is of the utmost importance to maintain control of petroleum exports.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, this Congress provided for those export controls. I cannot in good faith say that the controls have been exercised soundly or effectively. But I can say that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is doing everything possible to insist on administration of the export control powers to carry out the congressional mandate of protection of our domestic economy against serious injury by reason of the Government's program of exports. Some improvement has resulted. It is imperative that more effective action should be taken immediately. I hope that the President will interest himself in that problem when he reexamines the advice given to him as to the condition of our fuel supply.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today following the special order heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next following the business on the Speaker's table and any special orders already entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and to include extraneous matter.

UN BUILDING IN NEW YORK

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to be certain that it is made clear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that an attempt was made yesterday, by the opponents of the bill providing for the so-called loan to construct a building for the UN in New York City, to obtain a roll-call vote on the measure and that this met with failure.

It was generally known among the Members that a deliberate effort was put forth to prevent a record vote. The fact should be known to the public because the action taken would seem to reveal considerable sentiment not altogether favorable to the proposition. It would appear that if the Congress were as heartily in favor of the project as the announced vote would seem to indicate, there should not have been any hesitancy on the part of its supporters to definitely put themselves on record.

It should also be recorded that extraordinary pressure was put upon the Members to vote for the bill. Except for this, the matter in all probability would not have been considered at this session, or if it had been, the result might have been different.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House that it is my understanding that discharge petition No. 6 on the Speaker's desk, which would bring to the floor of the House the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, needs very few more signatures to complete the required number.

I take this opportunity to note that fact to the membership.

I should also like at this time to bring out something the people across our Nation are talking about and asking questions: Why does not Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, the Republican nominee for President and leader of the Republican Party, speak up on the vital issues before this Congress? Governor Dewey is reported in the press to have said that one of the major issues of the 1948 political campaign was to be inflation. Why has not Governor Dewey spoken on this issue? Why has he not offered the people of the country—the people who are being most cruelly hurt by inflation—the benefit of his views? If the Republican Presidential candidate is so concerned with inflation why has not he assumed the powers of his leadership to direct his party in Congress to take immediate and positive steps to halt this inflationary trend?

Is the answer, I ask, that Governor Dewey has abdicated leadership of the Republican Party in favor of the MARTINS, the WOLCOTTS, the TABERS, and the HALLECKS?

President Truman said quite correctly that high prices will not recess for the elections. Contrast that statement with Governor Dewey's weak lament that it was "cruel and inhuman treatment to call Congress back into session."

I say it will be "cruel and inhuman" treatment of the American people if we, the Congress, adjourn before enacting a strong anti-inflation law and a law to give our homeless veterans decent homes.

URANIUM MATERIAL FURNISHED TO RUSSIA

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the morning session of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I expressed concern and disgust over the manner in which our Government in the past had coddled the Soviet Union and had permitted that country's agents to infiltrate our Government. I brought out for the first time that as early as 1943, the Russians were able to obtain from us vital uranium compounds which were essential to atomic research. I said they obtained this as a result of pressure of the highest kind. I reiterate this statement, but to illustrate how hard and difficult it is to get the facts before the people of America, let me now cite a prime example of the type of double talk and cover-up which we encounter every time we attempt to expose the sinister activities of the Russian agents in this country. In the New York Times this morning there is an article which states as follows:

In the meantime a former associate of General Groves asserted yesterday that anyone at all familiar with the nature of the atomic project must seriously question the accuracy of Mr. McDOWELL's information.

In the first place, he said a distinction must be made between uranium compound and purified uranium metal. Uranium compounds cannot be used for atomic-energy work. Furthermore, such compounds are available everywhere, including Russia, and sold before the war for as little as $3 a pound. It is, therefore, absurd to believe that Russia had to bring tremendous pressure to obtain two shipments of 300 and 1,000 pounds of uranium compound, he added.

As for uranium metal, at the beginning of 1941, the total amount of the world's supply at the time was a few grams. The fact that this country succeeded in developing a process for purifying it was one of the war's most closely guarded secrets, as secret as the atomic-bomb project itself. We needed every bit of it, and more, for the atomic bomb, he said, and we could not have parted with any of it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to be premature regarding this important investigation which the Committee on Un-American Activities has been conducting and the incredible story which it will unravel to the Congress and the people in the near future, but I defy whoever this anonymous associate of General Groves is to identify himself and state publicly that the shipment on March 23, 1943, of 200 pounds of uranium oxide and 220 pounds of uranium nitrate which was furnished by the S. W. Shattuck Chemical Co., of Denver, Colo., and which was shipped directly to Col. A. N. Kotikov, of the Soviet Government Purchasing Commission, did not go. It was then transported by air from Great Falls, Mont., to Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, even though this vital atomic-research material got out of the country before even the Manhattan project knew about it, what is really pathetic is that we learn that 500 pounds of black uranium oxide and 500 pounds of uranium nitrate were shipped directly from Port Hope, Ontario, Canada, by the Canadian Radium & Uranium Corp., to Great Falls, Mont., United States of America, and then to the afore-mentioned Colonel Kotikov, and that our intelligence authorities, so far as we have been able to determine, did not even know that it had been flown out of the country. I say that it is time that all the facts are given to the public, and that is just what our committee proposes to do.

As further evidence of the appeasement policy and coddling of the Soviet Union by the United States of America, I call upon this anonymous associate of General Grove to deny the fact that uranium metal, of prime importance in the making of the bomb, was in fact sent to the Soviet Union in 1945 to appease them. I have the records and I have heard the testimony of over 30 people in connection with this, and I defy any of them to disprove this information.

After they got this last 1,000 pounds they came back and wanted 15 tons, but by that time somebody woke up, and so far as I know this order was not permitted to be filled.

AMERICA'S HOUR OF DESTINY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, Sumner Welles has said:

This is the hour when the fate of western civilization is at stake. This is the American hour of destiny.

I agree with this statement. We have fought a great war and won the contest of arms but for 3 years we have been laboring unsuccessfully to win the peace and bring about stability and peace among the nations of the world. World War II left more than 400,000 dead and 670,000 wounded of our American boys who engaged in the great contest to bring about world peace. Over $330,000,000,000 were expended in the conflict. This was more than the combined expenditures of Britain and Russia. We now have a public debt which with contingent liabilities aggregates $430,000,000,000. With an interest charge on direct obligations of over $5,000,000,000, with some six billions for veterans and upward of thirteen billions for national defense, the Nation is facing a critical situation in its economic and fiscal affairs. The Congress, therefore, has been viewing with utmost care and scrutiny any long-range programs, regardless of their merits, which involve the expenditure of other billions of tax dollars. It is far more desirable to forego for the time being much needed reforms than to strain the financial structure of our Nation to the breaking point. Otherwise all that we have been fighting for in the preservation of the American way of life and free enterprise and democratic processes will have been lost.

We in the Congress realize the seriousness of the problems now facing the Nation with respect to inflation, the high cost of living and the lack of adequate housing for low-income groups, including many thousands of veterans. We also realize the responsibility resting upon the United States as a world nation to do its share in aid to foreign countries in an endeavor to bring stability and peace to the world and prevent the spreading of communism throughout Europe and eventually to the Western Hemisphere.

When the extraordinary session of the Congress was called by the President, informed observers were almost unanimous in the conclusion that it was a political move. However, I took the position when the Congress convened that regardless of the motives of the President when calling it, since the Congress was in session it should ignore any partisan political considerations and devote itself to the sincere consideration of every constructive measure upon which action could be taken which would help to prevent the further spread of inflation, curb the high cost of living, provide adequate housing for our low-income citizens, and give some measure of relief to the elderly citizens of the Nation. Furthermore, I took the position that we should remain in session if necessary, until Christmas to achieve these objectives.

We are facing a most serious and critical problem in our international relations and the President and our diplomatic representatives thus far have been unable to reach an accord with respect to unity of action in Germany. As Sumner Welles said, the shadows are lengthening. None of us can fail any longer to understand what the impending crisis signifies. The new world order that took shape only 3 years ago at San Francisco, in which millions had placed their faith and their hopes, seems to be dissolving like mist before the sun. The civilization of the west that has slowly and painfully struggled past milestones of Magna Carta, habeas corpus, the American Constitution, "liberty, equality, fraternity," and the Bill of Rights, is threatened with eclipse. The peoples who have so often proved that they valued freedom more than life itself face the grim prospect that the same ideology which they believed had been forever crushed by their victory over the Axis, and which proclaims that the sole destiny of many is to serve a ruthless oligarchy, may yet, under a new guise, succeed in obliterating man's hard-won liberties from the face of the earth.

The Eightieth Congress has faced more and greater problems than any other Congress in the history of the American Republic. While it has not enacted all legislation which is considered by many to be necessary for the best interests of the Nation, yet it has been a hard-working Congress and has enacted many laws in the interests of the Nation as a whole and its people and in the opinion of most informed and unprejudiced observers has done a good job.

In the foreign field it has, with utter disregard of partisan politics, joined with the Administration in carrying forward the program of the Administration and has been more than generous in providing funds to enable the nations of the Old World to rehabilitate themselves, restore their economy and become self-sustaining. I have been glad to participate in this program and to do whatever lay within my power to help bring the world back into balance and restore normal peaceful relationships throughout the world. I was happy, therefore, my colleagues, to receive recently from our beloved Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, a personal letter in which he said:

May I extend to you my warmest felicitations on your renomination for Congress. It was a tribute to the splendid service you have rendered your district and the country.

The Eightieth Congress has reduced extravagance in government; it has made material savings in the cost of government; it has reduced taxes and it has restored powers to the people taken away in previous Congresses. It has built for a strong America and an America which has discharged its obligations to the world. You have aided materially in this program and that your district appreciates your service is indicated in your renomination. * * * Working together in harmony we will build for a better America and a better world.

Mr. Speaker, with all the problems facing us and the unsettled state in the international fields and the inflationary spirals that are plaguing our Nation and the high cost of the necessities of life

which so many of our low-income citizens are unable to meet, nevertheless we do have much for which to be thankful. No nation, even with all the adversity facing us, enjoys greater prosperity than we do here in this great Republic. With 6 percent of the world's area and 7 percent of the world's population, we have 46 percent of its electric power, 48 percent of its radios, 54 percent of its telephones, 59 percent of its steel capacity, 60 percent of its life insurance policies, 85 percent of its automobiles, and 92 percent of modern bathtubs. We have the highest standard of living of any nation of the world. We still have freedom of action, and freedom of speech and religion and free enterprise.

Free enterprise has been defined to be distinctly the product of the Constitution of the United States. The right of representative government to determine the laws which protect the rights of freemen is the foundation upon which free enterprise is built. In conjunction with this right of representative government, we have an economic framework which gives the citizens of the United States the right to own and hold property against seizure either by government or by individuals. It gives the citizen the right to develop and own the resources of the Nation and to benefit from the production of new wealth. Free enterprise means the right to produce and to enjoy the full benefits and fruits of toil. Therein lies the incentive for the individual to forge ahead. Basically then, our economy rests on a foundation made up of individuals. As individuals prosper from the production of goods and services, in that ratio the Nation prospers. A good income to the individual automatically means a prosperous community, a prosperous State, and a prosperous Nation. Free enterprise is worth fighting for.

A fundamental concept of our free America is the right of every individual to own property. As Abraham Lincoln said:

> Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; it is a positive good in the world; that some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my party in asserting that one of today's major issues is between radicalism, regimentation, all-powerful bureaucracy, class exploitation, deficit spending, and machine politics, as against our belief in American freedom for the individual under just laws fairly administered for all, preservation of local home rule, efficiency and pay-as-you-go economy in government, and the protection of the American way of life against either Fascist or Communist trends.

We believe that genuine social and economic progress can be achieved only on those American constitutional principles and it is our purpose to give our citizens this clean-cut choice.

I have been glad during my service in the Congress to have given full support to the program of my party to strike from the Nation's pay rolls all those individuals who are activated by foreign ideologies and principles subversive to the best interests of our own Nation. I have therefore joined with my colleagues in ridding from the Government service Communists and fellow travelers who would overthrow our Nation by force and destroy free enterprise as we know it under the American system and substitute in its place a totalitarian or police state where the individual would be subject to the control of a dictator. The committees of the Congress have unearthed and brought out in the open a spy ring which has permeated through many of the major departments of our Government, including the executive offices, Department of State, Department of Commerce, and the Treasury Department. Congress made available a large sum at the disposal of the President to inaugurate a loyalty program for the purpose of relieving from public office all subversive and communistic individuals. Unfortunately, as disclosed by the hearings of the congressional committees, the administration has not followed out the mandate of the Congress but has permitted such individuals to remain on the pay rolls and work their nefarious practices in securing secret records from Government offices and turning them over to Soviet Russian agents to be used against this country. The President has refused to cooperate with the Congress in ridding the Government of these disloyal employees and has even refused to make available to the committees the FBI's reports on their records. And worst of all there has been a continued, stubborn resistance by administration officials from the top down to a purge of Communist, "pinko," and other subversives from the Government household. This has been repeatedly demonstrated by hearings held by the committees of the Congress. There should be no place in our Government for such individuals. When the examinations and investigations now going forward have been completed every Government employee who is disloyal to our country or who espouses the doctrines of a foreign ideology and seeks to overthrow our Government by force should be summarily dismissed and brought to the bar of justice and punished.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the people of my district for their loyal support during my long tenure of office in the Congress of the United States. By reason of my length of service I am now the dean of the Oregon delegation and hold the record for length of service for the Third Oregon District. I have been happy to serve as a member of the Public Works Committee and as chairman of the Subcommittee of Rivers and Harbors, which is so important to the welfare of the great Northwest and to my own State of Oregon. I have been glad to take a part in the fight to reduce the high taxes which have burdened our people for so long, and to reduce the bloated cost of government, and to keep America solvent with full employment in private enterprise, with fair treatment for both labor and capital. I was glad to join with my colleagues in removing the wartime limitations, restrictions, and controls, believing that as soon as a right or liberty taken over by our Government can be restored to the people it should be done. There can be no justification for fastening regimentation or a police state upon the American people. Following out this objective, we forced the elimination of 76,000 Government rules, regulations, and orders that were blocking our transition from a wartime economy to peace.

Almost a third of the average income dollar is now taken to support the Government, both national and local, which is a heavy burden upon our people. The present high cost of Government means that the person working on the average of 40 hours a week is working 10 hours to support the Government and 30 hours to support his family. This administration and its predecessor have consistently followed a plan of wasteful spending which is characterized by the phrase "tax and tax, spend and spend." This is clearly brought to view by consideration of the costs of the Government in preceding years as compared with those of this spending era. In 1927 the total costs of Government were $2,761,000,000. In 1937 they were $8,177,000,000, and in 1947, a peacetime year, they reached $42,505,000,000. No nation can continue to make such profligate expenditures and hope to remain solvent. I have consistently fought to reduce the tax burden and prevent the waste of tax dollars, to reduce the public debt, and to balance the national budget, and to keep the expenditures of the Government within tax income.

I supported the Republican bill for tax relief which was vetoed by the President three times and was passed over his veto in the House by a vote of 311 to 88. Under this bill 71 percent of the $4,800,000,000 in tax relief provided, goes to persons with incomes of less than $5,000 a year. About 7,400,000 taxpayers in the lowest brackets no longer have to pay any income tax. Percentage tax reductions range from 12.6 in the lower brackets down to 5 percent in the top brackets. Husbands and wives are permitted to split their income for tax purposes, thereby lightening the family tax burden and eliminating discrimination against citizens of many States. An additional $600 tax exemption is granted to taxpayers who are over 65 years of age and for the blind there is also an additional $600 exemption. This is practical and real social security relief which I was glad to support.

The Republican Congress also passed over the President's veto a bill increasing payments by $5 per month for the needy aged and the blind, and increasing payments by $3 per month for each dependent child, thereby adding $184,000,000 annually to social security payments received by 3,500,000 dependent children, the aged and the blind.

For the first time in 14 years the Federal budget has now been balanced and it is significant that it was balanced for the first time when the Republicans took over the Congress. I believe that all profligate spending should be eliminated and that foreign aid should provide only a springboard for self-help and not a wheel chair for permanent doles.

I have been glad to have had a part in the Eightieth Congress in passing the many laws for the benefit and welfare of the veterans and their dependents. A grateful Nation demands that those who fought in its defense, their widows, and orphans must never be forgotten. The best medical care and rehabilitation, education, and training for all desiring it, and efficient assistance in securing homes, farms, businesses, and real jobs must be provided for the veteran. I have joined with my party in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses in fulfilling the foregoing objectives. The Eightieth Congress enacted 188 laws directly benefiting war veterans and meeting a wide range of needs.

We passed a measure authorizing financial assistance to disabled veterans in the construction of specially designed homes for veterans paralyzed from the waist down, with 50 percent of the construction costs to be borne by the Government. We also provided special-type automobiles for amputees and a bill to cash immediately the terminal-leave bonds of enlisted men, which was done over the protest of the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury. This was in keeping with a similar provision for officers which had not been extended by the administration to GI's. We also increased the allowances for veterans and their dependents and for schooling and training to compensate them for the loss of educational opportunities while fighting for their country. We also enacted a number of laws providing for long-term, low-interest-bearing loans and other rights to veterans, to enable them to secure housing for themselves and families, giving them preference over all others; and we in this extraordinary session have passed in the House additional legislation for the strengthening of the laws for the benefit of veterans' home building. As a result of the building program inaugurated by the Republican Congress, over a million housing units will have been constructed in 1948, which is a record construction program exceeding the high period of 1925. In 1946 under New Deal confusion and inefficiency 437,800 dwelling units were completed. In 1947 under Republican free enterprise 835,100 units were completed. Even with this record, I am strongly of the opinion that we should enact any additional laws which will enable not only veterans but other low-income groups to acquire homes within the reach of their incomes, either by purchase or rental, and I have consistently supported legislation to that end.

I have been happy to have taken a leading part in the fight waged in the Congress for the amendment of our social-security laws whereby our aged citizens would receive adequate annuities to take care of their needs in their old age, particularly in these days of high living costs. I have been happy to support the program of my party for the ending of appeasement and double talk in national affairs and for a 100-percent national defense for the protection of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, coming from the great Northwest as I do, I have been deeply interested during my service in Congress in the development of the natural resources of the Nation, and particularly the Columbia River basin. As a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and later the Public Works Committee, I have been glad to work early and late for the development of these great natural resources, including navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, reclamation, and irrigation. The welfare of the West is dependent upon the full utilization of these resources, and I am glad to state that the Eightieth Congress has been most generous in providing necessary funds for these great projects. President Truman, by an order issued in August 1946, froze much of the funds for this great internal improvement program that the Congress had appropriated, which effectively stymied the construction program. This Republican-controlled Congress, however, has appropriated more money for reclamation than any previous Congress—$389,804,000. Likewise it has made record appropriations for river and harbor improvements of $285,500,000 and for flood control $712,063,000, all of which are vitally essential to the development of these great resources and the expansion of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, during the primary campaign in my congressional district I made a pledge to my people to continue to fight for the principles I have enunciated herein. I want publicly here to renew that pledge. I will fight for the aged, blind, handicapped, and veterans and the development of Oregon's great natural resources—Columbia River, reclamation, hydropower, agriculture, industry, and for free enterprise and against bureaucratic controls, deficit spending, inflation, and high living costs. I will continue to fight to oust the spendthrifts and Communists from Government, reduce war taxes and exorbitant Government costs which are bleeding taxpayers white, stifling production, and dragging America into bankruptcy. I will oppose all profligate spending at home and abroad, believing that foreign aid should provide only a springboard for self-help and not a wheel chair for permanent doles. Let us end appeasement and double talk and maintain 100 percent national defense.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, in these days of great stress and strain, when the welfare of our Nation hangs in the balance and when many subversive interests are boring from within and endeavoring to destroy the cherished liberties of America, it is an appropriate time for all of us to renew again our vows of loyalty to our country and to remind ourselves that spiritual understanding is as important as political wisdom and that we must eschew intolerance, racial and political prejudices, and work together in unison for the preservation of our Nation. We cannot too often make known our allegiance by redcdicating ourselves to the principles set forth in the American's Creed:

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrified their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, may I ask the majority leader if he can tell us the program for the remainder of this week and next week?

Mr. HALLECK. I am not in position to say definitely what the program will be at this time. There are some special orders on the desk, which will be disposed of; then it is possible, under the unanimous-consent request obtained a few moments ago, for a recess to be declared by the Chair with a view to determining what further may be done today.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is for today?

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. RAYBURN. Not for tomorrow or next week?

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. I cannot say what will be brought up for consideration tomorrow. That will be subject to determination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I notice in this morning's Washington Post that Governor Dewey, the standard bearer of the Republican Party, has pressed a committee of the other body to bring out an amended DP bill. I want to commend Governor Dewey for this effort on his part to get out a fair displaced-persons bill in place of the iniquitous measure that was passed in the last session of the Congress.

Now that he has come out into the open and taken a stand on the Displaced Persons Act I hope he will also take a stand on the housing and inflation programs which face the Eightieth Congress and I hope that he will intercede with his friends on the Republican side of the House and indicate his wishes as to their action on housing and inflation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

GOVERNOR THURMOND MAY BE THE NEXT PRESIDENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely probable that Governor Thurmond, of South Carolina, may be the next President of the United States.

It looks now as if no candidate will get a majority of the electoral votes. In that event the election will be thrown into the House of Representatives; then under the Constitution each State will have one vote and the contest will be limited to the three candidates receiving the highest number of electoral votes.

If Governor Thurmond, Governor Dewey, and President Truman are the three leading candidates, and nobody gets a majority in the House on the first ballot, the chances are that Governor Thurmond will be elected, for the very simple reason that every Republican would rather have Governor Thurmond than President Truman, and every real Democrat would rather have Governor Thurmond than Mr. Dewey.

Governor Thurmond is running on a real American platform. He is running for President of the United States of America, and not for President of Israel, or Akhoond of Africa.

The gentleman from California a moment ago undertook to defend Governor Dewey for asking us to throw wide open the gates of immigration to alleged displaced persons.

That would mean the flooding of this country with more aliens, many of whom would bring with them communism, atheism, anarchy, and infidelity. We have too many of that kind in this country now. I should like for us to ship them out of the country.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] undertook to tell the House a while ago that if Governor Dewey were elected President he would clean the Communists out of Washington. He overlooks the fact that Governor Dewey through the FEPC law in New York has dug a veritable storm cellar for every Communist in America who wants to go there and seek employment.

Under that New York law, which Governor Dewey signed with 22 pens, and the regulations under it, one cannot ask a man in New York "what his name was before it was changed, by court order or otherwise," when he applies for employment.

You cannot tell him that the organization with which he is seeking employment observes the Fourth of July.

You cannot ask him where he was during the First World War, from 1917 to 1919.

You cannot ask him what his wife's name was, although he may have married a Russian spy.

You cannot ask him what organizations he belongs to in New York, although he may be a member of the Communist Party.

Governor's Dewey's chief adviser at the other end of the Capitol has introduced this FEPC bill, and it is now before the Senate. If it should become a law, and the same regulations put into effect under it that are now in effect in the FEPC law in the State of New York, then Russia or any other foreign country could pack their spies into every defense plant and put one at the elbow of every businessman in America.

I am not so sure that Mr. Dewey would not bring those Communists with him who are now enjoying the storm cellar of the FEPC law in New York, instead of cleaning out the ones that are already here.

We will have no such crazy laws enacted if Governor Thurmond becomes President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's primary in Tennessee, a progressive and liberal Democratic candidate for governor, an ex-Member of this House and a former Governor of that State, Mr. Gordon Browning, received a tremendous majority, and our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. ESTES KEFAUVER, also a real progressive and liberal Democrat, received a great majority for the United States Senate. The size of their majority and the number of Democratic votes cast assures their election in November and indicates that the action of the people in Tennessee in voting for progressive Democratic candidates will be followed by the people in other States. Consequently, it appears to me that the viewpoint of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] with regard to his Presidential nominee is erroneous. I think the American people appreciate the great efforts made by President Truman, and I feel that all fair-minded and honest people, when realizing that he has done everything possible to relieve them of the existing intolerable conditions brought about by the unholy coalition and the Republican majority in Congress, will reelect him. The Dixieites will not have the opportunity to throw the election in the House as the gentleman from Mississippi predicts.

President Truman may not be perfect, and I do not claim that he is perfect. Everyone makes mistakes. I regret that I have not agreed with him on some matters where he has erroneously followed the suggestions or recommendations of some clever Republican leaders, including John Foster Dulles and Mr. Herbert Hoover, in which matters I feel he was unfortunately misled by them. But he has been sincere in this effort to bring about a reduction in the high cost of living and the construction of low-cost homes that veterans and people in the low-income brackets can afford to buy, and he has demonstrated that he has the interests of the American people at heart as compared to the legislative record of the Republicans in the Eightieth Congress who have placed the interest of wealth above human needs.

STICK TO THE FACTS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I respect the opinion of every Member of this House who has any objection to FEPC on either a local or national basis, provided only that he sticks to the facts. If you look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 11 and March 15 you will find that I placed in the RECORD at that time statistics which clearly show that under FEPC in New York State employment is up, business has increased, more business has come in and more new business enterprises undertaken. Only last week our labor department in the State of New York stated, "We have sufficient places in industry and on the farms of New York State to absorb another 50,000 people if they are admitted under the recently enacted displaced persons bill."

If that is punishment, it is the kind of punishment the country needs.

Get emotional about this problem, if you must, but stick to the facts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REPUBLICAN POLICY IN ASIA

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker—

If American policy had attained its manifest objectives in China * * * China would be Communist today. * * *

The executors of our war policy have been carrying on a public love affair with China's rebellious and autonomous Communists.

This is the judgment of the Roosevelt-Truman policy in Asia expressed by one of our foremost military heroes, Gen. Claire L. Chennault. The general knows the problem well. He has been in China since 1932 when he organized the legendary Flying Tigers to fight Japanese aggression. After the United States entered the war against Japan, General Chennault became this country's top aviation chief in Asia as commander of the Fourteenth United States Air Force. As the general himself put it:

I am a witness to the disastrous results of that policy today.

Because of the blunders made by the Democrat administration both during and after the war, all of Asia is today slipping behind the iron curtain of Soviet imperialism. Our supplies have armed Communist rebel armies in China and other countries. Our policymakers have lent their prestige to the Communists and have exerted pressure on the legitimate governments to give greater and greater privileges to the Moscow-trained agents of the Comintern.

The situation has become disastrously critical in China where the national government under the able leadership of President Chiang Kai-shek is forced to surrender one military position after another, because of the lack of the most elementary military equipment. On the other side, the Soviet Union has poured into Red China untold tons of equipment, much of it seized from the million-strong crack Kwantung army of the Japanese, as well as valuable technical and strategic assistance.

As long as China can maintain itself free of communism, the western democracies will have a 4,000-mile long border facing the Asiatic holdings of Russia from which to attack the Red Army by air in the event of conflict. Knowing the dangers of a two-front war, the masters of the Kremlin will not be inclined to attack Europe or the United States, if there is a powerful and independent China at their back door. Stalin is concentrating much of his effort in Asia while the Truman administration is trying to snare him in Europe by pouring billions of dollars into the support of Socialist nations.

While the nomination-hungry Truman administration is shadow-boxing with the Soviet Union in Europe—

Writes the authoritative Far Eastern News Letter—

the deadly agents of communism are snatching Asia from under our noses. Despite the warnings of some of our foremost national leaders—including General MacArthur, General Wedemeyer, Ambassador Bullitt, and Governor Dewey—the Government of the United States is permitting Asia to slip into Soviet hands by default.

Communist seizure of China would represent a distinct and imminent danger to the defenses of the United States. It would make possible the extension of Soviet control over all of the western Pacific area, thus completely outflanking our toehold in Korea and our military position in Japan. Without a free China, the United States must surrender its occupation of Japan at the whim of the Red army.

The American taxpayer—

Ambassador William Bullitt told the House Foreign Affairs Committee earlier this year—

could for a time pay enough to keep the Japanese alive and to support a large army in Japan to keep down the Communists—but not for long. Domination of China by the Communists would, therefore, lead to eventual Communist domination of Japan. China is the key to the entire Far East.

If our Government should permit the Communists to take over China it would have failed to bar the way to attack on our country by overwhelming masses of Stalin-driven slaves.

On the other side of the international ledger stands the firm and determined record of the Republican-led Eightieth Congress and of every major Republican leader, including Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, Senator Robert A. Taft, and Senator Styles Bridges.

The Republican Party has advocated and enacted into law a new approach to the problems in Asia in line with its traditional policy of keeping the other side of the Pacific Ocean free of any potential aggressor who is a threat to the west coast of the United States.

For half a century American policy in the Far East has been a seesaw struggle between Republican firmness and Democratic appeasement of both Japan and Russia.

Just before the turn of the century, the great powers of Europe and Asia were beginning to make inroads on Chinese territory, taking for themselves strategic military and economic positions. France, Germany, Russia, and Japan were all set to parcel out China among themselves as a colonial empire. Realizing the danger of a potentially hostile coalition in Asia, Republican Secretary of State, John Hay, engaged in an exchange of notes with the powers for the purpose of preventing the partitioning of China and to protect American strategic and economic interests. Secretary Hay took the sound position that—

Whoever understands that mighty Empire socially, politically, economically, religiously, has a key to world politics for the next five centuries.

The result of his efforts was the crystallization in 1899, during the Administration of President McKinley, of the so-called open-door policy under which no nation was permitted to establish itself exclusively on Chinese territory. In its strategic sense, this position is the logical parallel to the Monroe Doctrine and to efforts to keep friendly nations in control of the Atlantic Coast of Europe.

The open door was the keystone of American policy under the succeeding Republican administrations and was instrumental in maintaining China, although weakened by internal disunity and century-long stagnation, as an independent political entity. During the early 1900's Japan and Russia were particularly interested in violating Chinese sovereignty. Their conflict over Asiatic territory finally erupted into the Russo-Japanese War. The Czar's navy was annihilated in the Straits of Shimonoseki and the Czar's army was decisively beaten on the battlefields of Manchuria.

Flushed by its victory over the supposedly formidable Russian military power, the Japanese tried to seize important territories on the Asiatic mainland. Again a Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, interceded and brought the two warring factions together at Portsmouth, N. H. His astute diplomacy and his unflinching adherence to the open-door policy finally forced the Japanese to give up much of the land that they had earmarked for conquest, thus preserving a safe balance of power in Asia.

Japan was not, however, willing to abandon its imperialist designs and kept pressing the United States for recognition of the fact that, because of her geographic position, she had special interests and special rights in the Chinese province of Manchuria. Secretary of State Knox, during the Taft administration, remarked dryly:

Why the Japanese need Manchuria any more than does China, who owns it now, or why it is any more vital to them than to China is not apparent.

The first abandonment of the open door came during the Democratic administration of President Wilson. After the beginning of World War I, the Japanese took advantage of American preoccupation with European problems to seize the strategic Shantung Peninsula of China and to force military and economic concessions from the Chinese Government. These inroads on China's sovereignty gave the Japanese a considerable advantage in east Asia over the United States and other nations.

After the surrender of the Central Powers, Chinese representatives at the Paris Peace Conference demanded the restoration of the lands seized from them at bayonet point. Despite the clear-cut violation of the open door President Wilson ignored these pleas. Encouraged by the attitude of the administration, the Japanese sent Viscount Ishii, as special emissary, to Washington to secure formal recognition of the "rape of Shantung" and agreement by the United States that Nippon had special rights in China beyond those of the other powers. It must be emphasized here that such demands had been consistently and firmly rejected by the United States Government for more than 20 years.

Yet, to the amazement of the entire civilized world, President Wilson's Secretary of State, Robert Lansing, not only recognized the Japanese conquests in violation of American policy, but, in an exchange of notes with Ishii, stated that—

The Government of the United States recognizes that Japan has special interests in China, particularly in the part to which her possessions are contiguous.

The sell-out of the open-door policy drew quick resentment from the Republican-controlled Congress, and, on August 11, 1919, Secretary Lansing was asked by Senator William Borah, of Idaho, and others, to explain how the Democratic administration could have permitted itself to be outwitted by the Japanese diplomat.

It is of particular significance that the 1919 agreement with Japan has all the earmarks of the 1945 Yalta agreement with Russia, both giving to a hostile power a blank check for imperialist adventures. World War II and the attack on Pearl Harbor were the logical results of permitting the Japanese to occupy strategic positions facing our west coast. If world war III should break out, it will be the result of the same kind of appeasement policy followed by the Roosevelt-Truman administrations.

In 1920, the Democratic administration was turned out by the biggest Republican landslide in history. The new Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes, worked

desperately to remedy the blunders of his predecessor. Although the Japanese could no longer be dislodged from their positions without military action, the American policy makers worked out a program of containing Japanese imperialism within its existing limits. At the Washington Peace Conference of 1922, Secretary Hughes—who later became Chief Justice of the Supreme Court—expressed strong disapproval over the continued presence of Nipponese troops in the vital port of Vladivostok. Sensing a new determination in Washington, the Japanese agreed to observe the open-door rule, and shortly thereafter withdrew their forces.

The next serious conflict in China erupted over Soviet invasion of Manchuria to seize the vital Chinese Eastern Railway in 1929. The Russian move was not only a violation of the open-door policy but was a flagrant breach of the Kellogg-Briand peace pact, which had been the great achievement of Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg, during President Coolidge's second term in office. Secretary of State Henry Stimson, who served under President Hoover, was greatly alarmed at the Soviet military activity and called for a conference of the powers in order to effect a peaceful solution. The Communist rulers of the Kremlin snubbed all attempts to secure their attendance although they were a party to the Kellogg-Briand peace treaty and went ahead with their imperialist designs. Despite the efforts of the United States, no action to halt the Soviet was taken.

INVASION OF MANCHURIA

Seeing the refusal of the powers to back the United States in any action to halt the Soviets, the Japanese Army brazenly moved into Manchuria in 1931, setting up the satellite state of Manchukuo under the deposed boy Emperor Pu-yi. Secretary Stimson immediately laid down a firm policy of nonrecognition of the puppet regime and set out to find a peaceful road for the return of the seized territory in conformance with the open-door policy. Unfortunately Stimson's work was interrupted by the elections of 1932 in which the Republican Party was defeated. To assure continuity of American foreign policy, regardless of internal political differences, both President Hoover and Secretary Stimson invited President-elect Franklin D. Roosevelt to participate in a bipartisan formulation of foreign affairs. It was soon found, however, that it was impossible to work in harmony with Franklin D. Roosevelt. His personality made any cooperative effort impossible and Mr. Hoover regretfully dropped his attempts at joint action.

With the Democratic administration in power, the United States embarked upon a 16-year period of appeasement of both Japan and Soviet Russia. The firm policy of Henry L. Stimson was dropped and valuable war materials, including oil and scrap iron, were shipped to Japan with the blessing of Washington. In the case of the Soviet Union, President Roosevelt abandoned the Republican nonrecognition policy of the outlaw Soviet Government and welcomed red Russia into the family of nations over the sharp protest of many loyal Americans.

These two steps: Strengthening of Japan and recognition of Soviet Russia, are the two basic reasons for World War II. They have created the principal difficulties now being encountered by the United States and the world in resisting Soviet imperialism and aggression. Both of these acts followed the footsteps of the Wilson administration 14 years earlier by bowing to the warlike designs of two major aggressor nations.

In the spring of 1933, the new Roosevelt policy became evident when the invasion of North China by the Japanese went by without protest from Washington. On September 29, Foreign Minister Koki Hirota announced that Japan would "establish an Asiatic Union comprising China, Japan, Manchukuo." Although this was a direct violation of the "open door," the Democratic-controlled State Department made no reply, uttered no opposition. Underlining its complete surrender to the Japanese pressure, the Administration recalled the Pacific battle fleet in November and ordered it to the Atlantic where there was no need for American battle wagons.

Then, in 1934, the Japanese Army was again on the move on Chinese soil. Instead of trying to stop this new aggression, the State Department engaged in an amiable exchange of notes with Tokyo, assuring the Japanese that "the American Government will be prepared to examine the position of Japan in a spirit of amity and of desire for peaceful and just settlement."

END OF OPEN DOOR

Spurred on by the friendship in Washington, the Japanese Foreign Ministry announced that Japan had the sole right to maintain peace and order in eastern Asia and that she would look with disfavor on any joint operations undertaken by foreign powers, even in the name of technical and financial assistance and would especially oppose supplying China with war planes, building airdromes in China, and detailing military advisers to China, or contracting a loan to provide funds for political use.

The open door which the Republican Party had guarded since 1899 was slammed shut a year after the Democratic administration took over.

During the next 3 years, while fighting continued on a small scale in China, the Japanese one by one denounced international peace agreements, including the Washington naval treaty. The policymakers in Washington looked on in bewilderment unable to cope with the problem.

On July 7, 1937, the Japanese launched a full-scale war in China, an operation which eventually carried them to Pearl Harbor. In a few weeks they had seized al' of North China. In Washington, the administration delivered itself of a few feeble protests while continuing to supply the Japanese war machine with essential products. More than 50 percent of the war goods imported into Japan came from the United States.

On October 5, 1937, President Roosevelt, bowing to persistent public opinion, called for a quarantine on aggressor nations but still American supplies kept pouring across the Pacific. It was not until 8 months later that the State Department declared a moral embargo on war material for Japan. During these 8 months, American interests were trampled in Asia; the United States gunboat *Panay* and three tankers were sunk and their survivors machine-gunned.

Even the embargo of 1938 was a sham. Japan still received more than 90 percent of her copper imports here, 90 percent of her imported scrap iron and steel, 77 percent of her aircraft and plane parts, and many other products. While Washington was trying to negotiate a peaceful settlement with the Mikado, Japan kept using the United States as a base for supplies. Even in 1939, the year in which World War II began, they were able to import from here petroleum products worth more than $45,000,000, iron and scrap steel valued at $33,000,000, copper at $28,000,000, power-driven metal-working machines at $25,000,000.

By 1940 Japanese intentions must have been clear even to the Democratic policymakers. Nonetheless, it was not until July 2, that Washington took action to limit the export of war goods to Japan. The National Defense Act of 1940 provided for the licensing of war-material exports and this device was to be used to cut off the flow to Japan. The administration made a public show of its righteousness, but Japan was still permitted to purchase vast amounts of power-driven machinery and other products in this country. Total exports of petroleum products alone amounted to more than $53,000,000, the major part during the last quarter of the year.

PEARL HARBOR

Even in 1941, the year of Pearl Harbor, Japan was able to get here 227,000,000 pounds of iron and steel bars and nearly 7,000,000 pounds of iron and steel plates, a tremendous increase over the previous year; all this with the consent of the administration.

The people of the United States were presented with the bill on December 7, 1941.

Had the open-door policy been followed by the only two Democrat Presidents of the present century, the Japanese empire would never have been in a position to challenge the power of the United States of America. By consenting to their continuous expansion into strategic areas, the Democrat Party made it possible for Japan to gain sufficient strength for a test of arms which, but for the valor of American men, might have cost us our liberties.

The greatest advantage that the United States had in the war with Japan was the fact that China had been able to hold out against the Japanese Army since 1937 and, despite severe losses, had tied up a vast number of the Mikado's troops. China had reason to expect substantial aid from the United States but the expected military assistance did not arrive; it was poured into Soviet Russia, the country which had made Hitler's war possible by agreeing to a division of the spoils in 1939.

The first American commander of our Asiatic theater was Gen. John Magruder,

who permitted diversion of planes intended for the Chinese armies to the British who were fighting a losing battle in southeastern Asia. He was replaced by Gen. "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell, who immediately came into conflict with the Chinese Government, particularly President Chiang Kai-shek because of his burning desire to be the big boss without advice from anyone else. General Stilwell's action brought sharp criticism from General Chennault who wrote, not long ago, that had it not been for the removal of "Vinegar Joe" in 1944 "it would almost certainly have meant the final ruin of the joint Chinese-American effort."

In the fall of 1944 the China theater command went to one of our most capable military officers, Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer. Although this brought about a change in the attitude of our military high command, the civilian missions in China, directly responsible to the State Department, intensified their public love affair with the Chinese Communists. It is not surprising to learn that some of President Roosevelt's emissaries and representatives in China—including Lauchlin Currie—have been mentioned recently in connection with the espionage activities on behalf of the Soviet Union.

During the war the Reds in China, as well as the Communist Parties in the other allied countries were under orders from Moscow to give lip-service loyalty to the legal governments and to cooperate in the war effort, not on behalf of their own country, but to assure the final emergence of a victorious and dominant Soviet Union.

In this effort, the Roosevelt administration was the greatest helpmate of the Communists, both in Asia and in Europe. American field representatives in China kept recommending that special aid be extended to the Chinese Communists, precisely as such aid had already been given secretly to Russian-trained leaders of Europe. In Chungking, the temporary capital of China, United States diplomats were openly criticizing President Chiang Kai-shek for his refusal to take the Communists into the government and were threatening to cut off aid to China unless the Reds were given greater power with which they could eventually take over the government itself.

SUPPORT OF REDS

As early as 1942, Gen. Patrick Hurley was sent to China with ambassadorial rank to bring about a coalition between the Communists and the Government. In 1944, President Roosevelt sent Henry Wallace as his personal envoy to China in order to further pressure the Chungking government into adopting the Communists. Accompanying Wallace were two men whose long-standing sympathies with the Communists are a matter of record, Owen Lattimore and John Carter Vincent, chief of the Far Eastern Division of the State Department. Wallace left the task of surveying the situation to his two accompanists, hardly unprejudiced or competent observers. The ex-Vice President himself spent much of his time inspecting United States Army Air bases, conferring with leading leftists and Communists, and holding himself up to public ridicule by trotting around in his shorts for exercise. He spent all of 4 days in Chungking, much of the time talking to such noted Communist fronters and sympathizers as Chang Lan and leaders of the pro-Communist Democratic League.

The report that was finally submitted by Wallace—written, of course by his left-wing ghost writers—recommended the strongly pro-Communist program which has been the basic policy in China of the Democratic administration.

Wallace himself told the President that China could not last more than 3 months. That was 4 years ago and China is still fighting communism. The Wallace mission gave the Communist leaders full confidence that the United States would use its power to force the Chinese government to capitulate. Mao Tze-tung, Moscow-trained head of the Chinese Communist Party, stated:

We will wait. American pressure on the Kuomintang cannot come until after the elections in the United States.

In Washington, the administration was doing its utmost to bring about Communist control over China. Officials of the State Department were urging the arming of the Communists with American equipment and the establishment of a branch of the United States Embassy in Communist territory. On orders from higher up, Under Secretary of State Joseph Grew cabled Ambassador Hurley in China to take as his guide the recommendations contained in the Wallace report.

YALTA SELL-OUT

By the beginning of 1945, it was certain that the valiant fight of the American armies would bring about the defeat of both Germany and Japan in short order. The Soviet Union, therefore, took immediate steps to consolidate its position and to reinforce its international fifth column. The Comintern which was buried in a mock funeral in 1943 as a sop to the Allies, suddenly redoubled its activities. Soviet diplomats worked feverishly to obtain widespread concessions from the other warring powers. Again President Roosevelt was their most generous ally. At the Yalta Conference he signed away to Soviet control 10 countries in eastern Europe and large slices of Chinese territory without so much as consulting the Chinese Government.

President Chiang Kai-shek was not informed of the secret Roosevelt-Stalin deal and he continued to place his faith in administration promises that Manchuria would be returned intact to China after the Japanese were driven out. In June 1945, the Soviet Government asked China to send an emissary to negotiate a treaty with the Kremlin. President Chiang sent Prime Minister T. V. Soong who was the first Chinese official to be informed of the secret clauses of the Yalta sell-out. Shocked by the humiliating agreement between Roosevelt and Stalin, Soong refused to sign the treaty and returned to China. The Chinese Government protested to Washington but was told bluntly by the White House to accept the Soviet demands or face the full fury of the administration. A new Chinese envoy was thereupon sent to Moscow and he signed on the dotted line to the profound sorrow of the entire Chinese nation.

Reduced to its simplest terms, the Yalta agreement meant that the United States was using its superior military and economic position to strip China—the one country that had been fighting Japan from the very beginning of the conflict with the Axis—of its most vital military and economic lands to reward the Soviet Union—the country which had made the war possible by concluding the infamous Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939. The same thing was true in Europe, where countries like Poland and Yugoslavia, which had valiantly resisted Nazi aggression while the Soviet Union was still swilling up the loot at the same trough with Hitler, were being turned over to Russia by President Roosevelt.

Reassured by the American surrender at Yalta and convinced that the subsequent defeat of Germany meant an early termination of hostilities, the Soviets dropped their mask of cooperation with the western democracies and moved to consolidate their imperialist aims and to reinforce their world-wide fifth column. The Comintern, which was supposely laid to rest in 1943 as a token of good will, suddenly reappeared and its leaders everywhere took an active part in promoting chaos and rebellion.

NEW SOVIET POLICY

On June 11, 1945, the official Soviet organ Izvestia published the Russian plan for the domination of China and laid down a new policy to be followed by the Communist Party and its fellow travelers. Among the demands made by Izvestia was that the legally constituted Chinese Government be purged of its principal leaders and that their places be filled by Communists. Izvestia was particularly vehement in its denunciation of President Chiang Kai-shek and his party, the Kuomintang.

The way to bring national unity in China—

Thundered the Moscow propaganda organ—

is to create a coalition government. * * * The Chinese should also improve their relations with the Soviet Union. * * * The first step should be the calling of an assembly of all parties. * * * The second the removal of all reactionaries now at the head of the Kuomintang.

Like puppets whose strings are controlled in Moscow, the left-wing clique which surrounded the President and dominated the far eastern section of the State Department—aptly dubbed the State Department's "red cell"—suddenly hopped aboard the Moscow propaganda line. They repeated as their own the policies laid down a few days earlier by Izvestia. The pressure on the Chinese Government was intensified and the demands for surrender to the Communists were now made the central theme of all American-Chinese negotiations.

All arms shipments to the embattled Chinese armies were cut off. Although we had promised to equip eight and one-half Chinese air groups, this commitment was ignored by the Truman administration.

Administration spokesmen repeated the Communist Party line with increasing frequency and increasing conviction. They were bent upon justifying the sell-out at Yalta regardless of its eventual effect on American interests.

Six days before the final surrender of Japan—August 14, 1945—the Soviet Union sent its troops into Manchuria. The Japanese, beaten to defeat by the troops under Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the fleet of Admiral "Bull" Halsey, and the bombers of Gen. Curtiss LeMay, offered only token resistance. Within a week the so-called Kwantung Army in Manchuria, the last Japanese army still intact, surrendered to Marshal Rodion Malinovsky.

It appeared to many observers that American men had died on Guadalcanal, on Iwo Jima, and on Okinawa so that, at the moment of victory, the Soviet Union could walk in and pluck the richest prize in Asia.

The propagandists had done their job well and protests against the surrender of Manchuria to Russia were lost in the pro-Communist howl raised by the White House palace guard.

The ghost of Manchuria could, however, not be laid to rest that easily. Republican leaders, who had kept silent during the war in order to present a united front, began to take a less charitable view of Democrat blunders in Asia. The demand for an explanation of the Manchurian fiasco became increasingly insistent.

In Manchuria itself, the Russians had clamped down an iron curtain. But soon disturbing rumors trickled out that the Soviets were engaged in a wholesale looting of the province. A few American correspondents were able to break through the steel cordon of the Red Army and the story and pictures they brought out showed wholesale devastation of what had been the most industrialized area of continental Asia. These first glimpses of Soviet plunder presented only a partial picture of what the world was to face.

During this period the Chinese Government engaged in negotiations with the U. S. S. R. in an attempt to obtain the restoration of Manchuria. On August 14, 1945, the Treaty of Moscow as dictated by Stalin to Roosevelt at Yalta was signed, providing for the return of Manchuria to Chinese sovereignty, although Russia was granted many privileges for a period of 30 years. When the treaty period expired the Red Army refused to move and final evacuation did not take place until 6 months after the original deadline fixed by Stalin.

They left the province more devastated than a plague of locusts. Everything movable had been stolen. Factories were completely stripped and many buildings were wantonly destroyed by explosives. In many cases, concrete foundations holding machinery were blasted away. Installations that could not be moved were destroyed.

LOSS OF MANCHURIA

Even this plundered Manchuria was not destined to be returned to the Chinese people. Instead, the Soviet Army surrendered control of the area to the Chinese Communist guerrillas, who were under strict control of Moscow. To make certain that the Government troops should not be able to take over Manchuria, the Soviets turned over to the Communists the vast military stores of the Kwantung Army.

Still, the administration in Washington was preaching coalition with the Communists. As a result, Ambassador Hurley threw in the sponge and resigned. Upon his return to Washington he charged that aides assigned to him by the State Department, as well as officials of the Far Eastern Division, were purposely sabotaging his work and were out to destroy the Government of China. He cited the fact that threats had been made to cut off lend-lease supplies unless President Chiang knuckled under to the Communists. Among the culprits named by General Hurley were John Carter Vincent and John S. Service. Instead of bringing about the much-needed house cleaning of the State Department, Hurley's charges merely drew from the Secretary of State a prompt prefabricated whitewash. General Hurley is now Republican candidate for the Senate in his home State of New Mexico and is the likely victor in the contest.

MARSHALL MISSION

To cover up the damage done to the administration by the Hurley resignation, the President sent to China as his representative, Gen. George Marshall, who had no political experience in or knowledge of the Far East. His mission, like that of all his predecessors, was to persuade President Chiang to widen the basis of government by including the Communists and other left-wing elements. For more than a year in China, General Marshall held innumerable conferences with both government representatives and Chou En-lai, the No. 2 Communist of China.

The presence of General Marshall in China for the sole purpose of getting them admitted into the government gave great hope and assurance to the Communists. Their mask of conciliation was dropped and their attitude toward the government became increasingly truculent. By June of 1946, the Red troops were on the march again. Despite this open rebellion Marshall was still trying to talk the government into the coalition. The situation would be comparable to a Chinese representative asking President Lincoln to take into his Cabinet Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee after the battle of Bull Run.

To support General Marshall's persuasive powers, the administraton in Washington threw its full measure of economic sanctions against China. Nearly all commercial intercourse and all assistance were cut off.

On July 29, 1946, at the request of General Marshall, the State Department ordered a ban on all shipments of arms and munitions to the Chinese Republic, despite the fact that Soviet Russia was providing the Communists with generous supplies of armaments for their rebellion. At the same time, it should be pointed out the administration was still shipping great quantities of supplies to Russia.

In October 1946, for example, China tried to buy surplus American ships from this country. In a letter to Admiral Smith of the Maritime Commission, Under Secretary of State Will Clayton, stated that the sale would have to be conditioned upon acceptance by the Chinese of American demands for a coalition government.

By December 1946, the civil war in China had flared into large-scale operations by the Communists and Marshall's demands for Communist recognition were rejected by President Chiang. In December 1946, the White House was forced to admit failure and General Marshall returned home. Another blunder had been added to the long list of the Democratic administration.

On December 18, 1946, President Truman announced that all lend-lease shipments to China "had been suspended," although we were obligated to make deliveries by previous agreement. In the light of the attitude of the administration toward the anti-Communist government of China it is of particular interest to recall that 2 months later representatives of the State Department appeared before a House committee to demand money for lend-lease shipments for the Soviet Union. The reason given to the astonished Representatives was that the United States was committed to make deliveries under prior agreements. The administration was quick to honor its commitments to the Soviets but not those to any anti-Communist government.

REPUBLICAN ATTACK

In January 1947, the new Republican Congress met in Washington and laid down the first challenge to the blundering foreign policy of the Roosevelt-Truman period. During the war, in full compliance with the bipartisan foreign policy, Republican leaders had refrained from justified criticism of the administration in order to present our enemies on the battlefield with a united American front. Undoubtedly, this expression of deep patriotism cost the Republican Party the election of 1944. Had they turned the full measure of objective analysis on the Roosevelt mistakes in the field of international relations, there is little question that Governor Dewey would have carried the Presidential contest.

In 1947, the Eightieth Congress was faced with the problem of rescuing the country from the disaster of the Democratic administration. It was necessary to reestablish American prestige in the world and to work for reconstruction of the foreign policy of the United States. Being in favor of genuine international cooperation, Republican leaders opposed any continuation of the Soviet appeasement which the Government had indulged in during 14 years of Democrat misrule.

This was no rubber-stamp Congress willing to give pro forma consent to any measure emanating from the White House. The Eightieth Congress demanded an immediate revision of this fatal policy in Asia. In a desperate last-hope effort, the administration tried to silence Republican criticism by trying

to secure one more whitewash of its activities.

WEDEMEYER MISSION

The man selected to do the job was Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, a soldier whose personal integrity and ability rank him with the great military heroes of our proud history. The general, unlike his predecessor, was thoroughly familiar with the situation in China. As the commander of Allied military forces in the China-Burma-India theater, he was in the best position to study China and her problems. Upon his shoulders fell the delicate job of restoring Chinese-American relations which had been badly battered by the State Department and General Stilwell. He performed both his diplomatic and his military mission well.

General Wedemeyer was sent on a fact-finding mission to China early in the summer of 1947 and he was back with a full-dress report in August. The report threw a bombshell into the White House. The expected whitewash did not materialize: General Wedemeyer called the shots as he saw them. Although pointing out that the Chinese Government had many faults, he made it abundantly clear that the difficulties of China were the result of Communist aggression. He left no question that the Communists were the tools of Moscow and recommended abandonment of the pro-Communist policy of the administration plus military assistance to China. There is considerable evidence that the left-wingers in control of the State Department rewrote the Wedemeyer report so as to support their pro-Communist stand and then tried to force the General to sign the fake document for public consumption. This General Wedemeyer refused to do.

Stunned, the administration classified the Wedemeyer report "top secret" and buried it in the inner recesses of the State Department. All congressional attempts to see the document have been rebuffed by the White House in line with the policy of the President to keep out of the public eye any material that might reflect on the Democratic Party in the coming election.

It was, however, too late to retrieve the damage done by the constant Republican hammering and in December the White House was forced to make a public disavowal of its demand that the Government of China surrender to the Communists. Even this act was typical of the present administration. In a public statement, Mr. Truman denied that this Government had ever suggested that Communists be taken into the Government. To give this statement the lie is a long chain of public utterances by many major Government officials as well as Democratic spokesmen in Congress. In fact, when General Marshall was in China, much of his time was spent in talks with the Communist envoy, and the Communist Party is the only organization outside the Government with which he had any serious dealings.

The 1948 session of the Eightieth Congress continued to expose the Truman policy in China. Congress included China in the foreign-aid bill and wrote in a proviso for military assistance. Administration officials were urged to make available to the Chinese Government surplus war material rotting on our Pacific islands to assist the Chinese Government in defending itself against the Soviet-engineered revolution, at no cost to the taxpayers.

While giving lip service to an anti-Communist program, the State Department has done everything in its power to sabotage the China-aid law. Instead of sending the arms authorized, the administration has been shipping tobacco to China. Impatient at the stalling in Washington, Chairman STYLES BRIDGES of the Senate Appropriations Committee called the State Department to task for general laxity, contrary to the interests of the American people, pointing out that, although emergency military aid had been on the law books for 3 months nothing had been done in Washington to comply with the mandate of Congress.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITY IN ASIA

The abandonment of China to the Communists, has had serious repercussions elsewhere in Asia. Other countries are slowly falling into the Kremlin trap, thus presenting the United States with an increasingly solidified Asia under Communist rule. In Korea, the Communists control the industrialized northern part of the country and are threatening to seize the United States-occupied area by force. In Indonesia, the self-styled republican government has strengthened its relations with Soviet Russia and has given additional power and governmental posts to leftists. In Indochina the Communists have maintained a full-scale war for nearly 3 years under the leadership of the notorious Soviet agent, Ho Chi-minh. This has immobilized some of the best elements of the French Army which would otherwise be stationed in Europe, ready for action in the event of Russian military aggression. Similarly, the Communists in Burma are in open rebellion and the Burmese Army is now preparing action against them. In Malaya, the British are fighting a Communist-led rebellion and troops have been sent there from Europe. Even in India, which has been relatively free of Communist agitation, there is increasing subversive activity and the Moscow propaganda machine is giving considerable attention to that area of the world.

It is not difficult to imagine the danger to the United States should Russia be able to mobilize the billion inhabitants of Asia against us.

REPUBLICAN POLICY

It is now certain that American policy in Asia will change with the election of a Republican President next November. Governor Dewey and the other leaders of the Republican Party have definitely committed themselves to a reexamination of our Asiatic policy and a complete housecleaning of the State Department.

Last fall, when the bankruptcy of the administration's pro-Communist policy became a matter of public record, Mr. Dewey told the Nation that—

> I believe the administration has been niggardly and faltering and inconsistent and blundering to the point of tragedy in the failure to adopt a realistic program to save China from the Communists. I am firmly convinced that we must adopt a realistic program that the leaders of the Chinese Government need, and increase our confidence in those willing to fight with us shoulder to shoulder.

His stand was seconded by Senator TAFT, majority leader in the Senate and chairman of the Republican policy committee, who declared:

> He—
>
> General Marshall—
>
> said that China was completely wrecked by civil war, but he opposed the policy of extending vigorous military aid, which alone could bring an end to civil war.

Approval also came from the United States Pacific commander and a leading Republican, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. In a letter to Chairman EATON, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he said:

> I can say without the slightest hesitation that a free, independent, peaceful, and friendly China is of profound importance to the peace of the world, and to the position of the United States. It is the fundamental keystone to the Pacific arch.

That the Republican position is sound and strategically vital is evident from the fact that it has the support of many officials and ex-officials who have served the Democrat administration for many years. Among them are William Bullitt, former Ambassador to Russia and France, as well as President Roosevelt's special wartime representative; ex-Governor George Earle, of Pennsylvania, who was minister to Bulgaria and Presidential envoy to the Near East; Gen. Lowell Rooks, former head of the ill-fated UNRRA; Generals Chennault, Wedemeyer, and MacArthur.

The Truman palace guard has tried desperately to counter this formidable array of experts by ordering Cabinet officers to publicly espouse the official policy of the administration. Even these pressure tactics have, however, failed. During the closing days of the last session of Congress, the White House ordered Army Secretary Royall to appear before congressional leaders in secret session and state that China could not hold out against the Communists—something that the White House has now been telling the country for years. In obedience to orders, Secretary Royall repeated the statements that were put in his mouth but he made it clear that they did not represent his opinion. He told congressional chieftains that he was not testifying as Army Secretary nor as a private citizen but only as a member of the administration.

In order to recover its lost position in Asia, the United States must immediately and irrevocably return to the traditional Republican policy of maintaining the open door in Asia. As Senator BRIDGES pointed out:

> The expenditure of billions of dollars to halt the spread of Communist forces in Europe makes little sense if at the same time this Government allows China to go to the Communists by default.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects; one, old-age assistance payments, and the other, the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in honor of a great Alabamian who by his work in preventive medicine made possible the building of the Panama Canal. The name of this outstanding American is Gen. William Crawford Gorgas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for a great many days I have repeatedly asked the House and the Congress to pass the bill H. R. 4488, the only bill that is ready for action that would provide houses for veterans. This is a housing bill for veterans, and veterans alone, and they are the ones who have suffered the most because of the lack of housing.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Senate will consider placing in the housing bill now under consideration as an amendment a bill introduced in the Senate by Senator MARTIN, and which is the same as the bill H. R. 4488. This bill was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Many Members of the House support this bill, but 29 Members besides me introduced this bill for the American Legion. We amended the bill. We think it is an excellent bill, a workable bill. The veterans can secure low-cost housing and low-cost rentals. They have 40 years in which to pay the loan back. The houses will be built for them, so that there will be no initial cost for the veterans. I am sure that if the amendment is placed in the bill in the Senate the House will approve it unanimously. Then the Veterans' Administration and the veterans can go to work, and the houses for veterans will soon be on their way.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts tell the House whether it is possible to pass legislation that will bring about the building of any more houses for veterans than are being constructed at the present time?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feel very sure it will. I think there will be a great deal of interest in seeing that supplies are given to the associations that are building houses for the veterans. I think that when the people who have the supplies for housing realize that they are for veterans, the materials will be forthcoming.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The situation regarding materials and labor that go into the building of homes is at the present time exceedingly tight. What could you do by legislation such as is being considered here now to change the situation?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think public opinion will do a great deal along that line. There are certain buildings that are not Government buildings whose construction is being planned. I think the Government could hold back on its building for a while, both as to those that are not under construction and some of those that are under construction. I think they could wait.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentlewoman refers particularly, I suppose, to the $65,000,000 voted yesterday for the United Nations building?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That could wait for a while. My recollection is that that was only an authorization bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I understand that is not only an authorization, but provides for the use of funds immediately.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am not sure about that; I believe the money comes out of the contingent fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAHAM). The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

INFLATION OF CREDIT AND CURRENCY

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, high on the list of purposes for which this special session of the Congress was called by the President was the current high cost of living to the American people.

Admittedly, the plight of millions of people in paying for their daily bills is a matter of serious moment and, quite properly, it is the responsibility of Government to find some adequate and sufficient means of relief.

It was the President's recommendation that authority be given to him to control prices, regulate wages and ration and allocate scarce commodities and goods. The remedy recommended by the President has been rejected by the Congress as being unsound, both in principle and practice. The principal evidence of the ineffectiveness of price control and rationing as a medium to curb inflation is the fact that it was so recently tried by the Government during wartime and was found to be both ineffective and highly unpopular.

Fundamentally, the President's recommendation fails to strike at the real causes of inflation and seeks to deal with its effects. High prices are analogous to sores appearing upon the human body, striking evidence that something is wrong with the human anatomy. In such a case, the remedy is not to scrape off the scabs or to pour antiseptics upon the sores but rather to diagnose the ailment by a study of the internal system and organisms of the body. This the President and the whole executive department of the Government has tragically failed to do.

The administration, in all of its bombastic talk about inflation and the high cost of living, and the program which the President has proposed, has assumed that high prices are the disease to be cured. As we all know, high prices are merely the symptoms, the outward evidences that something is wrong with the internal mechanism of our economic anatomy. The real disease which is the cause of these external evidences of an ailment is an overexpansion of credit and, to some extent, of currency. It is this colossal balloon of credit that puts an undue amount of purchasing power in the hands of both Government and the public and results in the reckless bidding up of prices for available goods and commodities.

There is only one way to get at the roots of this matter—only one real, effective, and permanent remedy, and that is by contracting credit and currency with a marked curtailment of governmental spending as the initial step. Yet, the administration, while proposing to tie down the safety valve, which represents prices, has continued to stoke the boiler by a deliberate policy of cheap money, easy credit, excessive public expenditures, and the creation of an almost unmanageable debt.

Actually, quite far-reaching powers already reside in certain executive departments and agencies to deal with the causes of inflation. I believe the spotlight should be turned upon these agencies and that the administration should be called to account for its actions, past and future, under these powers.

For example: Why has the Federal Reserve System been so slow to increase the required reserves of member banks and why has it not already put the ratio in central reserve cities up to the legal limit of 26 percent? What use does it propose to make of the rediscount rate, which, while presumably is not as effective as formerly, is nevertheless a weapon to be accounted for and used? What attempts had it made or can it make by means of open market operations, through the sale of securities, to cut down the excess reserves which are an actual or potential encouragement to credit expansion? What influence can it exert under its general selective powers, to curb credit extension in the fields of installment buying or other aggravated areas?

When is the Treasury going to change its policy of artificially holding down interest rates on its paper, to the definite stimulation of easy money conditions and credit expansion throughout the whole economy? What is the current scope of the gold-buying policy and what should be done to lessen its inflationary effects, whatever they may amount to? What are the innumerable Government corporations and agencies which operate in the field of building or utilization of scarce goods and labor doing to lessen the impact of such operations in the present market? The latter question would, of course, cover the RFC, the REA, Commodity Credit, and the like.

This is not the first time our country has been faced with serious problems of inflation. High prices such as we now have occur periodically as an aftermath of a war period. For the purpose of stemming previous inflationary spirals

and in anticipation of future similar conditions, the Congress has granted to various of the executive agencies, through the exercise of their normal business, a latitude of operation which, if exercised, could operate to stem inflationary tendencies.

By calling the Congress into special session, the President has indicated to the country that the responsibility for both the cause of the present condition and the cure of it rests upon the Congress. Actually, the cause exists within the operation of the executive department itself and various steps for its cure presently exist within the agencies of Government.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a resolution calling upon the executive agencies of the Government to inform the House of Representatives and the people what steps they have taken or propose to take in order to curb the existing inflation of credit and currency.

There are good precedents for a resolution such as I am suggesting. Like action was taken following the Civil War and World War I, when inflationary conditions in both cases were strikingly like those of the present.

Near the end of 1865, the House almost unanimously passed a resolution for the resumption of specie payments and the contraction of the greenbacks.

In May 1920, the Senate passed a resolution calling upon the Federal Reserve Board to "Advise the Senate what steps it proposed to take or recommend to the member banks of the Federal Reserve system to meet the existing inflation of the currency, credit, and the consequent high prices."

Following each of these resolutions credit and currency actually were contracted and commodity prices began to fall within a matter of weeks. If Congress has any real purpose to force deflationary action under powers already existing, here is a step which might accomplish some results.

I believe that the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency have contributed to public understanding of the responsibility of the executive agencies in this situation, and that the testimony before this committee strongly supports the sense of my resolution.

Considering the timing and effects of like action by the House and Senate in the past, there is reason to think that this resolution would induce action by the various executive agencies such as might change the whole trend of credit expansion and commodity prices. I might call attention especially to the similarity in both political and economic situations in 1920 and the present. The Senate was Republican then and the administration was Democratic. It was a Presidential election year. The high cost of living, particularly of meat, was a prime issue before the people. The Senate resolution in 1920 played a considerable part in inducing the Federal Reserve Board to tighten controls over credit and change the trend from expansion to contraction, with an almost immediate downward movement in commodity prices.

If such a resolution as this is adopted, which I strongly urge, it will serve the dual purpose of focusing upon the executive department of Government the attention of the public that powers already exist with the Government which, when exercised, will cause a downward trend and will stimulate action by the executive department in the exercise of those powers.

A responsibility does rest upon Government to cure this dangerous condition. The President has said this responsibility is ours. The remedy he has advocated is unsound. It is our obligation to tell the people the truth and show them that this situation was caused by Government practices and can be cured in a large way by a change in Government policies and practices under existing authority of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WHERE IS GOVERNOR DEWEY?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, according to a story in today's New York Times, Governor Dewey is planning to make the high cost of living a major issue in his Presidential campaign. His press secretary, however, when asked whether Mr. Dewey planned to submit an anti-inflation program to the current session of Congress, answered, "I do not believe so."

The country is now presented with a very sorry spectacle. Governor Dewey as the defeated candidate for President in 1944 of the Republican Party, and as the party's nominee for 1948, has the position of leadership of the GOP. Yet the ranking leaders of his party in Congress are confused and divided as to what should be done in this special session of Congress on the critical issues of high prices and the housing shortage. Some Republican Members of the other body have openly assailed the Republican opposition in the Congress to effective and immediate action to cope with these problems. These Members seem to realize what most Republican Members of Congress and apparently Governor Dewey do not. They seem to know as President Truman told the Congress that "high prices are not taking time off for the election," that "high prices will not wait until the next session of Congress," that high prices will not wait while Governor Dewey takes the stump to campaign for the Presidency. Something must be done now during this special session of Congress to give the people the relief they so sorely need. If the Republican leadership is unwilling to enact the program of President Truman for curbing high prices and for providing housing for people with low incomes, then let them submit an alternative program. Apparently, the Republican leadership in Congress does not have any constructive comprehensive program to offer.

But Governor Dewey must have such a program, for he has announced his intention of making the high cost of living a major campaign issue. Now, Mr. Speaker, would it not be more befitting the dignity of a candidate for the office of President of the United States to suggest measures with which to solve these problems than to play politics with them in his campaign?

Governor Dewey has not hesitated through his varied assortment of campaign managers, to make known his views on other less-important items of legislation which President Truman called to the attention of the special session of Congress, but he has carefully refrained from any active participation in the fight against inflation and the fight to put a roof over the homeless people of this country. Where is Governor Dewey today?

Why is he not down here assisting and guiding the Republican leaders in Congress? Of course, there is always the possibility that he fears he cannot persuade the Republican leaders of Congress to accept his views and to enact legislation which the emergency requires, but, Mr. Speaker, if this be true now, it is all the more important that the country know this fact. If Governor Dewey has already abdicated the leadership of the Republican Party to the reactionary leadership of the Republican Eightieth Congress, then the only alternative is to remove these obstacles and to give President Truman a Congress that will cooperate with him, starting next January. Governor Dewey recently said that it would be cruel and inhuman punishment for the President to call the Congress back into special session. Apparently he, through his inactivity and the Republican leadership in Congress, through their inactivity, are intent upon inflicting the cruel and inhuman punishment of continued rising prices and continued housing shortages upon the American people.

It is no answer and no excuse for Governor Dewey to say that he will make everything clear during his campaign. The big question is, "Where is Governor Dewey now, and has he or has he not surrendered his leadership of the Republican Party?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on price control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. GRAHAM]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS IN THE FIELD OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, before this special session of the Eightieth Congress draws to its inexorable close, it is appropriate, I think, to review briefly its accomplishments in the field of foreign affairs and point a finger in the direction in which we should move if we are to keep pace with the rapid crescendo of international events.

This Congress, which the Chief Executive has assailed as the worst in our history, will some day be recognized as one of the greatest Congresses.

This Congress created the legal basis for the establishment of the United Nations on these shores when it enacted the UN Headquarters Agreement Act. On yesterday it underwrote the United Nations headquarters with a $65,000,000 loan.

Fourteen months ago this Congress provided relief assistance to war-devastated areas in Public Law 84, sometimes known as post-UNRRA relief. It continued and strengthened the undertaking of promoting world peace through economic assistance in the Foreign Aid Act of 1947, which was passed after Congress was summoned back into session last November to deal with the economic crisis in Europe. This was an interim measure to bolster western Europe until the European Recovery Program could go into effect. Finally, after protracted hearings, careful study, and much devoted thought, the Congress worked out a formula for long-term European reconstruction in the Economic Cooperation Act, which was passed last April. This may be described as a strategical measure with relief characteristics. It constitutes an effort of gigantic and unprecedented proportions in the international arena.

This Congress legislated assistance to Greece and Turkey to buttress them against the Communist tyranny. It originated the principle of assistance to China, similarly threatened.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, has reported and the House of Representatives has acted upon a total of 31 public laws dealing with foreign affairs. I have mentioned the significant ones relating to economic policy and to the United Nations. In addition positive forward steps were taken in the general sphere of international organization and cooperation. This Congress passed legislation authorizing American participation in the World Health Organization, the International Refugee Organization, the Caribbean Commission, and the South Pacific Commission. This Congress authorized acceptance of the trusteeship for the territory of the Pacific islands. It reincorporated the Institute of Inter-American Affairs to carry on our mutual programs with various Latin American republics.

This Congress legislated the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948—better known as the Voice of America Act.

This Congress developed the policy of the 70-group air force, passed the Armed Forces Unification Act, and renewed selective service. These were concrete measures to show the world that we intended to back our word with our strength; that in our opinion peace is a product of strength, war a derivative of weakness.

A lesser measure of the same sort was the legislation extending authority to arm merchant ships in time of emergency.

This is a record of which any Congress, indeed any President, could be proud.

It would be fortunate if one were able to say that the slate is clean. The current accelerated tension is ominous and abundant notice to us that such is not the case. Since last February our ship of state has been moving gingerly through very dangerous and turbulent seas. Somewhat paradoxically this danger arises in great part from the success attending our economic legislation. The Soviet tyranny, finding itself unable to capture the governments of western Europe by outward pressure and by infiltration is, it is feared, considering more forceful means of encompassing its objectives. The fact that we are in the process of translating some of our war potential into actuality might, it is apprehended, induce the Soviet Union to force the issue.

This is a matter largely for delicate diplomatic handling. Surely we can glean some satisfaction from this evidence of the effectiveness of our legislation. There is, however, one great piece of unfinished business—concrete military assistance to western Europe in its undertakings of mutual self-defense. It is on this subject that I wish to speak.

More than a half century ago Lord Bryce wrote that the United States could not indulge its easy optimism "had Canada or Mexico grown to be a great power, had France not sold Louisiana, or had England, rooted on the American Continent, become a military despotism."

America lives in a world of peace—

He said—

Safe from attack, safe even from menace, she hears from afar the warring cries of European races and faiths. For the present, at least—it may not always be so—America sails upon a summer sea.

Lord Bryce's warning came true when the balance of power system was wiped out in World War II. No longer could America afford to rely upon the great nations of the other continents to neutralize each other's power. Only two great areas of military might were left. The strategic objective of the United States—borne of the necessities of the new situation—became that of insuring that the whole of the Eurasian land mass, with its vast resource in manpower and economic strength, should not fall into the possession of the one power which might threaten our security. For should the great Eurasian continent become united against us, we would find ourselves under siege in this hemisphere.

The nation was slow in recognizing the dangers and the requirements of the new situation. Before we came to face reality, diplomatic mistakes of huge consequence had been made. Our present dilemma is due in large part to the failure of our diplomats to understand and accurately to appraise the postwar conflict.

Finally, however, there emerged a doctrine by which America hoped to secure the position of the west while waiting for the United Nations to mature as an agency capable of realizing its mission of peace. This doctrine was worked out by the Executive in closest collaboration with Congressional leaders.

It may be described as the policy to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure.

This is the cornerstone of our strategic foreign policy. The ERP is the economics expression of that policy. We must develop a military policy to match it. Otherwise our great effort may well result in frustration, failure, and insolvency.

The new doctrine is not confined by geographic limits. It is an invitation to free peoples everywhere to stand up against the aggressor. We and the world must never forget that this nation alone cannot supply the military sinews to guarantee security in every continent. We can do it only with the help of allies.

Now the requirement for winning allies is the willingness to be an ally.

To be an ally means to engage in the common defense. It requires more than a mere promise to liberate allies after they have been victims of conquest. The peoples of western Europe fear that liberation may mean annihilation by the atom bomb and other terrible new weapons of destruction. It means the willingness to take protective measures.

The United Nations Charter provides for regional and other undertakings of mutual self-defense.

We have used the formula of Article 51 of the Charter as the basis of the Pact of Rio de Janeiro tying together the republics of this hemisphere in a common front against all potential foes.

Five of the governments of western Europe have been drawn together in a similar undertaking of mutual defense. Evidence of this nation's support of the Western European Alliance is found in the fact that this government has participated in staff conversations to implement the Brussels Pact. This support is manifested also in various Executive pronouncements, the Vandenberg resolution passed by the Senate, and H. R. 6802, which was reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and for which the leadership of the House has promised early consideration in the Eighty-first Congress.

Pronouncements and staff conversations are, however, not enough. We must affirm our support in concrete, measurable steps.

Let us rid ourselves of the illusion that support of the Western Alliance is a question for debate. The fact of the situation is that we are in Europe. We are involved whether we like it or not. The question is whether we shall be involved for the protection of our national security and of free peoples the world over.

Our forces occupy parts of Germany, Austria, and Trieste. A punative enemy could attack the western powers only by attacking us first. We could not be more inextricably involved if we had signed and ratified the Brussels Pact.

The only remaining question is: What steps should we in prudence take to support the undertaking?

We must develop a military counterpart to the European Recovery Program. Had the military staff committee of the United Nations Security Council been permitted to function, it would not be necessary for us to consider political guaranties and military lend-lease as strategical sequels to the European Recovery Program.

Until this comes to pass the responsibility of freedom rests largely upon us. We have taken steps to protect western Europe from internal aggression. We must now face the portentous problem of protecting western Europe against external aggression.

In approaching this problem we must recognize that the organization and disposition of the military forces of western

Europe should be based on European rather than on national considerations. Such a step would have many beneficial results:

First. The military establishments of the western European countries are a great burden on their national economies. To organize them on the lines I have suggested will eliminate much duplication and waste and thereby help the European Recovery Program and relieve the burden on the American taxpayer.

Second. Such a step will also help to achieve the goal of a European economic federation as the foundation for a United States of Europe.

Third. It will quite obviously result in far greater strategical strength.

Fourth. It will diminish the possibility that we may blunder into war because of any misunderstanding with respect to our intentions.

In order to encourage the western Europeans to undertake such an overall coordinated integrated military plan, we must be prepared to sell or lend-lease to them certain items of military equipment. We can also help them to manufacture such equipment for themselves. The details of such a move should be worked out with great care in order to insure maximum effectiveness at minimum cost.

I need hardly point out the gravity and the delicacy of the Berlin crisis. I believe that an indication of our determination to implement our policy in western Europe as we have implemented it in Greece, Turkey, and China will act as a powerful deterrent of war.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of regret that the President, in defining the mission of the reassembled Congress, did not see fit to include concrete proposals in support of the Western Alliance.

That project remains one of the items in the first order of business for the next Congress and the next Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington News.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Portland Oregonian.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include three editorials.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS AT ANY TIME

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, will the majority leader take us into his confidence as to whether or not there will be a session tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, there will be a session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to consider conference reports at any time they are submitted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as the message from the Senate has just disclosed, the housing bill, which was acted upon by the House some time ago and has been pending in the Senate, has been acted upon by the Senate, with certain amendments in which the concurrence to the House is requested. We might have called it up today, but it has been determined that in the interest of better understanding of the measure it should go over until tomorrow. That measure will be called up in the House tomorrow.

May I add that the bill dealing with inflation, which was acted upon by the House, is now under consideration in the other body. I would not undertake to predict what may transpire over there, but it now appears as a possibility, at least, that that measure may be acted on in the other body tomorrow and come back here for such further action as may be necessary to bring about its final enactment. As far as I am concerned, I express the hope that the measure will be here for action tomorrow, and that it can be promptly disposed of.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution relative to negotiations with the Canadian Government concerning the construction of railroads in Alaska and the establishment of reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, August 7, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 7131. A bill to exempt posts or organizations of war veterans from the tax imposed on billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 7132. A bill to amend section 203 (a) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 7133. A bill to assist local communities in financing the construction of low-cost houses; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 7134. A bill to provide national defense buildings for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOLGER:

H. R. 7135. A bill to repeal section 5a of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to certain agreements between carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. R. 7136. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence; to provide for the notification thereof to foreign governments; to provide for the assumption by the government of Puerto Rico of obligations under the treaty with Spain on December 10, 1898; to define trade and other relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the calling of a convention to frame a constitution for the government of the island of Puerto Rico; to provide for certain mandatory provisions of the proposed constitution; to provide for the submission of the constitution to the people of Puerto Rico and its submission to the President of the United States for his approval; to provide for the adjustment of property rights

between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the maintenance of military, coaling, and naval stations by the United States on the island of Puerto Rico until the termination of the war between the United States and Germany and Japan; to continue in force certain statutes until independence has been acknowledged; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7137. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 7138. A bill making appropriations for the War Claims Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7139. A bill to authorize public improvements in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 7140. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the use and occupancy of national-forest lands, and for other purposes," approved March 30, 1948 (Public Law 465, 80th Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the American Legion in April 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Res. 708. Resolution providing for a report by the President of the United States and other executive and administrative departments and agencies on the use or proposed use of existing powers to curb inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 7141. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathleen Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 7142. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marek Halpern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7143. A bill for the relief of Henry E. Weil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 7144. A bill for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLGER:

H. R. 7145. A bill for the relief of Numa A. Winstead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 7146. A bill for the relief of Sergio and Mara Lamberti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 7147. A bill for the relief of Kostas Kallinikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 7148. A bill for the relief of the aliens Nicholas Partheniades, Catherine Partheniades, and their son Constantine Partheniades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2142. Mr. COTTON presented a petition of the Council of the City of Franklin, N. H., relative to the high cost of living, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

SATURDAY, AUGUST 7, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, August 5, 1948)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy presence is our shield in the stillness of the night and our strength in the struggles of each new day. May this moment of prayer be a veritable mount of vision where we shall receive insight and inspiration for all our tasks and responsibilities.

Make us sensitive and responsive to the persuasions and leading of Thy Spirit. May we daily grow in nobler ways of living. May our characters be transformed from what they are to what they ought to be.

Grant that we may never be afraid of that which is high or hard. Keep us in the vanguard of those who are seeking to build a finer civilization. Give us the courage to believe that the Kingdom of God is emerging and that the day is coming when our quest will be a conquest and our hopes a blessed reality.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 6, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT—VIEWS OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in order that Members of Congress might be fully informed as to various angles of the international wheat agreement, which has been pending for some time, I invite their attention to a letter and report submitted by three great organizations of our country, the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Farmers' Union.

The various angles of this question deserve our consideration and study, and I therefore request unanimous consent that this letter be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 4, 1948.*

Hon. HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'CONOR: We, the heads of the three general farm organizations of the United States, appeal for your support in getting the international wheat agreement considered and ratified at this special session of Congress. The principal reasons in support of our appeal are:

(a) That the agreement assures to our wheat farmers the maintenance after World War II of the export markets lost to them after World War I;

(b) That the agreement stabilizes on the international level the world's most important commodity and thus stoutly reinforces our domestic agricultural price-stabilization and support programs;

(c) That the agreement precludes our being compelled by the weight of the stocks of wheat and other grains held by our Government under the commodity-loan programs to return to the extremely costly headaches of acreage reduction, marketing quotas, and all their concomitant and distasteful regulations;

(d) That the agreement guarantees to the United States, over and above our exports to the occupied areas of Germany and Japan and to any nonsignatory importing countries, an annual export market of 185,000,000 bushels compared with annual average exports of wheat, including wheat flour, during the 10-year period 1931–32 to 1940–41 (excluding 1935–36 and 1936–37 when the United States was a net importer) of about 60,000,000 bushels;

(e) That the agreement precludes cutthroat competition between three of the four principal wheat-exporting countries, thus greatly reducing the cost to the United States Treasury of the export subsidies required to maintain exports of wheat and wheat flour when the international price is below the market or support prices in the United States;

(f) That the agreement, in exchange for our guaranty to provide 185,000,000 bushels per year at a uniform ceiling price of $2 per bushel, guarantees an international price for our annual export quota of 185,000,000 bushels of not less than $1.50 per bushel in the first year, $1.40 in the second, $1.30 in the third, $1.20 in the fourth, and $1.10 in the fifth;

(g) That the agreement records, in the case of wheat, the success of the United States fight against bilateral discriminatory agreements; failure to ratify the agreement at the present special session of Congress would be a critical set-back;

(h) That the agreement is an integral part of the economic aspects of our bipartisan foreign policy;

(i) That the agreement contains the first fruits of the leadership the United States has given in international councils in the development of a world-wide program of cooperation between nations to expand production and consumption and thereby avoid a repetition of the economic waste which followed in the wake of the First World War;

(j) That the agreement makes a substantial contribution to the general economic welfare which is so potent an influence in strengthening peaceful and democratic processes;

(k) That the agreement assures, if ratified by the present special session of Congress, much more favorable terms to our wheat farmers than any agreement which could be renegotiated in the foreseeable future (with the sole exception of the United Kingdom, all the countries which participated in the negotiations at the International Wheat Conference held in London in the spring of 1947

were then prepared to sign an agreement which provided a ceiling of $1.80 per bushel; the present agreement provides a ceiling for 5 years of $2 per bushel; clearly the bargaining position of the exporting countries is now, and in all probability will continue to be, much weaker than it was when the agreement was negotiated in February of this year);

(l) That the agreement assures an adequate supply of wheat to the European nations which tried to become self-sufficient after World War I and should thereby prevent a repetition of uneconomic wheat production behind prohibitive tariff walls and would thus permit our wheat to flow in natural channels;

(m) That the agreement will cost the United States Government little or nothing because under the Economic Cooperation Act we are already committed to supply hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat at whatever the cost may be; such deliveries can be applied in most cases against our commitments under the wheat agreement; and

(n) That the agreement can be ratified subject to the condition that Australia and the United Kingdom (both of which declared to the International Wheat Council on July 6 that their withdrawal was solely attributable to the failure of the United States to ratify and that in the absence of any prediction that the United States Senate would ratify the agreement in time to bring it into force in the 1948–49 crop-year they felt they had no legal alternative to withdrawal) accede under article XXI to the agreement on its present terms and that the majority of the other importing countries which have not so far ratified, or which have withdrawn, also accede by a date to be fixed by the International Wheat Council.

In concluding this appeal to you, Mr. Senator, we should like to emphasize the importance we attach to keeping the wheat agreement within the framework of our nonpartisan foreign economic policy just as we are so keeping all other international economic questions such as those being dealt with by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (the FAO).

In the councils of the FAO and the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (the IFAP—a nongovernmental body consisting of the independent farm organizations of 20 countries) the farm organizations of the United States have played a prominent part. Our leadership has been recognized and accepted as objective, fair and democratic. We cannot overemphasize the importance we attach to the retention of the international good will we have so far succeeded in establishing.

Through the annual conferences of the FAO, and in other international agricultural forums, our Government, strongly supported by the farm organizations of the United States, has advocated the solution of international economic problems, such as the threatened wheat surplus problem, by multilateral commodity agreements. The world has accepted this approach. The wheat agreement is the first attempt to apply it. We cannot afford as the architects of that agreement to let it fail.

In the hope that it will be helpful to you in considering the arguments for and against the ratification at this time by the United States Senate of the international wheat agreement, we enclose a synopsis of the questions which have beer raised regarding it and our answers thereto.

Sincerely yours,

A. S. Goss,
Master, the National Grange.
ALLAN B. KLINE,
President,
American Farm Bureau Federation.
JAMES PATTON,
President, National Farmers' Union.

STATE SOIL-CONSERVATION WEEK—PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY GOVERNOR CARLSON, OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a copy of the State Soil-Conservation Week proclamation issued by Hon. Frank Carlson, Governor of my State of Kansas. I send the proclamation to the desk and request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE SOIL CONSERVATION WEEK

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF KANSAS,
Topeka, Kans.

To the People of Kansas, Greetings:

The preservation of the rich soil of Kansas is of prime importance if we are to continue our great productive capacity. To bring this essential fact more forcibly to the attention of the people it is appropriate that 1 week each year be set aside to emphasize the importance of soil conservation.

When the first settlers turned the soil they could not know nor realize that the fertility, the residue of nature's bounty throughout the years, was expendable unless proper methods of conservation were employed. Only when the constant toll of depletion and erosion had become a menace did there come a full realization of the imperative need for conserving the priceless vitality of our soil.

Kansas has been blessed with a rich and responsive soil. To protect and preserve its bounty is a duty we owe to ourselves and to future generations.

Now, therefore, I, Frank Carlson, Governor of the State of Kansas, do hereby declare the week of August 1 to 7, 1948, as State Soil Conservation Week and urge the people of Kansas to take this opportunity to emphasize the importance of soil conservation, to the end that the State may continue its proud position as the bread basket of the Nation.

Done at the capitol in Topeka under the great seal of the State this 21st day of July A. D. 1948.

By the Governor:

FRANK CARLSON.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2938. A bill for the relief of Eugene Cahan;

S. 2939. A bill for the relief of Gizella Cahan; and

S. 2940. A bill for the relief of Marianna Maria Racz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REVERCOMB (for Mr. McCARRAN):

S. 2941. A bill for the relief of Jacobus Lubbertus Muller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 2942. A bill for the relief of Nicholae Malaxa; and

S. 2943 (by request). A bill to establish the United States of America Patriotic and Charter Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2944. A bill to establish Admiralty Island National Park in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 2945. A bill for the relief of Ruston (Russi) Benjonji Bana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. J. Res. 240. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a commission to be called the National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the proposed United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Denver, Colo., as the Edward W. Combs Veterans Facility Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRINTING OF RECODIFICATION OF FEDERAL CORRUPT PRACTICES AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES ACTS (S. DOC. NO. 201)

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a report prepared by the Sub-Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration entitled "Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities—Federal Corrupt Practices Act—Hatch Political Activities Act." I will explain to the Senate that the document brings down to date a recodification of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and all political activities acts including the Hatch Political Activities Act and all amendments down to and including June 25, 1948. This being a campaign year numerous requests for these documents have come from all parts of the country. Not only have we brought all the measures down to date, but there are included the decisions and annotations thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMENTS BY SENATOR SMITH ON PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE AND ON THE INFLATION PROBLEM

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the record statements by him on President Truman's message to the Congress and on the inflation problem, which appear in the Appendix.]

WHY AMERICA NEEDS THOMAS E. DEWEY AS NEXT PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement prepared by him entitled "Tom Dewey—Why America Needs Him as Next President of the United States," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FRIENDSHIP FLEET—LETTER FROM SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter addressed by him to Gen. George C. Marshall regarding the Centennial Friendship Fleet, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECORD OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by him for delivery before the National Education Association, at Cleveland, Ohio, July 8, 1948, together with a

transcript of remarks which he delivered on the same occasion, which appear in the Appendix.]

CHINA TODAY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "China Today," written by him, and published in the newspaper PM, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY TO THE WEST—ADDRESS BY GOV. HERBERT B. MAW

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Contributions of the Democratic Party to the West, delivered by Gov. Herbert B. Maw, of Utah, at the concluding session of the Democratic National Convention, Philadelphia, July 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAM

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a recent press release by him expressing his views upon the minimum means which should be taken by Congress to curb inflation, which appears in the Appendix.]

VIEWS ON CURRENT CONDITIONS

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release by him expressing his views upon conditions prevailing during the special session of Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN ECONOMICS AND WORLD PEACE—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject, American Economics and World Peace, delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, before the World Affairs Institute, Estes Park, Colo, August 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY DR. CLINTON N. HOWARD

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Eightieth Congress," by Dr. Clinton N. Howard, to be published in Progress Magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. WALSH, PRESIDENT OF THE MARYLAND STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address by the Honorable William C. Walsh on the occasion of his election to the presidency of the Maryland State Bar Association, which appear in the Appendix.]

SUPPLY OF ANHYDROUS AMMONIA—LETTER FROM THE BAUGH & SONS CO.

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Baugh & Sons Co., relating to the supply of anhydrous ammonia, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE MARYLAND TAX DIGEST

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Aid to Education," from the Maryland Tax Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASE OF AUTOMOBILE PRICES

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the rise of automobile prices since 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

GROWTH OF IDEA OF A FEDERATED EUROPE

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by DeWitt Mackenzie, entitled "Idea of Federated Europe Continues to Gain Support," published in the August 5, 1948, issue of the Arkansas Democrat, and an editorial entitled "ERP and European Unity," published in the August 7, 1948, issue of the New York Times, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROGRESSIVE PARTY KEYNOTE, ACCEPTANCE SPEECHES, AND ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAYLOR

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the platform of the Progressive Party, the acceptance speeches by Henry Wallace and himself, the keynote speech of Charles P. Howard, and a radio address delivered by Senator TAYLOR on July 31, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN NOMINATING GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY AT THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD his address nominating Gov. Thomas E. Dewey as candidate for President of the United States at the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia, which appears in the Appendix.]

VETERANS' LEGISLATION IN THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding veterans' legislation in the Eightieth Congress, together with a memorandum regarding veterans' legislation prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by himself on the subject of universal military training, broadcast on June 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by himself on the privileges enjoyed by Americans, broadcast June 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICANS DO NOT WANT PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him on the subject Americans Do Not Want Peacetime Conscription, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT ON HOUSING BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on housing, prepared by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUNDRY STATEMENTS, NEWS ARTICLES, EDITORIAL, ETC.

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on National Freedom Day, a review prepared by him on flood-control problems in Pennsylvania, a statement on the need for stronger rent controls, and various news articles and editorials and other material, which appear in the Appendix.]

HENRY WALLACE: A DIVIDED MIND—ARTICLE BY GARDNER JACKSON

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Henry Wallace: A Divided Mind," by Gardner Jackson, from the Atlantic for August 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR RECORD OF LT. MERRILL H. TILGHMAN III

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the war record of Lt. Merrill H. Tilghman III, of Wayne, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR COOPER TO THE KENTUCKY SOCIETY OF NEW YORK

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the annual meeting of the Kentucky Society of New York in New York City, May 19, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR COOPER

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Kentucky Farm Bureau in Louisville, Ky., January 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR COOPER

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a meeting of the Kentucky Cooperatives of the Rural Electrification Administration at Louisville, Ky., April 12, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR COOPER TO THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUBS

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the national convention of the National Federation of Women's Republican Clubs, at Louisville, Ky., March 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the address by Senator HILL on the anti-poll-tax bill, from the Birmingham Age Herald of August 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY LABOR SHOULD BE INTERESTED IN THE 1948 ELECTION—LETTER FROM CATHERINE MICHO

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Catherine Micho, of Stockton, Pa., on the subject Why Labor Should Be Interested in the 1948 Election, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WHEAT SITUATION IN PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the wheat situation in Pennsylvania, which appears in the Appendix.]

MY DAY—ARTICLE BY ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column entitled "My Day," by Eleanor Roosevelt, from the Pittsburgh Press of August 2, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECORD OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the record of the Democratic Party, prepared by him and published in the Philadelphia Bulletin of July 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS BY THE SECOND SESSION, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements relating to the appropriations of the Eightieth Congress, which appear in the Appendix.]

RURAL ELECTRIC SERVICE TO COOPERATIVES

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from P. K. Mastel, Coordinator of the Kem Electric Cooperative, Inc., relative to the furnishing of electric service to rural applicants, together with his reply, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE SECOND SESSION, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the activities of the session of Congress which convened on July 26, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM E. WARNE BEFORE MISSOURI BASIN INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE MEETING

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the remarks made by Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, and chairman of the Federal Inter-Agency River Basin Committee, before the Missouri Basin Committee meeting in Riverton, Wyo., on July 29, 1948; which appear in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER URGING "FREEDOM OF OPPORTUNITY" PLANK IN THE 1948 DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by George J. Burger, representing the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., before the resolutions committee of the Democratic National Committee, urging the adoption of a "freedom of opportunity" plank in the 1948 Democratic platform; which appears in the Appendix.]

INFLATION—PRICE CONTROL

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of inflation-price control, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COST OF LIVING AND INFLATION

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement, prepared by him, on the cost of living and inflation, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL—FILIBUSTERS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congress Suffers," from the Miami Daily News, and an editorial entitled "G. O. P. Strategy Points To Only Seven States," from the Tampa Times, which appear in the Appendix.]

GREETINGS TO AMERICAN LABOR BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the final edition of the RECORD a statement of greetings to American labor on Labor Day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

HIGH PRICES: THE ANSWER—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the final edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I am preparing on the subject High Prices: The Answer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the order is made.

TEMPORARY REGULATION OF CONSUMER INSTALLMENT CREDIT

The Senate resumed consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate today is acting under a unanimous-consent agreement which provides for a vote at 4 o'clock p. m., and for control of the time after 1 o'clock. The immediate question before the Senate is the amendment of the House to the text of Senate Joint Resolution 157, to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed to the House amendment by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, striking out all after line 4 on page 2 of the engrossed amendment, down to and including line 15 on page 3, the same being section 2. The corresponding page and line numbers in the Senate committee print are page 3, beginning in line 11 and extending down to and including line 22 on page 4.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Tobey
Ecton	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Umstead
Feazel	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	Young
Hawkes	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed to the House amendment by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, striking out all after line 4, on page 2, of the engrossed amendment down to and including line 15, on page 3, being section 2.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the second committee amendment would delete from the bill the provisions for an increase in the gold-reserve requirements for Federal Reserve banks. In the opinion of the committee, such an increase would have at best only a psychological effect upon the control of inflation. As stated by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] yesterday when he spoke in opposition to the committee's recommendation, the gold reserves in the aggregate presently amount to about 51 percent of deposits in Federal Reserve banks and Federal Reserve notes. Hence, from the point of view of the committee no practical or immediate effect would be gained at present by raising from 25 percent to 35 and 40 percent respectively the gold reserve behind deposits in Federal Reserve bank deposits and Federal Reserve notes.

The disadvantages of the increase were so eloquently expressed by Mr. Allan Sproul, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, in his appearance on August 6, 1948, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that I think it would be advantageous to quote briefly from Mr. Sproul's testimony appearing in volume 4 of the hearings, page 537, as follows:

> Such a proposal might, of course, have arisen out of the fundamentalist thinking of those who believe that any strengthening of the gold basis is a desirable check on inflationary developments. I am not going to enter into that area of religious belief and religious disputation. In the area of economics and public policy I can discern rather dimly three arguments which might be made for this proposal, none of which, however, has anything to do with the inflationary problem.
>
> First, there is the argument that the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks were lowered during the war to meet an emergency situation and should be returned to their former level through the same process, now that the war is over.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Was evidence introduced before the committee to show

what was the lowest percentage of Federal reserves at any time after the reserve requirements were reduced to 25 percent?

Mr. CAIN. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not catch the first part of his question.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator just stated that at the present time there are 51 percent of reserves. What is the lowest reserve which has existed since the requirement was reduced from 40 percent to 25 percent?

Mr. CAIN. One of the reasons why the committee opposed the House proposal was that at the time of our hearing this subject was incidental to the main question of inflation and we benefited very little from testimony on the subject. I am therefore entering for the RECORD and for the information of Senators only pertinent parts of the opposition testimony as given by Mr. Sproul and several others. I therefore cannot answer accurately the Senator's question.

A member of the Committee on Banking and Currency has just laid before me what I think to be an answer to the Senator's question. The reserves fell to 47.8 in 1947.

I continue to read from Mr. Sproul:

Second, there is the argument that should you increase the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks it would sterilize the current gold inflow.

Third, there is the sort of catch-all argument that an increase in the reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks would put desirable restraints on the central bankers, give earlier public warning of critical conditions in our banking system, and bring the whole subject before the Congress for review.

On the first argument—aside from the pointing out the futility of a different reserve requirement for notes and deposits in a country with a highly developed deposit banking system, in which notes and deposits are completely interchangeable—I can do no better than to quote from a speech made by Senator TAFT at the time the present reduced requirement for Federal Reserve banks was adopted by the Congress in 1945.

Yesterday I think the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] made reference to those quotations credited to the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Ohio at that time gave his own answer.

At this point, Mr. Sproul set forth the argument that a 25-percent gold reserve is adequate, that a rush to demand gold of proportions sufficient to cause reserves to fall below 40 percent would not be likely to stop before also carrying the reserves below 25 percent.

I shall quote further from Mr. Sproul at some length, because he happens to be the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and therefore in our opinion a very competent witness:

I think that was good advice—

Referring to the speech of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]—

when Senator TAFT gave it, and I think it is good advice now. Our people are not afraid of the dollar. They are gravely concerned about rising prices, but they are not rushing to get out of currency and into things, as people do when there is a runaway inflation. Those who risk creating such fears about our currency, no matter how devious the approach, are performing a real disservice.

I might add this general argument about the more specific proposal. The reduction in reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks was made late in the war as a necessary adjustment to fundamental changes which had taken place and still were taking place in our banking system.

I think it is a fact that one of the reasons given for reducing those reserves was that we were likely to experience an immediate period of deflation.

The reserve requirement was lowered in order to provide the monetary authorities with sufficient excess reserves to meet any emergency which might develop. I can see no institutional or conventional reason for restoring the reserve requirement to what it was before the war so long as we cannot happily make the same adjustment in the public debt and the assets and liabilities of our banking system.

The action taken in 1946 was not solely an emergency action, but, if it had been, the emergency it was designed to meet is still with us.

I think little time need be spent on the second argument that increasing the reserve requirements of the Reserve banks would sterilize the current gold inflow. That is really just another way of saying that the Federal Reserve banks now have too much excess reserves, and it follows by definition that any increase in the reserve requirement would reduce the amount of those excess reserves. That is not sterilization, however, since it does nothing about member bank reserves, and it is at that level that the problem currently arises.

So long as we had a substantial Treasury surplus which could be used to retire Federal Reserve-held debt, we were able to offset the effect of gold imports in considerable part. That was the way in which we were sterilizing gold imports to the extent that we did sterilize them.

Finally, on this general argument about tightening up the brakes in our monetary machine, it has a reassuring sound but it may be a dangerous adjustment. Historically the chief reason for the suspension of the Bank of England Act, for instance, was the high fixed gold reserve requirement of the British currency system and in our own country we established a Federal Reserve System because we found that when we attempted to jam on tight brakes as a result of declining reserves, we usually had a money panic.

Theoretically, reserve requirements of Federal Reserve banks are unnecessary, in my opinion, but I am not arguing it and will not argue that point, because I think they are required by public opinion.

So granting that the Reserve banks should be subject to reserve requirements, I think they always should be permitted to have a wide margin of excess reserves. To be of real service in time of need the Reserve banks must be prepared to face the situation as they find it, to maintain broad contacts with the commercial banking system, and to extend accommodation on any sound asset.

That definition of "soundness" is thoroughly understood by all of us, and goes back into the management side of the Federal Reserve System. If we have sound management we must provide them with the tools to meet any emergency which may arise in our banking system.

Quoting further from Mr. Sproul:

It is essential that the public have confidence in its ability to obtain money when needed. While the Reserve banks should be in a position to impose restrictions and restraints on monetary and credit expansion, they should not be compelled to refuse demands by an automatic and inflexible mechanical brake on their powers.

The proposal to increase gold-reserve requirements may be based on the idea that the country's supply of gold should automatically govern the supply of credit. However, the flow of gold to or from a country is not geared automatically to the internal credit needs of the country. The change suggested by the House might at some future date require the Federal Reserve banks to reduce their credit at a time when the domestic economy makes such a course undesirable. At such a time the Federal Reserve banks might well be unable to act as a market to purchase Government securities, resulting in a serious decline or possibly a collapse in the prices of Government securities.

When questioned about this proposal for an increase in gold reserve requirements, the Chairman of the body charged with the duty of acting as a stabilizing influence in monetary and credit matters—Mr. McCabe, of the Federal Reserve Board—who was confirmed several months ago, I believe, in his position as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board—replied that he was not then prepared to make a recommendation on the subject, that the Federal Reserve Board is having a comprehensive study made of the proposal and that he would be very pleased to give the committee his views on the subject at some future time.

Speaking on behalf of the Banking and Currency Committee on this subject, I believe we should await the views of the Federal Reserve System on this matter before changing existing law in a manner which promises no early aid in the fight to control inflation. It would have no possible effect at this time in lowering the price structure. It obviously would have a great deal to do, for good or ill, with our over-all banking credit structure. Weighed in the scale of appreciable results the disadvantages of the House proposal outweigh its advantages. I urge adoption of the committee amendment to delete from the pending resolution any provision for an increase in gold-reserve requirements at this time.

For technical reasons, the adoption of the committee amendment will require the renumbering of section 3 of the pending measure as section 2, which is the subject of the third committee amendment. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the second and third committee amendments be voted upon as a unit.

Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee rests its case in support of the amendment it offers for action at this time.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. What witnesses did the committee hear among the bankers—and I have been in touch with a number of them—who are very much in favor of the amendment of the House? The Senator quoted Mr. Marriner Eccles and the Federal Reserve group. I realize that he is presenting the Eccles point of view on this question. There are those who do not agree with Mr. Eccles; and bankers with whom I am acquainted feel that we shall make a great mistake if we fail

to impose this curb at this time as one of the steps toward controlling inflation. I am asking for information.

Mr. CAIN. The question of the Senator is quite proper, and I can give him a concrete answer. The subject of increasing the gold reserve of the Federal Reserve System was not a part of the President's recommendation when he came before the Congress several weeks ago. We therefore went into committee session to concern ourselves primarily with his recommendations. During the course of the hearings almost casual reference and inquiry was made into this subject. I was but one of several Senators who, whenever Government witnesses came before us who knew anything about monetary or credit or fiscal affairs, asked them what their opinion was concerning the desirability of increasing the reserves at this time. That accounts for the fact that we heard only from Government witnesses.

However, I can say that so far as I know, the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate has received no requests from any private bankers to be heard on the subject. Most of us on the committee feel that the subject is exceedingly delicate and difficult, and we are prepared to stand by the recommendation of the Federal Reserve System that we consider taking no action until they have had an adequate opportunity to lay before us the results of their considered study of the problem, a study which is being undertaken at this time. But will the Senator permit me to suggest that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has a considerable interest in the problem, and I wish he would volunteer an answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from New Jersey that when section 2 relative to the gold reserve of the Federal Reserve banks was first suggested, the first intimation to me came in an informal conference with the House of Representatives this week. I was surprised, and I wondered what it was all about. I could see, on quick consideration, no particular reason to be concerned about it, and I offered no objections.

The more I have thought about it, the more it seems to me that the committee's decision to delete it from this bill was wise. It came out of the blue. It is a foundling on the doorstep of the Senate, without known parentage. It is a cowbird's egg in the legislative nest. It is a matter of such importance that it is absolutely beyond reason that we should pass on it here today without adequate hearings and opinions from all groups interested in the matter. It is an imposition on the legislative processes to ask us of the committee to support anything of this sort without adequate hearings; and adequate hearings could not be held, and can be held only after a proper introduction of the subject at the next session of the Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield on that point, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont to settle a question that is bothering me in this connection. I understand that the House committee held hearings on this matter, and that at the hearings there were witnesses on both sides of the controversy, and those hearings are reflected in the amendment.

I also understand that a 40-percent reserve—which would represent a breaking away from the 25-percent reserve which is apparently the present percentage—is now recommended.

I admit there is a difference of opinion, and I agree that the matter is difficult to deal with in a brief session. However, I am more in favor of the normal 40-percent reserve than I am of continuing the 25-percent reserve, which we provided for under emergency or unusual conditions.

Mr. CAIN. Is the Senator aware that we have more than a 40-percent reserve now.

We are very serious in our answers, because of the seriousness of the task of dealing with our monetary and credit and fiscal system. We approach it with great wariness, because those who have dealt with it in a hurry in the past, often have done great harm to the country.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am aware of that.

Mr. CAIN. Let me ask the Senator from Vermont a question. As one who has had great experience with the Federal Reserve and with banking operations, does the Senator from Vermont see any possible likelihood that any demands for additional credit will be made by the national banking system on the Federal Reserve System between now and the middle of next year, for example, in any sum approximating the billion dollars involved in this recommendation of increasing the 25-percent reserve to a 35-percent or a 40-percent reserve?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I would say to the junior Senator from Washington that there is no reason that I can see or imagine for making this provision a part of emergency legislation. The principal effect the passage of this measure could have at this time is a psychological effect along the lines suggested by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. However, I think the psychological effect will be entirely different from that which he envisaged. We have an enormous public debt. There is, as was indicated in Mr. Sproul's testimony, and as I think all of us realize, no fear that in any foreseeable future time there will be a flight from the dollar to things or goods, such as has occurred in European countries; but there is a question very much under discussion, very much in the minds of business and banking people, and I think it is beginning to get into the minds of the public. It is the question whether the Government is going to continue its support of Government bonds at par.

If this measure has any psychological effect whatsoever, Mr. President, it will be to accentuate the doubt as to whether the Government is going to support the price of Government bonds, because to the extent that the gold reserve is raised at this time, in the face of our enormous public debt, which is an element in the whole problem, and which was not in existence to the same extent at the time when the gold reserve was reduced, to that extent the increase of the gold reserve is going to reduce the ability of the Federal Reserve System to support the price of Government bonds.

So the psychological effect is going to be to increase the doubt of the people of the country as to whether the Government bond market will be supported, and that is a psychological effect which I think is important.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That is exactly the psychological effect it should have, because if the Government is going to say, we are prepared to spend any number of billions of dollars—thirty or forty billion dollars—to monetize the debt, rather than to let the Government bonds go down, that is an inflationary position which we should not establish.

If we put the reserve back to 40 percent, we say, in effect, you have $14,000,000,000 with which you can buy bonds. If you spend as much as $10,000,000,000, it is very doubtful whether you should go on; and we shall reconsider at that time whether we shall further reduce the reserve so that you can buy billions of dollars more of Government bonds and monetize them.

I think there should be a stopping point at which the Federal Reserve Board can buy Government bonds and issue currency in place of them. Today that stopping point is practically nothing; with a 25-percent reserve, that stopping point is perhaps $30,000,000,000, or some figure of that sort.

If we reduce it to $14,000,000,000, by putting the reserve up to 40 percent, if that is to be the point where we must stop and look around before we let them go on in what is clearly an inflationary process, it seems to me that will be a very good thing to do at the present moment, for the psychological effect.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Ohio for having supported the contention I have just made. Evidently he feels that that is the purpose of section 2, which has been introduced from the House. If that is the purpose, I submit it is no part of emergency legislation, and should not be considered at this time, but should have the earnest consideration of the Banking and Currency Committee, with full public hearings.

So I sincerely hope that this body will not simply follow the lead of the House of Representatives, which seems to be the fashion at the present moment, and to which I regret to see that my esteemed friend the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] apparently was acceding.

I trust that we shall arrive at our own conclusions on this matter, after adequate public hearings, and then shall present proposed legislation which the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will uphold.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think, so far as I remember, that in the meetings to try to find out what could be done in the matter of restraining inflation from a credit

standpoint I was the one who suggested that this provision be inserted. So I do not think it can be said that we are in any way following the leadership of the House. I agree it is not an absolutely vital matter whether we do it or do not do it, but it seems to me a perfectly sound provision.

I went through all the hearings 3 years ago when it was thoroughly examined by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and perhaps I have had more opportunity to hear testimony than the other members of the committee; so I am not criticizing the committee's action. But it does seem to me that something can well be done, something which can in no way handicap anyone in doing anything he desires to do, so far as I can see, but which will indicate that the Senate and the Congress feel in the first place that the currency should be backed by as solid a metal as can be found, so far as we can safely go; in the second place, that we should say to the Federal Reserve Board, "You do not have unlimited power to go out and issue all the currency you want to issue in behalf of a policy of supporting Government bonds, or any other policy; if you get to a point where you want to do something which is clearly inflationary, come around and see us again."

I notice that speeches I made 3 years ago at the time this was passed have been quoted, and I shall read from what I said at the end, explaining in part the reason why we did it:

> Just before the expiration of the 2 years, there would be a tendency among foreign nations and others to rush in and try to get the gold while it was still available; and because of the increased requirements of our own system, there might be great difficulty in meeting the demands of foreign nations for the export of gold.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me we should do what we are doing. We should leave for 2 or 3 years from now the final settlement regarding what the reserve should be in time of peace, if then we think it should be changed from the 25-percent rate. In other words, we did something which was a war measure at that time, and what I at least am proposing now is that we return to the peacetime basis for setting our gold reserves.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I asked during the time of the hearings if it was not recognized, when this reduction was made, that it was inflationary, but that it was best, solely because it was necessary in order to help finance the war, or was thought to be.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I should like to read later more of Mr. Burgess' statement before the committee at the time we did this. But in answering the Senator's question, he says:

> The bill before the Senate removes, in reducing this reserve, certain automatic checks on credit inflation.

I meant to say that the very reason I agreed at that time to the reduction in the reserve was that we eliminated the so-called Thomas amendment which authorized the indefinite issue of $3,000,000,000 of greenbacks. I think that was the bill in which we also eliminated the provision authorizing the issue of so-called Federal Reserve notes without any collateral at all. That was in effect a part of the arrangement made at that time to nullify the inflationary effect of the reduction of the gold reserve.

Mr. CAIN. As the Senator from Ohio does not criticize the committee for its recommendations, certainly the committee does not take violent exception to the position of the Senator from Ohio. The committee is not disposed to argue his main point, that the percentage of reserves behind notes and deposits of the Federal Reserve System should be higher. We are inclined, as a committee, to think the percentage should be higher. We do not know how much higher it should be. We certainly would not approve of that portion of the recommendation which makes a distinction between deposits, on the one hand, and notes, on the other. The only reason that is contained in the provision apparently is that it was there, I recall, before the prevailing 35- and 40-percentage points were cut back to 25, in 1945 or 1946. The committee feels that no practical purpose is to be served at this time by acceding to the recommendation of the House. We have a Federal Reserve System, the principal purpose of which, as I understand, is to care for the credit needs of the banks of the country in times of emergency particularly. Those whom we charge with responsibility for managing the Federal Reserve System acknowledge that there is a problem for consideration in connection with gold reserves, and that they are presently undertaking a serious step, which takes time, and they think it would not be proper to take any action until such time as their recommendations have been laid before the Senate for consideration and action. The committee thinks that position is substantial and sound.

Personally, I agree with the Senator from Ohio that there is a psychological advantage in adopting the recommendation of the House, but that advantage is based purely upon the fact that the average American has not the slightest idea of monetary and fiscal policies. We can take this action—and perhaps we should do so—and in effect say to people who otherwise will not know, that we are raising the reserve requirements, we are stiffening our credit policies, and we are therefore materially assisting in curtailing inflation. However, it is simply not going to work that way, and every Member of the Senate knows it. Because of the importance of the whole subject of money, the committee should not, without having a much firmer conviction on its part, recommend a change in the prevailing gold requirements presently imposed upon the Federal Reserve System.

I take it we are all in agreement that since the beginning of man there has been universal concern about the mysteries involved in the management of money. I hold to that view. There have been no concrete answers given, in decades and centuries gone by, which would enable us to obviate the difficulties we are experiencing at this time. We have given a major portion of our time to the consideration of those items which we thought would be of some substantial assistance in dealing with the problem now facing the country. It was because of that, and further because we thought this recommendation would not amount to anything at the moment or until such time as Congress returned for the next session, that we have recommended that it not be adopted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not care to repeat what I said yesterday, but I do want to ask for a correction of the RECORD on page 10131 of yesterday's daily RECORD. It reads:

> As I see it, a larger gold reserve does not have any meaning or effect.

What I said was:

> As I see it, a larger gold reserve does not have any immediate effect.

I ask that the correction be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The correction will be made.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President,' will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I have found difficulty in understanding two statements on page 10132 in yesterday's daily RECORD, and I am wondering whether either one of them is in error or whether it is my inability to understand it. It is in the second column, about halfway down. The Senator from Ohio is there quoted as saying, after referring to the Federal Reserve banks:

> Today they can still buy fourteen and one-half billion more Government bonds.

In the next paragraph it states:

> I do not know how much more they could buy under present conditions—perhaps $30,000,000,000 or so.

Is there an inconsistency in those two statements, or do I not understand the distinction which was in the mind of the Senator?

Mr. TAFT. I have sent for the figures to try to make it more accurate. My suggestion was that under the existing reserve of 25 percent, $30,000,000,000 or so can be bought. If it is increased to 40 percent, it would be limited to something like $14,000,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. That is what I deemed the Senator meant, although in that first paragraph to which I directed his attention the language is:

> Today they can still buy fourteen and one-half billion more Government bonds.

That sounds as if it has reference to the present conditions under which the 25-percent reserve is all that is required.

Mr. TAFT. That should be corrected. However, I hope to have the correct figures here in a moment.

Mr. President, I desire to add one further thing because it shows so clearly what the issue was at the time we reduced the reserve in 1945. I wish to read from the testimony of Mr. Burgess, presi-

dent of the American Bankers' Association at that time. He said:

Mr. BURGESS. There are two reasons for the restraints on Federal Reserve action which are contained in the legislation you are discussing; that is, restraint on the pledging of Government securities on Federal Reserve notes and the percentage of reserve required against deposits and not liabilities.

That was a different question.

First, to place some limitations on the very great power which the Federal Reserve Act puts in the hands of a few people.

Second, to serve as red lights when a huge expansion or credit takes place, for such credit expansion is dangerous.

We are in the process of going through red lights. In addition to the bill before this committee, a bill raising the debt limit is before Congress, and that also means passing a red light.

Remember, we were still at war at that time.

Inflation usually shows itself in rising interest rates, and we have suppressed by Government control, not the inflationary forces themselves but their danger signals.

The danger signals are being passed but the inflation is going forward. The money held by the people, both in currency and bank deposits, is piling up in unprecedented amounts. We now have the same forces at work, but in exaggerated degree, that gave us the inflation of 1919 and 1920 and the crash of 1921. It took years for the farmer to recover from that boom and crash that carried wheat prices up to $3.50 and down to $1; that doubled the price of farm land and then dropped it back again.

The same forces later caused the real estate and security inflation of 1927–29 and the later depression of the thirties. It took the war to pull business and labor out of that slump.

There are many signs that these inflationary forces are vigorously at work today.

This was the spring of 1945.

We see them in city and farm real estate and in all uncontrolled prices, in black markets and lower quality of goods. The amount and quality of food, clothing, shelter, and service that the citizen can buy for his dollar is steadily declining.

We bankers are working with the Treasury in selling Government bonds to the people. We have put on a lot of pressure and incurred, I believe, a moral obligation to those people to keep their dollars sound. After World War I the prices of Liberty bonds dropped 15 percent, but their buying power in goods dropped more than that. Today, the savings bond fortunately can't drop in price, but its buying power can fall and, in fact, is now falling.

This bill before the Senate removes certain automatic checks on credit expansion.

That is what we were necessarily doing. We were removing automatic checks on credit expansion; and I am suggesting that at the present time we put them back.

Then the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] asked a question. He said:

And ergo, it follows—

The Senator from New Hampshire was using the Latin term "ergo."

And ergo, it follows from your first statement to the effect that we are going through red lights, that it is a necessity to go through red lights.

Mr. BURGESS. We have to; yes, sir. To do so is a wartime necessity, but it means we must be increasingly alert. We ought to review where we stand on the inflation problem and take what steps we can to put the brakes in working order.

We, therefore, make the following definite suggestions:

1. That the bill be amended so that at the same time that the use of Government securities for Federal Reserve notes is made permanent, the 1933 emergency power to issue Federal Reserve bank notes and the power to issue greenbacks under the Thomas amendment of 1933 shall be repealed.

That advice was followed; those provisions were repealed.

2. That the committee consider whether it may not be better at this time to lower reserve requirements to 30 rather than to 25 percent. Thirty percent is likely to take care of the needs for many months—

At that time gold was going out of the country and we were getting fairly close to the point where many more Government bonds could not be bought. We were much closer to that point than we are today—

and if it then proves inadequate, it will be because credit expansion has gone to a point where congressional review may be desirable.

3. That every proposal for Government postwar spending be scrutinized with great care. Government spending is the chief cause of inflation. We agree wholly with Chairman Eccles' statement that "Nothing would be more helpful to prevent inflation developing than to have a balanced Budget shortly after the war." I am quoting from the text of the statement I saw. It was not a corrected text, and whether it has been corrected or not, or changed, I do not know. No campaign among the people and no price controls will be adequate to curb inflation unless the Government itself sets an example and puts its own house in order.

4. That the committee request the Federal Reserve Board to make a comprehensive report to Congress on the dangers of inflation and proposed methods for its avoidance.

That was the program submitted in 1945. The reduction in reserves was accepted with the greatest reluctance. So far as the American Bankers' Association was concerned, they thought it ought not to be in excess of 30 percent, and they feel today that it should be returned to the figure which obtained before the war. So I think it is clearly a question whether restoration of the reserve will be a deterrent to inflation. It may be a psychological deterrent, and it is something which I believe Congress ought to do at the present time. Should it be defeated, I think I shall offer it again at the next session of Congress.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. In connection with what the Senator from Ohio said in reading from the testimony of Mr. Burgess, I may say that Mr. Burgess was the man to whom I talked on this subject this very morning, and he is urging a restoration of the 40 percent. I am confused by the situation, because it seems to me that there is a very wide difference of opinion. While I agree with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] that we do not want to rush into it hurriedly, I feel that we should want to restore normal conditions.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. It happens that I know Mr. Burgess personally and in his official capacity, and I hold him in exceedingly high regard. He did not come before our committee, nor did he ask for permission so to do. That is true with respect to a number of other equally distinguished private bankers. It is clear, as the Senator from New Jersey has stated, that it is a controversial subject. The committee is recommending, in the absence of sufficient testimony on this important subject, and because the Federal Reserve System does not wish the rate limit to go higher, that a study be made with a view to making a recommendation as to what height it should go and whether it would be proper for the Banking and Currency Committee seriously to recommend the adoption of a measure which the committee itself thinks is deserving of a more thorough study. The very distinguished Senator from Ohio has just indicated that if the wish of the committee prevails he will introduce a bill in the next session of the Congress. The committee only urges the Senate to support the committee, and then the committee will, and I, in its name, do so now, encourage the Senator from Ohio to introduce for early consideration in the next session the subject of increasing gold reserves.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I certainly will.

Mr. DONNELL. In the existing law it is provided that—

Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves of gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against its deposits and reserves of gold certificates of not less than 25 percent against Federal Reserve notes in national circulation.

I should like to make two inquiries, one is a question of fact, the other a question of reason. The question of fact is, Can the Senator enlighten us as to the approximate amount of the aggregate deposits today in the Federal Reserve banks and the approximate amount of Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation at this time?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington cannot provide an accurate answer to the question without reference to the figures, which would take some time, but we can readily provide an answer to the question in a few minutes.

Mr. TAFT. I have some figures here, and after answering the Senator's question, I think they should be made a part of the RECORD. What is the question?

Mr. DONNELL. My question is, What is the present aggregate amount of deposits in the Federal Reserve banks?

Mr. TAFT. The total deposits are $20,316,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. The second subdivision of my question was, What is the present aggregate amount of Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation?

Mr. TAFT. The answer is $23,806,000,000.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Ohio referred to billions in each instance, did he not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; $23,806,000,000.

Mr. CAIN. And the Senator's other reference was to $20,000,000,000, not millions?

Mr. TAFT. $20,316,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from Ohio. Will the Senator from Washington yield that I may ask another question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. DONNELL. Can the Senator tell us the reason, if he knows, why the House amendment differentiated in the percentages which it made applicable with respect to deposits and to notes in actual circulation, so that 35 percent in the one case is provided in the House amendment, and 40 percent in the other case, namely, 35 percent against deposits, and 40 percent against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation? Has the Senator already given us that information?

Mr. CAIN. I have given it in brief fashion. I should like to restate for the information of the Senator from Missouri what Mr. Sproul of the Federal Reserve Bank in New York had to say on the subject. He thought it was rather futile——

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator means the differentiation was futile?

Mr. CAIN. He says it is futile to have a different reserve requirement for notes and deposits in a country with a highly developed deposit banking system, in which notes and deposits are completely interchangeable.

We have tried to ascertain as best we could—because it is an interesting question—wherein lies the logic for making this differentiation, and no man has yet given us any approximation of what appears to be a reasonable answer.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It was a part of the original Federal Reserve law, passed in the Wilson administration, in 1915, I think. I suppose the issue of notes was regarded as more inflationary than the acceptance of deposits on time. There is no real reason today for such a differentiation.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me say, with the Senator's consent, in order that the record may be complete regarding what the Senator from Ohio has just stated, that I hold in my hand the statute enacted December 23, 1913, the opening portion of which reads:

> Every Federal Reserve bank shall maintain reserves in gold certificates or lawful money of not less than 35 percent against its deposits and reserves in gold certificates of not less than 40 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation.

Of course that is the precise statement in substance the Senator from Ohio just made. I should like to inquire if the Senator from Washington knows the reason for the differentiation in the original statute, and knows whether or not the House gave consideration to the point Mr. Sproul makes as to the alleged invalidity of the differentiation.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. Sproul and the Senator from Ohio have both said they know of no logical reason at all for making any differentiation. I was not either in the Congress or interested in money matters at the time the Federal Reserve statutes were drawn. I do not know what was in the minds of those who urged that legislation at that time. All I know is that in the highly complex and delicate banking system from which all of us benefit in this country today, there is no continuing need for such a differentiation. Yet our primary reason for asking that the Senate consider this matter at a later date is rather firmly supported, I think, by virtue of the amendment which the House has sent to the Senate in which they include a requirement which one of the supporters of that amendment himself has just said is, in his considered opinion, totally unnecessary.

I wish I could give the Senator a more constructive answer, but I am inclined to think that in terms of the need for a distinction, there simply is not any, and that we should not be a party to continuing a mistake of the past.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood from the Senator from Ohio that the present amount of deposits in the Federal Reserve banks is $20,316,000,000. The amount involved, therefore, in changing the existing reserve requirement of 25 percent as regards deposits to 35 percent is approximately $2,031,600,000; one-tenth, in other words, of the amount of the deposits. Is not that correct?

Mr. CAIN. If I understood the Senator's question correctly, I think the Senator from Ohio yesterday introduced into the RECORD an editorial from a New York paper which answers the Senator's question in the following fashion:

> If there were 40 cents in gold behind each dollar of Federal Reserve currency, it would be possible, at the present level of reserve gold holdings, to issue about $14,500,000,000 in additional currency.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator referred to a statement I made yesterday, and he has said what I intended to say, that is, that if we accept the House measure, the Federal Reserve banks will still be able to buy over $14,000,000,000 more of Government bonds. Under the pending bill, I find from these figures, the Federal Reserve banks will be able to buy $45,000,000,000 of Government bonds with the 25-percent reserve.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask again, How many billion dollars of bonds would they be able to buy under the 35-40 percent reserve plan proposed by the House amendment?

Mr. TAFT. About $14,000,000,000 of bonds.

Mr. DONNELL. So that there would be a net decrease in the amount of bonds they could buy of approximately thirty or thirty-one billion dollars?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. There is practically no limit today on what they can buy. If they had to buy $10,000,000,000 more of bonds and issue Federal Reserve notes, and increase the currency from about $26,000,000,000, counting other things, to $36,000,000,000, I think we should take a look at it and decide whether or not we were going to let them indefinitely go on with such increases in the currency.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington permit me to ask the Senator from Ohio another question?

Mr. CAIN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I understand that if the 35- and 40-percent provision proposed by the House shall be put into effect, there will be an ability to buy only approximately $14,000,000,000 of bonds.

Mr. TAFT. Fourteen and a half billion dollars of bonds. They now have $21,000,000,000 of bonds which have been accumulated at the rate of more than three or four billion a year. It would mean a tremendous speeding up for them to buy $15,000,000,000 of bonds in 6 months.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood also that under the present law which requires 25-percent reserves in the case of deposits and notes in actual circulation there is an ability to buy approximately $45,000,000,000 of bonds.

Mr. TAFT. That is a very rough calculation, made in a hurry.

Mr. DONNELL. I have made only a hasty calculation myself, but the tentative calculation I have made does not enable me to follow the figures the Senator from Ohio has given. As I see it, under the present law regarding deposits, there would be a requirement to maintain a reserve of 25 percent, whereas under the proposed House measure the requirement would be to maintain a reserve of 35 percent. There are only $20,316,000,000 of deposits, so that the addition to the reserve which would be required under the House measure, as regards deposits alone, would be $2,000,000,000 and a fraction over, namely, 10 percent of the $20,000,000,000 of deposits. There would be a difference of $2,000,000,000 between the amount of reserves required under the proposed House bill and the amount required under existing law.

Mr. TAFT. The 35–40-percent proposal introduces a complication which makes it difficult to calculate the figures, but if we treat deposits and notes as practically the same, and assuming that a 40-percent reserve is required, as the Federal Reserve banks own $22,404,000,000 in gold or gold certificates, 40 percent reserves will support $89,000,000,000 of notes and deposits. We actually have today some $44,000,000,000 of notes and deposits. The difference between $89,000,000,000 and $44,000,000,000 is $45,000,000,000 for notes and deposits. That would be the figure if we required a 40-percent reserve. It is not proposed to require quite that much reserve; the requirement is only 35 percent. Therefore, the figure would be somewhat higher than $45,000,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington again yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not want to go too much into details on the mechanics of the

question, but I think it is of some importance to appreciate just how much in dollars, at least approximately, is involved in this proposed change by the House. I have not yet been able to make my computations come anywhere near the computations of the Senator from Ohio. As I see it there will be as much decrease in the ability to buy bonds as is equal to the increase in requirements of reserves if such increase is brought about by the pending measure.

Mr. TAFT. No; that is not so.

Mr. DONNELL. Why is it not so?

Mr. TAFT. Because what happens is this: If a Federal Reserve bank buys $10,000,000,000 of bonds it issues $10,000,000,000 of notes before it increases its deposits $10,000,000,000. Consequently it is necessary to take the existing liabilities, which are approximately $23,000,000,000 of notes and $20,000,000,000 of deposits, or a total of $43,000,000,000, and it is necessary to increase that to about $54,000,000,000 without increasing the gold reserves. In other words, the amount is added to both the reserves and the balance sheet. The limiting factor is the $22,400,000,000 of gold. So long as there is that gold reserve, and none of it is lost by buying Government bonds—and gold is not paid out for Government bonds; notes are given for them—so long as that $22,000,000,000 of gold is in the reserve it will support a total liability of the Federal Reserve banks of $89,000,000,000.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a further question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Just a moment. Take the figure $44,000,000,000. The Federal Reserve balance sheet is now made up of $22,000,000,000 of certificates and $21,000,000,000 of Government bonds. They would then have an increase of $45,000,000,000 of Government bonds, while having $22,000,000,000 of gold just the same. On the other side of the balance sheet they would have deposits and notes of about $85,000,000,000, and it would still be legal. They would have bought, therefore, $45,000,000,000 of Government bonds and they would still be within this reserve requirement. Such an operation, I think, would cripple the currency in the hands of the public and would bring about a condition which would be most unfortunate.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Ohio may well be correct, and I am very much interested in the figures he has given us. I should like, however, to have the RECORD show, so that at least this angle may be in the RECORD, that with the present requirement of 25 percent immediate reserves applicable to deposits in Federal Reserve banks, an increase in that requirement to 35 percent would mean an increase, as I see it, of 10 percent in the amount of the $20,316,000,000 of deposits, or $2,031,600,000. In like manner the present law applicable to Federal Reserve notes in circulation requires a 25-percent reserve, whereas the proposed House measure requires 40 percent, or not less than 40 percent, I should say. That is a difference of 15 percent with respect to these notes. Now 15 percent of $23,806,000,000 is, as I figure it, $3,570,000,000. And the aggregate of $3,570,000,000 and $2,031,000,000, in round figures, is $5,601,000,000. I should like to have those figures in the RECORD for the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator's method of calculation, I am sorry to say, is wrong; that is, in calculating how many more bonds the Federal Reserve banks could buy, the figures are wrong. The Senator, I think, can accept the statement from the editorial I read into the RECORD yesterday, that if the House amendment is adopted, the Federal Reserve banks can still buy $14,500,000,000 of bonds, and that under the present law there the limit is much higher, being in the neighborhood of forty-five billion or forty-six billion dollars of bonds.

Mr. TOBEY and Mr. HAWKES addressed the chair.

Mr. CAIN. If Senators will permit me, I should like to make one observation with respect to what the Senator from Missouri has said. I think one important fact to bear in mind is that the Senator from Ohio, who encourages very strongly the adoption of the House amendment, is the first to agree that Federal Reserve deposits and notes are entirely interchangeable. To carry that one step further, he is criticizing the amendment which has come to us from the House, because it would require 35-percent reserves behind deposits, and 40 percent behind notes. The only justification for the recommendation is purely an historical one, which goes back many years.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator accept an amendment of a flat 35 percent? I, myself, would even accept 30 percent flat. In fact, if the amendment of the House is retained I would be glad to offer an amendment to change the 40 or 45 percent figure to 35 percent flat, or, even, if it were acceptable to the Senate, to 30 percent.

Mr. CAIN. If the House amendment should prevail I would agree with the Senator that the first thing we would have to do would be to make it a good amendment. But the lack of competent testimony on the subject, not in this body, sir, but coming to us as a committee, does not justify our taking action at this time, and we should like to take the Senate's position to conference.

I shall now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I propose to speak in my own right before the vote is taken on the effort to change the gold reserves. But I do want to bring to my friend, the Senator from Washington, and my friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] an incident which may serve as an illustration relating to what has just taken place. I refer to it in view of the colloquy that has been going on in the elucidation of figures in the *n*th degree here, which I confess have me mystified, because this matter of figures is a very difficult thing to prove by other figures.

What we need is a lightning calculator like the one of whom I am about to tell the Senate. He was on a New England train going up into Vermont and New Hampshire. As he sat in his seat looking out of the window, he kept moving his shoulders this way and that way in apparently a very nervous manner. The conductor noticed his actions, and inquired, "Have you a nervous disease?" "No," answered the man, "I am a lightning calculator. While sitting here and looking out of the window I am just practicing my vocation. I count the cows in the fields as we pass by them." "So you can count the cows in the field?" said the conductor. "Well, I will give you something to do. Five miles from here is a farm on which there are a great number of cows. It belongs to my brother. You will identify it by a large red barn, with a cupola on it. There is a white house and a large green lawn in front of it, and you will see a great many cattle in the pasture, running alongside our tracks. When you come to that place count the cows, and when I return I will check the number with you and see if you are correct. I know the actual number there. If you make a correct count I will agree that you are indeed a lightning calculator." And I say, Mr. President, that what we need for the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and for the other Senators who have taken part in the discussion of figures, is a lightning calculator.

After a while the conductor returned and asked the man, "Did you count the cattle in the field I told you about?" The man said, "I did." "How many were there?" The man said, "Eighty-four." The conductor said, "That is exactly the number. It is marvelous. How did you do it?" "Why," the lightning calculator said, "that was easy. I just counted the teats and divided by four.' [Laughter.]

Mr. President, what we need in the Senate Chamber now is such a calculator to get the figures being dealt with correct.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency is hopeful that the Senate will support the committee's point of view, which is to reject the recommendation made by the House, so that the least opportunity we shall have is to take the matter to conference, to benefit from further views.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] on behalf of the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, while I happen to be chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, which is a great privilege and honor, and affords opportunities for fine fellowship, I must confess that I have many limitations to a complete understanding of finance, foreign exchange, and monetary matters. There is often a diversity of opinion around the committee table, as there should be in the democratic process.

However, I think I am safe in saying that I am not alone in limitations. I do not believe that there are many Members of this body who can be called real authorities on this subject.

The question before us now is that of restoring the gold reserves as they were 2 or 3 years ago. I am against it. The committee is against it. The committee voted 8 to 1 against it. Every witness who came before us was against

it. To whom are we to look for understanding of these problems if we do not look to the present Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. McCabe, the man who deposed Marriner Eccles as Governor; the head of the greatest bank in the Nation, Mr. Allen Sproul, head of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York—and I do not go down the scale when I mention the man in the light coat who sits behind me, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] who at one time was president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston. He understands finance and Federal Reserve matters as well as does any other man under this Capitol dome.

They all say, "Let the thing alone." The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the proponents of the change, including the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, present the amendment to us and say, "This will not affect things today. This is only a matter of psychology." How long have we been worried about psychology? Did we apply psychology in the action which we took yesterday, in taking away public housing and rent control? What sad psychology is involved in that action?

How is psychology applied to the teeming millions in this country who are burdened with high prices and who are wondering whether Congress cares anything about them? They ask for bread, and we give them a stone. As I contemplate the work of the Congress in this special session I am of the opinion that the mountain labors and brings forth a mouse. Opposition to increasing the gold reserves as proposed in the House bill is the sentiment of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the sentiment of Mr. Sproul, Mr. McCabe, Mr. Eccles, and all the banking authorities who came before us.

The proposal to increase the gold certificate reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks would make no contribution whatever to the fight against inflation. That is why we are here. We are here to make a fight against inflation but we have done nothing whatever against it. We have not lifted a finger against inflation in this session. We certainly cannot do it by putting something more or nothing in the basket. It is only psychology, we are told.

The proposal before us might well demoralize the Government bond market or precipitate the kind of money panic the Federal Reserve System was created to prevent.

The proposal is apparently based on the idea that the country's gold supply can, and should, automatically govern the supply of credit. Unfortunately, that simple theory does not fit the hard facts of how the economic system operates.

It has long since become evident that the flows of gold to or from a country have little or no relation to its internal credit needs. Tying the supply of credit rigidly to those flows of gold would be like tying it to a wheel of chance.

No one would seriously suggest that the Federal Reserve System should always increase Reserve bank credit to the full extent permitted by the gold certificate holdings of the Federal Reserve banks. If the System did that, it would have to increase Reserve bank credit by almost $12,000,000,000 above present levels even if the proposed 35 percent and 40 percent requirements were in effect. The disastrous folly of requiring the System to take such inflationary action at the present time is obvious.

But it would be equally unrealistic and unreasonable to place the requirements at a level that might arbitrarily require the System to reduce Reserve bank credit at a time when such action might be equally disastrous. The 35 percent and 40 percent requirements would have no effect for the present or foreseeable future—except to cause needless operating difficulties for some of the Reserve banks. But at some future time they might suddenly—and by the pure accident of gold movements—force the System, willy-nilly, to curtail credit. Such action might conform to the real credit needs of the country at the time, or it might not. It would be merely a lucky accident if it did.

The present requirement is thoroughly acceptable to the public and is ample to serve the only real purpose of such a requirement on a Reserve bank—that of helping to sustain public confidence in Federal Reserve credit and currency.

The proposal would appear to be a clumsy effort to force the Federal Reserve System to abandon support of the Government securities market and thus bring about sharp increases in interest rates. It is inconceivable that Congress or the public desire to create a run on the currency or collapse of the bond market. If that were the intention it should be done openly and frankly and not by indirection and in disguise.

The committee can see no reason for tinkering with a provision which is working well and has no relation to the present inflationary situation. Only harm could come from passing the present proposal which could not help solve the present inflationary problem and might well rise to plague the country in the future.

Psychology? Apply the test to housing, and the cost of living to the masses of the people. Will an interest in psychology lead us to change the fundamental banking laws of the Nation at a time of great crisis? If we do not follow the testimony of Sproul, McCabe, Eccles, and Ralph Flanders, whom are we to follow?

I leave the decision with the Senate. There is no question in my mind what it ought to do. Let us stand by the present situation. This is nothing but ephemeral talk having a subtle intent to withdraw Government support from the Federal bond market, which in my judgment should be supported consistently for some time to come.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 239) to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 7, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 239) to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report.

TEMPORARY REGULATION OF CONSUMER INSTALLMENT CREDIT

The Senate resumed consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] on behalf of the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I think this is a rather important question which we are discussing. I realize that it is full of technicalities, and rather difficult to understand. I should like to invite the attention of Senators to an excerpt from the testimony of Mr. Eccles before the House Banking and Currency Committee, which I placed in the RECORD yesterday. It appears at pages 9984 and 9985. He gives just about as plain an explanation, I believe, as can be given. I think it would be helpful to all of us in understanding this problem to read those two brief excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Eccles.

I have had assistance in preparing a memorandum which I think couches this problem in rather plain language which anyone can understand. I should like to present this brief memorandum to the Senate:

> Whether it is the purpose of the sponsors or not, the effect of the proposal to increase the gold reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks will be to destroy the policy of supporting long-term Government bonds at par.
>
> There are many important figures in the financial world who are opposed to the bond-support policy, but the President, upon the advice of the Treasury Department, of the Federal Reserve Board, and of the Council of Economic Advisers, has taken a very strong stand in favor of that policy. He has used the

most emphatic language in assuring the people that the Government will not permit the recurrence of the disaster of 1920 when the price of Liberty bonds fell to 82. He has also endeavored to reassure the thousands of bankers who read the repeated intimations in the eastern financial journals that the bond-support program will not really be carried out literally, and that after a little while, the price of Government bonds will be permitted to fall a little below par.

This gold-reserve proposal would so clearly destroy our ability to maintain the Government bond price at par, or even near par, that the small bankers of the country would no longer have any confidence that whatever happens they can sell their bonds without loss if it is necessary for them to do so. If they lose this feeling of security they will immediately begin to sell off a part of their very large bond holdings. That process will begin to grow, and will, in turn, affect the millions of holders of savings bonds. The demands upon the Federal Reserve banks, and upon the Treasury to buy and redeem bonds will grow in volume unless it becomes perfectly clear that the Government has the ability to buy all bonds offered. If, on the contrary, the people discover that the Government does not have that ability, the liquidation will become a panic. The Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks will be overwhelmed and will have to suspend purchases. The price of bonds will drop disastrously, and the credit of the Government will be shaken.

This is not overdrawing the picture. This $250,000,000,000 national debt has been handled so skillfully that even those people who shuddered when Roosevelt suggested 15 years ago that the country could survive even if the debt grew to $50,000,000,000 are now altogether too complaisant about a debt five times as large. As a matter of fact, our big public debt is not a domestic animal but is a wild beast if aroused, and we shall quickly learn that that is true if we once permit the people to doubt the ability of the Government to stabilize bond prices.

The relation of the gold-reserve requirement to the bond-management policy is this: Now that the Treasury has no surplus to use in buying bonds, the only way to support the bond market is by having the Reserve banks make loans to the Treasury for that purpose, or by having the Reserve banks themselves buy the bonds as an investment. The latter process is the normal method but the economic implications are the same, whichever plan is used. When the Federal Reserve bank buys the bonds, it pays for them by giving a deposit credit to the member bank which has acted as intermediary in the transaction, or perhaps has been the actual bond seller itself. The only limit upon the ability of the Reserve bank to carry on this process is the limitation which is placed upon commercial banks in making loans, namely, the reserve requirements.

If the gold requirements are lifted to 35 percent on account of deposits and 40 percent on account of currency, the Reserve bank will have to set aside an additional reserve of $350,000 for every million dollars of bond buying. Even a moderate financial and business disturbance would cause holders of Government bonds to liquidate enough of them to exhaust the reserve potential of the Federal Reserve banks very rapidly. If the proposed change in gold reserve requirements were made at this time the Federal Reserve banks as a whole would hold gold in the amount of $5,700,000,000 above its immediate reserve requirements. This excess reserve would be exhausted when the banks had purchased $16,000,000,000 of Government bonds. The banks could then neither buy more Government bonds nor could it make loans to the Treasury for that purpose because such loans also would be blocked by the reserve requirements.

Sixteen billion dollars of bonds is a very small part of the marketable securities now outstanding and it would be only a small financial storm which would bring forth that amount of liquidation if there were any doubt about the permanent ability of the Government to support the bond market. It would be terribly reckless to do anything to create such a doubt. What is needed of Congress now is not such action as increasing gold reserve requirements—which it is admitted will have no effect upon the current inflation but which will seriously limit the ability of the Government to stabilize bond prices. On the contrary, the best service Congress can render is to stop this constant stream of intimations from financial centers that the bond-support program will be modified, and this it can do by joining the President in a vigorous reaffirmation of our debt-management policies.

THE SPECIAL SESSION—PROPER ATTITUDES FOR SOLUTION OF NATIONAL PROBLEMS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a great American by the name of Henry William Grady, of Atlanta—one of the great journalists and thinkers of his time—wrote in the Atlanta Constitution in 1879, on the occasion of General Sherman's visit to Atlanta:

> We welcome General Sherman to Atlanta, on behalf of a people brave enough to bury their hatreds in the ruins his hands have made and kind enough to turn their passion toward recuperation rather than revenge.

With those words he welcomed General Sherman to Atlanta.

In these days when at home and abroad there is much to upset our sane thinking, that little incident impressed me with its vital qualities. It was such thoughts expressed through a great newspaper that brought about the reunion in spirit of this great people after a disastrous civil war.

Mr. President, in a few hours we shall leave this Chamber to go to our homes. Our purpose and intention in this session will be misrepresented by the evil and misunderstood by the indifferent. However, we will carry on, and will not permit those negative forces to interfere with our bringing our honest convictions to the attention of our constituents. As we do that, it is well to remember the words of Henry William Grady. This very session, of which so much has been written and said, will be a blessing in disguise if it will result in turning our people from the thought that, through legislative action, economic evils can be solved, and will turn our people from politics to work and production, from fear to courage, from selfishness to selflessness, from listening to fearists and doubters to listening to the voices of hope, charity, and love. Mr. President, in the period in which Henry William Grady lived, there was a gentleman from the South by the name of Lamar. Lamar was a Senator. In addressing himself to the problem of meeting the impact of the postwar situation which then existed, he said:

> To know one another, you will love one another.

Mr. President, indeed we need fewer stump speeches, and more stump pullers who will pull up the stumps of partisanship, lassitude, and un-American thinking. We need in our people a conviction of the blessings and advantages of America, with the result that some of our people who have been seeing green pastures over in Europe and Asia will, instead, begin to look at our own green pastures here at home. Yes; we need less talk and more work—more work of the right kind, work of the productive kind. We need not only the proper sort of physical work but also the proper sort of work of ideas, the yeast that dissolves wrong thinking, unproductive thinking. We need a realization by all of us that our problems will be solved, not by delegating the job to "George," and letting a legislative "George" do it, but by taking hold of the plow ourselves. That conviction must be widespread not only among legislators but also among merchants, bankers, lawyers, labor, and farmers. That is where our problems will be solved, if we get rid of some of our selfishness and in its place put selflessness and service.

There are those who assume that they are omniscient, that they know everything, and that the Congress knows nothing. However, the overwhelming proportion of the American people have enough reason and judgment to know that if the Congress refused to take action on certain arbitrary requests, its decision was a considered one, a conscientious one, and one based upon what the Congress faithfully believes is in the best interests of the American people. There are times when inaction on a wrong request is better than action on such a request. The fact that the Congress turned down certain items is an indication not of the fact that it is a do-nothing Congress, but on the contrary, that the Congress was indeed intent on not doing evil—which should be one of its foremost aims; just as another aim should be to do good; which is what it did.

TEMPORARY REGULATION OF CONSUMER INSTALLMENT CREDIT

The Senate resumed consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in view of an amendment which may be offered to the pending joint resolution, I want to make the objection, if it is necessary in order to raise the question, that it is not germane and that it is a revenue measure.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think it would be desirable, if we can vote before 1 o'clock, to get the committee amendments out of the way, in order to have a vote on the amendment which I am proposing. The amendment of the committee keeps the present reserve of 25 percent and refuses to increase it. It was said by the Senator from New Hampshire that gentlemen from the Federal Reserve Board testified it should not be increased. The difficulty with the Eccles philosophy of government is that he does not believe in any gold reserve at all. He made that perfectly clear when he testified in 1945. He says we are practically the only country that is on any such basis

of a gold backing for its money. The English and the Canadians do not have any gold reserve. They have no such requirement of a gold backing of their currency. We are the only country left that still has the idea of maintaining a gold reserve back of its currency. That is the philosophy that has reduced the gold reserve requirement, and it is the philosophy which I oppose in trying to restore the gold reserve to a figure where it will mean something in restraining inflation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest that we take a vote on the amendment. I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, a combined statement of the condition of the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement of condition of the 12 Federal Reserve banks combined

[In thousands of dollars]

	Aug. 4, 1948	Increase or decrease since—	
		July 28, 1948	Aug. 6, 1947
ASSETS			
Gold certificates	21,791,671	+7,001	+2,105,492
Redemption fund for Federal Reserve notes	612,505	+372	−60,108
Total gold certificate reserves	22,404,176	+7,373	+2,045,384
Other cash	272,058	−7,477	+4,850
Discounts and advances	282,530	−44,201	+159,483
Industrial loans	598	−191	−1,084
U. S. Government securities:			
Bills	7,388,012	−346,669	−6,702,674
Certificates	5,121,707	+164,300	−1,564,259
Notes	1,902,300	−51,000	+1,533,000
Bonds	6,966,185	+402,264	+6,243,495
Total U. S. Government securities	21,378,204	+168,895	−490,438
Total loans and securities	21,661,332	+124,503	−332,039
Due from foreign banks	49		−53
Federal Reserve notes of other banks	120,495	−11,980	+1,470
Uncollected items	2,380,022	−21,505	+214,432
Bank premises	32,433	−50	+557
Other assets	147,578	+7,821	+93,776
Total assets	47,027,143	+98,685	+2,028,377
LIABILITIES			
Federal Reserve notes	23,806,903	+81,555	−320,178
Deposits:			
Member bank, reserve account	17,605,901	+72,306	+1,196,990
U. S. Treasurer, general account	1,851,532	+29,748	+1,123,683
Foreign	387,941	+10,770	−161,909
Other	471,624	−26,056	−49,284
Total deposits	20,316,998	+86,768	+2,109,480
Deferred availability items	2,153,526	−71,038	+196,490
Other liabilities including accrued dividends	12,261	−2,357	−447
Total liabilities	46,289,688	+94,928	+1,985,345
CAPITAL ACCOUNTS			
Capital paid in	199,117	+72	+6,014
Surplus (sec. 7)	448,189		+8,366
Surplus (sec. 13b)	27,543		+88
Other capital accounts	62,606	+3,685	+28,564
Total liabilities and capital accounts	47,027,143	+98,785	+2,028,377
Ratio of gold certificate reserves to deposit and Federal Reserve note liabilities combined (percent)	50.8	−0.2	+2.7
Contingent liability on bills purchased for foreign correspondents	1,772	+196	−2,562
Commitments to make industrial loans	6,788	+364	−122

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment to the House amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 157.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not want this matter to be voted on without another word with respect to the dangerous character of the suggestion carried in the House provision, increasing the gold reserve. I should like to point out that the majority of the Banking and Currency Committee, a very overwhelming majority as I understand, only two members of the committee, I am told, having voted against the committee amendment, have come to the conclusion that this is no time to make the very substantial change in the gold reserve policy. The evidence before the committee was clear that the governors of the Federal Reserve System are now giving study to this precise question. No hearings have been held for this precise purpose, at any length. The implications of the increase are so great, they have been so clearly set forth in the remarks by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], that I feel all Members of the Senate should realize that if they vote now to change the present policy, they are seriously impairing the power of the Government of the United States to sustain its bonds.

We reduced the gold reserve from 40 percent to 25 percent during the war, but when we made that reduction the national debt was only a fraction of what it is now. The national debt was increased successively after that reduction had been made. To manage the national debt is the most difficult fiscal problem faced by any country. If the United States of America is not able to manage its debt, if Congress does anything whereby it impairs the power of the Government to carry on open-market operations, the result can easily be a collapse of the bond market.

There is no doubt in my mind that there are several persons of great importance who believe bonds should be permitted to go below par, who believe this change should be made; but it is absolutely too great a risk to take. The banks of the country, Members of Congress, members of the executive department, and leaders in business, all during the war have been selling the bonds of the United States upon the argument that those bonds will be maintained. Now, if without hearings, the Congress should undertake to deprive the Government of the only power by which it supports the bond market, we would be inviting disaster.

I sincerely hope the committee amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the next committee amendment.

The next committee amendment was, on page 4, line 4, to strike out the numeral "7" and insert the numeral "8."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I understand that amendment relates to the increase in reserves against time deposits?

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that the House increased the reserves which may be required in commercial banks against demand deposits by 3 percentage points. Our committee proposes to increase it by 5 percentage points. I think we should adopt the 3 percentage points, but, assuming that the Senate adopts the 5 percentage points and the bill goes to conference, it can be reasonably expected that it will come back with 4 percentage points as a compromise between the 3 and the 5. I have consulted with the House leaders and they assure me that if we adopt the 4 percentage points now, with the other two committee amendments which have already been adopted extending the date, striking out section 2, they will accept the Senate bill without conference. I suggest that the businesslike way to do it is to make that change, to amend the committee amendment so as to provide for 4 percent. I can give the Senate assurance it will not then be necessary to send the bill to conference. The difficulty of sending the bill to conference is that we shall not pass the bill until after 4 o'clock. It then has to go to the House; they will have to go through the procedure of agreeing to a conference and appointing conferees, and it may make 2 or 3 hours' difference in the time at which we adjourn this evening. I have talked to the chairman of the committee about it and I suggest that if he will suggest an amendment to change the percentage so as to strike an even compromise with the House, I can give the Senate assurance that that figure will be accepted by the House and that the bill will be accepted by the House without a conference.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask, what about the time deposit percentage?

Mr. TAFT. I think the best thing to do in that instance, perhaps, though I have

not discussed it with Members of the House, is to make a 1½ percent increase. The House increased it 1 point; the Senate committee proposes to increase it 2 points. I suggest that it be 1½ points, halfway between, which is what the conference committee inevitably would do when figures of that kind are involved.

Mr. CAIN. I should say to the Senator from Ohio that as representing the Banking and Currency Committee, I am not qualified to speak officially for all the members of the committee. In my opinion there is much to be said for the position and recommendation just made by the Senator from Ohio. I have been informed within the last few minutes that the Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the committee, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], a member of the committee, will subscribe to the recommendation. Do I infer correctly from the statement by the Senator from Ohio that the House would be agreeable to making the increase on demand deposits 4 percent, rather than 3 percent?

Mr. TAFT. Four percent.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is taking as an assumption 1½ percent on time deposits. If I were to speak on that subject, I should speak in support of it.

Mr. TAFT. If that is agreeable, I move then that the committee amendment be amended by striking out the figure "8" and inserting the figure "7½."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Just a moment. Without objection, the announcement of the vote agreeing to the Senate amendment is rescinded. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] whether he consulted any other members of the committee besides the chairman, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Mr. CAIN. Those were the only Senators from whom I have had a concurrence in the proposal made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I would speak strongly in favor of the suggestion, as an individual, but I cannot, as I endeavored to suggest, speak officially for each member of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the committee's suggestion was not so strong as the recommendation made by the President.

Mr. CAIN. The President recommended 10 and 4. The compromise finally turned out to be 5 and 2.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? As I understand, the Banking and Currency Committee was evenly divided on the 5, so they almost accepted the 3 percent figure. Is that correct?

Mr. CAIN. We voted, first, and got no decision, on 10 and 5, 6 and 4, and 3 and 1, and finally arrived at a compromise on 5 and 2.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Ohio whether we are being asked again to make a serious mistake in order to accommodate another body. Do we have a stop-watch on the session? Does the Senate have to adjourn at a certain minute, and, in order to avoid a conference, do something which the committee did not recommend? I do not see any objection to letting the matter go to conference. If it can be agreed to promptly, it will be agreed to. It seems to me that the idea that the Senate is now compelled to make another mistake in order to avoid a conflict with the House——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a question of principle is not involved, but a question of degree. A matter of 3 points will authorize the Federal Reserve Board to increase the required reserves on demand deposits by approximately $2,700,000,000. Another point would make the figure approximately $3,000,000,000. If we get into conference with the House it is a question of whether we should take the halfway figure, which we usually do. The next question is extending the date from March to June and striking out section 2, on one of which our conferees might give way. So that on the whole the deal, if the Senator wants to call it that, is perhaps better than we would get if we should go to conference.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, whether it is a matter of principle or policy is not very important. It seems to me, in view of this discussion and this second effort to compromise in advance matters which ought to be thrashed out between the two Houses, it might be well to suggest that we consider providing that all senatorial committees shall find out in advance what the House will do, and then bring in bills according to the wishes of the House.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I remember when the distinguished minority leader was in charge of this body, and he had a great deal of trouble with the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I had trouble with the House.

Mr. TAFT. In a short session, such as this one, time is limited. The ordinary legislative process, as the Senator knows, involves passage here and passage in the other House about 3 days later, if every rule is followed. Then a conference committee is appointed, which takes another 2 or 3 days. I am only trying to assist the convenience of the Senate in an effort to bypass that process to some extent.

Mr. BARKLEY. The convenience of the Senate is not a vital matter. It is not the matter for which we were called back by the President. The welfare of the American people, as well as the convenience of the Senate, it seems to me, is involved. I appreciate the Senator's reference to the days when I was majority leader. I did have trouble with the House. I have had trouble with this House sometimes. But I do not recall that I have ever hot-footed it over to the House day after day, hour by hour, and even minute by minute, to find out what they would allow us to do.

Mr. TAFT. This is my proposal to try to avoid a possible long spreading-out this afternoon while the conference committee tries to work it out.

Mr. BARKLEY. We do not have to spread out today. We might spread out on Monday.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection. But I have found it to be the sense of the Senators that if we have to do certain things anyway, we can do them today rather than on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I still object to the argument that we should do something hastily and maybe erroneously, because the House has been canvassed by someone, and that someone has told the Senator from Ohio that the House will not agree to what we do here. That is no way to legislate.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see why not. It is perfectly reasonable to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the motion made by the Senator from Ohio is altogether in harmony with the policy which has been adopted on the majority side, namely, to do as little as possible with the tremendously important problem of controlling inflation. Everyone agrees that inflation should be controlled. Everyone agrees that we are in the midst of very serious inflation. The Republican convention, in its platform referred to the cruelly high prices which the people are being compelled to pay for the cost of living. But the members of the majority are not disposed to do anything. It was reported at the very beginning of the session, upon very excellent authority, that the Republican leaders had advised the majority members just to stick around for a couple of weeks and then recess. Of course, the mere fact that we are doing anything at all is a confession upon the part of the majority that there is a serious problem. The mere fact that we are passing a housing bill, and the mere fact that the majority is willing to consider consumer credit, which was held up in the House for almost a year, are absolute confessions on the part of the majority that there is a problem. But the policy of the majority is to do as little as possible.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to say for the record that that is not the policy of the majority. I want to state for the record that if we cannot compromise this question we should take it to conference, and when the conference report comes back, if it take a day, a week, a month, or a year, I am willing to stay here and thrash it out. That is the policy of the majority.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to point out to the acting majority leader and to the Senator from Wyoming that the policy of the majority today was the policy which was enunciated by the Senator from Ohio in a speech on this floor on July 24, 1946, and it has not changed one iota.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator will quote it.

Mr. McMAHON. This is what he said:

If the consumers think that the price is too high today, they will wait until prices are lower. I feel that in time the law of supply and demand would bring prices into line.

They should not try to fool the American people into thinking they have any different philosophy today from what they had before. Everything they are doing is in conformance with the philosophy enunciated by the Senator from Ohio in July 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All Senators will suspend. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time is in the control of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator indicate how much time he yields?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not believe it will take me more than 3 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield the Senator 3 minutes, or 5, if necessary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am prompted to take my seat now because of the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. The policy of the majority is to be determined not by what any member of the majority may say here, but by what the majority proposes to do. The majority is clearly intending to adjourn Congress by tonight, if it is humanly possible to do so. It is clearly the intention of the majority not to pass any other legislation dealing with inflation than that which is contained in the measure before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator in favor of title III and title IV of the President's bill, which cover price control, allocations and control of wages? Is the Senator for them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That will be presented——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator vote for them?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That will be presented here in a few moments. I am pointing out that the policy of the majority party is to pass two bills, the housing bill and this inflation control bill, and then a little appropriation bill, although there are before us——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not care to answer the question, because that issue is not here.

Mr. WHERRY. The issue is here. That is the only issue we are going to decide here this afternoon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The issue is——

Mr. WHERRY. The last time I asked the Senator the question he said he had not studied it. The Senator has had 2 weeks, and I ask him now, is he in favor of title III and title IV of the President's bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WHERRY. I said the President's bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky. I want to get some results to control inflation. I do not believe that the proposals offered by the majority party will do that.

Oh, it is a blessing, in my opinion, that now that the Congress has been called back into special session by the action of the President of the United States we are going to have consumer credit control. That will hold down the supply of money. It is a great blessing, of course.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. The last statement of the Senator was a very interesting one. Are we or are we not going to have consumer credit control? That is proposed here today, and the Senator just referred to it as coming from the President and being consumer control. It is consumer installment credit control.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Installment credit control.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield the Senator from Wyoming two more minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for two more minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not care to infringe upon the Senator's time at any great length. My friends on the other side are introducing all sorts of divergence to get away from the fact that a too-little program is being offered. I only hope and pray it will not be too late also.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to discuss the pending amendment.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] could agreeably speak now, I am sure, if it suits the wish of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much time would the Senator like?

Mr. CAIN. About 20 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. That will not in any way affect my right to offer the amendment, will it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will not.

Mr. CAIN. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I realize that under the order of procedure obtaining in the Senate now any remarks to be made upon any phase of the joint resolution or any proposed amendment must be made at this time, because at 4 o'clock we will begin to vote, and we cannot make our comments after that hour.

Mr. President, the high inflationary prices confronting the people today constitute a problem that cannot be lightly examined and speedily cured with the passage of one, two, or three acts by the Congress. There are so many different sides contributing to this economic question, so many complexities, that it is utterly unreasonable to assume the dilemma can be solved with one slashing blow.

Of course, I am concerned, as the people of my State of West Virginia and the whole Union are concerned, when the prices of meat, and bread, and milk, clothing, and all the necessities of life, soar upward in cost to such a tremendously high level that the drain on family incomes is dangerously heavy.

As I have always strived upon every occasion during my service in the United States Senate, I want to help seek out and support affirmative, constructive legislation which will relieve the people of our Nation from this intolerable burden of inflation. But no man can declare wisely that this serious problem can be worked out in a short space of days or weeks. Nor can it be truthfully stated, in my opinion, that the many facets of inflation can easily be reconciled by Congress in the midst of a political campaign.

Conditions, events and circumstances, some the doing of individual men, some the inevitable out-growth of the war, and some bearing the unmistakable stamp of origin among those who desire things for themselves, have lapped and overlapped into a vast, diversified picture which reflects the unhappy situation confronting us today.

To say flatly and with unqualified assertion that there is one basic cause or one basic remedy is to argue with no logic or reasoning at all. There is no escaping the fact that high expenditures by this Government's administration is a contributing cause. The public debt attests the dollars poured from the Treasury. Is this the cause?

We are embarked on a huge program of spending in the name of economic recovery for the war-devastated countries of the world, and at the same time committed to energetic spending for the purpose of strengthening our armed forces. Loans by our banks are thrusting unlimited sums into the pool of purchasing power of the people. Wages are at high peaks, and I hope they can justifiably be kept there.

High taxes, maintaining the flow of dollars from the taxpayer into the Treasury for more Government spending return to haunt that same taxpayer in the form of hidden costs in the higher prices.

At this time the Government has embarked upon a great spending program of purchasing commodities on the open market, such as wheat, knowing that by such action it is sending up the price of wheat, or maintaining the price, or promising a higher price for the future.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Do I understand correctly that the Senator complains that the Government's program for the purchase of agricultural commodities is inflationary?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I complain where it goes beyond the point and is administered beyond the point, I may say to

the Senator, of making a shortage for the American people of grains, or of any other commodity.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator realize that the program of purchasing by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Agricultural Department is in exact conformity with the law as laid down by the Congress, and as laid down with the help of the Senator's vote?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am entirely in favor of the support of proper prices, but not to the point of buying that causes inflation.

Mr. President, I must proceed with my remarks, because I am limited in time.

The causes to which I have referred and countless others have inflated prices to their present high levels.

Let no one argue that overnight the inflationary spiral can be battered down by law or edict. It is impossible to do that, and it is foolish to think it can be done.

There can be no following of the course of police-state methods, as the present occupant of the White House so aptly described price controls and rationing as we knew them at the war's end.

Perhaps the quickest way to control prices is to give the power to control them into the hands of the Executive, but I doubt the wisdom of doing that in view of the experience we have had under the present administration in the handling of price controls. I doubt the wisdom of giving that power back into the hands of the Executive until every other method has been used to curtail inflation. Yet, Mr. President, the Chief Executive has asked for a return of that power. I am reluctant to place it in the hands of those who had it before. I recall that formerly this power was used to an extent and administered—I should say misadministered—in such a way that even foodstuffs were not on store shelves and could not be obtained.

Mr. President, I remember well that in my own State it was estimated there were 600,000 head of cattle at a time when the people could not obtain sufficient meat. West Virginia is not a large cattle-producing State, but the number of cattle in the State at that time would have been of value if some of them could have been used to supply meat for the people of my State. However, the cattle were in the fields and the people could not get sufficient meat. Why? Because under the orders of the administration slaughterers' permits were not allowed to be issued. People went hungry while at the same time there was an available meat supply right at their front doors.

Consider the plight of Great Britain under peacetime regimentation of prices and business and labor in general. We see there scarcities in food and clothing, and almost universal misery and want. No, price controls and a return to wartime rationing are not the answer we seek against inflation at this time.

Power rests in the administration at this moment to control completely the shipments of products abroad. Much as I favor foreign trade and the exportation of articles to those abroad who are in need, I want the people of this country to have a sufficient part of the benefit of America's full production so that we will not be in want here or subjected to the inflationary prices which exist today.

I repeat, Mr. President, it is impossible for Congress after a fortnight's study, to enact a bill or law that will strike a shattering blow against the evil of inflation. We can make the best headway possible now. We can take steps proposed to be taken at this time; but I do not think the whole evil can be cured by the administration of one or two doses of medicine. I do not believe any right-thinking man or woman expects Congress to perform an overnight miracle.

High prices did not spring upon us suddenly. They have grown slowly and steadily to ominous maturity on an intricate economic framework. If we thoughtlessly and impulsively begin tinkering with this complicated economic picture, it will without warning fall into the jig-sawed separate pieces which it actually is.

I am convinced that the entire complex problem of inflation deserves careful, deliberate attention by both Houses of Congress. Let us proceed here as far as we can in the present short session; let us do what we can and do it earnestly. But more must be done to meet the problem. I believe that the Congress should undertake to tackle the difficult and serious situation in a correct way.

The proposal I make today is not a new method. Ever since the time when the first representatives of the American people assembled in the Congress the problems of the Nation have received initial consideration by committees of the Congress. It is such a committee which I believe the Nation needs today, and it is such a committee, with a serious task before it, that I urge be formed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to the pending measure directing the creation of a joint congressional committee composed of five Members of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives to investigate the present high prices of consumer goods, and report its recommendations to Congress not later than January 9, 1949.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I recommend the appointment of such a committee, although I know that other committees have studied the question. I know that it is unusual to ask for the appointment of a special committee, and if there is any real objection to the appointment of a special committee I am perfectly willing that such a direction be contained in the amendment so that any committee that may properly deal with the subject may continue the study of the problem.

I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am not sure whether the Senator from West Virginia is aware of the fact that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, a committee composed of Members of both Houses, chairmaned by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], has been studying this problem for 2 years, and that hearings have been held by that committee in various parts of the country. That committee was broken up into three subcommittees, and the subcommittee of which I was a member held hearings from New Hampshire to Florida. Hearings were held by other subcommittees in the Midwest and in the Far West. Sufficient studies of the subject have been made. I think the joint committee, which is well staffed, has ably and completely studied the problem and can continue whatever study of the problem is necessary to be made. Recommendations have been made by that committee, at least by the minority members, to curb inflation. But no action has been taken, I will say to the Senator from West Virginia. What we need now is some action. We have studied the subject. We are aware of the problems. We do not need anyone to tell us that prices are high. We have looked into the situation completely. Now is the time for action. The difficulty is that we are not obtaining action during the special session of Congress. The little bits of action we are receiving may result in more inflation. We need a general, rounded program to stabilize the cost of living or to roll it back. Although I think the Senator's proposal is a splendid one, the studies have been made, the facts are before us, and the time has now arrived for action.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I agree with the Senator that a rounded, full program must be worked out, and I agree that action, so far as it is wise to be taken at this time, should be taken. However, I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he desires to place controls in the President at this time in respect to the fixing of wages and the fixing of prices for goods?

Mr. MYERS. I believe the situation is now so serious that we should meet it as we met the serious situation brought about as the result of the war. Yes; I will say to the Senator from West Virginia I will vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to give the President more power to impose selective controls in order that we may prevent the cost of living from spiraling further upward. The cost of living will spiral upward.

Mr. President, we are being told each week and each month by Members of Congress that the situation will work itself out; that the law of supply and demand will take care of the problem. But prices continue to rise.

I will support the President's program; yes. No one else has submitted an adequate program in this Congress. No program has been submitted by the majority party. The majority have accepted two of the President's proposals, but those two alone cannot do the job. I will vote for those two measures, but I know they will not do the job. We must have more. We must have a rounded program.

Of course, I do not like controls. No one likes controls. But I say to the Senator from West Virginia that the situation is becoming so serious that we had better fight this inflation as we fought the war. We had better fight to win. Unless we are willing to do something, and something drastic, we will not win the battle, we will go over the precipice so fast that then we will be worrying about deflation rather than inflation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator that it is perfectly possible that we will have to come to controls, even severe controls, in the United States. Where the Senator and I differ is that I do not want to place such controls in the same hands that administered them before, because I have not forgotten what happened heretofore as a result of the administration of controls. I am perfectly willing to approach this to any end, but I am very wary and very apprehensive at this time of putting the power of controls back into the hands of those who administered the controls before. I want to take every other course, every other step possible before that is done. The step that is proposed to be taken by the majority today is to approach the subject as gradually as we can, and if controls have to come, the Senator from West Virginia will be ready to vote for them. But I am reluctant to do it at this time under the present situation.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator from West Virginia mean that he is willing to allow inflation to continue, for the cost of living to rise, the cost of foodstuffs to rise, the cost of everything the housewife buys to rise, until some future date when he may determine in his own mind that the situation has gotten out of hand, and it is time to impose controls? Or does he mean, since he states that he did not have any confidence in those who formerly managed the program, that he wants to wait until after the election, and allow prices to rise until election day, or until next year?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is not a question of waiting until after election. Nor can the Senator from West Virginia say that he is going to wait until any certain day. The Senator from West Virginia says that in the desperate situation which confronts us today every step should be taken before we place so-called police-state controls in the hands of the present administration.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator knows that that was said last year. It was said in June 1946; it was said in the fall of 1947; it was said in January 1948. "Let us wait." We have waited. The American people have waited, and the cost of living is getting entirely out of hand. How long should we wait? What is the "target day"?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let us take the steps proposed today and see what the results may be. Let us not take the severe steps proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Kentucky and place control back in the hands of the administration. That is the position of the Senator from West Virginia. I hope I have made it clear. I urge that this amendment for the formation of a joint congressional committee be made a part of the bill. I am perfectly willing that the existing committee take over the work and carry it on, to meet the problems of today under the facts which exist today, and to continue such studies as may eventually result in methods of meeting this problem, which does not arise from any one cause but from many.

It may be that controls are necessary. Let us not adopt them until it is necessary to do so. I, for one, am not willing to place controls upon the American worker and the American buyer today. That is my own position.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator realizes, does he not, that under price control prices rose about 6½ percent? That meant that the wage earner had to earn $1.065 in 1945 and 1946 to buy what he could have bought for a dollar in 1939. Since that time the index has risen to $1.265. Is it the Senator's position that he wants to tell the American people and the people of West Virginia that they can enjoy dollar hamburger and 88-cent eggs while he has a commission appointed to study prices? Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Oh, no, Mr. President. I am working just as hard as any other Member of this body, and I am just as hopeful as any other Senator that the steps taken here will relieve the situation so that we shall not have such prices for hamburger and eggs. But I can never forget the wrongs which were done under the former administration of price controls by those in power today.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator in answer to his observation that I shall never forget the swarm of lobbyists which the National Association of Manufacturers turned loose on the Congress to destroy price control, and their assurances that if only price control were removed, everything would be all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the minority leader yield me 1 minute?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Connecticut cannot forget the assurances which were contained in advertisements which were carried in every newspaper in the country, that if only price controls were removed production would increase, and prices would rise for a time and then come down. That was 2 years ago. Since that time it has been absolutely demonstrated that although prices have risen, production has not increased in proportion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The able Senator from Connecticut never heard any statement of that kind from the Senator from West Virginia. The Senator from West Virginia wanted price controls lifted after the abuses which arose under them, and at a time when there was no food upon the shelves of the stores of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to continue the argument so ably presented, but unfortunately interrupted, which related to the promises of the National Association of Manufacturers, a branch of the Republican Party, that if we would only remove OPA control, production would rise and prices would fall——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I have not been able to finish my first sentence yet. I think it is a little early. I shall be glad to yield later.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will yield, I assure him that I shall not interrupt him again. On the point which the Senator is discussing, I think the Senator has made an inadvertent error. I understood the Senator from Rhode Island to say that the National Association of Manufacturers had made certain allegations or statements to the Republican Congress. Of course, the Senator recalls that the controls were taken off by the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was a Democratic Congress, and were also taken off by the President of the United States.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator from California misunderstood me. I said nothing about a Republican Congress. I did not use the words. I referred to the fact that the National Association of Manufacturers was in a sense a representative of the Republican Party, and that it had made its appeal not to the Congress of the United States, but to the people of the United States.

As an illustration of that fact, I have in my hand two full-page advertisements from the Washington Post, one of April 18, 1946, and the other a little later. The earlier one was headed "Paging Mr. Bowles," and discussed the question of the lack of meat, underwear, household appliances, men's suits, butter, and radios. It then gave the recipe of the National Association of Manufacturers for a cure for the high prices of those materials. The advertisement stated that the high prices were due to lack of production, and that lack of production was due to controls. The advertisement concluded with this question:

> Isn't this the answer? NAM has said: Remove price controls on manufactured goods and production will step up fast. In a survey of a representative cross-section of NAM membership, 97 percent find price controls are hampering production. Remove these controls and goods will pour into the market. Within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally—as they always do when production goes up—in line with the real worth of things. This is the way you can get the goods you want at prices you can afford to pay.

That was two and a quarter years ago. Are the people getting the goods they want at the prices they can afford to pay?

About a month later there was another full-page advertisement, which was headed: "Would you like some butter or a roast of beef? Well, here's why OPA ceilings make them hard to get." Similar reasons are given, and the advertisement concludes with a similar question:

> Isn't this the answer? Remove price controls on manufactured goods and production will step up fast. Goods will then pour into the market, and, within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally and competitively, as they always have, in line with the real worth of things. This is the

way you can get the goods you want at prices you can afford to pay. Write your Congressman your views—today.

That was two and a quarter years ago. I suggest that if we are to follow the advice of the National Association of Manufacturers, the people might write to their representatives in Congress their views today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the two advertisements to which I have referred printed in full at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the advertisements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Washington Post of April 18, 1946]

PAGING MR. BOWLES

On March 24, Chester Bowles, Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, said, in The New York Times:

"The heads of the National Association of Manufacturers * * * tell us that under price ceilings goods will not be made. * * * If any person reading this article knows of any instance where price controls are actually holding up production I hope he will * * * give me the facts."

Here, Mr. Bowles, are some of the facts you asked for, as reported by leaders of American industries, in the Roll Call on Production broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System last Tuesday:

MEAT

"As a direct result of OPA regulations, legitimate meat packers are producing substantially less meat of all kinds than normally. Industrial surveys in representative cities from coast to coast show most consumers in those areas are paying black market penalties of about 20 cents on each dollar's worth of meat they buy. The whole trouble is that OPA regulations are unworkable. What is needed is for Congress to do away entirely with all OPA meat and livestock regulations so that cousumers again may get the kind of meat they want, when they want it, at a fair competitive price." (Wesley Hardenbergh, president, American Meat Institute, Chicago, Ill.)

UNDERWEAR

"An estimate from figures compiled all over the entire country shows the manufacturers of summer and winter underwear are only producing about 60 percent of their normal output of essentially needed underwear items. OPA has forced manufacturers, generally, to discontinue low-priced items. * * * OPA policies make it impossible for manufacturers to intelligently plan the operation of their plants and this can only mean continued low production." (Edward J. Ashe, executive vice president, Standard Knitting Mills, Knoxville, Tenn.)

HOUSEHOLD APPLIANCES

"We have had confusion where we should have had production. This chaotic price situation still forces many manufacturers in this field to produce at a loss or not to produce at all. The prompt elimination of price control would rapidly increase the production of household appliances." (Howard E. Blood, president, Norge Division, Borg-Warner Corp., Detroit, Mich.)

MEN'S SUITS

"Production has been retarded on account of the determination of OPA to enforce the absorption of very considerable wage increases, without adequate relief in selling prices.

"Government efforts to stimulate production of low-priced suits by granting priorities have largely failed.

"Our greatest need is more production and less control, and unless the maximum average price regulation is eliminated, the present scarcity of suits will continue." (Bertram J. Cahn, president, B. Kuppenheimer, Inc., Chicago, Ill.)

BUTTER

"Butter production is now at the lowest level in 25 years because OPA keeps butter prices 20 percent below other dairy products. Consumers are being robbed by the black market. OPA price controls are restricting production, that is why you can't find butter." (L. S. Hurtz, president, the Fairmont Creamery Co., Omaha, Nebr.)

RADIOS

"Home radio receivers * * * have been in low supply for lack of those parts that go to make up a radio receiver, manufactured mainly by specialty companies. And this shortage is due to low price ceilings * * * the OPA does not permit to be included in the selling prices the actual cost increases realized by the manufacturers. * * * Here we are, 8 months after VJ-day and in those 8 months, my own company has made only as many radio sets as we should have made in each of those 8 months * * * the industry had a very easy reconversion job to do and by this time the market should have been flooded with radio receivers." (R. C. Cosgrove, vice president and general manager, Crosley Corp., Cincinnati, Ohio; president, Radio Manufacturers' Association.)

Isn't this the answer? NAM has said: Remove price controls on manufactured goods and production will step up fast. In a survey of a representative cross section of NAM membership, 97 percent find price controls are hampering production. Remove these controls and goods will pour into the market. Within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally—as they always do when production goes up—in line with the real worth of things. * * * This is the way you can get the goods you want at prices you can afford to pay.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS.

[From the Washington Post of May 4, 1946]

WOULD YOU LIKE SOME BUTTER OR A ROAST OF BEEF?

Well, here's why OPA ceilings make them hard to get—

Because OPA "controls" discourage the production of butter. And much of the little produced is being sold in the black market.

"Fifty percent of all butter production today is going into the black market and selling for 80 cents or more a pound." (D. K. Howe, president, American Butter Institute, Chicago, Ill.)

Because OPA "controls" drive meat away from legitimate packers into the black market.

"The plain fact is that OPA meat regulations are driving the honest operators out of business and are turning the business over to crooks and cheats and chiselers." (Wesley Hardenbergh, president, American Meat Institute, Chicago, Ill.)

It's the same with other things you want: men's suits, underwear, socks, work gloves, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, electric irons, toasters, women's low-priced dresses, moderate and low-priced textiles, lumber and other building materials, furniture.

Production of too many of the things you have been waiting for is held back by OPA.

Instead of the things you want, you are too often forced to buy high-priced merchandise you don't want. And you know what the black market is in your home town.

OPA—with an army of 31,784 employees and $150,171,000 to spend this year—has failed completely to stop the modern bootleggers and racketeers who prey upon us all.

OPA MEANS LOW PRODUCTION—LOW PRODUCTION MEANS BLACK MARKETS—BLACK MARKETS MEAN NEEDLESSLY HIGH PRICES

Isn't this the answer? Remove price controls on manufactured goods, and production will step up fast. Goods will then pour into the market and, within a reasonable time, prices will adjust themselves naturally and competitively, as they always have, in line with the real worth of things. This is the way you can get the goods you want at prices you can afford to pay. Write your Congressman your views—today!

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield approximately 5 minutes to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, an effort has frequently been made to represent the farmers of the United States as the villains in this inflation tragedy now threatening our economy with collapse. Hardly a day passes but we can hear in congressional debates or read in the press of the big industrial centers attacks on the farmers, charging them with responsibility for the high cost of living. On the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] recently indicted the farmers of America as the real culprits in the present inflation, insinuating that the high price of farm products was the real cause of the high cost of living. He charged that the prices of steel had gone up only 45 percent, while the prices of agricultural products had risen 150 percent. That statement is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 30, at page 9565.

The people of Montana can easily see the utter unfairness of that argument. Prior to the war, the prices of farm products had sunk to the lowest point in our history. In 1933, when the Roosevelt administration came into power, wheat was selling at 25 cents a bushel in Montana and the farmers were losing their shirts. On the other hand, steel, which is a monopoly, had curtailed its production, raised its prices, and was making huge profits, paying the steel corporation directors huge bonuses and the stockholders fat dividends, even during the depression. When the war came on, steel did not have to raise its prices; its prices were already so high that in 1938 the steel corporations were making more profits than they had made in 1929, which was the highest period of American industrial activity. With the stupendous war contracts, through the war they made fabulous profits, while small business was suffering severely.

However, throughout the period of the depression, the farmers faced bankruptcy. Naturally, when the war came on, with the great demand for farm production, their prices rose with all prices. But the prices of everything that the

farmers had to use on their farms—labor, machinery, trucks, farm implements, fertilizer, seed, everything a farmer uses—went up, and the net profits of the farmers were curtailed. They could not lay away great reserves as the steel industry could.

Mr. President, I do not want to be understood as attacking the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for his stout defense of big business and his effort to relieve big business from the charge of responsibility for our runaway prices. He speaks for the industrial East; he speaks for the conservative party, which is dominated by the big corporations and industries of the Nation. I think, however, it is only fair that his efforts to fasten upon the farmers of America the blame for the inflation we are now experiencing should be analyzed and refuted.

It must be clear to anyone who has studied this subject of inflation that the farmers of America are not responsible, either directly or indirectly, for the present inflationary conditions. Farmers do not fix prices in our economy. Farm prices are fixed in the national and international markets; and when the basic prices of the Nation go up, farm prices must necessarily follow.

Recently, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, said that the wheat now being harvested is the most expensive wheat crop in history. This is due, of course, to the increased labor costs, machinery and seed costs, and to the price of everything used in producing a crop. The same plea can be stated regarding the production of other farm crops and of meat.

All economists of the country recognize the fact that in an industrial Nation like ours, the prices of the basic products, such as steel, copper, aluminum, cement, and other such items, are the ones that influence inflation and high costs of living. It is well recognized that all the big monopolistic organizations in the country controlling basic industries raised their prices at the beginning of the war and made excessive profits. These prices have been constantly rising; and when labor demands increased wages to meet the increased cost of living, the big basic industries grant the wage raises, but immediately increase their commodity prices far more than the increased wages justify. It is that vicious circle which is causing inflation; and the attempt on the part of the Republican Senators in the East to fasten on the farmers of America the blame for the high costs of living, is utterly unjustified.

Some of the large newspapers of the country and some of the Republican columnists seem to think that Congress should pass laws designed to prohibit the American farmer from earning a living. The big industries of the Nation want low farm prices and high profits for themselves. If living costs go up, they have to pay higher wages. Consequently, they seek to depress farm prices and avoid the payment of better wages. In many of the big newspapers and magazines, the farmer is being pictured as a fat profiteer, burdening the taxpayers by his subsidies, and generally to blame for the high costs of living. That propaganda does not fool the people in Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the statement which I have prepared may appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm income in Montana, of course, has reached an all-time high; but the farmer, like everyone else, is putting out more money for what he has to buy. While farm products have increased in price 11 percent during the last year, the prices for what the farmer buys have soared 16 percent. Furthermore, many Montana farmers buy a large percentage of their food from merchants; and when those farmers shop, they have to pay for the cost of production and the costs of selling, wholesaling, distribution, and speculation. When they buy clothing, trucks, tractors, farm machinery, a family auto, gasoline, tires, or anything else, they have to pay the highly inflated prices that exist. They have to maintain their houses, farm buildings, machinery, and fences, and are obliged to pay the wage scale which has mounted during this period of inflation.

The farmers, the workers, and the small-business men of the Nation are being threatened with bankruptcy by this inflation we are passing through. They are demanding that something be done about it. The President has called Congress into special session and has presented to the Congress a program to control the inflation. But what is the present Republican-controlled Congress doing about it? At first it threatened to do absolutely nothing, and to adjourn sine die, without the slightest action. Lately, however, it decided to present some measures for action. So we are having a few of the proposals recommended by the President acted upon. However, this is an incomplete and ineffective program. The major program for inflation control is being completely ignored.

The able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the leader of the minority party, has offered an amendment to the pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 157. This amendment seeks to provide measures which will protect the people of this country from a further rise in inflationary prices which is certain to result in a final economic collapse if something is not done about it. The Barkley amendment has been fully discussed; and I shall not take up the time of the Senate to review its provisions, except to say that I think the Congress of the United States will make one of the greatest mistakes in its history if it fails to take action on this matter and give the people of this country legislation along the lines of the Barkley amendment, to protect the country from the dangers which today threaten it. It is my intention to support the Barkley amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does either the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to speak to the remaining amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. CAIN. The first two amendments have already been adopted by the Senate. The fourth committee amendment would increase to 8 percent the lawful reserve which member banks of the Federal Reserve System could be required to maintain behind time deposits. The law presently fixes an upper limit of 6 percent for this purpose. The House amendment would increase that amount only to 7 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the purpose of keeping the RECORD clear, does the Senator from Washington desire to yield to himself, at this time, a certain number of minutes?

Mr. CAIN. I desire to yield to myself an unlimited number of minutes, in order to inform the Senate as to the remaining committee amendments to be considered.

I hope the Senate will understand that I am referring only to time deposits, as opposed to demand deposits.

As I said a moment ago, the law presently fixed an upper limit of 6 percent for this purpose. The House amendment would increase that only to 7 percent, or an increase of 1 percentage point.

If we are to arm the Federal Reserve System to combat inflation, we should arm it reasonably. The committee is of the opinion the House amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 157 in respect to this matter would not do so as well as would the recommendation submitted now by the Senate committee. The ease of expanding currency by the present ratio of approximately 6 to 1 represents a potent source of inflationary credit. This problem would be remedied in proportion to the extent the "lawful reserve" requirements of member banks of the Federal Reserve System are raised.

In speaking of the bank credit control proposals in Senate bill 2910, Mr. Sproul, President of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York said:

It will reduce somewhat the ratio of expansion on reserves.

He explained it as follows:

With a modern central banking system operating in a highly developed deposit banking system, and with a decreasing reliance upon gold, much of the need for low reserve requirements and consequent economizing in the provision of money by commercial banks has disappeared. In these circumstances there may well be a balance of advantage in higher reserve requirements, as a means of reducing the dangerous expansibility and, at times, destructive contractability of a money supply based on low reserve ratios of commercial banks.

The proposal expressed in the committee amendment in this respect, is therefore, more effective than the House provision on this particular point. At the same time it represents a fair compromise, we think, between the higher figure of 4 percent requested by the administration and the lower figure of 1 percent requested by the House.

As stated by Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, presently a Governor of the Federal Reserve Board, before our committee—

The very fact that the Federal Reserve Board had that power would have a very wholesome influence upon the banking system, even without putting the increased reserve requirement into effect, for this reason: Every bank would want to keep themselves in a position where they would have either excess reserves or have securities readily available that they could dispose so as to meet the increased reserve requirement if it were put into effect. * * * The very fact that we get increased reserve requirements is going to cause the banks to hesitate at least to increase their loans as freely when they have to sell Government bonds

to do so, because as they sell Government bonds in the market and they increase their loans, they become less liquid and they become less able to meet the increased reserve requirement. Therefore, the expectation of having to do that in itself would be a deterring factor.

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has assured us the power requested in order to control bank credit would be used with extraordinary care. Mr. Sproul corroborated that the present Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is fully aware of the delicacy of applying credit restraints. As a matter of practicality, the committee proposal represents a fair compromise between the higher figure of 4 percent requested by the administration and the lower figure of 1 percent requested by the House.

The Banking and Currency Committee, by unanimous action, as I recall, recommends adoption of the amendment by the Senate.

The next three committee amendments are numbered 5, 6, and 7. I should like to explain them briefly.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS 5, 6, AND 7

The fifth committee amendment would increase to 31 percent of demand deposits the lawful reserves which the Federal Reserve Board could require of member banks in central reserve cities. The present legal limit is 26 percent. The House version of Senate Joint Resolution 157 would increase that limit only to 29 percent.

In the case before us, the House has recommended that the additional requested reserves against demand deposits be 3 points, whereas the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency recommends an increase of 5 points.

The sixth and seventh committee amendments provide for comparable increases of 5 percentage points above existing legal limits in reserve cities and country bank cities, respectively, instead of the increases of 3 percentage points approved in the House version of the joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 157.

Every argument I have advanced to sustain the fourth committee amendment relating to time deposit reserve requirements applies with even greater vigor to the fifth, sixth, and seventh committee amendments. Without repeating those arguments in detail, I would remind my colleagues that increases in reserve requirements beneficially decrease the ratio of expansion of currency on reserves, that the benefits are proportionally greater the higher the reserve requirement is placed, that mere possession of the power by the Federal Reserve Board has a deflationary effect, that it may be expected that such Board would, on the basis of past practice, apply such increases in requirements judiciously, and that the committee amendments relating to member-bank demand deposit reserve requirements represent a practical compromise between the 10 percentage point increase requested by the administration and the 3 percentage point increase voted by the House.

By unanimous action, the Committee on Banking and Currency fully supports the committee amendments numbered 5, 6, and 7. The question obviously will be raised, as it should be, as to why the committee thought it proper not to accept the administration's recommendation that reserve requirements behind the time deposits be increased 4 points, and the requirements behind demand deposits, 10 points. The committee thinks serious consideration should be given by the Congress to the granting of additional stand-by powers to the Federal Reserve Board. The committee feels, however, in the present instance that the Congress was not called back into emergency session in order to consider any long-range changes within our national banking system which may be determined to be necessary. The committee is completely satisfied that to grant the additional authority to the Federal Reserve System at this time as recommended by the committee in its amendment will provide sufficient stand-by authority and increased reserves adequately to protect our banking system against whatever we may conceive may possibly arise in the period between now and when we shall have had a more adequate opportunity to examine into the administration's recommendation, at some latter period during the first year of the next regular session.

Many people throughout the country do not understand money or its management. The committee makes no pretense of being individually or collectively a complete authority on the subject. What the committee knows is that it would not be humanly possible for the Federal Reserve System, without serious injury to the economy of the country, to utilize the total authority which we are recommending they be given. It will be used for the most part as stand-by authority. Certainly it will be used judiciously, wisely, cautiously, and without haste. There is nothing we could give them in this field of endeavor by way of further power, which they could possibly use in the national interest within the next year or two.

The last committee amendment is No. 8, and it is simply a clarifying amendment. It would authorize the Federal Reserve Board to require the increases in reserves behind time and demand deposits until June 30, 1949. The House voted to terminate such authority on March 31, 1949.

The committee is of opinion that the June 30, 1949 date should be fixed in order that the next Congress may be afforded an adequate opportunity to reappraise the situation and the need of further legislation in the light of conditions then existing. The June 30, 1949 date would also be consistent with that placed in the consumer installment credit provisions of the pending measure through an earlier acceptance by this body of the first committee amendment.

We merely think that to adopt the House recommendation calling for an expiration date of March 31, 1949, would not permit the Congress to give the proper amount and kind of consideration to the problem which it will deserve before the legislation expires.

That, Mr. President, is a brief explanation of the remaining committee amendments now before the Senate. I trust that later on, during the course of the afternoon, questions will be raised by Members on both sides of the aisle concerning the nature and wisdom of each of the amendments. If it suits the convenience of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, I should like to conclude my remarks at this time, and have him take the floor if he is prepared to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remarks which the Senator from Washington has just completed consumed 13 minutes of his time. To whom does the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think we should dispose of the pending amendment, because I desire to offer an amendment, which I cannot do until this amendment is disposed of.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington has been advised that the period between 1 and 4 o'clock is to be devoted to discussion, and that no action is to be taken on any of the pending amendments until the hour of 4 o'clock arrives. I hope I have been misinformed.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not my understanding. We have been voting on pending amendments all morning but, while the debate is to be controlled, I did not understand we could not vote on committee amendments and get them out of the way.

Mr. CAIN. I hope the Senator's understanding of the situation is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Otherwise, I should have no opportunity of explaining the amendment I offer. May I ask the Chair if that is a correct understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling of the Chair is that it is entirely possible under the unanimous-consent agreement for a yielding to occur for the purpose of voting upon an amendment. The unanimous-consent agreement provides only that at the hour of 4 o'clock the Senate shall proceed to vote upon any pending amendment. That does not preclude the disposal of amendments, as the Chair rules, earlier in the afternoon, by agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. It does not include the offering of other amendments at 4 o'clock, does it? At any rate, we can vote on this one.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if the decision of the Chair is that it is now proper to take action on the committee amendments, I should like to call up the next amendment, which I think is No. 4, and ask for its immediate consideration and adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state for the information of the Senate that the question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], to strike from line 13, page 5, of the committee amendment the figure "8," which figure is by the committee amendment proposed to be substituted for the figure "7," in line 4, page 4, of the House engrossed amendment, and further to substitute for said figure "8" the figure "7½."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to speak very briefly on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. What it means is that the Senator from Ohio has recommended that instead of adopting the committee's recommendations of 5 points for demand deposits and 2 points for time deposits, we should approve a figure of 4 percentage points against demand deposits and of 1½ points against time deposits. As everyone knows, the President urged Congress to provide the Federal Reserve System with additional authority to increase reserves against member banks, 10 points against demand deposits, and 4 points against time deposits. The committee, after giving the matter thorough consideration, and for reasons which the record contains all through it, thought at this time that there was not sufficient reason to justify the President's recommendation. Therefore we looked for a figure which, in our opinion, could be construed to be more practical and more nearly emergency in character.

The House included within its proposal a recommendation that the reserve requirements be increased to 3 points against demand deposits and 1 point against time deposits. The Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate has recommended reserve increases of 5 points and 2 points. The distinguished Senator from Ohio is of the opinion, and I agree, that the House of Representatives would accept a compromise figure of 4 points against demand deposits and 1½ points against time deposits, for the reason that, in my opinion—and I think I now speak for the entire committee—it would not be possible for the Federal Reserve System to invoke either 4 points against demand deposits or 2 points against time deposits between now and, let us say, June of next year. I think it is perfectly reasonable for the Senate to compromise the position which has been taken by the Banking and Currency Committee. I speak not alone for myself but, I understand, for the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who understands the Senator's compromise amendment, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is, I think, generally agreed to be the best authority among all of us on subjects pertaining to Federal Reserve requirements and needs, and the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. TOBEY], who are all willing, together with myself, to compromise the committee's position in support of the recommendation as presented by the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to strike from line 13, page 5, of the committee amendment the figure "8," which figure is by the committee amendment proposed to be substituted for the figure "7" in line 4, page 4, of the House engrossed amendment, and to substitute for said figure "8" the figure "7½."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, what we have just done was to take action on the committee amendment No. 4, which concerns itself with time deposits?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Therefore the action to be taken is on the demand deposit amendments which are numbered, I think, 5, 6, and 7. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as amended by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in respect to demand deposits?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Washington that it is in respect to time deposits. The effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is to substitute, in line 13, at page 5 of the committee amendment, the figure "7½" in place of the figure "8." [Putting the question.]

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I call up the next amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the time taken for the discussion of these amendments and the adoption of them charged to the time of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it would be the opinion of the Senator from Washington that the time would be——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state its ruling. In the absence of an agreement concerning the division of time, the time will be taken from the side by whom the proposal to vote is presented. Therefore, up to this time, the time has been taken from the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington is entirely satisfied with the decision of the Chair. Mr. President, may I call up the next amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 6, of the House engrossed amendment, it is proposed to strike out "29" and to insert in lieu thereof "31."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment just stated to the House amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment by inserting the figure "30" in lieu of the figure "31."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, to the committee amendment, to substitute "30" for "31."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment as so amended is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

Is that the desire of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CAIN. It is, Mr. President.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the "23" and insert in lieu thereof "25."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment by striking out "25" and inserting "24."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment, as so amended, is agreed to.

Does the Senator from Washington desire to take up the next amendment?

Mr. CAIN. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "17" and insert in lieu thereof "19."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to strike out "19" and insert in lieu thereof "18."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendment, as so amended, is agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I now call up the last committee amendment, No. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "March 31" and insert "June 30."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, to be found on line 20, page 5, of the printed copy before the Senate, substituting "June 30" for "March 31."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington would like to determine the wishes of the Senator from Kentucky, who I think is about to speak to and offer his amendment to the measure presently before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky desire to yield at this time to any other Member of the Senate?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. On the desk and printed there is an amendment which I propose to offer to the pending joint resolution. It is possible I may want to substitute another amendment in place of the one that is on the desk at this time. Is it necessary in order to make that substitution that I offer the substitute prior to 4 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be necessary for either the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Kentucky to yield time to the Senator from West Virginia for that purpose.

Mr. REVERCOMB. At the proper time I shall seek such permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand, all committee amendments have now been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I therefore offer an amendment which I send to the desk. Inasmuch as the amendment has been printed and has been on the desks of Senators, first in the form of a bill and later in the form of an amendment to the pending joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the reading of the amendment will be dispensed with, and it will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. BARKLEY is as follows:

At the proper place, insert the following:

"SEC. 4. That this joint resolution may be cited as the 'Anti-Inflation Act of 1948.'

"FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 5. (a) Existing inflationary conditions, caused primarily by World War II and continuing as an aftermath of that war, threaten further increases in the cost of living in the United States.

"(b) Certain materials and facilities continue in short supply at home and abroad as a result of the war and the need for strengthening the national security. There is a danger that these scarce materials and facilities will not be available for essential purposes, at home and abroad, and that the demand for these scarce materials and facilities will result in further inflationary rises in prices.

"(c) Such inflationary conditions and maldistributions of scarce materials, unless corrected, will impair the standard of living in the United States, disrupt commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, produce subsequent deflation and widespread unemployment, undermine national security, and obstruct the foreign policy of the United States.

"(d) In view of the foregoing, the Congress hereby declares that it is necessary, in order to promote the flow of commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, provide for the national security, provide for the general welfare, and implement the foreign policy of the United States, that the Federal Government pursue a comprehensive and coordinated anti-inflation program, including the fixing of maximum prices for commodities which substantially affect the cost of living or the cost of industrial or agricultural production and the further regulation of rents and credit, protection of the domestic economy from the injury which would result from maldistribution of scarce materials and facilities which basically affect industrial and agricultural production or the cost of living, and promotion of the production at home or abroad of such materials critically needed in the United States.

"TITLE I—PRICES AND WAGES

"TIME LIMIT; APPLICABILITY

"SEC. 101. (a) The provisions of this title, and all regulations, orders, price schedules, and requirements thereunder, shall terminate on June 30, 1950, or upon the date specified in a proclamation by the President, or a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this title is not necessary, whichever date is the earlier; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred prior to such termination date, the provisions of this title and such regulations, orders, price schedules, and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense.

"(b) The provisions of this title shall be applicable to the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

"ORGANIZATION

"SEC. 102. The President shall designate the departments, agencies, or officials of the Government that shall exercise the power, authority, and discretion conferred by this title. For the purposes of this title, the departments, agencies, or officials of the Government so designated are referred to as the Department.

"CONDITIONS FOR ESTABLISHING MAXIMUM PRICES

"SEC. 103. The Department may establish a maximum price for a commodity in conformance with section 104 whenever in its judgment the following conditions are satisfied:

"(a) The price of such commodity substantially affects the cost of living or the cost of industrial or agricultural production;

"(b) The price of such commodity has risen or threatens to rise at least 20 percent above the price therefor prevailing in June 1946 (or, if the Department determines that the prices prevailing in June 1946 were not generally representative because of abnormal or subnormal market conditions or other cause, then above the prices prevailing during the month or consecutive months of the calendar year 1946 in which, in the judgment of the Department, the prices for such commodity were generally representative);

"(c) The regulation of the price of such commodity is practicable and enforceable; and

"(d) The public interest will be served by such regulation.

"REGULATIONS AND PRICE STANDARDS

"SEC. 104. (a) Whenever in the judgment of the Department the conditions set forth in section 103 for the establishment of a maximum price have been satisfied, it may by regulation or order establish such maximum price or maximum prices as, in its judgment, will be generally fair and equitable and will aid in controlling inflation. So far as practicable and reasonable, any maximum price for the commodity or commodities included in such regulation or order shall be established at the level of the prices prevailing on August 1, 1948 (or if, in the case of any commodity, the prevailing prices on such date are not generally representative because of abnormal or seasonal market conditions or other cause, then to the prices prevailing during the nearest 1-month period in which, in the judgment of the Department, the prices for such commodity are generally representative): *Provided*, That, in establishing any maximum price, the Department (1) shall make adjustments in the prices prevailing on August 1, 1948 (or in the nearest generally representative 1-month period), for such relevant factors as it may determine and deem to be of general applicability; and (2) may consider, among other factors which it deems relevant, speculative fluctuations, general increases or decreases in costs of production, distribution, and transportation, and general increases or decreases since June 30, 1946, in profits earned by sellers of the commodity or commodities: *Provided further*, That no such regulation or order shall contain any provisions requiring the determination of costs otherwise than in accordance with established accounting methods.

"(b) Before issuing any regulation or order under the foregoing provisions of this section, the Department shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with persons who, in the judgment of the Board, are representative of the industry which will be affected by such regulation or order, and shall give consideration to their recommendations. In the case of any commodity for which a maximum price has been established, the Department shall, at the request of any substantial portion of the industry subject to such maximum price, regulation, or order of the Department, appoint an industry advisory committee, or committees, either national or regional or both, consisting of such number of representatives of the industry as in the judgment of the Department may be necessary in order to constitute a committee truly representative of the industry, or of the industry in such region, as the case may be. The Department shall from time to time advise and consult with the committee with respect to the regulation or order, and with respect to the form thereof, and classifications, differentiations, and adjustments therein. The committee may make such recommendations to the Department as it deems advisable, and such recommendations shall be considered by the Department.

"(c) After the issuance of any regulation or order establishing a maximum price under subsection (a), the Department may on its own initiative and shall at the request of the industry advisory committee, established under subsection (b), review and, when necessary, revise the maximum price established by such regulation or order. In making such review the Department shall consider, among other factors which it deems relevant, general increases or decreases in costs of production, distribution, and transportation, and general increases or decreases since June 30, 1946, in profits earned by sellers of the commodity or commodities.

"(d) Every regulation or order issued under the foregoing provisions of this section shall be accompanied by a statement of the considerations involved in the issuance of such regulation or order.

"(e) Whenever in the judgment of the Department such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this joint resolution, it may, without regard to the foregoing provisions of this section, issue temporary regulations or orders establishing as a maximum price or maximum prices the price or prices prevailing with respect to any commodity or commodities during such 5-day period subsequent to June 1, 1948, as the Department shall specify; but any such temporary regulation or order shall be effective for not more than 90 days, and may be replaced by a regulation or order issued under the foregoing provisions of this section.

"(f) Whenever in the judgment of the Department such action would be necessary or proper in order to assist it in determining whether to establish a maximum price under subsection (a) or subsection (e) of this section, it may, without regard to the foregoing provisions of this section, issue regulations or orders providing that sellers of a commodity may not increase the price of such commodity except after such notice to the Department, not exceeding 30 days, as the Department may specify. During such period, the Department may require any seller who has filed such a notice to appear at a public hearing to be held by the Department with respect to the need for and the effect of such price increase. Failure of the Department to establish a maximum price before the end of any such period shall not preclude it in any way from establishing at a later date a maximum price lower than the price specified in such notice of increase.

"(g) The Department shall make an adjustment for hardship to a seller caused by a maximum price established under this section, if in the judgment of the Department such adjustment is necessary to prevent gross inequities and can be made without impairing compliance with the provision of this title.

"(h) Any regulation or order under this or any other section may be established in such form and manner, may contain such classifications and differentiations, and may provide for such exceptions and adjustments, as in the judgment of the Department are necessary or proper in the public interest and in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, and may be modified or rescinded by the Department at any time.

"(i) Whenever in the judgment of the Department such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this title, it may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit manipulative practices (including practices relating to changes in form or quality) or hoarding, in connection with any commodity which in its judgment are equivalent to, or are likely to result in, price increases inconsistent with the purposes of this title.

"(j) Regulations, orders, and requirements under this title may contain such provisions as the Department deems necessary, to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof.

"AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"SEC. 105. (a) The maximum price established for any agricultural commodity shall be a price which will reflect to producers of such commodity not less than the parity price, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, or, in case a comparable price has been determined for such commodity under subsection (b), such comparable price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials); and no maximum price shall be established or maintained hereunder for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefor equal to the parity price or comparable price, as so determined.

"(b) For purposes of this title, in the case of any agricultural commodity other than the basic crops corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, the Secretary shall determine and publish a comparable price whenever he finds, after investigation and public hearing, that the production and consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for basic commodities: *Provided*, That comparable prices heretofore determined by the Secretary may be used for the purposes of this title.

"(c) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or affect the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, or to invalidate any marketing agreement, license, or order, or any provision thereof or amendment thereto, heretofore or hereafter made or issued under the provisions of such act.

"(d) Wherever a maximum price has been established, under this title or otherwise, with respect to any fresh fruit or any fresh vegetable, the Department from time to time shall adjust such maximum price in order to make appropriate allowances for substantial reductions in merchantable crop yields, unusual increases in costs of production, and other factors which result from hazards occurring in connection with the production and marketing of such commodity.

"WAGES

"SEC. 106. (a) The adjustment of wages, salaries, or other benefits (hereafter referred to as wages) through collective bargaining to reflect increases in productivity, to protect and improve standards of living, and to afford an equitable distribution between wages and profits, is in accord with the policy of the United States. This title is not intended to modify this policy, but rather to further the objective of preventing price increases which tend to destroy economic stability and correspondingly to destroy the value of the wage earner's dollar.

"(b) There is hereby established a Temporary Wage Board, hereinafter referred to as the 'Board.' The Board shall be composed of six members, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two of whom, including the Chairman and the Vice Chairman, shall be representative of the public, two representative of employees, and two representative of employers. For each member of the Board the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an alternate member who shall serve as a member of the Board in the absence of his principal. The Board shall be within the Department of Labor, but shall be independent of the Department of Labor with respect to its policies and decisions.

"(c) An increase in wages may be granted by an employer who produces or processes a commodity for which a maximum price is in effect under this title. To the extent that such wage increase is found by the Board to be necessary for the purposes specified in subsection (d), it shall be taken into account for the purpose of adjustments in the maximum price of such commodity. Otherwise, such wage increase shall not be taken into account for the purpose of such adjustments until 6 months have elapsed after the wage increase has become effective. A wage increase may be referred to the Board by an employer at any time for a determination under subsection (d).

"(d) When an increase in wages has been referred to the Board, it shall be the duty of the Board to determine whether the wage increase or any portion thereof is necessary for one or more of the following purposes: (1) To compensate for increases in the cost of living or prevent lowering of living standards, or (2) to correct inequities in the wage structure, or (3) to correct substandards of living, or (4) to maintain essential production at levels certified by the Department. The decision of the Board shall be rendered within 30 days after receipt of the application unless the time is extended by the Board with the approval of the Anti-Inflation Coordinator provided for in section 502. Decisions shall be by the majority vote of the Board.

"(e) Members of the Board shall receive necessary traveling expenses and a per diem of $25 on such days as they are actually engaged in performance of duties in pursuance of this joint resolution in lieu of actual expenses. The public members of the Board shall also be compensated on a when-actually-employed basis at $25 per day.

"(f) Service of an individual as a member of such Board shall not be considered as service bringing such individual within the provisions of section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. 198 and 203), or of section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (41 U. S. C. 119), or of title 18, United States Code, section 281, 283, or 284 (Public Law 772, 80th Cong.), or of section 190 of Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"(g) In the exercise of the authority conferred upon the Board by this joint resolution it may issue rules, regulations, and orders, and include therein such provisions as it finds are reasonably necessary to exercise its functions hereunder.

"PROHIBITIONS

"SEC. 107. (a) It shall be unlawful, regardless of any contract, agreement, lease, or other obligation heretofore or hereafter entered into, for any person to sell or deliver any commodity, or in the course of trade or business to buy or receive any commodity, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of any regulation or order under this title (including the portions of the Emergency Price Control Act, as amended, which are incorporated in this title), or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the United States, or for any adviser or consultant to the Department in his official capacity, to disclose, otherwise than in the course of official duty, any information obtained under this title, or to use any such information for personal benefit.

"(c) Nothing in this title shall be construed to require any person to sell any commodity.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 108. (a) The Department may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as are necessary in order to carry out the functions and duties under this title, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Department may utilize the services of Federal, State, and local agencies and may utilize and establish such regional, local, and other agencies, and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Department in any case in any court.

"(b) The Department or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all the powers under this title in any place.

"INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 109. (a) The Department acting under this title shall have the authority which was vested in, and be subject to the limitations which were imposed upon, the Price Administrator by the following sections and subsections of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, namely:

"(1) Section 201 (c) (relating to authority for expenditures).

"(2) Section 201 (d) (relating to authority to issue regulations).

"(3) Section 202 (relating to investigations; records, and reports).

"(4) Section 203 (relating to procedure on protests): *Provided, however*, That such protests may be filed only within a period of 60 days after the issuance of the protested regulation or order; or, if such protest is based solely on grounds arising after the issuance of such regulation or order, within a period of 60 days after such grounds arise.

"(5) Section 204 (relating to review in the Emergency Court of Appeals); and the Emergency Court of Appeals already created shall continue in existence.

"(6) Section 205 (relating to enforcement); except that subsection (b) of section 205 (relating to criminal penalties) shall not be in effect and section 310 of the present act is provided in lieu thereof, and except further that subsection (f) of section 205 (relating to licensing and revocation or suspension of licenses) shall not continue in effect.

"(b) The sections and subsections listed in subsection (a) of this section are hereby incorporated herein by reference, the same as though set forth in full, and shall be applied to this title with such changes in designation of provisions as may be appropriate and with any exceptions specified in said subsection (a). Specifically, but not exclusively, any references in said incorporated sections or subsections to a regulation or order issued under section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be construed to mean a regulation or order issued under section 304 of this title and references in said incorporated sections or subsections to a violation of section 4 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be construed to mean a violation of section 307 of this title.

"ENFORCEMENT

"SEC. 110. Any person who willfully violates any provision of section 107 of this act, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under section 304 of this title or section 202 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Department has reason to believe that any person is liable to punishment under this section, it shall refer the matter to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, after such investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as he may deem necessary, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

"QUARTERLY REPORT

"SEC. 111. The Department from time to time, but not less frequently than once every 90 days, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this title. If the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session, such reports shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate, or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 112. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'sale' includes sales, dispositions, exchanges, leases, and other transfers, and contracts and offers to do any of the foregoing. The terms 'sell,' 'selling,' 'seller,' 'buy,' and 'buyer' shall be construed accordingly.

"(b) The term 'price' means the consideration demanded or received in connection with the sale of a commodity.

"(c) The term 'commodity' means commodities, articles, products, and materials (except materials furnished for publication by any press association or feature service, books, magazines, motion pictures, periodicals and newspapers, other than as waste or scrap), and it also includes services rendered otherwise than as an employee in connection with the processing, distribution, storage, installation, repair, or negotiation of purchases or sales of a commodity, or in connection with the operation of any service establishment for the servicing of a commodity: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize the regulation of (1) compensation paid by an employer to any of his employees, except as provided in section 107 or (2) rates charged by any common carrier or other public utility, or (3) rates charged by any person engaged in the business of selling or underwriting insurance, or (4) rates charged by any person engaged in the business of operating or publishing a newspaper, periodical, or magazine, or operating a radio-broadcasting station, a motion-picture or other theater enterprise, or outdoor advertising facilities, or (5) rates charged for any professional services.

"(d) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing, and includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of any of the foregoing.

"(e) The term 'maximum price,' as applied to prices of commodities, means the maximum lawful price for such commodities. Maximum prices may be formulated in terms of prices, margins, commissions, fees and other charges, and allowances.

"(f) The term 'documents' includes records, books, accounts, correspondence, memoranda, and other documents, and drafts and copies of any of the foregoing.

"(g) The term 'district court' means any district court of the United States, and the United States Court for any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and the term 'circuit courts of appeals' includes the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

"TITLE II—PRIORITIES AND ALLOCATIONS

"SEC. 201. In order to effectuate the policies set forth in section 5 of this joint resolution, section 2 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended, is reenacted and paragraphs (1) and (2) thereof are amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. (a) (1) (A) In order to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948, the President may, in his discretion, assign priority to deliveries under any contract or order over deliveries under any other contract or order, and he may require acceptance of and performance under such contracts or orders in preference to other contracts or orders for the purpose of assuring such priority, whenever the President finds that any of the following circumstances exists:

"'(i) The prompt filling of the contract or order is needed to bring about an early increase, or prevent a substantial reduction or break-down, in the production of a material or facility, at home or abroad, which is critically needed in the domestic economy and which basically affects industrial or agricultural production or the cost of living;

"'(ii) The prompt filling of the contract or order is essential to the national security; or

"'(iii) The head of the agency designated by the President for this purpose certifies that the prompt filling of the order is of high public importance and essential to carrying out the foreign policy of the United States; and the head of the appropriate agency designated by the President to act under subparagraph (B) certifies that proposed action will not have an unduly adverse effect upon the domestic economy of the United States.

"'(B) Whenever the President in his discretion determines that a shortage in the supply of any material or facility which basically affects industrial or agricultural production or the cost of living is interfering or may interfere with the fulfillment of the over-all requirements for the defense of the United States or for carrying out the foreign policy of the United States or is resulting in an adverse distribution of such material or facility which is causing or threatens to cause a failure to fulfill requirements essential to the domestic economy or which will contribute to inflationary price increases, the President may allocate such material or facility, in such manner, upon such conditions, and to such extent as he may deem necessary or appropriate in the public interest and to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948; and he may assign priority to deliveries of such material or facility under any contract or order over deliveries under any other contract or order, and may require acceptance of and performance under such contract or order for the purpose of assuring such priority, in order to carry out such policies.

"'(C) The allocation authority granted in paragraph (B) shall not be initially exercised with respect to any material or facility except after a public hearing held upon reasonable notice, including publishing a notice in the Federal Register, and after such investigation as the President may deem appropriate: *Provided*, (i) That such hearing or notice is not required where the President finds that a hearing or notice would defeat the purpose of the proposed allocation by tending to promote hoarding, excessive consumption, excessive speculation, or other action contrary to the public interest in anticipation of the exercise of allocation authority; and (ii) that the authority to allocate authorized under this section at the time of the enactment of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948, may, without prior hearing, continue to be exercised subject to the terms and conditions then provided.

"'(D) Whenever the President deems it necessary, in order to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948, he may restrict and control inventories of any scarce material which basically affects industrial or agricultural production or the cost of living, so as to carry out such policies, without regard to the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C) above, and in so doing he may establish specific inventory limits for different classes of persons and different materials.

"'(E) Discrimination against orders or contracts to which priority is assigned or for which materials or facilities are allocated under this act or under any regulation or order issued under this act, either by charging higher prices for such orders than for other generally comparable orders, or by imposing different terms and conditions for such orders than for other generally comparable orders, is prohibited.

"'(F) The President may issue such rules, regulations, and orders as he may deem necessary to carry out this subsection 2 (a) (1), and any such rules, regulations, and orders may contain such classifications and differentiations and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as in the President's discretion are necessary or proper to carry out the policies set forth in section 2 of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948.

"'(2) This section 2 (a), as amended (including the amendments made by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and section 401 of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948), shall be in force until June 30, 1950, except that the Congress, by concurrent resolution, or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any power, authority, or discretion hereunder. The amendments to subsection 2 (a) (1) made by section 401 of the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948 shall not be construed to amend the Rubber Act of 1948.'

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 202. (a) The President may exercise any part or all of the power, authority, and discretion conferred on him by this title through such department, agency, corporation, or official of the Government, as he may direct.

"(b) Each officer or agency to which the President delegates any of the powers, discretion, and authority conferred by this title shall make a quarterly report, within 30 days after each quarter, to the President and to Congress of its operations under this title. Each such report shall contain (1) a statement of the controls which it exercised under this title during the quarter (2) detailed information as to the manner in which the controls were exercised and the effects of the controls, and (3) a statement of the facts and reasons for the continuance of each of the controls exercised during the quarter.

"MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 203. (a) Title XV, section 1501, of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 1501. Titles I, II, IV, V, VII, and XIV of this act and the amendments to existing laws made by such titles shall remain in force only until March 31, 1947. After the amendments made by any such title cease to be in force, any provisions of law amended thereby shall be in full force and effect as though this act had not been enacted.'

"(b) The repeal of the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, as amended, which is effected by paragraph (a) of this section, is not intended to restrict the powers and authority conferred on the President by said act, it being the intent of the Congress that the

powers and authority conferred on the President by this title include the powers and authority conferred by said act.

"EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROLS

"SEC. 204. Section 6 (d) of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, is amended by striking out 'February 28, 1949' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1950.'

"TITLE III—RENT CONTROL

"REESTABLISHMENT OF MAXIMUM RENTS

"SEC. 301. Section 303 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 is amended to read as follows:

"'Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, he may, by regulation or order, establish such maximum rent or maximum rents for any housing accommodations in a designated defense-rental area or establish or reestablish the regulation of rents in any defense-rental area or portion thereof, as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable. So far as practicable, in establishing any maximum rent for any defense-area housing accommodations, the Housing Expediter shall ascertain and give due consideration to the rents prevailing for such accommodations, or comparable accommodations, on or about April 1, 1941 (or, if prior or subsequent to April 1, 1941, defense activities shall have resulted or threatened to result in increases in rents for housing accommodations in such area inconsistent with the purposes of this act, then on or about a date (not earlier than April 1, 1940), which in the judgment of the Housing Expediter does not reflect such increases), and he shall make adjustments for such relevant facts as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability in respect of such accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within such defense-rental area.'

"RECONTROL OF PERMANENT HOTEL RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND NEW CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 302. Section 202 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended in the following respects:

"(a) Clause (1) of paragraph (c) is amended by striking out the first word 'those' and inserting after the word 'accommodations' the following: '(other than dwelling units occupied by nontransient tenants)':

"(b) By striking out clause (3) of paragraph (c) in its entirety and renumbering clause (4) as clause (3).

"RECONTROL OF DECONTROLLED UNITS

"SEC. 303. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(h) For housing accommodations not included within the definition of "controlled housing accommodations" as this definition read prior to amendment by the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948 the maximum rent shall be the higher of (1) the rent generally prevailing in the defense-rental area for comparable accommodations on the maximum rent date for such area, plus due allowance, where new construction is involved, for general increases in the cost of construction in the area from 1939 until date the construction is or was completed; (2) the maximum rent last in effect for such housing accommodations under Federal rent control.'

"TREBLE DAMAGES

"SEC. 304. Section 205 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out from the heading of such section the words 'By Tenants'; and by changing the period at the end of the sentence 'Suit to recover such amount may be brought in any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction within 1 year after the date of such violation' to a colon and inserting: *'Provided*, That if the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received, either fails to institute an action under this subsection within 30 days from the date of the occurrence of the violation or is not entitled for any reason to bring the action, the Housing Expediter may institute such action on behalf of the United States within such 1-year period. If such action is instituted by the Housing Expediter, the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received shall thereafter be barred from bringing an action for the same violation or violations.'

"CRIMINAL SANCTIONS

"SEC. 305. Section 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 206. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of this act, or of any regulation or order or requirement under this act, or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing.

"'(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter any person has engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, he may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such act or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing by the Housing Expediter that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"'(c) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Housing Expediter has reason to believe that any person is liable for punishment under this subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

"'(d) The district courts shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violations of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and concurrently with State and Territorial courts, of all other proceedings under section 205 and subsection (b) of this section. Such criminal proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Such other proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred, or may also be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found. Any such court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of any criminal or other proceedings brought before it under this section. No costs shall be assessed against the Housing Expediter or the United States Government in any proceeding under this act.

"'(e) No person shall be liable for damages or penalties in any Federal, State, or Territorial court, on any grounds for or in respect of anything done or omitted to be done in good faith pursuant to any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder notwithstanding that subsequently such provision, regulation, order, or requirement may be modified, rescinded, or determined to be invalid. In any suit or action wherein a party relies for ground of relief or defense upon this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, the court having jurisdiction of such suit or action shall certify such fact to the Housing Expediter. The Housing Expediter may intervene in any such suit or action.

"'(f) The principal office of the Housing Expediter shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place, and attorneys appointed by the Housing Expediter may appear for and represent the Housing Expediter in any case in any court.

"'(g) The Housing Expediter is authorized to make such studies and investigations, to conduct such hearings, and to obtain such information as he deems necessary or proper to assist him in prescribing any regulation or order under this act, or in the administration and enforcement of this act and regulations thereunder.'

"EVICTIONS

"SEC. 306. Section 209 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 209. Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices or renting or leasing practices (including practices relating to recovery of the possession) in connection with any defense-area housing accommodations, which in his judgment are equivalent to or likely to result in rent increases inconsistent with the purposes of this act.'

"TITLE IV—REGULATION OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES

"SEC. 401. The Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (42 Stat. 998; 49 Stat. 1491; 52 Stat. 205; 54 Stat. 1059), is further amended by inserting at the end of section 4a the following:

"'(5) (A) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the nature or extent of speculative trading on boards of trade causes or threatens to cause sudden or unreasonable fluctuations or unwarranted changes in the price of any commodity, he may prescribe rules and regulations governing the margin to be required with respect to the purchase or sale of any such commodity for future delivery, or the maintenance of a position resulting from such purchase or sale, on or subject to the rules of any board of trade, whether or not designated as a contract market under section 5 of this act.

"'(B) It shall be unlawful for any person to buy or sell, or accept orders for the purchase or sale of any such commodity for future delivery, subject to the rules of any board of trade, or maintain or carry a position resulting from such purchase or sale, unless margin funds or securities are deposited and maintained in compliance with the rules and regulations promulgated under this paragraph (5). No floor broker shall be deemed to have violated this paragraph (5) with respect to any transaction in connection with which he has acted solely in the capacity of floor broker.

"'(C) All money, securities, or property deposited as margin shall be handled by the person receiving such margin in compliance with the requirements of section 4d (2), regardless of whether such person is a futures commission merchant as defined in this act and, for the purpose of this provision, the term "contract market," as used in section 4d (2), shall be deemed to mean board of trade.

"'(D) It shall be unlawful for any person to engage in soliciting or accepting orders for

the purchase or sale of any commodity for future delivery on any board of trade, whether or not such board of trade is designated as a contract market, unless such person shall keep a record in writing showing the date, the parties to such contracts and their addresses, the commodity covered and its price, the terms of delivery, and the amount and kind of margin deposited. Such record shall be kept for a period of 3 years from the date of the transaction and shall at all times be open to the inspection of any representative of the United States Department of Agriculture or the United States Department of Justice.

"'(E) For the purposes of this paragraph (5), the term "commodity" when used in this act includes any agricultural commodity or product or byproduct thereof.

"'(F) For the efficient execution of the provisions of this paragraph (5), the provisions of section 21 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 899), as amended, are made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Agriculture in administering and enforcing the provisions of this paragraph (5) and to any person subject thereto.'

"TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

"PRESIDENTIAL DUTIES

"SEC. 501. (a) The President shall issue such orders and regulations to such departments, independent establishments, and other agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government, including any corporation which is an instrumentality of the United States, as he may deem necessary to provide for the exercise of their powers in a manner to assist in accomplishing the objectives of this joint resolution.

"(b) From time to time but not less frequently than once every 90 days the President shall transmit to the Congress a report on the progress that has been made in controlling inflation and on such legislative action as he may deem necessary or desirable. If the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session, such reports shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate, or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

"ANTI-INFLATION COORDINATOR

"SEC. 502. (a) There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President an Anti-Inflation Coordinator (hereinafter called the 'Coordinator'), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"(b) The Coordinator shall assist the President in the coordination of the anti-inflation activities of the executive agencies exercising powers conferred by this joint resolution and perform such other functions pursuant to this joint resolution as the President may designate. For this purpose the Coordinator shall make or cause to be made such studies, require such reports and information from executive agencies, and consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, as he deems necessary.

"(c) To the fullest extent practicable, the Coordinator shall utilize the facilities and personnel of other executive agencies. Within the limits of funds which may be made available, he may employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out his functions. The Coordinator may appoint not to exceed six deputies, specialists, or other experts without regard to the civil-service laws and may fix their compensation without regard to the classification laws, except that one such person shall be compensated at a rate of $14,000 per annum and five such persons shall be compensated at a rate of $12,000 per annum. All other officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"ANTI-INFLATION ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 503. There is hereby created an Anti-Inflation Advisory Board, the members of which shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. All of the members of the Board shall represent the public interest, but in order that the Board may have the benefit of experience in the matters with which it will deal under this joint resolution, the Board shall include members who have had experience in business management, in agriculture, in matters relating to labor, and in consumer problems.

"(b) The Board shall advise with the Coordinator with respect to the anti-inflation program and make to him such recommendations relating to policies, procedures, and legislation as it may deem necessary.

"(c) Members of the Board shall receive necessary traveling expenses and, in lieu of other necessary expenses, a per diem allowance of $25 for each day spent in actual meetings of the Board or at conferences held upon the call of the Coordinator.

"(d) The provisions of section 106 (f) of this act shall be applicable to members of the Anti-Inflation Advisory Board.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 504. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the joint resolution and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 505. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT INAPPLICABLE

"SEC. 506. Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting after 'Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947,' the following: 'the Anti-Inflation Act of 1948.'

"Amend the title so as to read: 'Joint resolution to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes.'"

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish briefly to explain the purpose of the amendment which I have offered, and I hope I may do so without any interruption while I am going through the amendment for that purpose, in order to save time, because under the limitation of time it is possible to become engaged in a colloquy over one point which may consume all the time I have. Therefore I should appreciate very much if I may be able to follow the course I have suggested.

May I inquire how the time stands now between the two sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has approximately 72 minutes, and the Senator from Washington has approximately 45 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall take such time as may be necessary briefly to explain the purposes of the amendment and the circumstances surrounding its offering and, of course, I shall be charged with such time as I occupy.

The amendment which I have offered is practically the same as the bill which I introduced on July 29 seeking to carry out the President's recommendations in his message to the special session dealing with the subject of inflation. The bill which I introduced contains seven titles. Title I dealt with the control of consumer credit, and title II with bank reserves. Those two titles being the subject matter of the joint resolution now before the Senate, I have eliminated them from the amendment which I have offered. Otherwise the amendment contains the provisions of the bill which I introduced on the 29th of July, and which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, with one or two changes in date and the numbering of sections, which are merely technical changes to conform with the fact that the amendment contains only the remaining titles instead of all the titles originally contained in the bill.

Mr. President, I do not think any of us can deny that there has been and is now a dangerous inflation besetting our country. I do not wish to go into any political argument about who was responsible or who was not responsible for the termination of price controls in 1946. We all know what the record is so far as the Senate was concerned, and how difficult it was to secure, at any time since the end of the war, any extension of price controls. Efforts were made not only to repeal and terminate them, but efforts were made to throw restrictions around the enforcement such as to make it impossible to effect genuine price control. Be that as it may, price controls did effectively terminate in 1946 over a period of weeks, some of them earlier and some of them later.

It is pertinent to inquire—and I think to make a matter of record—what has happened in the matter of prices since 1939 and since 1946. Since June 1939 the consumers' price index for all items has risen 74 percent. On food alone it has risen 129 percent. By far the most rapid increase took place immediately after June 1946 when price controls were relaxed and later terminated.

It is pertinent to inquire what the increase in prices has been, then, since 1946 with no controls of any sort in operation. The increase has been 29 percent for all items entering into the cost of living, but 47 percent for food. So that in 2 years the cost of food to the American family has increased, to be exact, 47 percent, which is not far from a 50-percent increase. The increase since June 1947 a year ago, has been 9 percent for all items entering into the cost of living, and 12 percent for food. Those are official figures which cannot be denied, and they prove conclusively that we have not reached the leveling off process in prices. They are still on their way up. They have increased at a very rapid rate since 1939, and at a relatively more rapid rate since 1946, and they are still increasing.

I realize that there is a difference of opinion among honest men, particularly here in the Senate, in regard to the method by which this continuing spiral of increased prices can be brought to a halt. Surely we cannot allow it to continue during the next 12 months at the rate of increase of the last 12 months.

In my judgment it would be dangerous to our economy if it were allowed to increase at such a rate for as much as 6 months from now, until January, February, or March of next year.

I favor the provisions of the joint resolution before the Senate dealing with consumer credit and bank reserves. They are a part of the program recommended by the President, but only a very small part. While they may be helpful by themselves to a small degree, I think those provisions would be more helpful if tied in with a more effective price-control measure so that the entire picture might be before the administration of any law that Congress enacts, and so that they might be related one to the other in such a way as to make a well-rounded program. It is for that purpose that I have offered the amendment setting up real price control, not through a reestablishment of an OPA, not by establishing any independent agency, but by authorizing the President to designate any department which he may desire, for the purposes of administering the law and enforcing its provisions.

I shall now read the conditions under which price control might be instituted:

SEC. 103. The Department—

Whichever department is designated by the President—

may establish a maximum price for a commodity in conformance with section 304 whenever in its judgment the following conditions are satisfied—

These are the conditions without which no price control can be instituted:

(a) The price of such commodity substantially affects the cost of living or the cost of industrial or agricultural production;

(b) The price of such commodity has risen or threatens to rise at least 20 percent above the price therefor prevailing in June 1946 (or, if the Department determines that the prices prevailing in June 1946, were not generally representative because of abnormal or subnormal market conditions or other cause, then above the prices prevailing during the month or consecutive months of the calendar year 1946 in which, in the judgment of the Department, the prices for such commodity were generally representative);

(c) The regulation of the price of such commodity is practicable and enforceable; and

(d) The public interest will be served by such regulation.

All these conditions, Mr. President, must be satisfied before a department designated by the President may institute price controls. As introduced in the form of a bill the price-control section provided that prices might be set at a level approximating the prices which existed in November 1947. But having in mind from our experience during the 60-day hiatus between the lapse of all price controls and the reenactment of controls 2 months later the difficulty of reestablishing, or rolling back, as we say, prices which have already increased, I have changed that from November 1947 to August 1, 1948, as the date on which approximately the level of prices may be determined in the event the conditions which I have mentioned are satisfied and price control is instituted. So that under the amendment there would be no roll-back in prices beyond the 1st of August 1948.

Of course, the amendment provides for industry committees, as heretofore in the administration of price control, and for public hearings by the department on the request of interested industries before a permanent price control may be instituted. So far as the details of administration are concerned, the department designated by the President would follow somewhat the pattern of the administration processes by which the price control law was administered heretofore. So I shall not go into the details of that matter.

The price-control section deals also with agricultural commodities. It provides that no price can be set for an agricultural commodity at less than parity, which may be determined and is determined under the law from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture. It is a flexible quantity, because it depends upon the cost of purchases by farmers in the conduct of their agricultural enterprises. So that the higher the cost of things they buy, the higher parity is for the articles which they produce.

It also provides that no processed article made in whole or in substantial part from an agricultural product shall be fixed at a price which will not at least reflect parity, and where there is no parity existing, as it is in the basic commodities of cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, a comparable price may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. The price cannot be fixed below the comparable price for articles in the basic law which we enacted some years ago.

The amendment provides also for the fixing of wages. It sets up a temporary wage board which may determine all the elements, including the increase in the cost of living and other elements which may appropriately go into the fixing of wages. It does not interfere with collective bargaining, and it does not deal with the question of the ability or the right to strike. It has no reference whatever to that subject. But it does provide that where an increase in wages has been given without the consent of the temporary wage board, no increase in prices based upon such an increase can be made for 6 months following the effective date of the increase.

The amendment also contains a provision in regard to rents. There are certain administrative provisions which go through the amendment which I shall not undertake now to explain, because it would take more time than I have available, and I could occupy all the time at my disposal if I saw fit to do so, but other Senators desire to speak upon the subject, and I shall take as little time as I can.

The amendment provides for the reimposition of rent controls with respect to permanent quarters in hotels, but not to temporary or transient quarters. It does not apply to motor stations or motor accommodations, such as trailer yards or things of that sort. It applies particularly to the reimposition of controls over permanent quarters in hotels. It provides for recontrol within defense rental areas of houses individually occupied, and it provides also for control over rents brought about by new construction, giving allowance for all increase in the cost of construction since 1939.

It contains the usual enforcement provision.

It provides for priorities and allocations by the department designated by the President in regard to materials in short supply. A priority may be issued in behalf of the fulfillment of a contract over other contracts where the public interest requires it or there is such a shortage in materials subject to contract as to make it desirable that one contract be fulfilled in advance of another, in harmony with the best interests of the country and the economy of the country in regard to the use of materials which are short for any purpose in the manufacture of commodities or in construction.

The power to issue priorities and allocations is circumscribed by what seems to me to be adequate protection and consideration in regard to the use of that authority in giving preference to the use of certain materials. So long as materials are substantially short, so that there is no way by which there can be an equitable allocation for desirable purposes of the material necessary in any given enterprise, or in the entire economy of the country, it seems wise to clothe the President, through the department designated by him, with authority to issue priorities of that sort under certian conditions.

The amendment would also authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to impose margin requirements on the commodity markets of the United States. We know from our experience a year or so ago, growing out of speculation on the commodity market, which affects the cost of living and the price of agricultural commodities, that there was an insistent demand here and outside this Chamber for some better regulation of the requirements for marginal dealings in the commodity markets of the United States. At the present time the board of trade is the arbiter of what the margins may be. It may fix them at any point within its discretion. The amendment would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to impose marginal requirements, even up to 100 percent margin deposits, if it is necessary in his judgment to stabilize the markets in agricultural products or to prevent undue fluctuation in the markets for such commodities.

The amendment would authorize the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint an Anti-inflation Coordinator, who would cooperate with the department designated by the President as the agent through which price control would be enforced.

A little while ago I mentioned the temporary wage board, which would be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The board would be composed of six individuals, two of whom would represent the public. One of the public representatives would be chairman and the other would be vice chairman. Two of the members would represent employers, and two would represent employees. So the temporary wage board of six would be divided equally among the public, the employers, and the employees, so that all interests would be adequately represented.

The provisions of the amendment would automatically terminate on June 30, 1950, unless sooner terminated by proclamation of the President or by concurrent resolution adopted by both Houses of Congress, whichever may be the earlier. So there would be three ways by which this law might terminate—first, automatically by its own terms; second, by proclamation of the President; and third, by concurrent resolution adopted by the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, I do not wish at this juncture to take more of the time allotted to me. I have offered this amendment in good faith. I have offered it because I do not believe, meritorious as are the two provisions now before the Senate in regard to consumer credit and bank reserves, that we can deal with the problem which now faces the American people and our economy, and faces every household in America, without imposing some form of authority similar to that asked for by the President, and similar to that provided for in the amendment which I have offered.

Of course, we do not know whether the President would be required to exercise that authority. I assume we would all naturally hope that the spiral of increases, the inflationary marathon which is now in operation in all parts of our country, without regard for all the elements which have entered into the cause of it, would abate. However, in my judgment we cannot sit idly by and see that marathon continue without endangering the safety of our economy, without endangering even our own national defense to some extent, and without having an impact upon our foreign policy in dealing with the recovery of the world under all the legislation which we have enacted.

I would naturally hope that the price situation would level off and stabilize itself, if possible; but it has not done so. It gives no hope now of doing so, without some artificial method of control. We must all admit that this is an effort to deal with the problem by the imposition of artificial elements, such as price controls of one kind and another. But the President is not required in any given case, or with respect to any given commodity or industry, to exercise the power and authority granted to him in this amendment. He will not be expected to exercise it, and will not, of course, exercise it, unless it is necessary. The very fact that he has the authority, which has been termed a stand-by authority—the very fact that he has this "big stick behind the door," if we may so designate it, might have a salutary and stabilizing influence upon the continuous rise in the prices of commodities and in the cost of living.

It is amazing when we consider the proportion of American families which receive an income of less than $2,000 a year. Approximately half of all the families in America receive less than $2,000 a year. The impact of high prices and inflation—this creeping thing that they cannot themselves individually fight—is affecting more disastrously families with an income of less than $2,000 a year than any others. In that connection I think it ought to be stated that approximately 25 percent of the families of the United States receive less than $1,000 annual income.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have indicated that I prefer not to yield. I am almost through.

The figures which I have given are round numbers. I am not attempting to be exact as to the number of families, but I have given the approximate figures. I shall place the exact figures in the RECORD, because I think they are important. However, I shall not take the time now to refer to my memorandum to obtain them.

We all understand the great difficulty, under normal conditions, no matter what profession or occupation a man may follow, in supporting a family of four. The difficulty is increased in proportion to the increase in the size of the family. It is difficult for us in the Senate to appreciate the position occupied by the head of any family of four who makes even $5,000 a year, or even $10,000 a year, in coping with this creeping thing which we call the increase in the cost of living. But if it is difficult for a $5,000-a-year income to provide the normal necessities—not merely the bare necessities of cheap clothing and scant food, but the ordinary necessities which we think should go into a normal American household—if it is hard for a family with an income of $5,000 a year to get by, how much more difficult and how much more tragic it is for a family of four or five persons to try to live on an income of $2,000 a year or an income of $1,000 a year.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have declined to yield at the moment. I shall be through in a minute or two; and then, when I have concluded, I shall be glad to respond to questions.

Mr. President, although the bank-credit provision and the consumer-credit provision may help a little, I doubt if they will ever reach down to the $1,000 or $2,000 a year families in any effective way that such families can recognize by any process of sight with which I am familiar.

I think the amendment I have offered—and it is offered in good faith, in the hope that it may be adopted—not only will be able to stabilize the cost of living for all these families, but it may stop the increase in the cost of living. Certainly, the cost of living has gone high enough up to now. We do not want the process of reducing the cost of living and stopping the upward spiral of the cost of living to be followed by an economic collapse or debacle, such as we have witnessed in years gone by, as a result of the pyramiding of prices and the inability of the American people and our economy to withstand the impact of such pyramiding and such dangerous conditions.

Mr. President, let me ask how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has approximately 42 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then I shall reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used approximately 30 minutes in the course of his speech.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida wish me to yield to him?

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to speak at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much time would the Senator from Florida like to have?

Mr. PEPPER. Can the Senator spare me 15 minutes?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think so; I have only 42 minutes remaining altogether. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator, and we shall see whether that will suffice.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the face of the national crisis which faces the country concerning high prices and inflation, and in the face of the call of the President, the program of the Republican Party is a response which obviously is too little and too late.

Let it be remembered that the distinguished acting majority leader, the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], in speaking to the Mid-Atlantic Lumbermen's Association on February 5, 1948, said:

> I do not need to remind the membership of this association that it was the Republican leadership in the Senate and in the House that was responsible for ending OPA.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 12, 1946. At that time I offered an amendment for the continuation of OPA, as it had existed in the past, until June 30, 1947.

In offering that amendment, I received the support of one Republican Member of the Senate—the distinguished and able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—and I was also supported by 21 Democratic Senators. I was opposed by 31 Republican Senators. So it is very clear that the record confirms the claim of the Republican Party that it killed OPA.

In June of 1946, when that casualty occurred, the price index was 133.3. In June 1948 that index has reached 171.7, or an increase of 38 points, or a percentage increase of 29. In other words, the increase in the cost of living index has been four times as much since OPA was killed in June 1946 as it was from May 1943, when effective price controls took effect, to June 1946, when the Republican leadership, as it claims, killed OPA.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator please repeat those figures?

Mr. PEPPER. I have only a limited time; but I say that the increase in the price index was from 133.3 in June 1946 to 171.7 in June 1948, an increase of 38 points, or about 29 percent.

Mr. President, corporate profits after taxes, a matter close to the Republican heart, in June 1946 were $12,800,000,000 a year. By 1947, with no OPA, they had reached $18,100,000,000; and for the year ending March 31, 1948, they have reached $19,200,000,000. In other words, since the OPA was killed, an event about which

the Republican leadership boasts, corporate profits have increased 50 percent.

Food prices have increased during the same period 47 percent. Let it be remembered that over 50 percent of the poor families' budgets goes for food for the family.

What has happened to wages and salaries in private industry, the means by which the masses of the people of the United States live? What have they done? In 1946 they were $91,000,000,000. In 1947 they were $104,700,000,000. In 1948, they were $111,100,000,000—an increase of 23 percent from 1946 to 1948 or less than half of the rate of increase of corporate profits since the killing of OPA by the Republican leadership. And remember 40 percent of the increase of the poor man's income went to buy the food he had to have, at a dearer price.

Naturally, higher prices and relatively falling wages and salaries of the people affected the people's savings. In 1946, for example, the people's savings were $14,800,000,000. By the end of 1947 they had declined to $10,900,000,000.

Let me state some of the effects of higher prices upon the people, given by the head of the public welfare board of my State, Mr. Leland Hiatt. On January 18, 1948, Mr. Hiatt said—I quote from the Tampa Sunday Tribune, January 18, 1948:

> In reporting the heavy increase in the number of applications, Hiatt said 49,215 persons were receiving old-age assistance at the end of 1946, but there were 55,890 recipients at the end of 1947.

He also said the increase in the number of children on relief almost doubled in 1947 over 1946; and he said the number of blind on relief also increased sharply in 1947 over 1946. Then Mr. Hiatt concluded—I quote from the article mentioned:

> The increase in applications was explained by Hiatt, who said many persons who were able to get by on their limited incomes in previous years, now need supplemental financial aid, due to the high cost of living.

Naturally, Mr. President, the people who had, in effect, lowered incomes, due to higher prices, first had to exhaust their savings, and then had to borrow. So the borrowings of the people increased from $10,200,000,000 in 1946 to $13,300,000,000 in 1947.

The next obvious step the people had to take was to cash in their bonds; and so we find that, as to the $100 War Savings bonds, which were bought by the little man or the little woman, the ratio of bonds turned in to sales increased from 23 percent in 1945 to 87 percent in 1946 and 136 percent in the first 6 months of 1947, and for smaller denominations of savings bonds the increase in these ratios was even greater.

But, Mr. President, nothing could better tell the story of where the Republican interest is, and, according to the Biblical references, therefore, where its heart is, than in the tax structure of the country. In 1939 individuals paid 25 percent of Federal income taxes. In the same year, corporations paid 23 percent. Mind you, Mr. President, 25 percent was paid by individuals, 23 percent by corporations. But in 1948, with the Republican tax bill in force, the figures changed. Individuals paid, not 25 percent, but 50 percent of all the income taxes paid to the American Government, while the corporate contribution shrank from 23 percent to 21 percent.

As between individuals, Mr. President, it is the same old story. In 1939 individuals making less than $5,000 a year contributed 9.8 percent of all Federal income taxes. In 1948, after the Republican tax bill was in effect, they contributed, not 9.8 percent, but 51 percent of all the Federal income taxes, while those over $5,000 in income in 1939 paid 90 percent of the Federal income taxes contributed by individuals, but in 1948 after the Republican tax bill was in effect, their share—that is, those receiving over $5,000 in income—had shrunk to 49 percent.

So you see, Mr. President, that what we face today is the Republican Party wedded to the privileged few and serving their interests, and beating down and down and down in ratio to corporate profits the wages and the salaries, the standard of living in the American home.

Mr. President, we come here to the particular legislation before the Senate. It has three parts to it: Consumer-credit control and increases in Federal Reserve ratios and member bank Reserve ratios. That was called for by the President in 1947. Legislation covering consumer-credit control was passed by the Senate in December 1947, after it had expired on November 1, 1947, and lingered in the House of Representatives until this special session, with no action taken. The other portion of the Republican bill will mean little if anything in lowering high prices. So, Mr. President, the story is the same as in the past. The special interests are served, and the public interest is disserved by the Republican leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the benefit of the occupants of the galleries, the Chair makes the announcement that any demonstrations whatever in the galleries are strictly contrary to the rules of the United States Senate. The rules will be enforced. Therefore no further demonstrations will be permitted by the occupants of the galleries.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news dispatch headed "Taft advances new price-cut plan—eat less," by Robert C. Albright, which was published in the Washington Post on September 13, 1947.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Washington Post, September 13, 1947]

TAFT ADVANCES NEW PRICE-CUT PLAN—"EAT LESS"—OPENS WESTERN TOUR WITH PLEA FOR VOLUNTARY BELT-TIGHTENING

(By Robert C. Albright)

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF., September 12.—Senator ROBERT A. TAFT today opened his tour of the west coast with a suggestion that people "eat less and eat less extravagantly."

Asserting the price rise may well top all other questions, including the labor act, as a 1948 campaign issue, he said return of price controls isn't the answer.

Instead, he suggested "voluntary" reductions in domestic food consumption as a partial solution.

TAFT briefly discussed prices, foreign policy, and a wide range of other issues at a press conference here.

Then he plunged into a vigorous defense of the Taft-Hartley Act and States' rights in two separate panel discussions before the California State Bar Association.

TAFT IS BOOED

TAFT was booed by some 200 A. F. of L. and CIO union pickets as he entered the Civil Auditorium tonight.

The pickets wore signs reading, Repeal the Slave Labor Act and Taft for President, Ha Ha.

They made an opening for Senator JAMES MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, speaking against TAFT. TAFT arrived and moved unmolested through the break MURRAY had made. TAFT grinned at the boos and catcalls.

Welcomed to California last night by Governor Warren, and other State GOP leaders, a jovial, laughing TAFT, contrasting with the often stern "boss" of the Senate, teamed twice in 1 day with Indiana's CHARLES A. HALLECK, House majority leader.

HALLECK, often rumored a Thomas E. Dewey ally, paired with TAFT against Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, and Representative RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana, both administration Democrats, in the panel discussions.

In the bar association debate, TAFT cited last Tuesday's special election in Pennsylvania's Eighth Congressional District as evidence of his contention that the labor law cannot be made a successful issue.

Backing up TAFT, HALLECK also termed the law "fair and moderate." He said it had already belied "vilifying" charges of labor leaders that it would enslave labor, destroy unions and undermine collective bargaining.

MURRAY and MADDEN bitterly replied that the act was punitive, discriminatory, and has already "turned back the clock."

But it was TAFT's earlier free-for-all press conference, with no topics barred, that topped the day's news in the postseason quiet of this beach resort town.

"I would be very loath to return to price controls," TAFT told newsmen. "It would mean a return of the black market that existed when OPA was in operation. I question whether it would be an effective means of dealing with the price problem."

Saying the price rise is partly attributable to the big domestic demand, influenced by tremendous domestic consumption, he recalled Herbert Hoover once proposed people "save food and eat less." TAFT said he agreed. "People are buying it, and have money to buy," he said. "True, a lot of people can only get just enough, but many others can save food by eating less. They should eat less meat and eat less extravagantly."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask to have printed a telegram received by me from the president and secretary of the chamber of commerce, and the president and secretary of the merchants association, both of Dunedin, Fla.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUNEDIN, FLA., *July 28, 1948.*

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The executive boards of Dunedin Chamber of Commerce and the Dunedin Merchants Association met in joint session July 27, 1948, for the express purpose of discussing present inflationary trends in all commodi-

ties. We are cognizant of the political significance of President Truman's call for special session of Congress. We are also cognizant of the political significance, the threat by the Republican-controlled Congress to recess immediately. We believe that taxpayers resent being a political football. That present food prices are of no benefit to the retailer, and a hardship on the consumer. Therefore, the following resolution was unanimously approved.

Resolved, That the present special session of Congress, as duly elected Representatives of the people, cease playing politics and remain in session until corrective legislation is passed pegging all food prices and if necessary reviving OPA.

Yours truly,

THOMAS R. HOOD,
President, Chamber of Commerce.
MRS. VERA L. WILLIAMSON,
Secretary, Chamber of Commerce.
JAMES W. NOLAN,
President, Merchants Association.
R. A. BERKIHISER,
Secretary, Merchants Association.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I desire to submit an amendment to the pending measure, which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Connecticut that there is an amendment now pending, namely, the one offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut consequently will be received and will lie upon the table for the present.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, it is hardly necessary to point out that the American people are most worried and concerned about high prices. Our own experiences, and public opinion polls, have provided that information. It is our obligation, as representatives of the people, to do everything in our power to relieve them of the dangers inherent in inflationary living costs.

Because it is the one item that we cannot postpone or do without, food is the most important element in the high cost of living. About 30 percent of the national food budget is accounted for by meat and we know that the present prices of meat preclude thousands of families from having an adequate supply, and require most Americans to pay more than they can afford for the meat they use.

Whether the high cost of meat is due to the Government price program and subsidies or whether it is due to the fact that the President pointed out the other day when he said the farmers should be grateful to the Democratic Party for providing an increase in income from two and one-half billion in 1933 to about eighteen billion in 1947, or whether it is due to exorbitant profits on the part of distributors, or whether it is due to the cost of other materials and commodities, is open to argument. But the American people are not so much concerned about the cause as they are about effecting a cure.

Between August 15, 1939, and June 15, 1948, the price of meat to the consumer has risen 167.5 percent.

I should like here to point out, Mr. President, that a part of that increase occurred under OPA. We are often apt to shut our eyes to that fact in this political atmosphere, but, in spite of the fact that during the war OPA had put a very heavy lid upon all food prices, nevertheless OPA was compelled to increase them in order to attempt to get an adequate, or what proved then to be an inadequate, supply. Even since a year ago, it has risen 18 percent. Last week, between July 23 and July 30, the price of hogs and steers per 100 pounds jumped about $1. The production of meat has dropped since 1943 from 24,500,000,000 pounds in 1943 to an estimated 21,000,000,000 pounds in 1948.

I may point out here, Mr. President, that the recent order issued by the Department of Agriculture, which is calculated to bring more meat from the ranges into the market, in my humble judgment in the long run may add something to our supply now, but may dangerously interefere with the breeding animals we shall need for the next year and the year thereafter. Having in mind also from my own experience on the farm as a small boy that a meat animal is not produced in 60 days.

During the same period, the civilian per capita consumption has increased an estimated 4 pounds. Obviously, there is a tremendous pressure on the meat supply, but it is interesting to note that presumably because of increasing prices, the civilian per capita consumption which reached its peak in 1947, will probably be reduced about 12 pounds per capita during 1948. That is not because people choose to buy less meat, but because they cannot afford to buy as much as they did in 1944 or 1945 or 1946 or 1947.

Mr. President, I appreciate that it is highly improbable that this Congress will want to adopt any measures imposing price controls or price ceilings. It is my own humble judgment that a vast number, if not a vast majority, of the American people have demonstrated that they were so thoroughly dissatisfied with price controls and the OPA in 1946 they would not want to see them reimposed. On the other hand, Mr. President, I do not believe that this Congress can afford to adjourn without taking some measure looking to the future as it concerns the price of meat.

We have two standing committees in the House and Senate, the Banking and Currency Committees of the respective Houses, concerned with matters of this kind. My amendment, Mr. President, would ask the chairmen of these committees, or direct the chairmen of these committees to set up a permanent committee with a staff to watch meat prices.

In my opinion, several things would be accomplished by such a survey. In the first place, I may say very frankly that in the confusion of the information and material we have now available to us, I myself would be reluctant to say that the President should have, or that anybody else should have, the opportunity to impose price controls. I do not think we know enough about it. I think that is unfortunate, because in the anti-inflation bill which was passed by the Congress in December 1947, and signed by the President, there was a complete and adequate program provided, whereby the President and the administration, with its many agencies, could have provided us with this information. They could have provided us with this information last January or February, or at any other time we were in regular session.

But the President and the administration have seen fit completely to ignore the procedure outlined in the bill. So we do not have and have not had, pursuant to the provisions of the bill, specific recommendations as to how to deal with this one specific item. That, Mr. President, is what the President asked for in his special message to the Congress in special session last fall.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I will say to the able Senator that I am very much interested in his amendment. As a matter of fact I have on the desk, to be called up, an amendment dealing not only with meat, but with all consumer commodities. I should be very glad to have the Senator read and consider my amendment. As a matter of fact, I expect to offer a substitute for my amendment. The substitute is similar to a measure which is pending in the House today and which deals with the same subject of creating a committee to consider the matter.

Mr. BALDWIN. I think meat is a special case, and I think there should be a special committee which would gather the facts so that, if necessary, we could return after the election, when we would not be completely surrounded by a 100 percent political atmosphere, and deal with the subject in a factual way.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington wish to yield time?

Mr. CAIN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I send to the desk, to lie upon the table, an amendment which I have designated "Amendment No. 2." Its contents will appear on the desk of each Senator. It is entitled as a House joint resolution. I have changed the title and the heading of the joint resolution to make it an amendment. I make this explanation so that the Senators may know the contents of the amendment which I now send to the desk and, at the proper time, will call up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, with regard to the amendment which I have at the desk regarding the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine, to be offered to the pending bill, I find it is not in conformity with the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on yesterday.

In view of this fact, Mr. President, I shall not offer it to the Senate for action. I wish to say, however, that I think the Senate has been highly inconsiderate of the wishes of the American people and the will of the House of Representatives in not acting on the subject of the repeal of the unjust taxes imposed on oleomargarine. I hope the Senate and the House will take up this matter at the beginning of the next session and that satisfactory legislation will be passed by the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD some remarks on the subject of oleomargarine and the repeal of the taxes on that commodity, which I had prepared for delivery, but, because of the limitation of time, under the unanimous-consent agreement, I shall not be able to make at this time.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is evident that Congress will go home without final action on H. R. 2245, the measure proposing repeal of Federal antimargarine legislation. That bill is now pending on the Senate Calendar. It passed the House by an overwhelming vote, was reported unanimously by the Senate Finance Committee and undoubtedly would be approved by the Senate if it came to a vote here.

I feel that the leadership of the Senate erred in not bringing the bill up in the closing days of the regular session or at the special session which is drawing to a close. I think everyone will agree that there is extraordinary interest in this measure. The mail on the subject is evidence of that fact. I made a speech on this issue last December and have made several subsequent speeches. As a result, I have received more than 1,000 letters about margarine from every State in the Union. Very few of these letters criticized my stand. I also would like to state that the contents of the letters were such that almost all of them clearly were written by housewives and others genuinely interested in this question.

At the next session of Congress—if there is no other special session—the attempt to repeal the Federal anti-margarine legislation must start all over again. Bills will have to be introduced in both the House and Senate and, since in theory, the tax on margarine is a revenue measure, the House will act first. In the past, the House Agriculture Committee, to which House margarine bills are referred, has refused to report any bill proposing repeal or modification of the Federal antimargarine laws. As you know, the House committee voted last spring to table all margarine legislation for the remainder of the Eightieth Congress. H. R. 2245 came before the House through a discharge petition, an unusual procedure. Ordinarily, the House abides by the decision of its major committees. It is only when the House feels that a committee is thwarting the will of the Members that a measure is taken away from the committee and acted upon by the House itself. Such an action obviously is a rebuke to the committee involved.

I am hopeful that the House Agriculture Committee will take into account the will of the House and will promptly report a bill to repeal the antimargarine laws when the next session begins. For this issue is not dead. I predict that there will be the same intense interest in the question during the next Congress that there was during the Eightieth Congress. Furthermore, I predict passage during the Eighty-first Congress of a bill to repeal the Federal antimargarine laws. I intend to do all that I can toward passage.

In so doing, I have in mind, of course, the fact that margarine is made primarily from cottonseed oil and soybean oil. Both cottonseed and soybeans are major products of my State. Yet, I have another and more impelling motive in trying to repeal the Federal antimargarine laws. I think these laws are wrong. I believe their presence on the statute books violate fundamental principles of our economic system and of democracy itself.

For 160 years this country has been justly proud of its principles of political equality and free markets economically. It constitutes the largest free trade area in the world. No Fourth of July oration is complete without mention of free enterprise and free markets.

We have not always been equal to all the fine words we have said, but by and large we have lived up to them. For nearly a hundred years, until 1886, the national Government had never undertaken to erect an internal tariff against one industry and one group of American producers in favor of another industry and another group of American producers.

And yet, in that year when the first Federal antimargarine law was enacted, we broke that precedent. And for 62 years that unwise legislation has been on the statute books.

It was a new species of legislation so far as this Government was concerned. It was a departure from our concepts of free markets, free enterprise, and fair play. It placed a penalty on one domestic industry for the benefit of another. It taxed an essential table food of the low-income groups and left untaxed a rival food which, even then, many of the poor could not afford to buy. It was rightly called a tax on the poor man's spread. It deprived one domestic industry of an opportunity to compete freely in the market place in an effort to give an advantage to another and rival industry. It took income from the American farmers—and their families—who produced the ingredients of margarine and attempted to channel that income into the pockets of other American farmers who produced the ingredients of butter. I have said it did these things when it was passed. It has been doing them for 62 years. It is still doing them. And it will continue to do them until Congress remedies this long-standing wrong.

If our boasted tradition of free enterprise means anything at all it means that every industry should have the right to compete on equal terms with domestic competitors; it means that initiative and enterprise and inventive skill in one industry shall not be penalized and restricted and hampered for the benefit of a competing industry.

It is said that margarine is an imitative product, made to look like butter and to taste like butter. But even if this were so—if we are going to levy a tax on all products which imitate the original, in color and other characteristics, we will wreck our entire economy. The very essence of competition is to develop new products which are like the old but which are cheaper and better. Until the butter lobby achieved its unique claim to legislative protection from the Federal Government, this development of new products was generally considered as indication of progress. It is still so considered, I believe, except in the case of margarine.

I do not intend here today to discuss at length the merits of this matter. They have been thoroughly aired in both the House and Senate and will be discussed again. I do not believe the claims made by the butter lobby are taken too seriously any more. The trend is toward repeal of both the Federal and State antimargarine laws. Since we began discussion of this legislation last December, five States have done away with laws prohibiting the sale or manufacture of colored margarine. These States are Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Maryland, and New Jersey. Nineteen States still retain laws which prohibit the sale or manufacture of colored margarine. I predict repeal in many of these States during 1949.

An effort and a consistent one has been made to persuade the dairy industry that it would suffer if the antimargarine laws were repealed. This is not the fact. I have pointed out time and time again that the sale of milk for butter is the least profitable use of milk. I have emphasized the tremendous increase in the use of fluid milk and byproducts of milk other than butter and the decline in butter production. Less butter is being produced for a very simple reason. The dairyman can get more for his product by selling it for other uses. This decline in butter production has increased during 1948 and now it appears that butter output this year will be 1,110,000,000 pounds as compared to approximately 1,650,000,000 pounds in 1947.

As a matter of fact, the use of high-priced butter is competitive with the more profitable uses of milk. As all of you know, the sharp increase in the cost of living has put a great strain upon the food budgets of many families. In this connection, let me point out that the housewife who buys 1 pound of table spread a week for her family would pay—at July 1947–June 1948 national average prices—$21.06 for margarine or $45.84 for butter.

The saving by using margarine—$24.78, or 54 percent—would purchase (on the same price basis) 131.8 quarts of milk.

I would like to remind the dairymen that any saving in the family food budget, such as would result from the purchase of margarine rather than butter, means more money available for the purchase of fluid milk and other uses for milk that are more profitable than butter.

I am indeed sorry that Congress is going home without final action on H. R. 2245. It is my feeling, however, that the fight has not been in vain. I have already mentioned the accelerated trend toward repeal of antimargarine legislation in the States. There is another byproduct of the effort to repeal the Federal antimargine laws which is not generally realized. That is the increase in the use of margarine and the corresponding increase in the use of cottonseed oil and soybean oil.

The production of margarine for the first 6 months of 1948 is not known exactly but it will be in the neighborhood of 472,000,000 pounds. This is an increase of 42 percent over the same period last year. The current year's production of margarine, on the basis of existing conditions, will be close to 922,000,000 pounds as compared to 745,000,000 pounds in 1947. Back in 1941, margarine production totaled 362,800,000 pounds. Approximately 150,000,000 pounds of cottonseed oil were used in the manufacture of margarine in 1941. This oil was valued at approximately $15,500,000. The value of the cottonseed oil used in margarine manufacture in 1947 approximates $89,400,000 and for the January-May period, 1948, the value of the cottonseed oil used in making margarine is valued at about $72,000,000.

The value of soybean oil used in the manufacture of margarine in 1941 approximated $10,000,000; in 1947, $66,500,000, and for the January-May period, 1948, more than $30,000,000.

With the exception of shortening, margarine provides the greatest outlet for both cottonseed oil and soybean oil. If the present trend continues, the use of cottonseed and soybean oil in margarine probably will exceed the use in shortening.

The consumption of margarine has been increasing steadily over the years. Numerous factors have contributed to this. However, the substantial increase in 1948 over 1947 undoubtedly goes back in large part to the public attention given margarine as the result of the attempt to repeal the antimargarine laws. Many people learned from the debate and publicity attending the repeal effort that margarine is fully as nutritious as butter and that in some ways it is a more dependable product.

I am certain that the cotton and soybean farmers already have benefited greatly as the result of the drive for repeal. I feel that they will benefit more as time goes on. A profitable price for cottonseed and soybeans depends in large part upon the oil from these crops which goes into margarine. With repeal of the State and Federal antimargarine laws I look for greatly expanded uses for margarine which will assure a fair and remunerative price for cottonseed and for soybeans during the years ahead.

MARGARINE PRODUCTION AND USE OF AMERICAN MATERIALS

Production: In 1941, margarine production reached 362,811,900 pounds, or about 2.7 pounds per capita, for domestic use, compared with about 15.9 pounds per capita of butter (creamery and farm combined). Since then, margarine production has considerably increased its rate of production. Most striking, however, is the still accelerated increase of 1948 over 1947, and of the continued gains margarine is making this year. Interest in Federal legislation abolishing the antimargarine law undoubtedly has been a factor, as well as margarine's appeal to family budgets as a nutritious table fat at economical price.

Production in 1946 totaled 572,537,990 pounds. In 1947 this rose to 745,644,815 pounds. The increase between 1941 and 1946 was 58 percent; between 1946 and 1947, 32 percent; and the rate of increase for 1948 over 1947 will be over 20 percent.

Production for the first 6 months of 1948 is not yet exactly known, but may be estimated fairly closely at 472,000,000 pounds. This is an increase of 42 percent over the same period last year. If 1948 margarine production maintains the same increase over 1947 for the period June–September as it did during January–May, and then is the same for the period October–December as it was in 1947, the current year's production total will be about 922,000,000 pounds. This is a fairly conservative estimate on the basis of conditions as they existed through July.

Ingredients: As a result, American growers of oilseed crops have enjoyed a far larger margarine market than ever before, as illustrated by the following table:

Item	1941	1946	1947	1948 (January to May)
Cottonseed oil:				
Amount (million pounds)	149.9	222.8	322.6	204.6
Estimated value (million dollars)	15.7	39.7	89.4	71.8
Soybean oil:				
Amount (million pounds)	75.6	206.7	227.7	103.7
Estimated value (million dollars)	9.8	39.3	66.3	30.3
Peanut oil:				
Amount (million pounds)	2.2	13.8	17.5	4.5
Estimated value (million dollars)[1]	.2	2.1	4.6	.15
Corn oil:				
Amount (million pounds)	.6	.7	.7	.3
Estimated value (million dollars)	.1	.1	.2	.1

[1] Crude.

Source: Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Adopting the conservative estimate of 900,000,000 pounds margarine production for 1948, and extending the proportions used so far of the major oils, their total use would be: Cottonseed, about 457,000,000 pounds; soybean, about 231,000,000 pounds; peanut, about 11,000,000 pounds; corn, about 700,000 pounds.

In 1947, margarine used approximately 29 percent of cottonseed oil consumed in this country, and 16 percent of soybean oil. This year, consumption of cottonseed oil by margarine has increased absolutely and relatively.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 33 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, how much time has the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has 32 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. It is my understanding that the Senator from Kentucky is detained from the floor at the moment because he is, quite properly, having his lunch. Together with a number of other Senators, I had the pleasure a few moments ago of listening to the Senator from Kentucky as he discussed his proposed amendment to the measure which is before us, and I should like a little later to have an opportunity to ask the Senator some questions.

The position of the Banking and Currency Committee, by which the bill of the Senator from Kentucky was considered, is that the committee is not enthusiastic about it. We did not share the indifference of the Senator from Kentucky with respect to the proposal. We looked at it, thought about it, worried over it, but turned it down conclusively because we did not then think and we do not think at this time that the proposals which the Senator is presently asking the Senate to act upon will work. We do not think we should be doing the American people any good service at all by returning, as most certainly we would return, to a system of price controls and rationing if the recommendations of the senior Senator from Kentucky should be adopted.

One of our reasons, Mr. President, for taking in the committee and, I hope, on the floor of the Senate, a strong position in opposition to the recommendations and proposals presently placed before us by the Senator from Kentucky is that we became more and more convinced that the administration had not given very much thought to the recommendations which we were asked to consider. The record shows that leading proponents within the administration had different and contradictory ideas as to what would result from the passage of the requested legislation. The Senator from Kentucky a few minutes ago said, if I correctly understood him, that the powers requested by the President were stand-by powers and, in his opinion, they probably would not be invoked, but that for psychological reasons they would be of assistance to the President and the administration.

The President's coordinating administrator, Mr. Paul Porter, appeared before the committee, and in answer to a question as to when he proposed that the powers would probably be put into effect by the President, he said, "immediately." I, in concert with many other people, want to know precisely from the Senator from Kentucky whether his opinion is valid that the requested powers are to be stand-by authorizations, or whether they are, as Mr. Porter testified, to be invoked immediately.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator want me to give my opinion now?

Mr. CAIN. I should appreciate it very much if the Senator would do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it has been my understanding all along that the powers requested were to be stand-by powers, to be used if and when, and according to the need as it developed. The very conditions under which the powers can be exercised are set forth in the amendment itself. They are, in a sense, stand-by powers to be exercised if all the conditions prescribed should take place.

Mr. CAIN. Apparently Mr. Porter is of the opinion that all the requirements have already been met which would necessitate a return to price controls immediately and it appears to be the opinion of the Senator from Kentucky that he has not given any thought to that particular problem.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill provides that the President or the department must make a finding that these conditions do exist. We cannot assume that they exist merely by the enactment of the legislation. A definite finding must be brought about based upon the conditions set forth in the amendment. Certainly until that finding has been made and those conditions have been set out and specified it would have to be a stand-by power, because it could not be exercised until the conditions had been met.

Mr. CAIN. Yet I think it very important for the Senate to know, and for the Americans present in the gallery and those throughout the country to understand, that in the opinion of the man who has been selected to speak officially for the Administration, the price controls and rationing authorization requested would immediately be invoked. It happened to be the opinion of the Committee on Banking and Currency that further and more substantial study should be given to such recommendations before a determination of their need was made in final sense.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for an insertion in the RECORD, and for the Senator from California to address one or two questions to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune, entitled "Truman's Blaming Republicans for Inflation is Termed Unjust."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the same article has hitherto been offered today. If it should develop that it has already been presented, would it be agreeable to the Senator from California that it might be omitted as requested by him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It has been offered for printing in the RECORD, but I think it is appropriate to the pending discussion, and I think it should be placed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN'S BLAMING REPUBLICANS FOR INFLATION IS TERMED UNJUST—MARK SULLIVAN CALLS INCREASED DEFENSE COSTS AND ERP, BOTH URGED BY PRESIDENT, PRINCIPAL CAUSES OF HIGH PRICES; SEES UNITY IMPERILED

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, August 5.—For understandable reasons, including a reticence which the most responsible leaders in Congress and of the Republican Party enforce upon themselves, the impression made by this special session of Congress and its intended early ending, is superficial and incorrect. It is not that congressional and Republican leaders are so much angry at President Truman as in despair about him.

The surface picture which portrays Congress as angry at President Truman because he called them back to Washington in hot weather, and because he denounced the body and as further angry because he called the special session in a spirit of and for the purpose of partisan politics—all that is true enough so far as it goes. But Congress and the Republicans would regard that sort of thing as the give-and-take of politics.

What deeply concerns the Republican leaders, what they regard as their highest obligation, is the need for national unity in the face of the foreign situation. The Republican position on this, formulated on the highest level of party leadership, is in a statement given out July 24 by Governor Dewey in consultation with Republican Senator VANDENBERG and Governor Dewey's adviser on foreign affairs, John Foster Dulles. They were soberly aware of what they were doing; they devoted their painstaking hours to composing the statement. What they renounced was as important as what they pledged:

"The Berlin situation is critical. * * * The present duty of Americans is not to be divided by past lapses but to unite to surmount present dangers. We shall not allow domestic partisan irritations to divert us from this indispensable unity."

REASON FOR DESPAIR

What puts the Republican leaders in despair about President Truman is the course followed by him which shows either a lack of adequate concern about unity or lack of comprehension of the effects of his actions. It is the sober conviction of men in Washington who are at once the best informed and the most poised in temperament that the danger of war with Russia is at least 50–50. It is this condition that determines the course of the Republican leaders.

In this condition President Truman, by his call for a special session and the manner of it, creates division between himself and Congress and between himself and the Republicans. Adding to his provocativeness, he blames Congress and the Republicans for inflation. As put by the Democratic platform and often repeated in equivalent words by Mr. Truman; "The Republican Eightieth Congress is directly responsible * * * for high cost of living," that is for inflation.

Now every Republican in Congress is conscious that they enacted two measures which make for inflation because they involve immense Government expenditures and divert industry from production of goods for domestic consumption—the vastly increased appropriations for national defense and the likewise vast appropriations for the European recovery program.

TWO DANGERS BALANCED

The Republican Congress passed these measures knowing that they increased the danger of inflation. They balanced this danger with the foreign danger, decided that the latter was the greater and were thereby forced to increase the former.

The Republican Congress did this at the request of President Truman, in willing and complete support of the foreign program laid down by the Truman administration, and in the spirit of unity in face of the foreign threat. Now, President Truman puts blame on the Republican Congress for inflation without a single mention of the inflationary acts and that they were his own program. If the Republicans, and Congress, were to defend themselves from Mr. Truman's charge of responsibility for inflation, they must defend the inflationary measures, increased military appropriations and the European recovery program. To defend these would bring up foreign relations in Congress during the Presidential campaign. A "who-done-it" debate on inflation might become a "who-done it" debate on responsibility for our foreign crisis, and that would go angrily into actions and policies of the Truman administration and even more the Roosevelt one. Hardly anything could be more disruptive. Avoidance of disruption would be helped by an early ending of the special session, and this the Republican leaders decided upon.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the able Senator from Kentucky, for whom I have very high regard, whether he has made any estimates of the number of employees who would be required to administer the OPA proposal he has offered to the Senate. I may say as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, that I have checked with that committee to ascertain the number of OPA employees when the OPA was functioning, and also we have double checked with the Byrd committee, and we tried to get the Bureau of the Budget on the telephone today, but they apparently are closed down, this being Saturday afternoon. From the best figures we can obtain, the two authorities agree that they had 64,818 employees.

The staff of the Committee on Appropriations made a very rough estimate as to what that number of employees would require in the way of funds, and they roughly estimate that it would run from $120,000,000 to $170,000,000.

I was wondering if any estimate had ben made by the experts of the administration as to the number of employees who could be required under the Senator's OPA reimposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from California will understand that the OPA, which was an independent agency operating by itself, was different from what the amendment proposes. We do not propose to set up an independent agency, but that the President shall designate an existing department, perhaps a Cabinet member, perhaps the Department of Agriculture, or the Department of Commerce, whatever department he feels would best administer the act. Obviously that whole department, insofar as it would be available, would be utilized. The amendment also provides that any other Government agencies may be utilized by direction of the President.

It would be difficult for me—I have not done it, I may say to the Senator—to estimate the number of additional employees who might be required over and above those already in the department which might be designated by the President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, the minority leader, that under the plan he is proposing to the Senate, which I am sure if put into effect would require a considerable amount of policing, unless existing agencies or departments of the Government are tremendously overstaffed so that the employees are in fact twiddling their thumbs, I do not see how they could take on this great obligation without adding employees. The mere fact that an independent agency is not being created, if there is a job to be done, would not change the situation so far as concerns the number of employees required to do the job, regardless of under whose supervision the job was to be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think any employees in any of the department are twiddling their thumbs in idleness.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not charge that they were. I said that unless they were doing so, I did not see how they could assume this great extra burden.

Mr. BARKLEY. Someone might draw an unjustifiable implication from the Senator's use of the words "twiddling their thumbs."

The Committee on Appropriations, the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, all of us, have been combing the departments with respect to reduction in the number of employees. Undoubtedly it would require some additional employees, but it would not require as many, in my judgment, as would be required if we were creating an independent agency similar to that to which the Senator referred, the OPA. Undoubtedly designating a department with ability to deal with the subject would require fewer additional employees, admitting there would be some, than would be necessary if we were establishing an entirely different agency.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The last question I should like to propound to the Senator is this: Under the proposal of the President in 1946, when he made his talk in October, he indicated that it might be necessary, at least it had been given consideration by the Cabinet, to seize the cattle on the ranges because they had not been brought in to augment the meat supply. As I read the Senator's amendment, it provides a control of inventories. Very extensive powers are vested under the amendment. Is it the Senator's judgment that, under his amendment, if a person did not want to dispose of a commodity, the Government could seize the cattle on the ranges, or the grain in the fields, or whatever the commodity might be?

Mr. BARKLEY. My answer to that is emphatically "No," because there is a provision in the amendment which prohibits the Government, through any agency, compelling anyone to sell what he has, and that would apply of course to farm products, as well as others.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield so

that I may ask the Senator from California a question?

Mr. CAIN. I should like to yield, but time is very precious, and if the Senator will ask for time from the Senator from Kentucky, it would be appreciated by me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a tremendous contradiction faces the Senate as it gives serious consideration to the proposals made by the senior Senator from Kentucky. Congress was called into special session, coming from every corner of a very great land, and after we had gotten here there was laid before us a proposal—a price and wage control and rationing bill. It was offered to the Senate and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency under the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky. We had every right in the world to conclude that it was a considered, a thoughtful, and a carefully designed bill. We further had reason to understand that it was the administration's last word on the subject.

In that bill there were a number of recommendations, but time will not permit me to discuss them all. One was the suggestion, as I read it, and as every other member of the committee, both Democrat and Republican, read it, to roll back prices. To where? To 1947. Every member of the committee, as I recall, said it could not be done, that it would not work, that we would not even give any further consideration to the subject. Mr. Paul Porter, the President's administrative coordinator, came before us and testified that it would not work.

Now, when we are presumably within 50 minutes of taking action, we have another so-called considered proposal before us, a proposal to freeze prices, as of August 1948 which would not work as proposed. I have a very high regard, affection, and respect for the senior Senator from Kentucky, but I wish to say to the Members of the Senate that it simply is not possible to give his proposal any substantial thought, particularly when the administration on one day says that we can roll back prices, and less than 2 weeks later makes a recommendation which, in itself, has nothing to do with rolling back prices.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I should like very much to continue for a minute or more until I conclude, if the Senator will permit me. We are dealing with the fate of the Nation. Every man had better say what he most seriously thinks. In regard to rolling back prices, I do not think it can be done in any approximation of a free economy. As to freezing wages or freezing the price structure, which is the last recommendation, I am satisfied that that is not practicable, and I inquire, Is there not a better answer to this problem than that?

The Senator from Kentucky a few minutes ago in discussing his amendment spent quite a little time in talking to us about the need for relief for the low-income families of the country, the 25 percent of the families referred to by the President in his speech. Every human individual has a sympathy for the plight of people who do not have as much as it takes to get along, and the President said that 25 percent of the people of the country last year spent more than they took in. What would the proposal to freeze prices as of August 1948, do to the people for whom the Senator so feelingly pleaded and for whom so many of the rest of us would like to find a reasonable, legitimate way in which to be of service? I merely point that out because I feel so strongly that the Administration is presenting for consideration to the Congress a series of contradictions which thoughtful men cannot tolerate and cannot put into the form of law.

I am among those who do not know exactly what it is that we can do to meet the problems of the inflationary day in which we live, but I do know what we should not do. Whatever chance we have to stabilize the national economy, it will not be done by adopting, without far greater thought than has been given to the subject, proposals which have been requested of us by the administration of this country. I refer any thoughtful man or woman, any citizen in or out of Congress, to the record which was written by the Committee on Banking and Currency as the greatest justification for that committee coming before the Senate and saying, "Whatever you do, do not pass affirmatively on administrative recommendations which are not even understood by those who present them."

Mr. President, I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. BARKLEY. Am I to assume that the Senator does not have any time to yield to me, as I requested?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to take the Senator's time in this limited debate. I merely desire to call attention to the fact that my amendment does not automatically freeze anything. It provides that the administration of the act cannot go back of August 1. Now it is up to the administration to determine whether any price ceiling shall be fixed, or any price regulation made, but that is not a freezing, because the law itself does not take effect except through the human agencies set up in the measure.

Mr. CAIN. How right the Senator is. But that is the purpose and expressed hope of the measure before us, and the contradiction I have pointed out is that the Senator is now, quite properly from his point of view, asking us to enact legislation which in his opinion would freeze prices, and I should like to think that they could be frozen. But I should say to the Senator from Kentucky in all humility, that 2 weeks ago, his proposition was that we attempt to roll prices back to November 1947.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is criticizing me for offering an amendment different from the one which he and all the members of his committee said could not be administered, so far as roll-backs are concerned.

Mr. CAIN. Exactly, sir.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are we, as Senators, not supposed to be benefited by the enlightenment given us by the great Banking and Currency Committee?

Mr. CAIN. In one instance you were—and I used the word "you" not in a personal sense. The Senator from Kentucky listened to the views expressed by the comparatively small group of men composing the membership of the Committee on Banking and Currency considering the Senator's proposal, which is that of the administration, and the Senator said the Committee on Banking and Currency was correct, and the Senator said he would make the change. I will say to the Senator that our most serious criticism is that action was requested of Congress on measures which deserve the most careful and painstaking study, and which could not be acted upon in the time Congress has at its disposal in the session to which it was called back by the President.

Mr. BARKLEY. For the Committee on Banking and Currency I have the greatest respect, because I served as a member of it for 20 years. But I believe it has acted wrongly in not reporting anything to the Senate which in my opinion would be effective in curbing the constantly increasing cost of living. The committee would not report anything of that sort. So, when I have offered a modified amendment, modified only with regard to the date at which it should take effect, the Senator indulges in criticism of such action.

Mr. CAIN. It may very well be, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, that the committee—and I am desirous of sharing fully in the responsibility—has done wrong in not recommending more positive action than we have done, but we have come forward in all seriousness with a recommendation as to what should not be done. For the good of the country, we should not adopt either one of the price-control measures that have been laid before us by the senior Senator from Kentucky for the administration.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is much talk about stand-by controls, and that the powers sought to be granted would not ordinarily be exercised. I think the first thing that ought to be known is that the amendment gives complete, arbitrary, and unlimited authority to the President of the United States to reestablish OPA in all its details. It actually removes many of the restrictions which were contained in the OPA Act, because Mr. Porter wrote the new measure, and he removed things on which we had formerly relied, and he criticized some of the things we did. This is not a stand-by proposition. This is a request to give the President unlimited power to fix prices of every commodity, of every service that is rendered in the country. We cannot escape our responsibility. We cannot say, "Well, here is a stand-by power. Use it now and then. This is only going to be a selective control." We are giving the President arbitrary power over the operations of every business in the United States. We are giving him power to say how businessmen shall conduct their businesses, what kind of prices they shall charge. The amendment is not confined to prices only. It gives power to say how they shall distribute their goods.

Our experience is that once we embark on price control we cannot stop. We cannot fix the price of meat unless we are prepared to fix the price of grain, corn, wheat, and oats. We cannot fix the price of meat unless we are prepared to fix the price of chickens, because the moment we restrict the price of meat and hold it down, it immediately affects the price of chickens, and it reduces the production of chickens so that the prices of chickens rise at once far beyond what they would normally be. We cannot have a stand-by control; we cannot have a partial control. That is what the President himself said when he decontrolled all prices under the OPA law in 1946. He then said to the people:

I am convinced that the time has come—

This was after the election of 1946, when the President in his proclamation said:

I am convinced that the time has come when these controls can serve no useful purpose. I am, indeed, convinced that their further continuance would do the Nation's economy more harm than good. Accordingly, I have directed the immediate abandonment of all control over wages and salaries and all control over prices.

The President continued:

The Price Administrator has advised me that, with so much of the economy freed from price controls, clinging to the rest would, in his judgment, lead to distortions in production and diversion of goods to an extent far outweighing any benefit that could be achieved.

The President went on to say:

Some shortages remain—

And so forth—

but I believe the law of supply and demand operating in the market place will, from now on, serve the people better than would continued regulation of prices by the Government.

That was President Truman speaking at the end of 1946. There is not any way to do this on a partial basis. What we are asked to do is to give the President a power which, if he begins to use it, will gradually include all the features of OPA, the War Production Board, and rationing. We cannot effectively enforce a good many prices without rationing the goods which are distributed. This is a complete power which is asked. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky said that the President cannot go out on the farms and seize the cattle. We placed a special provision in the bill to prevent that, because the President suggested that very serious consideration had been given to it. He so stated in the summer of 1946.

As a matter of fact this amendment really does give that power, because it permits allocations. The administration may not say, "You must sell to the Government," although I rather believe that the powers even go to that extent. They did during the war. Certainly it could say, "You cannot sell it to anyone else. You cannot sell to the packers." So the farmer would be placed up against the proposition of either selling to the Government or not selling to anyone, and selling at a price fixed by the Price Administrator under the terms of the proposed law.

So far as placing the administration in another department is concerned, what difference does it make? Give it to the Department of Commerce, and tomorrow it would establish an OPA as a bureau of the Department of Commerce, under Paul Porter. We can see exactly what the President had in mind when he called Paul Porter back here to do this job. He was the man who went all-out for OPA at the end. He was the man whose arbitrary action injured practically everyone under OPA.

The roll-back provision is eliminated, but the President is not prevented from rolling prices back. He is not compelled to roll them back, but the amendment very clearly provides that the administration shall make adjustments "in the prices prevailing in November 1947 for such relevant factors as it may determine and deem to be of general applicability."

There is full power to find that none of the circumstances are of general applicability; full power to set up the 1947 price, just as it was before. The Senator removed that as a primary consideration, but he left it in his amendment for the purpose of giving general permission, to make it perfectly clear that the administration can go back to that date, base everything on that date, and give attention only to such considerations as it chooses to regard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I decline to yield. I am sorry, but the time is extremely limited.

The difficulty with this proposal is just what we have said all along. This is an attempt to leave the causes of inflation in operation and try to hold against the results. It cannot be done. It never has been done. During the war, through a certain amount of general determination and interest in the war, combined with patriotism, we got enough people to conform, so that we got a certain amount of conformity. There were some violations, but they were not very important. But just the moment the war ended we saw everything go into the black markets, which is a natural condition under such control.

The American people do not believe that the Government has any right to limit their power to act as they see fit to act. We saw corn go into the black market, the moment the price of corn was fixed. If the general free price is higher than the price fixed, trucks go to every farm and the farmer is paid a higher price. An illegitimate trade is developed. That is what happened in connection with meat. At the end of OPA, 80 percent of the meat was sold in the black market. The President himself refers to it in the proclamation decontrolling meat. There were not enough cattle in the regularly established packing plants, in the legitimate channels of industry, to produce enough leather for shoes and enough insulin for the treatment of diabetes. The situation reached the point where practically no meat was handled in the regular channels. There is no reason to believe that conditions would be any different today if we had such controls again. Price control will not work in America in time of peace.

It seems to me that we must get at the causes. Those causes are many. The Government must go about the problem with complete sincerity, and in every possible line in which it can operate.

There is the general problem of the restraint of credit. It is said that people generally are very much worse off. Of course they are not worse off as a whole. On the average the people are much better off than they were before the war. The general cost of living has gone up from 100 to 170, at the same time that the average weekly earnings of factory workers—approximately 14,000,000 of them—have gone up from $23.86 to $52.81, or about 120 percent. The difficulty is that we have such a tremendous purchasing power, and such high wages that the purchasing power has constantly increased the demand as against the supply, so that we cannot keep up, even though production has been constantly increasing.

We can reduce inflation somewhat by holding down Government expenditures. I have stated that we were to blame for not doing more than we did. However, the President can still reduce many of the expenditures of the Government. He still has power to enforce economies in the military service. He has power to enforce economies in our treatment of foreign countries.

As a general cause, we have the tremendous excess of exports from this country, some of them necessary for European relief.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield me two more minutes?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The President has power to cut the exports to some extent—not necessarily those to Europe. About half of this surplus goes to other parts of the world.

That is the only way we are going to stop this inflation. There is no magic means by which we can do it. The bill before us provides certain credit-control powers. However, the administration already has powers which it has never exercised. I refer to the raising of the interest rate on short-term Government issues, and the raising of the rediscount rate. The administration has not even used the power which it has. The administration can raise the rediscount rate for the New York and Chicago banks 2 percent without any legislation. The Federal Reserve Board can generally cut down the expansion of bank credit. Last year it provided $7,000,000,000 of additional purchasing power over what is normally produced by production.

I think we have given all the powers we can. There is every reasonable hope that we may accomplish what we wish to accomplish.

At this point I wish to refer to an American Federation of Labor bulletin for January 1948, in which it is stated that the root cause of the upward price

spiral was "the inflated money supply resulting from wartime fiscal policies." I believe that Mr. Boris Shishkin, the man who wrote it, is one of the best economists in the country:

> The upward pressure of the huge money supply has been so great that prices were breaking through ceilings and black markets were appearing long before OPA expired. This was to be expected. Price control cannot dam an ever-growing flood of money inflation. This has been proved again and again, in country after country. We must attack the root cause of inflation, the excess money supply.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of answering, in a word, the Senator from Ohio.

He says that notwithstanding the date of August 1, 1948, back of which the President cannot go in fixing prices, we could go back to November 1947, anyway. There is nothing in the amendment that even implies that such a thing can be done, any more than it can be implied that we could go back to November 1920, 1930, 1940, or any other year. Such authority simply is not there.

So far as compelling anyone to sell anything is concerned, the Senator from Ohio stated that the amendment would authorize the President to compel anyone to sell anything to the Government. Let us read only the sentence which prohibits it.

> Nothing in this title—

That is, the price-fixing title—

> shall be construed to require any person to sell any commodity.

That means sell it to anyone. The Senator from Ohio is a good lawyer. I am defending his reputation as a lawyer in what I am saying, notwithstanding the more or less pettifogging argument to which he resorted.

Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it may be that price control is not the answer for the inflationary period in which we are living. But up to this time the majority has presented nothing that will do anything serious about the fires of inflation which are now burning around the national home of America.

We can discuss from now until doomsday the disadvantages of price control, and all the irritations and annoyances which we were compelled to put up with during the war; but I make this prophecy: Unless the Congress of the United States does something with respect to high prices, if we continue one inflationary spiral after another, sooner or later the so-called boom period in which we are living will be followed by a bust; and the higher the prices the deeper the depression, bringing with it misery, bankruptcy, and all the other horrible consequences that go along with a major depression.

With respect to price control, Mr. President, let me say that when I think of what happened here 2 years ago and what was said then by those who were attempting to destroy price control, and when I think of the promises and the prophecies that were made, I am constrained to repeat just a few of those statements made by various prominent businessmen and prominent Members of the Senate who predicted what would happen once price control was destroyed. Some of them said that for a short while there would be chaos and confusion and higher prices, but that in a short time everything would level off and prices would be reasonable and stable and in line with what they were before the war.

Let me point out here that John E. Jaeger, president of the National Association of Retail Grocers, in speaking to the American Wholesale Grocers Association on February 3, 1946, said that—

> We (retail grocers) feel that the time has arrived when * * * action must be taken * * * to prevent renewal of the Price Control Act * * *. Competition will * * * benefit the consumer by making available ample food at reasonable prices.

I wonder whether Mr. Jaeger would say the same thing today? Does steak at a dollar a pound, butter at a dollar a pound, eggs at 90 cents a dozen, and milk at 25 cents a quart represent reasonable prices? How long do the experts who testified 2 years ago expect these high prices to continue until prices level off? They say economy is necessary; they say the people should eat macaroni. For instance, the Senator from Nebraska said recently they should eat chicken. Or perhaps others would say the people should eat fish or eat crow; or if they cannot get bread give them cake, but obviously they do not wish to have anyone disturb the high prices and the profits that grow out of them. That is what they are telling the American people at this time. They tell the millions of people who cannot afford to buy houses because prices are so far out of reach, "Wait until there is more production." But today every factory is busy and every acre of land capable of producing food is producing it. Nevertheless the so-called experts ask the people to wait for more production. They said, "Just wait." We have been waiting, waiting, Mr. President, for the time to come when these prices will be stabilized; but today they are going still higher.

On yesterday, hogs and cattle on the Chicago market sold for the highest price in the history of the Nation; and they constitute a part of the food which should go to the lower-income families of this country, in order to provide a healthy, and stable diet.

I remember that in 1930, when the bread lines were getting longer and longer, the Republicans had the same sort of slogan: "Just wait. Prosperity," they said, "is just around the corner. Everything will be all right." But nothing was done; and then we went into the greatest depression in American history.

Mr. President, as certain as it is that my name is LUCAS, unless we do something to halt these high prices and the inflation that is gripping this country, that situation will take us into a depression that not only will ruin the economy of the United States but could well lose the peace of the world, because at this particular time the economy of the United States and world peace are tied hand in glove. If America goes to the bottom of the abyss, economically speaking, the democracies of the world depending upon the United States for help to lift them out of their present difficulties, will be lost. Mr. President, this is the most difficult domestic situation the Nation has faced since I have been a Member of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] says we are dealing with the fate of the Nation. I am glad someone on the other side of the aisle finally treats this matter as an emergency. They have been treating it as no emergency at all.

Here is what Mr. Jay T. Taylor, of Amarillo, Tex., said in 1946, in speaking in behalf of the Joint Livestock Committee:

> We are convinced that, if you should discontinue the present livestock and meat program, the actual price of meat would be lowered. Our abundant supply would see to that.

That is what Mr. Taylor assured us in December of 1946, and, of course, it was in February 1946, that Mr. Jaeger said that the prevention of the renewal of the Price Control Act would benefit the consumer by making available ample food at reasonable prices.

Mr. President, are prices reasonable today? In 1946 porterhouse steak sold for 43 cents a pound, but today it sells for 98 cents a pound. In 1946, sirloin steak sold for 39 cents a pound; today it is 93 cents a pound. In 1946 rib roast was 29 cents a pound; today it is 79 cents a pound.

Millions of our citizens, I contend, have paid for the folly of Congress.

I wish I had more time to speak on this matter. I should like to name many of the persons who advocated or spoke in favor of the repeal of OPA. I should like to state what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] said on the floor of the Senate, and I should like to inform the Senate what was said by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] in regard to what would happen after OPA was destroyed and in regard to the leveling off of prices.

I should like to tell the Senate what was said by Mr. Bruce, of the lumbermen's organization, who told how they would build homes, once the OPA was out of the way.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield a few more minutes to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 2 minutes more to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] went along with Mr. Bruce in a speech he made to the Middle Atlantic Lumbermen's Association on February 5 of this year. He told them:

> I do not need to remind the membership of this association that it was the Republican leadership in the Senate and the House that was responsible for ending OPA.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have time.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the Senator how many houses were built under Public Law 388? The answer is 500,000. How many houses were built in 1947? Eight hundred and eighty thousand.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am surprised that my friend would interrupt me in that way.

Mr. WHERRY. I should have a chance to answer the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not yield. The Senator from Nebraska is the acting majority leader, and he knows the rules better than anyone else does.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator please not to do that to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] said on July 8, 1946:

> I should like to say that I was never more convinced of anything in my life than that if the economic and business interests of the United States could be free from price controls production would increase, prices would level off.

When are prices going to level off? I ask the Senator from Oklahoma.

The figures I have obtained from the Department of Labor show that in the 2 years since this Congress killed price control prices have given no indication of leveling off. According to the predictions that were made by various persons in 1946, the reduction of prices is long overdue. For instance, an economist for the Cotton Textile Institute told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on April 30, 1946:

> On the other hand, there isn't any doubt in my mind and in the mind of anybody in the market that if Congress were to abandon the OPA tomorrow, cotton textile prices would decline immediately.

But, Mr. President, the prophecies made by those gentlemen at that particular time are so far from the mark that I sometimes wonder whether their conscience does not bother them a little. That is especially true when they see the housewife going to the corner grocery store and paying such tremendous prices for meat and milk, and paying such exorbitant prices at the clothing stores and at the shoe stores for the clothing and shoes the children of the family must have.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it is not my intention to go back to 1946 and attempt to lay the blame or endeavor to determine who may have destroyed or killed OPA. I have my own thoughts and ideas on that subject.

However, I shall go back only 24 hours. Yesterday, in one of the newspapers, appeared an article headed:

> Ford Raises Car Prices for Third Time in a Year.

Today in one of the Philadelphia newspapers we see an article headed—

> Meat, Food Prices Expected To Rise.

And, Mr. President, the price of milk has just been increased a cent and a half a quart in my own city of Philadelphia.

What is the Congress going to do about this situation? Congress is here for the purpose of dealing with this situation. Does any Member of the Senate think that any restraint on consumer credits or bank credits will lower the price of a Ford automobile? The price of steel has increased $10 a ton. What are Senators going to do about that? Are they simply going to give us this little bit of legislation that is now proposed—necessary legislation, but not adequate? It will be adequate only if it is a part of a general, rounded-out program That is what we are here for. Let us forget for a moment responsibility back in 1946 and 1947. Let us take care of that in the campaign. Let us now rise to the occasion. Let us do something. Let us remain here Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday, or all next week. Do not attempt to fool the American people. Do not have a headline in the newspaper, "Inflation control put into effect by the Congress," if there is no action to back it up. The people cannot be fooled in that way except possibly for a short period of time.

Now we have been hearing here about the black market. I have more confidence in the American people and American business than some appear to have, even in this Chamber. I believe during OPA the great rank and file of the American people used their coupons and did not go into the black market. But let me remind the Senator from Ohio of a study made by his own committee, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. They obtained their data from the American Meat Institute. They had figures on the average overcharges, or black-market charges, while OPA was in existence. They said there was an average overcharge in the black market during OPA of 12 or 13 cents a pound for round steak, and certainly not everyone was in the black market paying that overcharge. Since OPA round steak increased, by April 1948, 43 cents a pound, or more than 100 percent. Black-market prices were mild in comparison. Let us take another item, that of rib roast. The Senator's own committee—and I refer to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]—in a study of the subject indicated that the average black-market overcharge for rib roast was 9 or 10 cents. Since the repeal of OPA it has gone up 32 cents. And so on down the line on every item.

The overcharge in the black market on chuck roast averaged 9 cents a pound. By last April, however, chuck roast had gone up 28 cents, or more than 100 percent over OPA prices.

Black-market overcharges on hamburger averaged 7 cents. By last April, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics, hamburger was up 22 cents over OPA.

Veal cutlets cost an extra 13 cents in the black market. Now they cost an extra 49 cents, again double the OPA price.

Leg of lamb, sold at a premium of 3 cents in the black market, now costs at least 29 cents more a pound than during OPA.

Pork chops sold for 37½ cents during OPA and black markets charged an average of 4 cents more. Yet, in April, pork chops sold for an average of 73½ cents, or just about double.

Yes; the black-market prices—which most Americans refused to pay—were modest and mild compared to present outrageous legal prices.

I think the American people are honest. They obey the law, they do not cheat and they do not endeavor to get into black markets. The argument that is used here is, "Oh, there is going to be a black market." Well, I think it is time we fought inflation as we fought the war and as we fought the depression. The Congress and the administration had the courage in those dark, dreary days, to fight the depression. When the war came along, we all joined together and fought that war, and we won the war. We are now faced with a serious situation, a crisis which confronts the American people. I think we should have the same courage. We should fight with the same determination. We should win the battle of inflation as we won the war, by not retreating from reality. But it takes courage to do it, Mr. President. I think the Congress should have that courage. They should remain here and meet this problem. If they do, then I am convinced they will earn the thanks of the American people. Let us forget November for a week or two. Let us forget the election for a short time, and let us think about the children of today and the people of tomorrow; let us think of the future of this Nation and of the world. That future rests on a solvent, stable American economy; wishing will not make it so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, when the President presented his message to Congress over a year ago, he connected up the idea of price control with European relief and European recovery. He made a very logical argument for it. We had an opportunity then to do something about prices. We did nothing. In January of last year, a bill to control prices was introduced by myself, and was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The bill contained the provisions which are now being considered by that committee. Therefore we have wasted a whole year because the bill was not considered at that time. We now confront a similar situation but with conditions very much worse and very much more grievous. The President delivered his message to the Congress. We paid little attention to it.

Three times the request has been made to the Congress of the United States, and only a partial answer has been given. It has been said that it is impossible to effectuate controls, that nothing can be done about inflation, that it must merely be allowed to take its course. That was the argument made during the worst period of deflation we have ever had, that

nothing could be done, and therefore it was said, "Let us do nothing about it." But, Mr. President, the facts are otherwise. Statistics prove that control can be effective. I should like therefore to refer briefly to some statistics. We have just listened to the Senator from Ohio saying "How imposible. How impossible. How impossible." Everything is impossible, but listen to these figures.

In 1935–39, all the items of rent, food, and clothing, which came under control, may be taken at 100 percent. By 1943, the figure on all items had increased to 125 percent. Food was 143 percent, clothing was 127.9 percent, and rent, 108 percent. By the time controls were removed, all items were up to 133.3 percent; food, 145.6 percent; clothing, 157.2 percent; and rent, 108.5 percent. Rent, of course, remained under control.

By June 1948 controls were removed in the face of the argument which was advanced that nothing could be done about it. Here are the facts. On all items, the cost had risen to 171.7 percent, a rise of over 40 percent above June 1946. Food was up to 214.1 percent, a rise over 1946 of about 70 percent. Clothing was up to 196.9 percent, a rise of about 40 percent. Rent, still partially controlled, had risen to 117 percent.

Mr. President, the question is whether we are going to do anything or not. The determination, judging from what has been said by Members of the Senate in support of the measure which is before us and against the proposal submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], is to do nothing. If Senators desire to do nothing, nothing will be done. But, Mr. President, I would remind the Senate that in years of "bust and boom," the going up is quite as perilous as the coming down, in spite of the fact that the drop is almost instantaneous.

Mr. President, in order that we may be able better to appreciate the points I have tried to make during this discussion, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this place in my remarks a table on the cost of living, based on figures obtained from the Department of Labor and from the Department of Commerce, the table showing consumer prices for moderate-income families in large cities.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cost of living—Consumer prices for moderate-income families in large cities

A. 10-YEAR PERIOD: 1935–39=100

Date	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent
1935–39	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
May 1943	125.1	143.0	127.9	108.0
June 1946	133.3	145.6	157.2	108.5
June 1948	171.7	214.1	196.9	117.0

B. MAY 1943 TO JUNE 1948: MAY 1943=100

Date	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent
May 1943	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
June 1946	106.6	101.8	122.9	100.5
June 1948	137.3	149.7	153.9	108.3

NOTE.—During the 3 years of effective price control, the cost of living rose only 6.6 percent and the cost of food only 1.8 percent.

Cost of living—Consumer prices for moderate-income families in large cities—Con.

C. WHAT HAS HAPPENED SINCE THE END OF PRICE CONTROL: JUNE 1946=100

Date	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent
June 1946	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
June 1948	128.8	147.0	125.3	107.8

NOTE.—During the 2 years since the end of price control, the cost of living has increased more than 4 times as much as during the 3 years of effective price control.

Source: Department of Labor.

Average weekly earnings in manufacturing

A. 10-YEAR PERIOD

(1939 monthly average=100)

Date:	Earnings
1939 monthly average	100.0
May 1943	180.6
June 1946	181.5
June 1948	221.3

B. MAY 1943–JUNE 1948

(May 1943=100)

Date:	
May 1943	100.0
June 1946	100.5
June 1948	122.6

C. WHAT HAS HAPPENED SINCE THE END OF PRICE CONTROL

(June 1946=100)

Date:	
June 1946	100.0
June 1948	121.9

NOTE.—Real wages of the American worker have increased faster than cost of living over the 10-year period since 1939; but since the end of effective price control in June 1946 the trend has been reversed. Cost of living has increased faster than average weekly earnings.

Source: Department of Labor.

Corporate profits after taxes

A. 10-YEAR PERIOD

(1939=100)

Date:	Profits
1939	100
Second quarter, 1943	212
Second quarter, 1946	240
Second quarter, 1948	360

B. SECOND QUARTER 1943–SECOND QUARTER 1948

(Second quarter, 1943=100)

Date:	
Second quarter, 1943	100
Second quarter, 1946	113
Second quarter, 1948	170

C. WHAT HAS HAPPENED SINCE THE END OF PRICE CONTROL

(Second quarter, 1946=100)

Date:	
Second quarter, 1946	100
Second quarter, 1948	150

NOTE.—Over the 10-year period, corporate profits have increased 260 percent, while the cost of living increased 71.7 percent and average weekly earnings 121.3 percent. Since the end of effective price control, corporate profits have increased 50 percent, while average weekly earnings have increased 21.9 percent and the cost of living 28.8 percent.

Source: Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. How much more time have I?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Nine minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had intended to cover some more facts and figures on the present high cost of living than have been covered here today, but, inasmuch as time is short, I shall now ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the portion of my remarks which I shall have to omit because of the time element.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the senior Senator from Washington as to whether the remarks he holds in his hands constitute a speech he was to have given on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MAGNUSON. These are certain figures to which I intended to refer.

Mr. CAIN. On the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. May I inquire why the Senator has not found it convenient to give those figures on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Because of the limitation of time. I have only 2 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. All I meant to suggest was that the Senator had not found it convenient to ask for time heretofore to make the figures known to the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some of them were filed only this afternoon.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON Mr. President, when this Congress adjourns there will be statements placed in the RECORD, as usual, with respect to the cost of the Congress, namely, how much money has been appropriated, and there will be some comparisons made as to whether the Eightieth Congress was the costliest Congress in history, or how it compared with other Congresses.

I contend that this has been the costliest Congress in history, for the American people. The present majority party assumed control of this Congress on January 1, 1947, and even then the President of the United States warned against the inflationary spiral——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if I may have half a minute additional time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield a half minute to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On November 17, 1947, the President called our attention to the same subject, and only a few days ago the President again called our attention to it. This Congress, in its do-nothing attitude, has been not only the costliest Congress in connection with its appropriations, but has cost the American people, since the first time the President called attention to the inflationary spiral, approximately $30,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place this statement in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY'S COSTLIEST CONGRESS

(By Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON)

The Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress is history's costliest Congress in peacetime. The present majority party assumed

control on January 1, 1947. In his first message sent to this Congress, President Truman warned: "An important present source of danger to our economy is the possibility that prices might be raised to such an extent the consuming public could not purchase the tremendous supply of goods and services."

On November 17, 1947, the President called the Congress into special session. He urged the Congress to enact a 10-point program, designed to break the inflation spiral. The Eightieth Congress was challenged, but it refused to fight for the welfare of the American people.

A preview of the economic philosophy of Republican leaders took place on the floor of the Senate and in committee hearings during the June 1946 fight to extend OPA. Here's what the president of the National Manufacturers Association said at that time: "If OPA is finally dead, women will now use the canned meats and other goods they have on their shelves to see them through any temporary period of price rises. If OPA is eliminated entirely, prices of automobiles may be expected to reach a normal within 6 months, while rents might take at least a year."

Similar sentiments were echoed by Senators on the other side of the aisle, present here today. That was a philosophy of let nature take its course, let the economic forces run rampant, this is a free-enterprise economy, let supply and demand regulate prices, even if it means a boom and bust. It is a philosophy of "do-nothingism." It represents a course consistently pursued by the majority leadership.

The majority party here in the Congress has gambled with the welfare of the American people. They have wagered that supply would catch up with demand, even though they had been warned over and over again that our productive plant is operating at full capacity. They have known that our farms, our factories, and our labor force are being fully utilized and they should have been able to deduce from this fact that headway on the supply side of the equation would be a slow process. They were warned over and over again that we could not discharge our full obligation to a world yearning for peace and prosperity without creating demand for goods and services. They knew when we voted on a bipartisan basis to assist the Marshall-plan countries that additional claims would be made on goods and materials. They knew when we voted on a bipartisan basis for a bigger Military Establishment that new demands would be created. Yet in the face of all this, the Republican leaders still gambled that prices would level off, that somehow or other we can avoid run-away inflation—at least until after the election.

The majority party wagered and lost. The stakes were high and who is now paying off the bet? The American people. Do you know how much this reckless gamble and "do-nothingism" is costing the American people? Let me give you a few figures. In January 1947, Republicans took control of both Houses of Congress. Since Congress convened on January 3, 1947, consumer prices have risen over 18½ percent. In the first quarter of 1948, consumers were spending at an annual rate of over $170,000,000,000. Republican "do-nothingism" has added over $30,000,000,000 to their annual bills. Since June 1946, food prices have risen 47 percent. Consumers in the United States spend in the neighborhood of $40,000,000,000 a year for food alone. The Republican wager to let supply and demand halt rising food prices will cost the American consumer over $18,000,000,000 this year.

I am sure the majority party knows that Senate Joint Resolution 157 is not an anti-inflation program. It represents merely an attack on one facet of the problem. Debate here on the floor has demonstrated that the leadership on the other side of the aisle recognizes they are giving the administration only one blunt tool with which to work. There are numerous fronts from which the inflation problem can be attacked. The Eightieth Congress proposes to go home without granting the administration the power it needs to launch a real counteroffensive. It prefers to get out of the Washington, D. C., heat with the job still undone. The do-nothing, let-nature-take-it-course philosophy of the majority has made this history's costliest Congress. It is the American people who will dig out of their pockets the $30,000,000,000, in the form of higher prices, to pay off the bet the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress has already lost.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, with regard to the construction of houses under OPA control and under the administration of that agency by Mr. Wyatt, there were built less than 100,000 units. The President himself admitted the program was a failure and removed controls. Last year, without controls, 880,000 houses were constructed. This year, at the rate at which we are now going, I wish to state to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] that we shall have more than 1,000,000 units constructed without price control.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, while America benefits today from high wages and full employment, it suffers, at the same time, from high prices. In too many instances we are all fully aware of that. The job of this Congress, on both sides of the aisle, is to endeavor to do almost the impossible, which is to maintain full employment and high wages while controlling or leveling off prices.

It is the opinion of the Banking and Currency Committee that the proposal of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] will by no means accomplish that objective; that it will do more harm than it will do good.

I should like to say to all America that because of the debt structure which this country has we shall have inflation for a long time. If we want to protect the financial integrity of the United States our task is to eradicate the causes of inflation. I wish it were possible for me to stand up, recommend, and sponsor on this side for the committee, legislation which would result in artificially reducing prices, but I cannot do it. I think we are compelled for a period of time to suffer because of the difficulties which confront us, which are greater than we have ever previously faced in all our history. I think it is incumbent upon us all to cooperate with self-sacrifice in the hope that in the early part of the next session we may cure, for the first time, some of the causes of the ills which we suffer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All of the Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 6 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON].

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, some propaganda has been issued by the Republican Party saying that it is time for a change. I agree that it is time for a change from Republican control of the Congress. The American people will have complete and final proof of their callous disregard of their welfare by their denial of additional housing and of relief from the high prices which are robbing them of the caloric diet necessary to sustain them at work. This special session of Congress is going to add to the previous record of the Republican Congress a record which includes no attention to education, no attention to health, no attention to the minimum wage, and a total disregard of the Republican platform pledges on social security.

Yes, Mr. President; it is high time for a change, and the Congress today will give final and complete evidence of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the four remaining minutes I can only reiterate what I have heretofore said on this subject.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] referred to the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency heard several distinguished members of the administration, Cabinet members, and others. That is true. It did hear them. The Banking and Currency Committee declined and I think, ruthlessly, to hear representatives of millions of American people who were anxious to be heard before Congress ended. I went before the committee a few days ago with a telegram from Mr. A. F. Whitney, head of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, asking and pleading that he be allowed to testify. He was denied the opportunity to do so. I placed in the RECORD telegrams from——

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry, but I cannot yield. I have but 3 minutes left.

I placed in the RECORD telegrams from the heads of the railway brotherhoods, the American Federation of Labor, the CIO, and I have on my desk copies of telegrams which have been sent here by representatives of millions of American citizens who have a right to be heard but who cannot be heard because they have been denied the opportunity. In this connection, Mr. President, I should say that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], was sympathetic in the matter.

I was asked a while ago by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] how much it would cost to administer this amendment if it should be adopted. I was unable to give the Senator the figures, and I cannot do so now, but I am willing to make the prediction that if nothing more is done regarding inflation and the high cost of living than has been proposed by the majority of the Senate, within 12 months it will cost the American people $10,000,000,000 in further increases in the cost of living.

The Republicans have done nothing on housing, nothing on inflation, nothing on

minimum wages, nothing on education, nothing on social security. I suggest that the theme song of the Republican Party between now and next November should be "I've Got Plenty of Nothing."

Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be adopted, that it will be sent to the House of Representatives, to give that branch an opportunity to act, and, before we adjourn, whether it be tonight or next week, to express their opinion and their attitude with respect to this great problem which confronts the American people. I hope the Congress of the United States will not take the attitude of flouting the desire and the will of the American people to have Congress undertake to do something which would affect the household welfare of every man, woman, and child in this Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time for debate has expired under the agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Hoey	Reed
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Tobey
Ecton	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Umstead
Feazel	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hatch	Murray	Young
Hawkes	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—33

Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Ellender	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Feazel	Langer	Pepper
Fulbright	Lucas	Russell
Green	McFarland	Sparkman
Hatch	McGrath	Taylor
Hayden	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	Magnuson	Tydings
Holland	Murray	Umstead

NAYS—53

Aiken	Ferguson	Revercomb
Baldwin	Flanders	Robertson, Va.
Brewster	Gurney	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Stennis
Buck	Jenner	Stewart
Butler	Kem	Taft
Byrd	Knowland	Thye
Cain	Lodge	Tobey
Capehart	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Capper	McClellan	Watkins
Cooper	Malone	Wherry
Cordon	Martin	Wiley
Donnell	Millikin	Williams
Dworshak	Moore	Wilson
Eastland	Morse	Young
Ecton	Reed	

NOT VOTING—10

Ball	George	Wagner
Bushfield	McCarran	White
Chavez	Maybank	
Downey	O'Daniel	

So Mr. BARKLEY's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with my amendment which was just acted upon, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD copies of telegrams I have received from four organizations asking for the adoption of certain legislation in the present session of the Congress.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANHEAD, MD., *August 7, 1948.*

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the 5,250,000 members of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers I implore you to use your influence in keeping Congress in session until the Federal aid-to-education bill is brought to the floor of the House. Equal educational opportunities for all children should not wait for next session of Congress.

MRS. STANLEY G. COOK,
Chairman of Legislation.

CHEVY CHASE, MD., *August 7, 1948.*

Senator BARKLEY,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

American Association of Social Workers deplore passage McCarthy housing bill. Demand open hearings on this bill. Hope you can keep Congress in special session till housing needs under bill are met.

PHILIP SCHIFF,
The American Association of Social Workers.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *August 6, 1948.*

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Inflation in the United States has reached tremendous and frightening proportions. America's inflationary economy can no longer be controlled solely by the isolated measures for restricting credits and increasing bank reserves passed by the House in its anti-inflation bill. The control of inflation requires a coordinated program which takes into consideration all aspects of the economy.

Today the cost of essentials—of food, clothing, and housing—places a serious strain on the budget of the majority of Americans. Savings are rapidly being used up in a desperate effort just to live. Small luxuries have become possible only for a very few.

It is clear that America's economy cannot withstand this strain of inflation for long. An effective remedy must be applied at once.

The members of the National Council of Jewish Women feel strongly that the battle against inflation requires the immediate enactment by Congress of price control, the rationing of foods in short supply, and strengthened rent control. Only by these measures will the rise in prices be halted and the fruits of American production once more be made available to all Americans. We urge you, Senator BARKLEY, to exert every effort in your position of Democratic leadership to bring about the immediate enactment by this special session of Congress of a strong anti-inflation program that will include price control, more effective rent control, and rationing.

MRS. JOSEPH M. WELT,
National President,
National Council of Jewish Women.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 5, 1948.*

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

According to public press and radio, Congress has already planned to adjourn its special session without enacting adequate anti-inflation and housing measures. The continually rising cost of living and the wholly inadequate housing program are a dire threat to our economy and are therefore a very vital concern to the plain citizens of our country.

The International Association of Machinists, representing 600,000 wage earners who, with their families, aggregate approximately 2,000,000 plain citizens, urge you and your associates to remain in session until the two afore-mentioned basic issues are adequately dealt with in a manner that will bring immediate tangible relief to the plain citizens of this country. The International Association of Machinists further requests that we be given an opportunity to be heard in connection with any anti-inflation or housing measures which the present special session of Congress may consider.

H. W. BROWN,
International President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be proposed to the House amendment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I call up my amendment No. 2, and ask for its adoption

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the amendment is a long one.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if it is in order to do so, I shall ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, because it is printed and on the desks of Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TAFT. I object. I think the amendment should be read. Senators do not know what it is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the appropriate place in the House amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

There is hereby created as an agency of the Congress a select committee to be known as the Congressional Economic Study Committee composed of 15 members to be named as follows:

Five members from the Senate of the United States to be named by the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Five members from the House of Representatives to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Five members from civilian life eminently qualified to assist in solving problems in the fields of finance, labor, industry, or agriculture and familiar with the problems of the consuming public to be named jointly by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall designate one member of the committee as chairman and another member as vice chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to make a study of (1) economic maladjustments which it believes are contributing to undesirable levels of prices, wages, and supplies of commodities in the United States or places where the United States has a special responsibility for economic conditions, (2) measures which in the committee's judgment might contribute to an improvement or solution of such economic problems, (3) and to consider and evaluate any reports on economic conditions submitted to the Congress by the executive branch of the Government during the life of the committee. The committee may well study, but is not limited to, any economic situations arising out of money supply and monetary relationships in this and other countries.

The committee shall report to the Senate and the House (or to the respective clerks thereof if the Congress is not in session) from time to time as it shall deem appropriate, but finally not later than March 1, 1949.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress and until the date of its final report at such times and places as it deems advisable, whether or not the Congress is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel and such special assistants, to hold such hearings, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Reports of its activities may be made public from time to time, but its conclusions and recommendations shall be reserved for its reports to Congress as above provided.

Members of the committee who are Members of Congress shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the committee. Members of the committee who are not members of Congress and whose other relationships to the Federal Government do not prevent shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the committee, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

There is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $50,000 or as much thereof as may be necessary to meet the expenditures authorized by this resolution, which expenditures shall be payable upon vouchers signed by the chairman and vice chairman.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is this the first time the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] has been presented to the Senate of the United States?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not advised. The Chair is advised by the clerk that the amendment has been lying on the table. The amendment is in order and is not debatable.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to the House amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia to the House amendment. [Putting the question.] The "nays" appear to have it——

Mr. REVERCOMB. I ask for a division.

On a division, Mr. Revercomb's amendment to the House amendment was rejected.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, there is an amendment on the desk which the junior Senator from Connecticut has submitted. I now offer the amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the House amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC —. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee of the membership thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the present high prices of meat.

SEC. —. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than February 1, 1949.

SEC. —. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] to the House amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN. On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the House amendment. [Putting the question.] The "nays" appear to have it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be offered to the House amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the House amendment, as amended, to the text of Senate Joint Resolution 157.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment of the House of Representatives amending the title to read "Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures" will be agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the last issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some remarks by the junior Senator from Colorado on the subject of social security and excess-profits taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, with amendments, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 445.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, following the first paragraph, under the title "Displaced Persons Commission," to insert the following:

The appropriation of $2,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, Public Law 785, Eightieth Congress, second session, may be apportioned for obligation and expenditure during the first three quarters of the fiscal year 1949.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there is so much disorder in the Senate that many of us cannot understand what question is being put.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to have the question restated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to have the question restated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will again state the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, following the first paragraph, under the title "Displaced Persons Commission" it is proposed to insert:

The appropriation of $2,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission in the Second Deficiency Act, 1948, Public Law 785, Eightieth Congress, second session, may be apportioned for obligation and expenditure during the first three quarters of the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I address a question to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], chairman of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I understand, this is the proposal which was adopted in the committee today, in lieu of passing the $2,000,000 appropriation for which a budget estimate was submitted by the President.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. It is for the purpose of giving greater latitude in spending the money already appropriated, so that it may be spent without fear of violation of the antideficiency section of the law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senate should know that the Congress, in the regular session, provided an appropriation of $2,000,000 to administer the Displaced Persons Act. It was the report of the executive branch of the Government that this was not sufficient. The original request for this purpose was $4,000,000. A new budget of $2,000,000 was submitted to bring the appropriation up to that which was originally requested by the President, upon the ground that the $2,000,000 fund would seriously reduce the number of displaced persons who could come into the United States under the law. This substitute for an appropriation is merely a legislative provision to eliminate the effect of the Antideficiency Act, so that the $2,000,000 which was appropriated may be more rapidly expended than would have been the case otherwise.

The committee has had no hearing. It is impossible to determine whether that will be a sufficient relaxation to enable the displaced persons law to be administered as it was intended to be administered by the Congress only last June, when it was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if the figure he is using is based upon the so-called present law, or whether there was any discussion as to what the figure would be if the law were changed as suggested by the President—and I understand from press reports, also suggested by the Republican nominee. It was suggested that the date be changed. Was there any discussion of that question?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Washington knows that the only thing the Appropriations Committee can do is to base its action on the existing law. It is not within our province to go into any amendments to the basic law. We merely act on the basis of existing law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate that, but I thought that perhaps the Congress might change it, and then we would be without funds to take care of the added burden if the law were changed as suggested.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator that the amendment will adequately take care of everything, and the Congress will be in session again in January. I think the Senator has no cause for worry. I believe there is sufficient latitude so that every consideration may be met.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to know whether this will include the Japanese nationals; or is it limited exclusively to displaced persons in Europe?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is limited to the basic law. I have not the basic law before me, but this is the entire appropriation covering displaced persons. The Senator, being a member of the committee which reported that measure, may know more about it than I. We are dealing with the entire displaced-persons problem.

Mr. LANGER. I am desirous of ascertaining, if I can, whether it also includes the Japanese nationals who were included in a subsequent bill. Does the Senator know about that?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is not my understanding that it does. It refers to the basic original law affecting displaced persons, the act of 1948.

Mr. LANGER. Does this include purely administration?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Does it include the cost of ships to transport persons to this country?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is not my understanding. It has to do only with the administration of the act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the paragraph under the title "Treasury Department," it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, under the title "Motor Carriers Claim Commission," as follows:

Section 6 of Public Law 880, Eightieth Congress, second session, an act to create a Commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers, is hereby amended by striking out the words "six months" in said section and inserting in lieu thereof the words "nine months."

Section 13 of said act is amended by striking out the words "six months' period" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "nine months' period."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to provide additional time after January 3 for the filing of motor vehicle carrier claims which would otherwise expire on January 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to add a comment or two about this item.

The Congress enacted the Motor Carriers Claims Commission Act in July of this year. It was provided that the claims of motor carriers who were alleged to have suffered loss by reason of the fact that the Government of the United States, for purposes of the war, took over certain lines—about 120 in number—in 10 or 11 States of the West during the war, should be filed by January 3. The intention of the law was that such claims should be expeditiously handled.

However, the bill naturally carried no appropriation. The President set up a budget estimate calling for an appropriation of $100,000 to enable the Claims Commission to handle these claims expeditiously—in fact, to enter upon the work immediately.

The appropriation was suggested in the committee, but it was rejected, the purpose of the committee being, as I understood it, not to provide any appropriation other than those which have already been presented by the committee.

This legislative rider changes the law which was enacted in July by extending for 6 months the period during which the claims may be filed. The hope was entertained by those who were supporting the measure when it was under consideration in the Senate that funds might be made available immediately and the work undertaken at once.

Personally, I greatly regret that the appropriation of $100,000 has not been made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I now offer, and send to the desk, individual clarifying amendments, and I ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses

The amount made available under this head in the Government Corporations Appropriations Act, 1949, for administrative expenses for the Office of the Administrator, is increased from $750,000 to $1,050,000.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 10, it is proposed to strike out "Constituent units of the Housing and Home Finance Agency" and insert "Federal Housing Administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 12, after the words "administrative expenses" it is proposed to insert "of the Federal Housing Administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$2,400,000" and insert "$2,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to some omissions in this measure which seem to me to be of real gravity. I intend to make a motion with respect to some of these items.

When the Interior Department appropriation bill was under consideration during the regular session, the Congress had before it the recommendations of the President, through the Budget Bureau, with respect to the construction of power facilities and transmission lines in the West. However, the Senate saw fit to curtail many of those appropriations. In other words the amounts recommended by the President were reduced by the Congress.

One of the appropriations reduced by the Congress was that for the Kortez Dam, in the State of Wyoming. That appropriation was reduced by $715,000.

Some $560,000 was cut from the appropriation for transmission lines in the Missouri Basin, for the completion of a distribution system in the States of Nebraska, Colorado, and Wyoming.

The President has submitted a budget estimate of $1,825,000, that being the exact amount of the reductions which were made in the regular appropriation bill with respect to these matters.

Throughout the West, as indeed, throughout the entire country, there is a shortage of power. The development of the mineral resources of the West, the development of the ordinary business in the West, is being curtailed by lack of power; and one of the purposes of the public power program and the construction of power facilities and particularly the construction of the transmission lines was to hasten the development of this power and make it available.

During the debate upon inflation we have been told over and over again that the best and easiest way to fight inflation is to increase production. It was the desire to increase production which prompted the President of the United States to submit these budget estimates. Therefore, when the Congress curtailed these appropriations, it was acting to curtail production, and thereby it was acting to prevent one of the most effective antidotes for inflation, about which we have heard so much, namely, increased production.

Not only was it true that these reductions were made on a Wyoming project and on Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado transmission lines, but I should also like to call attention to the fact that the appropriation for the Colorado-Big Thompson project has likewise been cut in the amount of $2,775,000. I read from the President's estimate, as submitted by the Budget:

These additional funds are necessary so that the construction of the power-producing and transmission features will not be delayed. It is essential that these funds be made available early in the current fiscal year in order to avoid serious disruption of construction schedules with material delays in the production and transmission of electric energy.

Here is another item in Montana—the Hungry Horse project, in Montana, for which the appropriation requested has been cut $2,183,350. With respect to this project, the President's budget estimate says:

The amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1949 for the Hungry Horse project is $2,183,350 less than the estimate of appropriation submitted. Failure to restore this amount will retard realization of the power benefits of the project for a full year, by delaying increased power production at downstream plants, including Grand Coulee and Bonneville, which will be dependent on the seasonal release of water stored at Hungry Horse.

The appropriation for the Columbia Basin project, in Washington, was cut in the amount of $1,473,000. With respect to that item the budget estimate says:

Estimates affecting power production on this project for the fiscal year 1949 were reduced by $1,473,000. It is essential that this reduction be restored in order to avoid delay in the construction and installation of additional generators at Grand Coulee Dam. Such a delay would accentuate the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest.

An estimate was submitted with respect to the Fort Peck project, in Montana, for an additional amount of $1,500,000—

to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations under this head shall be available for the construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and related substations.

The elimination of this appropriation from the bill was another instance of the kind of curtailment, which took place over and over again, of appropriations which would make electrical-transmission lines available. The policy seemed to be to cut away, so far as possible, any appropriation of the construction of public transmission lines which would take the public power from the generators to the consumers who need the power, and who, indeed, are crying for it.

The budget estimate says:

Additional funds are required to initiate construction of facilities to deliver low-cost electric energy from the Fort Peck project to rural areas in the vicinity of Havre and Shelby, Mont., in accordance with the present power program of the area and to avoid a serious delay in accomplishment of this program.

The same was true with respect to the Central Valley in California. I shall not stop to read the proposed amendment which was sent up, but I merely call attention to the fact that the budget estimate makes this comment:

Additional funds are necessary so that the power-construction program of the Central Valley will not be delayed. Also, modification of restrictive language in the 1949 appropriation act is requested.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all these items. I ask unanimous consent that the Budget estimates may be printed at length in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the estimates were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY, THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

(Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations in the total amount of $56,428,450 proposed for the fiscal year 1949, for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Army)

July 29, 1948.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 28, 1948.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: On July 27, 1948, I presented a message to the Congress in which I urged restoration of reductions made in certain estimates of appropriations for fiscal year 1949 relating to the generation and transmission of electric power and, in the case of the Department of the Interior, removal of certain restrictive limitations on expenditures. I now have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress supplemental estimates of appropriation in the total amount of $56,428,450 proposed for the fiscal year 1949 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Army, as well as certain proposed changes in restrictive limitations contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949.

The details of these estimates and the related revisions of existing law are set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitted herewith, in whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington 25, D. C., July 28, 1948.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: Consonant with your message to the Congress dated July 27, 1948, in which you urge that congressional reductions in certain estimates of appropriation for fiscal year 1949 be restored and certain restrictive limitations on expenditures be removed in order to carry forward the Federal power program consistent with national needs and obviate delays of at least 1 year in the generation and

transmission of electric energy, I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration, supplemental estimates of appropriation for fiscal year 1949 in the total amount of $56,428,450 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of the Army.

In every case where appropriations are requested, the amounts represent restoration in whole or in part of reductions made in your recommendations to the Congress. In addition, certain revisions of existing law are requested. The estimates of appropriation follow:

"TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

"Tennessee Valley Authority: For an additional amount for 'Tennessee Valley Authority,' for construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., $4,000,000, to remain available until expended; and the limitation under this head in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount available for capital expenditures is increased from '$21,689,000' to '$25,689,000.' "

The purpose of this estimate is to permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to begin construction of a steam generating plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., at once and not allow it to be delayed a year. The total cost of this plant is estimated at $54,000,000. The capacity will be 375,000 kilowatts. The plant is necessary to firm up the power supplied by hydro units in dams on the Tennessee Valley Authority system and is urgently needed to meet the growing demands of the area.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"Office of the Secretary

"Expenses, power transmission facilities: For an additional amount for 'Expenses, power transmission facilities,' $97,000: *Provided,* That appropriations under this head for the fiscal year 1949 shall be available for operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities."

These additional funds are requested to adequately maintain and operate existing public-power facilities in a shortage area in the southwestern part of the country.

"Construction, power transmission facilities: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, including the construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities; purchase (not to exceed nine, of which five shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and printing and binding; $2,462,000, to remain available until expended."

The funds requested will provide (1) switching stations to interconnect with existing facilities which will materially relieve the critical power situation in the area; (2) a tie-in to the Fort Gibson project now under construction, thus making this power, when ready, available to the whole region; and (3) additional facilities, general plant, and equipment, all of which are needed to make the Norfork-Denison line more flexible in meeting the growing power needs of the region. Provision of these essential power facilities will be delayed 1 year unless the additional funds are made available in the current fiscal year.

"Continuing fund, power-transmission facilities: All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), generated or purchased in the southwestern power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of $300,000, including the sum of $100,000 in the continuing fund established under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944 (57 Stat. 621), which shall be transferred to the fund hereby established; and said fund of $300,000 shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary and shall be subject to check by him or his duly authorized representative to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuous operation of the facilities, and to cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of transmission lines and appurtenant facilities of public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies."

The continuing fund in this additional amount of $200,000 will provide (1) for emergency expenses, and will thus insure continuous operation of the facilities owned and operated by the Federal Government; (2) for the purchase of electric power and energy; and (3) for the rentals and other costs in connection with the use of transmission lines and appurtenant facilities owned by other public agencies and private interests.

"BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

"Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system: The proviso under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which reads, *'Provided further,* That not exceeding 8 percent of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis:', is hereby repealed."

The Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, included a proviso that not to exceed 8 percent of any construction appropriation for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account. This proviso interferes with the economical and expeditious performance of the authorized work of this Administration and its repeal is therefore recommended.

"BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"General offices

"Salaries and expenses (other than project offices): In addition to the amount appropriated under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, there shall be available for expenditure under said head any sums transferred thereto for work performed or to be performed for the benefit of specific projects or undertakings for which other funds or appropriations of the Bureau of Reclamation are available; and the first and fourth provisos under said head are hereby repealed."

The Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, continued in the first proviso under this head a limitation of $7,800,000 on the amount transferable to this appropriation for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects. This limitation restricts the funds to be expended by the Branch of Design and Construction and its facilitating services in Denver, Colo., where all major power-design work is performed by a specialized staff of engineers. The Bureau's total design load for the fiscal year 1949 is 50 percent greater than for 1948. An increase in the transferable amount is required to provide an adequate engineering staff for the preparation of designs and specifications for power equipment and construction now authorized.

The act also included in the fourth proviso under this head a limitation of $48,000,000 for administrative and other personal services. The power program authorized for 1949, together with the additions recommended herewith, will require additional personal services for proper performance of the work on schedule.

Repeal of these restrictive provisos is recommended.

The language recommended above would repeal both of the provisos referred to, and would continue without limitation as to amount the authority to use funds transferred to this appropriation on account of work performed for the benefit of specific projects or undertakings.

"CONSTRUCTION

"Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch Dam: Funds heretofore appropriated under this head shall be available for construction of a transmission line and related facilities from Anderson Ranch power plant to Mountain Home, Idaho."

No additional funds are required for the construction of the authorized transmission line from Anderson Ranch to Mountain Home, Idaho, but the statement in the report of the House Appropriations Committee that funds for the construction of this transmission line are specifically disallowed will in effect leave a completed power plant with no means of disposal of this power to any existing system. Under present schedules, power will be available at Anderson Ranch by July 1950. Unless authority is immediately given to the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with the construction of this line, the capacity of the plant upon completion could not be utilized for its intended purpose since, under present conditions, at least 2 years are required to secure materials and construct such facilities.

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

"Central Valley project, California: For an additional amount for 'Central Valley project, California,' from power revenues, $45,600.

"Columbia Basin project, Washington: For an additional amount for 'Columbia Basin project, Washington,' from power revenues, $135,000.

"Shoshone project, Wyoming: For an additional amount for 'Shoshone project, Wyoming,' from power revenues, $28,500."

These funds from power revenues are required to provide adequately for the operation and maintenance during fiscal year 1949 of additional generating capacity which was placed in operation during fiscal year 1948, and not previously provided for, and of additional capacity which will be placed in operation during fiscal year 1949.

Without these additional funds the proper operation and maintenance of urgently needed generating units cannot be adequately provided to assure a continuous source of reliable power.

"GENERAL FUND, CONSTRUCTION

"General fund, construction: For additional amounts for continuation of construction, to remain available until expended, as follows:

"Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada, $3,302,000."

These funds are required for the continuation of construction on schedule of all the features of Davis Dam project. An additional power supply is urgently needed in the Southwest, particularly in the State of Arizona, where deficiencies in existing power supply have been extremely serious in respect to irrigation pumping. These funds are necessary for initial generation at Davis power plant early in 1950, on schedule, to meet the requirements for irrigation pumping at the beginning of the irrigation season in the spring of that year. The construction of the project's major backbone transmission system is geared to the schedule for the installation of generating equipment, so that transmission facilities will be available for operation at the time new generation is brought in at the Davis power plant. Supplemental funds in the amount of this estimate are required to avoid serious delays in supplying power to an area which has one of the most serious deficiencies in our Nation.

"Central Valley project, California: $3,990,000 to be available as follows: transmission lines, Shasta to Delta (Tracy) via Oroville and Sacramento, Shasta-Tracy No. 1 and No. 2 (west side line), Shasta-Roseville, Tracy-Contra Costa-Clayton-Ignacio, and Keswick-Tracy via Elverta, communication equipment and Roseville substation, $2,264,000, to be consolidated with the limitation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount available for 'transmission lines, Shasta to Delta (Tracy) via Oroville and Sacramento,' which is increased from '$500,000' to '$2,764,000'; switchyards at Elverta and switchyard facilities at Tracy, whether or not required for operation of the project pumps, to be consolidated with the limitation under said head on 'switchyards, Shasta, Keswick, and Tracy pumping plant,' which is increased from '$3,250,000' to '$4,776,000'; and Delta steam plant, $200,000: *Provided*, That in carrying out the terms of the proviso under said head, unobligated balances may be classified and combined with and expanded for any of the foregoing amounts in the same manner as prescribed for amounts previously appropriated for under said head."

Additional funds are necessary so that the power construction program of the Central Valley will not be delayed. Also, modification of restrictive language in the 1949 Appropriation Act is requested.

"Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $2,775,000."

These additional funds are necessary so that the construction of the power producing and transmission features will not be delayed. It is essential that these funds be made available early in the current fiscal year in order to avoid serious disruption of construction schedules with material delays in the production and transmission of electric energy.

"Hungry Horse project, Montana, $2,183,350."

The amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1949 for the Hungry Horse project is $2,183,350 less than the estimate of appropriation submitted. Failure to restore this amount will retard realization of the power benefits of the project for a full year, by delaying increased power production at downstream plants, including Grand Coulee and Bonneville, which will be dependent on the seasonal release of water stored at Hungry Horse.

"Columbia Basin project, Washington, $1,473,000."

Estimates affecting power production on this project for the fiscal year 1949 were reduced by $1,473,000. It is essential that this reduction be restored in order to avoid a delay in the construction and installation of additional generators at Grand Coulee Dam. Such a delay would accentuate the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest.

"FORT PECK PROJECT

"Fort Peck project, Montana: For an additional amount for 'Fort Peck project, Montana,' $1,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations under this head shall be available for construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and related substations."

Additional funds are required to initiate construction of facilities to deliver low cost electric energy from the Fort Peck project to rural areas in the vicinity of Havre and Shelby, Mont., in accordance with the present power program of the area and to avoid a serious delay in accomplishment of this program.

"MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

"Missouri River Basin (reimbursable to the extent and as provided in the act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534)): For an additional amount for 'Missouri River Basin,' $1,825,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the second proviso under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, funds appropriated under said head shall be available for and in connection with the acquisition or installation of power facilities or transmission facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana."

Additional funds in the amount of $550,000, together with elimination of the legislative restrictions relating to the construction of the Canyon Ferry Dam and power plant, are required to avoid delay in the orderly construction of this project including the development of power in line with the original authorization.

Additional funds in the amount of $715,000 are necessary to continue the construction of Kortes Dam and power plant on schedule.

Additional funds in the amount of $560,000 are required for the Missouri Basin Transmission Lines Unit for the early completion of the power system in the tri-State area of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado. All of these lines are under contract or will be placed under contract at an early date.

"FORCE ACCOUNT WORK

"That part of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which reads 'not exceeding 8 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed $200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive' is hereby repealed."

The Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, included a proviso that not exceeding 8 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in the act shall be available for construction work by force account. From long experience, the Bureau of Reclamation has found that the installation of certain electrical equipment and other work may best be performed economically and expeditiously by force account.

The experienced volume of such force account operations is small in relation to the total power program but the ratio varies in respect to individual project appropriations. Repeal of the restrictive proviso is recommended.

"NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

"CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CORPS OF ENGINEERS

"Rivers and harbors and flood control

"Rivers and harbors

"Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: For an additional amount for 'Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works,' $10,583,000, to remain available until expended."

These additional funds include $2,000,000 for Jim Woodruff Dam in the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers system and $8,000,000 for McNary Dam in the Columbia River Basin and are required to maintain normal and economical construction progress on these projects. The remaining $583,000 will be used to continue planning activities on Chief Joseph (Foster Creek) Dam in the Columbia River Basin in order that construction on this project may be initiated in fiscal year 1950.

"Flood control

"Flood control, general: For an additional amount for 'Flood control, general,' $21,829,000, to remain available until expended."

These additional funds include $3,000,000 for Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark., $800,000 for Blakely Mountain Reservoir, Ark., $800,000 for Narrows Reservoir, Ark., $2,000,000 for Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla., $1,172,000 for Whitney Reservoir, Tex., $7,287,000 for Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky., $4,400,000 for Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak., and $2,370,000 for Folsom Dam, Calif.

With respect to the request for Folsom Dam, it is contemplated that the Congress will expand the present authorization for this project, in accordance with the recommendations contained in your message dated January 12, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 496, 80th Cong., 2d sess.), to provide for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of a power plant and transmission lines, as well as irrigation works, and for transfer of the dam and reservoir, upon its completion, to the same agency for operation.

It is essential that these additional funds for rivers and harbors and flood control be made available early in the current fiscal year in order to forestall serious and costly disruptions in construction schedules with resulting delays of at least 1 year in the generation of much-needed electric energy as well as adverse effects on the industrial economy of the respective areas and unwarranted drains on the petroleum resources of the Nation.

The need for these appropriations was fully explained in your message of July 27, 1948. I recommend that the estimates be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In order that we may have a determination by the Senate as to whether or not the Congress should endeavor to supply this public power by the early completion of the project and by the construction of the necessary transmission lines, I shall offer the amendment dealing with the Missouri River Basin. The amendment reads as follows:

I move that there be added to the appropriation bill, in the appropriate place, the following language:

Missouri River Basin: Missouri River Basin (reimbursable to the extent and as provided in the act of December 22, 1944, Public Law 534): For additional amount for "Missouri River Basin," $1,825,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the second proviso under this head in the Interior Department appropriation Act, 1949, funds appropriated under said head shall be available for and in connection with the acquisition or installation of power facilities or transmission facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana.

Let me add, Mr. President, this comment from the budget estimate:

Additional funds in the amount of $550,000, together with elimination of the legislative restrictions relating to the construction of the Canyon Ferry Dam and power plant, are required to avoid delay in the orderly construction of this project including the development of power in line with the original authorization.

Additional funds in the amount of $715,000 are necessary to continue the construction of Kortes Dam and power plant on schedule.

Additional funds in the amount of $560,000 are required for the Missouri Basin transmission lines unit for the early completion of the power system in the tri-State area of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado. All of these lines are under contract or will be placed under contract at an early date.

I might add that the proposed dam under the plans as they were submitted and approved, and for which the budget estimate was prepared, would have been completed by the end of December 1949. Because this amount was eliminated, it

will not be possible to complete the dam before the middle of 1950 at the earliest.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit the amendment and earnestly hope it may have the support of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to offer, as an amendment to the amendment just proposed by the Senator from Wyoming, the addition of the following language:

Hungry Horse project, Montana, $2,183,350.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a point of order? Is this an amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it an amendment beyond the second degree?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. It is an original amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming is an original amendment. The Senator from Montana, as the Chair understands, is offering an amendment to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct. The amendment which I have just proposed is intended to make it possible to complete the Hungry Horse Dam in Montana 1 year earlier than it will be completed under the existing appropriations. The appropriations that were requested for that project were cut down to a sum which was $2,183,350 less than the estimates submitted for the construction of the dam; which, as I say, will delay the construction of that dam for a whole year, and will be a great injury to the country in view of the fact that there is tremendous shortage of power.

I also wish to add as another item, the following:

FORT PECK PROJECT

Fort Peck project, Montana: For an additional amount for "Fort Peck project, Montana," $1,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations under this head shall be available for construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and related substations.

This item is essential for the purpose of carrying out the construction of this transmission line in Montana, which will enable the farmers in my State to get the advantage of low-cost power produced at Fort Peck Dam. It provides for a transmission line that will carry that power from Havre, Mont., to Shelby, Mont.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I correctly understand that the Fort Peck amendment which the Senator offers is for $1,500,000?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest to the Senator from Montana that the amendment he now offers with respect to Fort Peck is within the budget estimate.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment which he offers with respect to the Hungry Horse project is not within the budget estimate. In order that the issue may not be confused, may I suggest to the Senator that he withhold his Hungry Horse amendment, because if he goes above the budget the whole amendment will be jeopardized.

Mr. MURRAY. The able Senator from Wyoming suggests that I withdraw that item relating to the Hungry Horse project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Perhaps I did not correctly understand the Senator. Was his Hungry Horse project amendment for the sum of $2,183,350?

Mr. MURRAY. The original amount was very much larger. I have forgotten the exact figure, but it was something like $16,000,000. It was curtailed to the extent of $2,183,350. It was less than the amount the budget estimate called for, for the construction of the dam, in order to complete it within the time specified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My understanding now is that the Senator's amendment with respect to the Hungry Horse project is to carry out the budget estimate.

Mr. MURRAY. It is within the budget estimate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the question now before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is offering an amendment to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming to the appropriation bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming, and what is the amendment to the amendment, submitted by the Senator from Montana?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming will again state his amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to appropriate $1,825,000 for the Missouri River Basin under the reclamation laws. This would include $550,000 for the Canyon Ferry Dam in Montana, $715,000 for the Kortes Dam in Wyoming, and $560,000 for electrical transmission lines in the tri-State area of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado.

The Senator from Montana has offered two amendments to my amendment; one of them being to appropriate the budget estimate of $2,183,350 for the Hungry Horse project in Montana; the other, to appropriate $1,500,000, as submitted in the budget estimate, for the Fort Peck project in Montana. All these were items which were denied in the last appropriation bill, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I merely wish to discuss briefly the need of these appropriations to carry out the construction work in Montana. Everyone knows there is a serious shortage of power in the country. It is having a very serious effect upon economic conditions.

A shortage of production in many lines has been created. There is a serious shortage of production of aluminum in this country. Many small business concerns are being forced into bankruptcy as the result of their failure to get the aluminum necessary to keep them in operation. So it seems to me that the Senate would be acting wisely if it accepted these amendments and made it possible for us to go forward with the construction of the projects in the West, which will contribute very materially to the stabilization of economic conditions and to increasing production.

Mr. President, for many years I have been associated with our distinguished colleague from Wyoming in problems concerning the West. I have always found, as I am sure we all have, that Senator O'MAHONEY is a profound and penetrating student of economic factors which affect the well-being of our Western States and of the entire Nation.

I want to join with the able Senator from Wyoming in the proposal he has made and I want particularly to lend emphasis to his point, that essential to the fight against inflation is the increased power developed in the West which would result if this Congress were to adequately finance these projects.

Only last week I addressed the President of the United States on this subject as follows:

JULY 31, 1948.

It occurs to me that while congressional committees are holding hearings on other matters, there is no reason why the Congress should not act immediately to provide funds for justified hydroelectric, reclamation, and rural electrification projects in the West. Such developments by increasing production can provide a key to the price situation and help retard the inflationary trend now threatening the country.

In my own State of Montana there are several such projects which I have on earlier occasions discussed with you. Full appropriations for the Fort Peck construction program including the Havre-Shelby line and three substations, and a $3,500,000 appropriation for work on the Yellowtail Dam project are, I believe, two essential items in such a program.

I know you will realize that this is in no sense a special plea for special favors for my State. I have just returned from Montana and I know that the people out there are keenly aware of the importance of these measures. I am positive that they are reflecting the opinions of the people in all our Western States. They feel that this Congress has given them too much legislative lip service and not enough action. I am sure that the people of Montana and of the entire West will support your demand that the Congress take action on these subjects which have been mentioned approvingly in the campaign platforms of both political parties.

Mr. President, in the message of the President of the United States to the Congress, a legislative program was laid down in which the urgent needs of the people of this country were stressed. The President pointed out that we are in the midst of a dangerous inflation which may ultimately result in economic collapse, widespread economic chaos, and bankruptcy.

These needs of the people cannot be ignored or evaded without serious danger to our economic system. The people are demanding that Congress take prompt action to check the rising costs of living and the rapidly mounting inflation threatening the country. These demands are coming from citizens in all walks of life and from all over the Nation.

Unless something is done to curb these mounting living costs, we will be plunged into a deadly depression, with widespread unemployment and bankruptcy for thousands of small-business men. It will be a repetition of the depression which we experienced in the thirties, with even more serious consequences.

The President, in his message calling attention to the needs of the country, pointed to the acute shortage of electric power, which has created serious problems in the field of industrial production. Anything that holds back production is bound to increase costs of living; anything that increases production tends to lower the costs of living.

Mr. President, these two problems—high costs of living and the shortage of electric power for industrial development—are closely related. The shortage of electric power is causing serious distress and financial loss to many business concerns deprived of adequate supplies of aluminum, newsprint, fertilizer, and other industrial products which require a heavy use of electric power.

From many sections of the country last winter we heard demands for relief from the shortage of oil and coal, so essential in our homes and in industrial production. Notwithstanding these facts, we have been neglecting to harness our river systems for the production of low-cost electric power to relieve these pressures. A program along the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority, applied to other sections of the Nation, would have a revolutionary effect on our whole economic situation.

Publicly constructed low-cost hydroelectric power projects is one of the great issues of our times. Nothing could be more effective in bringing widespread prosperity to our Western States. It is demanded by the people but vigorously opposed by the power monopoly. A proper program for the harnessing of our river systems and the development of hydroelectric power would not only solve the problem of our short supply of oil and coal; but it would also bring about vastly increased industrial production, overcoming many of the shortages now causing high living costs and inflation.

The President in his message has now appealed to the Congress to reconsider its record, which has struck sharply at our national electric power policy. He is requesting Congress, in this special session, to consider appropriations needed for power projects in the West which, if constructed, will do more to overcome these dangerous economic problems than any single thing that could be considered. This is a program in which the sparsely settled Western States are vitally interested. In Montana, for example, we have been witnessing a dwindling population and an ever-increasing tax burden on the people. Montana's small population and low tax income are insufficient to support the operations and services of a government in the vast State we live in. There is only one solution for this problem, and that is the development in Montana of processing plants and industries that can be related to our natural resources. This would mean increased population, increased taxable values, and a stronger and more efficient government.

Mr. President, the establishment of a fertilizer industry in our State, for example, would have an immediate and permanent effect on our future growth and prosperity. Montana has large deposits of phosphate rock, which is the basis of cheap chemical fertilizers necessary to replenish and maintain the croplands of the Nation. The Federal Government has gone beyond the planning stage in developing the western fertilizer industry, private businessmen are ready to make their investments in it—all that is holding things up is the completion of power-generating dams and transmission lines to provide cheap hydroelectric power near the vast deposits of phosphate rock.

Yet Montana may not get it share of these fertilizer plants unless the people of our State, realizing the importance of this great new industry, become fully aroused to insist that no delays be allowed to interfere with the Government's program of increasing hydroelectric development. This is the key to the industrial development of Montana. It is why I supported the construction of Hungry Horse Dam long before it was a popular cause; why I urged the construction of Fort Peck power-generating installations, and why now I am doing my utmost in Washington to secure other electric power dams to be put to use powering the machinery to make cheap chemical fertilizers abundant.

Mr. President, a single large-scale superphosphate chemical plant located in Montana would mean a direct investment of $4,000,000. It would require 300 workers employed in such a plant and in the mines, with a pay roll of approximately $1,000,000 a year being spent in Montana. Several such plants could be located in our State.

In the counties where such a phosphate industry might be located, not only will the local residents find steady work at high pay, but there will be a gain of 10 percent or more in additional population. Demands for all kinds of things will increase, too—for food, clothing, housing, amusements, professional services, schools, and community activities. But there would be substantially greater increases in taxable wealth to pay for the added costs to the counties and cities where this phosphate plant is located. Experts have estimated that such a plant would add approximately one-fourth to the taxes collected in the counties where it operated, giving great opportunity for community improvements, while at the same time reducing proportionately the taxes now being paid in such counties.

The production of triple superphosphate in Montana will give the stockmen and farmers vast quantities of this much-needed fertilizer right at their very dooryards at a great reduction in price over what they now are forced to pay for fertilizer, much of which is freighted across the continent.

This is no small matter to our State, where so much of our wealth and so many of our people are dependent on agriculture for their living.

Let me repeat, there is only one major obstacle standing in the way of building a great fertilizer industry in Montana in the near future—and that is the lack of an adequate supply of low-cost hydroelectric power. Just consider this one fact: Tennessee, which has 2 percent of the Nation's phosphate rock, now produces and markets over a fourth of all this chemical fertilizer in the United States. She does so for one principal reason, that she has the TVA with its tremendous amount of low-cost power. And the making of chemical fertilizers requires a great amount of cheap electric power.

Montana is doubly blessed by a provident Nature. She has great quantities of phosphate rock ready to be mined, and she has more and better places to put dams, and larger amounts of unused water flowing down her stream beds than almost any other area of the country.

And yet, because of the powerful opposition of the Electric Power Trust, we continue to neglect to provide programs for the control and development of our great river systems and the development of low-cost hydroelectric power. We continue to permit soil erosion and floods to carry down our streams the rich topsoil of our agricultural lands, to be dumped in the ocean and lost forever. On July 8, 1948, General Eisenhower, touching on this subject at a conference in New York, made the statement:

> You can stand at the dock in New Orleans, where the Mississippi enters the Gulf of Mexico, and witness a 40-acre farm go past your feet on its way to the ocean every 30 seconds. We in this country must do our part on all of these fronts.

Will we in Montana accept this advice and do our part in conserving our great resources of water and soil, and in the development of our great electric power potentialities? Or must we go on exhausting our resources, losing population, while other sections around us are enjoying ever-increasing prosperity? Or must we continue to be a backward State, saddling upon the taxpayers one of the largest and most costly highway systems in the Nation on a population of only 500,000 people?

My answer, and I am sure it is the answer of the people of Montana, is that we must work continuously to support the program for the development of low-cost electric power in our State as the basis of our industrial growth. We must work for the development of a chemical fertilizer industry in Montana, and for other industries and businesses that will be stimulated as a result of such a program.

This is the answer to Montana's problem of lack of adequate population to

support a sound and efficient State government, and lack of adequate taxable values which make it necessary for the people of our State to assume excessive tax burdens. By such a program we will increase our population, spread the burdens of taxation, increase opportunities for our young folks to secure jobs, and bring genuine prosperity to our State.

This will not only help Montana but it will help the Nation solve the problem of production and advance the living standards of all our people.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would it be in order for me to offer an amendment similar to the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in connection with these western projects? My amendment would add other projects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is an amendment to an amendment already pending. As soon as that amendment is disposed of, the Senator's amendment would be in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, Mr. President, at this time I wish to associate myself wholeheartedly with the remarks made by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Wyoming on the matter of western power projects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like very much to make a very brief observation regarding the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and the amendment offered to that amendment by the distinguished Senator from Montana. One has to do with the Missouri River Basin appropriations in the amount of $1,825,000. The other has to do with the Hungry Horse project in the amount of $2,183,350, and also the Fort Peck project, involving $1,500,000.

I should like to state to the Members of the Senate that these are some of the projects which were given full consideration in the hearings in the House, which lasted from early in January until May, and those hearings were made the basis of the findings of the Senate committee. The Senate committee also held continuous sessions on each one of the projects, going into the justifications of all of them. Let me give the Senate some idea of the amount of money involved in the regular appropriation bill. The regular budget estimate which came to the House was in the amount of $235,059,000. That is the over-all estimate. The House, after giving each one of the projects full study, allowed $187,924,175. Then the Senate reviewed the House findings. All the new testimony and other testimony was considered. The Senate subcommittee and the full committee recommended the amount of $207,994,000. It was reported to the Senate and passed the Senate. Then the bill went to conference, and the total amount of new appropriations which the conferees brought back and which both Houses adopted was $202,541,037.

The President asked to have reinstated for reclamation, rivers and harbors, and civil functions the amount of $56,428,450, which is the difference between what the budget estimate was and what Congress allowed in the regular session. For reclamation it amounts to $20,016,450.

I want to be fair about this, Mr. President, as I know does the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. Much can be said about the merits of these projects. I do not want to dispute with him as to that matter. It is a question of how fast the program should proceed. It was with a great deal of pride that I listened to the complimentary remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming wherein he said that the committee had done a good job. There was no quarrel with the amounts brought to the Senate floor. Even though we might have had some personal differences, the subcommittee and the full committee endorsed the items which are now sought to be amended in order to get additional funds.

As I recall, the only difference we had was over the minority report that was filed by the Senator from Wyoming, I believe it was, and I think the Senator from Arizona, relative to the restrictive language which had to do with the employment of the reclamation officials. I believe that is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to repeat now what I said at the time the original appropriation bill was brought in. I think the Senator from Nebraska did a very excellent piece of work in bringing about several substantial increases in the appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Nevertheless, as he has said, there were in many cases sums appropriated below the budget estimates. In the case of the Kortes Dam in particular the fact remains that this reduction of $715,000 prevents the completion of the dam within the year. If that appropriation were added it would mean the finishing of that plant, it would not mean a continuing appropriation. Therefore, the President has sent these budget estimates to the Congress, pointing out that he has not added any new money, but some of the items had been cut down, causing a delaying effect on the construction of the power facilities and the transmission of public power.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his restatement relative to the work of the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall yield to the Senator before I conclude.

When the Senate assembled, it was my opinion that the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations on the Interior Department of both the House and Senate had considered all the items, but there was no new evidence, and we felt that we should not reopen the items unless there could be new evidence submitted, or a new need submitted for justification.

I took this matter up with the chairman of the House committee, and he said he agreed with me. We looked all the items over, and I have here an analysis of the additional appropriations asked by the President, and I should like to insert it at this point in the RECORD, because I think very definitely it should be in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1949, AS SUBMITTED IN HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 735, DATED JULY 29, 1948

In House Document 735, July 29, 1948, there was submitted to the Congress supplemental estimates for the fiscal year 1949 totaling $56,428,450 for the following:

(1) Tennessee Valley Authority	$4,000,000
(2) Interior Department	20,016,450
(3) Corps of Engineers—civil functions	32,412,000
Total	56,428,450

The items and projects for which the supplemental amounts are requested appear in tables attached to this memorandum.

In addition to a request of $20,016,450 for the Interior Department, various language changes are requested in the 1949 Interior Department Appropriation Act, which are discussed in the pages in this memorandum relating to the Interior Department.

The Acting Director of the Budget Bureau in transmitting the supplemental estimates to the President stated the purpose of the supplemental estimates to be as follows:

"Consonant with your message to the Congress dated July 27, 1948, in which you urge that congressional reductions in certain estimates of appropriation for fiscal year 1949 be restored and certain restrictive limitations on expenditures be removed in order to carry forward the Federal power program consistent with national needs and obviate delays of at least 1 year in the generation and transmission of electric energy, I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration, supplemental estimates of appropriation for fiscal year 1949 in the total amount of $56,428,450."

The Acting Director of the Budget Bureau further states in his letter to the President as follows:

"In every case where appropriations are requested, the amounts represent restoration in whole or in part of reductions made in your recommendations to the Congress."

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ITEM IN SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET ESTIMATE, HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 735, JULY 29, 1948

The supplemental estimate proposes an appropriation of $4,000,000 as an additional appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority, fiscal year 1949, this amount to be used toward construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., the estimated cost of which is $54,000,000.

This is the item for which an estimate of $4,000,000 was submitted to Congress in the regular 1949 budget. The item was included in the Government corporations appropriations bill, 1949, as passed by the Senate.

Following conferences between the Senate and House conferees, and failure to reach an agreement, the chairman of the Senate conferees on June 19, 1948, moved that the Senate recede from the amendments involving the New Johnsonville steam plant. The motion that the Senate recede lost on a roll-call vote, 37–47.

The amendments (Nos. 1, 2, and 3) involving the steam plant were subsequently reported in disagreement by the conferees of the Senate and House. Following adoption of the conference report by the House, a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments lost on a roll-call vote, 186–201. The House then insisted on its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

Following adoption of the conference report by the Senate, a motion was made that the Senate recede from the amendments relating to the steam plant, and this motion was agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT ITEMS IN SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET ESTIMATE, HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 735, JULY 29, 1948

A. Supplemental items involving requests for additional funds.

1. These items are listed on the attached table.

B. Supplemental items involving requested changes in language.

1. Bonneville Power Administration:

The supplemental estimate proposes to repeal the following proviso appearing in the 1949 act: *"Provided further,* That not exceeding 8 percent of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis."

As passed by the House the limitation on force account work was fixed at 6 percent.

As passed by the Senate, the House proviso was deleted, and the following proviso was inserted in lieu thereof: *"Provided further,* That no part of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except for management and operation, maintenance and repairs, installation of machinery or equipment, engineering and supervision, routine minor construction work, or in case of emergencies, local in character, or in those instances when no bids have been received in response to a public invitation therefor."

The proviso as finally agreed to by the House and Senate appears above, and House Document 735, page 3, proposes the repeal of this proviso.

2. Bureau of Reclamation:

(a) General offices, salaries and expenses (other than project offices):

The supplemental estimate proposes to delete from the 1949 act the following proviso: "*Provided,* That in addition to the foregoing amount there may be transferred to this appropriation from other appropriations made to the Bureau of Reclamation not to exceed $7,800,000 for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects and to insert in lieu of the foregoing limitation the following provision, which in effect is the same language as was contained in the 1949 budget estimates:

"Salaries and expenses (other than project offices): In addition to the amount appropriated under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, there shall be available for expenditure under said head any sums transferred thereto for work performed or to be performed for the benefit of specific projects or undertakings for which other funds or appropriations of the Bureau of Reclamation are available."

The Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, as it became law appropriated $3,600,000 for "Salaries and expenses (other than project offices)," and in addition it made available to this appropriation "not to exceed $7,800,000 for work to be performed for the benefit of specific projects." The $7,800,000 is a limitation on the Denver office, and the effect of repealing this proviso and inserting the proposed language would be to remove the ceiling on the amounts for transfer to this office for work performed or to be performed for the benefit of specific projects.

The bill as passed by the House provided for a limitation of $6,000,000, the bill as passed by the Senate provided for a limitation of $8,500,000, and the conferees agreed on $7,800,000.

The supplemental estimate also proposes to repeal the following proviso appearing under the appropriation "General offices, salaries and expenses (other than project offices): *Provided further,* That not exceeding $48,000,000 of appropriations available for expenditure by the Bureau of Reclamation during the fiscal year 1949 shall be used for administrative personal service and other personal services."

This proviso as passed by the House provided for a limitation of $45,341,615. The Senate deleted this proviso from the bill. In conference a compromise was reached, fixing the limitation at $48,000,000.

(b) Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch Dam: The supplemental estimate proposes the enactment of the following provision:

"Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch Dam: Funds heretofore appropriated under this head shall be available for construction of a transmission line and related facilities from Anderson Ranch power plant to Mountain Home, Idaho."

The House allowed $5,100,000 for the Anderson Ranch Dam project, and the Senate agreed to this amount. The House in its report, however, stated that $139,444 for construction of a transmission line from Anderson Ranch power plant to Mountain Home, Idaho, was specifically disallowed.

The provision proposed in the supplemental estimate, therefore, would make funds appropriated to this project available for construction of the transmission line referred to.

(c) Central Valley project, California:

In proposing an additional appropriation of $3,990,000 for this project, the language submitted sets forth certain transmission lines, substations, and switchyards.

The 1949 act contains the following proviso in connection with this project: "*Provided,* That the unobligated balance on June 30, 1948, of funds heretofore appropriated for this project shall be classified under and combined with these amounts and shall be expendable only for the specific purposes set forth in this paragraph, subject to determination by the Comptroller General."

The supplemental estimate proposes the following provision with respect to the foregoing proviso: "*Provided,* That in carrying out the terms of the proviso under said head, unobligated balances may be classified and combined with and expended for any of the foregoing amounts in the same manner as prescribed for amounts previously appropriated for under said head."

(d) Fort Peck project, Montana:

In addition to proposing an appropriation of $1,500,000 for this project as an additional amount for the fiscal year 1949, the supplemental estimate proposes to insert the following proviso in the 1949 act: "*Provided,* That appropriations under this head shall be available for construction of the Havre-Shelby transmission line and related substations."

The House in allowing $990,000 for this project stated in its report that funds were specifically disallowed for the Havre-Shelby transmission line and related substations. A provision was also placed in the bill by the House rescinding carry-over funds totaling $560,197, which would otherwise have been available during the fiscal year 1949 in connection with the Havre-Shelby transmission line and related facilities.

As the bill passed the Senate, the appropriation for the Fort Peck project was increased from $990,000, as proposed by the House, to $1,980,000, and the rescission provision was deleted.

In conference, the appropriation was fixed at $990,000, the House figure, and the Senate receded from its amendment deleting from the bill the rescission provision.

(e) Missouri River Basin:

The supplemental estimate, in addition to proposing an additional appropriation of $1,825,000, recommends the following language: "*Provided,* That notwithstanding the second proviso under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, funds appropriated under said head shall be available for and in connection with the acquisition or installation of power facilities or transmission facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana."

As the bill passed the House, it carried the following proviso respecting the Canyon Ferry Reservoir: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate Canyon Ferry Reservoir at a higher maximum normal pool elevation than 3,766 feet, unless and until such time as the waters above the Hebgen Dam have been completely utilized for irrigation purposes; or for or in connection with the construction of the power plant, power facilities, or transmission facilities in connection with the Canyon Ferry project, Montana, other than excavating costs in connection with the construction of the dam and foundation for a powerhouse."

The Senate struck this proviso from the bill.

In conference, the proviso was restored to the bill in the following form: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate Canyon Ferry Reservoir at a higher maximum normal pool elevation than 3,766 feet, unless and until new land in Broadwater County, Mont., equal to acreage of the irrigated land to be inundated in Canyon Ferry Reservoir above elevation 3,766 feet is provided with facilities for irrigation; or for or in connection with the acquisition or installation of the power facilities or transmisson facilities for delivering power from the Canyon Ferry project, Montana."

(f) Force account work:

The supplemental estimate proposes repeal of the force account provision in the 1949 act by enactment of the following:

"That part of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, which reads 'not exceeding 8 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed $200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive' is hereby repealed."

The force account provision in the 1949 bill as passed by the House reads as follows:

"Not exceeding 6 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis."

The Senate deleted from the bill the House provision on force account work and inserted the following force account provision in lieu thereof:

"No part of any construction appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except for management and operation, maintenance and repairs, installation of machinery or equipment, engineering and supervision, routine minor construction work, or in case of emergencies, local in character, or in those instances when no bids have been received in response to a public invitation therefor."

The Senate and House conferees agreed on the following force account provision, which the supplemental estimate proposes be repealed:

"Not exceeding 8 percent of the construction appropriation for any project under the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis, except for projects or items the estimated construction cost of which does not exceed $200,000, and only then in cases where the Bureau of Reclamation finds the lowest bids to be excessive."

Comparative figures on Bureau of Reclamation items for which supplemental estimates were submitted in H. Doc. No. 735, July 29, 1948

Item	Regular estimate	Allowed by House	Allowed by Senate	Amount in 1949 act	Amount of supplemental
Expenses, power transmission facilities	$180,000	[1] $260,000	[1] $260,000	[1] $260,000	$97,000
Construction, power transmission	3,000,000				2,462,000
Continuing fund, power transmission facilities	[2] 200,000				[2] 200,000
Operation and maintenance:					
Central Valley, Calif	1,160,000	979,675	1,110,000	1,044,837	45,600
Columbia Basin, Wash	1,780,000	1,600,000	1,690,000	1,645,000	135,000
Shoshone, Wyo	231,000	165,000	199,000	182,000	28,500
General fund, construction:					
Davis Dam, Ariz.-Nev	25,427,000	18,000,000	22,884,300	22,125,000	3,302,000
Central Valley, Calif	47,186,000	40,000,000	42,467,400	41,358,900	3,990,000
Colorado-Big Thompson, Colo	23,000,000	19,750,000	20,700,000	20,225,000	2,775,000
Hungry Horse, Mont	[3] 16,795,000	8,100,000	15,115,500	14,611,650	2,183,350
Columbia Basin, Wash	50,000,000	45,312,000	45,312,000	45,312,000	1,473,000
Fort Peck, Mont	2,200,000	990,000	1,980,000	990,000	1,500,000
Missouri River Basin	63,900,000	52,767,500	56,275,800	54,786,650	1,825,000
Total	235,059,000	187,924,175	207,994,000	202,541,037	20,016,450

[1] Consolidation of appropriation items under "Expenses, power transmission facilities."
[2] Increase in continuing fund from $100,000 to $300,000 requested.
[3] Includes $6,945,000 not before House but submitted in S. Doc. 166.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL FUNCTIONS—ITEMS IN SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET ESTIMATE, HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 735, JULY 29, 1948

House Document 735 proposes additional 1949 appropriations for the Corps of Engineers for rivers and harbors and flood control, general, totaling $32,412,000.

The $32,412,000 requested in the supplemental estimate is divided as follows:

(1) Rivers and harbors (3 projects)	$10,583,000
(2) Flood control, general (8 projects)	21,829,000
Total	32,412,000

Comparative figures on the three rivers and harbors and the eight flood control, general, projects appear on the attached table. In each instance the amount of the supplemental request is the amount of reduction made by Congress in the regular 1949 budget estimate.

Comparative figures on Corps of Engineers, civil functions, items for which supplemental estimates were submitted in H. Doc. No. 735, July 29, 1948

Item	Regular estimate	Allowed by House	Allowed by Senate	Amount in 1949 act	Amount of supplemental
Rivers and harbors:					
Jim Woodruff Dam, Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers system	$5,000,000	$2,000,000	$5,000,000	$3,000,000	$2,000,000
McNary Dam, Columbia River Basin	30,000,000	20,000,000	27,000,000	22,000,000	8,000,000
Chief Joseph (Foster Creek) Dam, Columbia River Basin	[1] 625,000	[1] 42,000	[1] 625,000	[2]	[1] 583,000
Total, Rivers and Harbors	35,625,000	22,042,000	32,625,000	25,000,000	10,583,000
Flood control, general:					
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark	17,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	3,000,000
Blakely Mountain Reservoir, Ark	4,000,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	800,000
Narrows Reservoir, Ark	3,600,000	2,880,000	2,880,000	2,880,000	800,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla	9,000,000	6,500,000	9,000,000	7,000,000	2,000,000
Whitney Reservoir, Tex	5,172,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	1,172,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky	19,687,000	12,400,000	17,600,000	12,400,000	7,287,000
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak	30,400,000	25,000,000	28,900,000	26,000,000	4,400,000
Folsom Dam, Calif	3,370,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	[3] 2,370,000
Total, flood control, general	92,229,000	68,900,000	80,500,000	70,400,000	21,829,000
Grand total	127,854,000	90,942,000	113,125,000	95,400,000	32,412,000

[1] Planning funds.
[2] Of planning funds appropriated for rivers and harbors, $534,000 was not earmarked. Funds from this amount are available for the Foster Creek project in such amount as may be allocated by the Corps of Engineers.
[3] The following statement appears in the supplemental estimate with respect to the Folsom Dam: "With respect to the request for Folsom Dam, it is contemplated that the Congress will expand the present authorization for this project, in accordance with the recommendations contained in your message dated Jan. 12, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 496, 80th Cong., 2d sess.), to provide for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation of a power plant and transmission lines, as well as irrigation works, and for transfer of the dam and reservoir, upon its completion, to the same agency for operation."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, after I had seen these requests I learned that there was no new evidence, that it was merely a question of asking for the amounts. The matter under discussion comes home close to me, because this very transmission line about which the Senator is speaking is needed in the State of Nebraska. But I have to be fair with the committee, and I have to be fair with all its members. If we upset this appropriation bill by allowing the money requested we may throw out of balance all the projects to which we agreed to apply a formula. We simply cannot possibly do this without opening up the whole bill and giving every Senator a chance to do the same thing with projects in his own State.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Let me finish, and then I shall yield.

Secondly, if we do what the Senator from Wyoming asks, even though we would like to do it, it is my opinion that it would disturb the language relative to the Canyon Ferry project, and if it does, and if this is legislation on an appropriation bill, as I think it must be, I believe it could be stricken out on a point of order. I am not going to make the point of order, but I do point that matter out to the chairman of the committee, because I think the point should be raised.

My State needs this project as badly as does that of the Senator from Wyoming, and when we talk about the merits of one of these projects or the merits of another, let me say that in the face of all the demands made upon the Congress, I think the Eightieth Congress was the most reclamation-minded and did more for such projects than any other Congress in the history of reclamation, in 46 years.

Let me state the appropriations for reclamation:

1939	$44,544,600
1940	76,934,600
1941	73,194,600
1942	101,361,631

We have to be fair, and say that during the war the appropriations were not made on as large a scale, because war was on, and we had to conserve wherever we could.

I continue reading the appropriations:

1943	$89,727,270
1944	38,275,500
1945	24,155,200
1946	117,365,050
1947	116,346,843
1948	136,644,738

In the Interior Department Appropriation Bill, 1949, Congress appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation $245,566,139, plus contract authorizations of $3,600,000, which together with an estimated carryover at the time of the Senate hearing of

approximately $26,000,000 will provide a total of $275,166,139 for the Reclamation Bureau in the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. President, that is two and a half times as much money as has ever been spent on reclamation in any one year in the history of reclamation.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. First I shall yield to the Senator from Montana, then to the Senator from Tennessee. As a matter of fact, I do not have the floor, but if the Senator from New Hampshire will allow me, I will yield to the Senator from Montana first.

I should like to put this table into the record. It is found on page 3 of the Senate hearing on the Interior Department Appropriation Bill, 1949, the paragraph that has to do with the appropriations for the last 10 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Regular annual and deficiency appropriations made to the Bureau of Reclamation, fiscal years 1939 to 1948, inclusive, and amount allowed by House for 1949

Fiscal year—	*Amount*
1939	$44,544,600
1940	76,984,600
1941	73,194,600
1942	101,361,631
1943	89,727,270
1944	38,275,500
1945	24,155,200
1946	117,365,050
1947	116,346,843
1948	136,644,738
1949 (House allowed)	226,794,897

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was with the distinguished Senator from Montana at the very place where the proposed dam is to be built. He came to me and I said, "Senator, we are going to do our level best to get the money to be spent there this year." He told me personally that he thought we had done a good job. I know he can stand here and make a good case for building the Hungry Horse Dam faster than has been contemplated in the program. I know the transmission lines should be built. The farmers want them; they want them in my State, and in every other State. The only question is how fast we should proceed.

This matter has been worked out in fairness to every State in connection with all the projects, and if we increase the appropriation for the project of the Senator from Wyoming, who is most persuasive, and if we do the same for the Senator from Montana, then each Senator who was denied has just as much right to come forward and say to the committee, "We want our appropriations restated, too," because there are other cases just as meritorious as these.

Mr. President, I wanted to make this statement, and to reiterate that I wish to be fair. The Senator from Wyoming was most cooperative, and I agree with him in his appeal. The situation is very difficult for me, because the very appropriation for which he is asking is for a project which comes into western Nebraska, and I should like very much to have it completed. I worked for it, and we got what the committee felt should be allotted to that particular project. We did our level best. When we have done that, I think the matter should not be disturbed, but we should proceed to do the best we can next year.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to what happened in the committee this morning. As everyone knows, I am very greatly interested in power projects in Tennessee under what is known as the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have been interested in that nearly all my official life, which has been a long time.

The committee has been most generous to the Tennessee Valley Authority all along the line. The present committee feels about it as others have. I offered an amendment, a very necessary amendment, in the interest of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the erection of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

Mr. President, I was told by the chairman of the committee that under an arrangement which had been made it would be impossible, owing to a situation which existed, to get the appropriation through at this session of the Congress, and after hearing it discussed in the committee it seemed to me that what the chairman of the committee had said was very reasonable, and I withdrew the amendment. If the Senate were to adopt an amendment making appropriation for the Missouri Valley, naturally the people in my section would want to know why appropriation was not made for the Tennessee Valley. I feel that such action would place me in a very bad situation. I believe the committee has been very generous, and that both branches of Congress have been very generous to the power projects of the country. We have built them just as rapidly as we could. The Senator from New Hampshire said that in January these matters would all be straightened out, and I am going along with him. I think it is probably best to consider them when Congress meets next year.

I again say that I thank the Senate and the House for the generous attitude they have shown toward power development in my State, and I want to go along as best I can and in a manner which will be fair and just to everyone. I am extremely interested in the projects in the West. I think they should be built, and as rapidly as we can build them. I want to vote for measures along that line.

I felt that I should let the Senate and the country know just what has happened, and just what we in the Appropriations Committee of the Senate think about the subject.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Supplementing what the Senator from Tennessee has said, I wish to say that the full Appropriations Committee this morning, with a very large attendance, considered, discussed, debated, and voted upon whether or not we would undertake to restrict the appropriations to those matters which were the subject of legislation in the present extra session. The Senator from Tennessee has stated correctly the vote, which as I recall was about 16 to 2, to restrict the appropriations to such amounts as are necessary for the legislation considered in the present session. We all agreed that if we opened up the situation every Senator interested in a project here or there would be entitled to present an amendment respecting the matter in which he was interested. We felt that if the Missouri Valley were to be provided for, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Tennessee Valley, would be entitled to make a request of a similar nature. With the exception of the two Members who voted in the negative, the committee felt that the only reasonable thing to do was to restrict the appropriations to those matters connected with legislation considered in the present session.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that I was amazed to hear him say that this Congress had been more lavish and liberal toward reclamation than has any other Congress. I hope he will keep that statement uppermost in his mind. I hope he will remember it during the campaign, when speeches are made this fall charging the high cost of living to the failure of the Federal Government to reduce expenditures.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hope the President of the United States will also keep it in mind, because after all he does not have to spend this money if he does not want to.

Mr. MYERS. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will keep both those political statements in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us be fair to the American people, and let us both keep them in mind.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appreciate the desire of the able Senator from Nebraska to be absolutely fair in this matter. He has visited the projects in question. He knows what they are. He knows how important they are to the country. He is willing to see the full appropriations made. It is not his fault that the appropriations have not been provided for. I am not in any manner criticizing him. But I want to point out that there is absolutely no justification whatever for the reduction that was made. The reduction makes the construction of the project inefficient. It makes it more costly in the end, and it delays its completion one whole year. Who is going to receive any benefit from that? The money in question is not going to be taken out of the Treasury and given to the people of Montana. Every dollar spent on this project is going to be paid back. It is 100-percent reimbursable. So where is there any justification for the talk of generosity on the part of committees to the people of the country who are asking for these projects? The only reason we are not getting them is that the power interests do not want

them. That is the truth of the matter, and everyone who knows the situation will understand that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator yielded to me to make reply to what had previously been said, and I think I ought to have the privilege of answering.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire declines to yield further.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, when anyone makes such a statement as that which the Senator from Montana has made, that the only reason the appropriations are not provided is because of the power interests, it is not true. The Senator knows it is not true.

Mr. MURRAY. I know it is true.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator knows it is not.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from New Hampshire must be a mind reader if he can inquire into the secret workings of my mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire declines to yield.

The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Has the Senator from New Hampshire concluded?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned I had hoped that we were going to get through with the appropriation bill. We have come to a very definite agreement on it. If the bill is opened up there will not be merely one or two projects with which a few individuals will want to play politics, but there are dozens of projects which have some merit and to which some consideration should be given if we open this matter up wide. All the reclamation projects the Senator has discussed have received consideration. All of them are coming along. All of them will receive fair consideration from the next Congress. It is not as if they had not been treated with fairness. There is nothing new about them. If this situation is opened up at all it will mean that it will be opened up wide. I sincerely hope that nothing like that will happen, and that the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be defeated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield the floor?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. As I have said, Mr. President, I have no criticism to make of the chairman of the subcommittee who conducted the hearings which gave consideration to the appropriations for these projects in Montana. I know that he visited them, as I have said, and that he is in full accord with them. I cannot understand how any justification can be offered for the proposition of cutting $2,183,000 from the estimated cost of that project merely for the purpose of delaying its construction, rendering its construction inefficient. How is anyone going to be benefited by that?

Mr. President, the real reason for the objections can be found in the remarks I made a few moments ago. There is a project which I mentioned, that is involved in the Fort Peck Dam item; that is the construction of a transmission line from Havre, Mont., to Shelby, Mont., which will transmit the power generated at the Fort Peck Dam to the farmers in that section of the State. The farmers have formed a cooperative. They have gone to great expense in laying out their project there. If this project is denied to them they will lose many thousands of dollars. It will deprive them from getting the power to their farms which they have planned. Besides, the entire project which they are asking for is repayable to the United States Government; every dollar of it. Where can anyone find any objection to such a project? I know the real objection. The power interests do not want that transmission line built because they are seeking now to tie these farmers up with contracts to make them pay twice or three times as much as the power would cost them if they had this transmission line built.

We in Montana all understand that. We know that is the only opposition to the projects—the opposition being that of the power interests, and no one can escape from that. Anyone who says that is not true is playing politics himself, but he is playing politics on the other side of the line, for the power interests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I appreciate what my distinguished colleague has been trying to do. I wish to thank the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the members thereof for their very generous treatment of us in Montana. There are some of these projects for which we would like to have had a little more money if it had been available, but we feel that we have been pretty generously treated all the way around.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. Just a minute. Let me finish.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask one question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield at the moment.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the inference has been made here that the power interests in my State are responsible for higher rates, and this, that, and the other. I wish to say that in the State of Montana we have a public-service commission of three members elected by direct vote of the people of the State, and they are the ones who set the rates for the State of Montana, including the farmers and all the other people. So there is no monopoly in Montana so far as power is concerned. So long as we have a board elected by direct vote of the people of the State, which sets these rates, there can be no monopoly of power.

I appreciate the fact that we could use more money. I think all of us could. If it were another time, I would go along with my distinguished colleague; but at this late hour when we are trying to wind up this special session, I wish to say to Members of the Senate that, in my opinion, the majority of my people and my colleague's people in our State are willing to accept the verdict of the regular session. It is not necessary to open the appropriation bill now before the Senate to this item.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ECTON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. As I understand, my distinguished colleague feels that he cannot support the amendment which I have proposed.

Mr. ECTON. Under the present circumstances, as explained by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I regret very much that I shall have to vote against it.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator said something about there not being a monopoly of power in Montana. Will the Senator tell us what other power utilities are delivering power to the people of Montana besides the Montana Power Co.?

Mr. ECTON. There is another company at Kalispell which has been delivering power.

Mr. MURRAY. That is a little steam plant.

Mr. ECTON. We get power from Fort Peck.

Mr. MURRAY. Fort Peck is a Federal project, not a utility.

Mr. ECTON. The South Dakota Utilities Co. operates in the State of Montana. The Senator knows that there is no monopoly. My position is that so long as we have rates fixed by a public service commission which is directly responsible to the people, it cannot be said that there is a monopoly of power. They are supposed to protect the people. I think the Senator recognizes that that is true in our case.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, that argument would justify monopoly in every State in the Union. It seems to me that my colleague's argument is that you may have a monopoly provided you have a utilities commission to regulate the rates, and that no Government power project should provide power in the State when there is a utility company being regulated by the utilities commission. I do not think that answers the question which is before the Senate today.

I am not talking about the regulation of the Montana Power Co. or the regulation of rates of any monopoly. I am talking about the need for these particular projects at Fort Peck and at Hungry Horse. The one at Fort Peck involves a transmission line which will be of tremendous value to the farmers of that area, and I am sure that my colleague will not stand on the floor of the Senate and say that that project should not be approved. I am sure that he will consider that it is a valuable project, and that it is essential for the

farmers to have it in order to get low-cost power on their farms. They cannot afford to pay the rates which the Montana Power Co. charges. We have low-cost power there. The law especially favors the distribution of that power to the farmers and to the municipalities where they can have access to it. I cannot understand why there should be any objection to this project, and I cannot see what could justify my colleague in making any remarks opposing this particular project.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to add my voice to those advocating the reinstatement of appropriations for western power developments. I have watched such developments for a great many years. Appropriations are made, but the funds are insufficient. The work has to be stopped right in the middle of a project. The machinery is taken away, and the labor force scattered far and wide. Then they get another appropriation, start again, and collect the machinery and the workers. In that way the projects cost a great deal more than they would if the work could be carried on continuously until the projects were completed. I think it would be good business, as well as good sense and service to the people, to make the money available so that these projects could be completed.

I should like to comment on what the Senator from Montana had to say about power monopolies. I know what they are. In Idaho we have the Idaho Power Co. in southern Idaho, and in northern Idaho it is the Washington Water Power Co. We have been having quite a fight out there over a Columbia Valley Authority. The power companies pour money into the battle without stint. They call anyone a Communist who favors a Columbia Valley Authority development similar to the TVA. They have called me a Communist out there for years, simply because I favored a Columbia Valley Authority development.

At campaign time the power company hires a great many young men, gives them a briefing, and sends them out as service employees, to service electric irons, toasters, and other appliances of customers, even out in the rural areas. While they are tinkering with the electric iron they always manage to bring up politics. They say to the farmers that if they vote for that Communist TAYLOR, the water will be taken off the land and run through generators to make power, and it will be no good for anything else after that. Of course, when they tell the farmers that they are going to lose their water, they do not have to prove it at all. Merely intimating it scares them to death.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Montana to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SPECIAL SESSION

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I have a statement which I should like to make regarding the acomplishments, shall we say, of the special session. I think I might as well get rid of that speech, and then I shall be through. I have not participated in the farce which has gone on here for the past several days. I have kept silent.

I

President Truman called the session, in his acceptance speech of July 15, 1948, to needle the Republicans about high prices, housing, civil rights, and a number of other pressing issues. Having had his say, however, the leader of the Democratic Party retired into semi-inactivity. His party chieftains in the Senate and the House called no caucuses of the embattled minority to fight for the President's program and give the country leadership in solving these pressing economic and human problems. A member of the President's party told a union delegation this week "We never get called together, we do not know what the program is, or where the party is trying to go." Representative RAYBURN, Democratic leader in the House, admitted to a delegation that a majority of House Democrats would not support public housing, which was demonstrated by the vote in the other Chamber today. The Democratic leaders in both Houses declared it would be futile to call a Democratic caucus; it "would only create a row." That was demonstrated by the filibuster on the anti-poll-tax bill. The Democratic administration sent its Secretary of the Treasury to fight for price control before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, where he made the statement that he liked price control about as much as he liked castor oil.

President Roosevelt used to have his problems with Congress too—even with a Democratic Congress. But President Roosevelt took the issues to the people—on the radio. Last night, as this special session prepared to fold up its tents and silently slink away, having accomplished just one of the President's 11 points, and played bipartisan politics with 2 others, did we hear the President appealing to the American people to demand that this Congress stay in session and pass his program? No. Where was the man who on July 15, 1948, proclaimed boldly:

> They are going to try to dodge their responsibility * * * but I'm here to say to you that Senator BARKLEY and I are not going to let them get away with it.

On the day when some of us fought to postpone the overriding of President Truman's veto of the Taft-Hartley bill, President Truman went to the ball game. Last night, as Congress scuttled his program for the special session, President Truman was cruising on the Potomac.

II

If the Democratic Party in the special session has demonstrated impotence and hypocrisy about its campaign pledges, the Republican Party has demonstrated consummate arrogance. The Republican Party stands proudly on its record of inflation, chaos in labor relations, and Quonset huts for veterans.

The Republican Party was advised by Tom Dewey to stay down here just long enough to throw the blame for the failures of the special session onto the Democrats. So they took the needle which President Truman was attempting to stick in them, turned it around, and jabbed the Democrats. They called up the anti-poll-tax bill. As the Washington Post of July 29, 1948, commented—

> The object, of course, is plain—to let the special session peter out with the Democrats quarreling among themselves.

The Scripps-Howard press Washington staff called the move "a transparent political phony," and pointed out that—

> instead of trying to break the filibuster, Senate Republicans are cozily cooperating by adjourning early. They even suggested how one southerner might regain the floor after overnight rest.

When I fought for time to let the people make their voices heard on the Taft-Hartley bill and the draft bill, Mr. President, I was accorded no such courtesy.

III

The score for the special session, for both parties, is virtually a goose egg. Of President Truman's 11 points, just one—the appropriation for the United Nations home—was enacted. On two others—prices and housing—both parties played politics for a while, and then settled down to do just what the NAM and the real-estate lobby would have done if they were sitting in Congress.

On housing, the Senate "recanted," as the New York Times puts it today, on its own bill which it had passed three times before. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] took the lead in renouncing his own bill. The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], who reputedly stands high in the counsels of Mr. Dewey, supported the Senator from Ohio.

As to price control, the bill to restrict consumer credit and to raise bank reserve requirements is not a price-control bill. It is a credit-control bill. It does not check the soaring cost of living. It checks only the amount of money which consumers and small businessmen will have to meet the soaring cost of living and the rising cost of doing business. The big corporations which are mainly responsible for high prices, will not be squeezed; they can live off their undistributed profits, depreciation reserves, and other internal assets which now total around $62,000,000,000 of working capital.

Mr. President, the only honest way to meet inflation is to freeze and roll back prices, or to increase the purchasing power necessary to pay the high prices. This Congress has chosen to do neither. Instead, it has taken steps in the direction of reducing purchasing power while doing nothing to freeze and roll back prices. In effect, the Congress—and the administration—would cure deficiencies of diet by withholding the means to buy

more food. It does not make economic sense.

Do not tell me it is impossible to control prices, that nothing can be done about them, Mr. President. I was looking at a chart the other day as to the situation in England, a country we are helping handsomely. I am glad to help them if they need it, but I believe that charity begins at home in this respect. I find that in England one can buy a rib roast, for example, for 47 cents a pound, and can buy butter for 30 cents a pound. The people of England pay 15 cents a pound for oleomargarine. There is some difference between those prices and what the taxpayers of the United States are having to pay.

I say that if that can be done in England, with its limited resources, and largely dependent upon our generosity to keep going, we should be able to do it for our own people in America.

IV

Both parties have attempted to divert attention from their failures here this month by holding a three-ring circus. In ring No. 1, Representative THOMAS has exhibited those neurotic exhibitionists, Miss Bentley, Mr. Chambers, and Mr. Budenz, in a proceeding which has shocked the civilized world for its callous disregard of due process of law and the rights of innocent people to be protected against irresponsible smears.

Mr. President, I have on my desk some editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post which I should like to have printed at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks. The editorials state how improper and un-American the proceedings that have been going on are, in that they smear people without due process of law; they are guilty without a trial, instead of being innocent until proven guilty. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials may be embodied at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of August 2, 1948]

EXHIBIT ON THE HILL

Committees of both Senate and House are vying with each other in hoisting Elizabeth Bentley into a notoriety that in the light of her revealed character may not be entirely unwelcome. It is curious procedure. For what she has done the average reader will wonder why she is not before a grand jury answering one of a variety of possible charges—from the violation of security regulations to failure to register as the agent of a foreign principal. It is in a court of law that she should be given a chance to turn state's evidence.

The fact is, of course, that she has had her day in court. Evidently she appeared before the grand jury in New York which went over the ramifications of her sordid tale of espionage. Evidently she was granted immunity if she turned state's evidence. Evidently no indictable offense was discovered against the men she pilloried. Evidently the records of the grand-jury hearings, which are supposed to be secret, were turned over to congressional investigators in quest of sensations useful for smearing and vote-getting. It is reprehensible, let alone curious, procedure. Publicity is not enough of a penalty for some of the persons touched by the Bentley disclosures. But there are others who are now being caricatured in a circus of publicity by a muddleheaded and foolish woman who admits that a lack of truth was one of the "principles" that she embraced when she became involved with the dead man Golos.

The revelations are certainly sensational, though the only shortcoming in this respect, as compared with the Canadian spy trial, is that no Russian is forthcoming. He may, of course, be waiting in the wings. But whether he is there or not, the story has some of the elements of melodrama, after the dirt has been scraped off it. Elizabeth Bentley and her friends and fellow Communists seem to have trapped or seduced officials in responsible wartime positions into disgorging data for relay to the Russians. In her favor were the circumstances of the times. The artfully contrived atmosphere of treason is artificial. A war was on, and Soviet Russia was our ally, for whose feats of arms, moreover, most Americans were full of admiration. In those days even Representative RANKIN had a good word to say about Stalin. This does not condone leaks, but it explains some of them. In wartime the Capital was a free-and-easy place where even the itinerant imbibed "classified" information with free cocktails. There was no need to stand at street corners for it.

How much of the dope thus collected was valuable to the Russians is not explained. It might ruin a good story. After all, this country was officially in cahoots with the Russians, and surely the bulk of the data that the Bentley crowd got with such ostentatious surreptitiousness must have been made available to Moscow. Those were the days when officials were trying to encourage confidence in Russia by example. Moreover, the Russians, according to such authorities as General Deane in his "Strange Alliance," are so full of suspicions that they look askance at gifts, let alone information. There was the case of the factory that was sent to Russia with an offer of American engineers to set it up. The offer was not accepted, and the plant remained in pieces, rusting away as if it were tainted. Much the same distrust doubtless went into the evaluation of the mountains of odds and ends of news that this spy ring purloined and relayed.

Except for Remington, the dramatis personae of this fantastically told plot still have to be heard. Remington, whatever his political beliefs, does not inspire confidence in his sense of responsibility. Nor is he an example of good hiring practice in Government service. But too much can be made of his position as chairman of the Department of Commerce Committee on Export Licenses. From the figures this committee seems to be made up of inverted Micawbers waiting for applications from countries east of the iron curtan to turn down. And the chairman is a cipher compared with the military member, for this latter has a veto power. However, Remington seems to have been put in responsible jobs before he had arrived at the age of discretion, and this is the mildest thing one can say about him.

Except for him and another person on the list, the fact remains that not one of the men whose names Elizabeth Bentley is now broadcasting with toothsome enjoyment is now on the Federal pay roll. What is clear is that by grace of Congress she is doing a better service for Moscow by her revelations than she did by her gumshoeing and sleuthing. Without a doubt eternal vigilance is the price of American security. And to this end, in view of the presence in our midst of an international conspiracy aimed at undermining it, the security laws should be invoked where they apply, and strengthened where they are weak. An equal price of our security, however, is wisdom and sobriety in the conduct of the Nation's affairs. Both qualities are lacking in dealing with Elizabeth Bentley. We can imagine the feeling against any east-west trade Elizabeth Bentley is being allowed to generate, the undermining of the integrity of Government service, the inculcation of that reciprocal fear between Government and the citizenry that Ferrero spoke of as an evil beyond computation.

[From the Washington Post of August 3, 1948]

EXPOSING SPIES

(Commenting on our editorial of yesterday, Senator FERGUSON, chairman of the Senate investigating committee, informs us that though a request for a court order asking for release of the grand jury testimony into the Bentley case was considered, no such request was, in fact, made, and further, the committee has not had access to or information about such testimony. Every witness at the current hearing is instructed not to divulge what was said during the New York proceedings.)

The sensational story of twin Soviet spy rings in Washington, narrated by Miss Elizabeth T. Bentley under the auspices of two congressional committees, has been widely likened to the disclosure of Soviet espionage activities in Canada by a royal commission just a little more than 2 years ago. Perhaps, therefore, it would be useful to compare the procedures followed in the two cases. Some of the differences between them are enlightening.

The Canadian disclosures, like those currently emanating from Capitol Hill, were based in the first instance on the testimony of an apostate Soviet agent—a Russian citizen named Igor Gouzenko employed by the Soviet Embassy in the one case, a disillusioned American citizen working for the American Communist Party in the other. Gouzenko's testimony, however, was supported by voluminous documents which he took with him from the Soviet Embassy's files, the authenticity of which was carefully ascertained. Miss Bentley's testimony, on the other hand, has thus far had no documentary corroboration whatsoever.

In Canada, before the names of any persons involved in the spy ring were made public, there was established, through an Order in Council, a royal commission to make a complete inquiry and to report on all the circumstances of the case. The commission heard 116 witnesses and studied about 1,000 exhibits, developing in connection with each person it denounced as implicated in espionage a detailed interlocking network of evidence. At the same time it took great pains to avoid divulging the names of persons mentioned in the course of testimony but innocent of any wrongdoing. After listing those actively involved in one way or another with the spy ring, the commission report declared:

"The names of certain other persons were mentioned in such a context that it was considered advisable to examine them and to investigate their activities. In each case we were satisfied that their conduct has been entirely proper and that while the Russians designed to draw some of them into the net in future, having, in anticipation of doing so, actually given them cover names, such hopes were in our opinion completely without foundation and the objects of those hopes were unaware that they were being considered * * *. The names of a number of persons, in Government service and otherwise, who were members of Secret Communist cells have been disclosed by this inquiry.

These names appear in the volume of evidence. As there is no evidence that these persons were implicated in, or aware of, the espionage networks, we do not consider it necessary to mention these names in this report."

The procedure on Capitol Hill, by contrast, has been first to publish the names of those alleged by Miss Bentley's unsupported testimony to be involved in espionage and later on, presumably, to inquire into the validity of her allegations. This seems the more remarkable since there is a firmly fixed American tradition to the contrary. It must be supposed that no congressional committee would carelessly make public an unsupported allegation that Government officials, or former Government officials, of high repute had embezzled funds or committed arson. Yet there appears to be no hesitation at all in letting such public servants be denounced as traitors to their country—on the mere affirmation of a turncoat Commie. Perhaps the Canadians benefited somewhat from the fact that their royal commission was thoroughly nonpartisan—and was not obliged to conduct its inquiry in the course of an election year.

[From the New York Times of August 4, 1948]

DUE PROCESS IN WASHINGTON

If there is one thing above all others in our American way of life in which most thoughtful citizens take pride and in which they firmly believe, it is in the principles of civil rights enunciated in the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. They were attached to the Constitution on the demand of the people of the Thirteen Colonies before they would accept the Constitution itself. They make up what is popularly called our Bill of Rights. Among these are a guaranty against being called to answer for an infamous crime except upon grand jury indictment, a promise of open trial by a jury of one's peers, the right to confront one's accusers in open court after having been previously informed of the nature and the cause of the accusations. We do not believe these fundamental rights are being observed today in Washington by the congressional committees investigating communism in the United States. Let us look at the record.

Two former high officials of the Government, and others, have been accused by Miss Elizabeth T. Bentley, herself a confessed former spy for the Communists, with having engaged in espionage during the war, with having violated their oaths of office, with having acted as unregistered agents of a foreign government. Did they learn of these charges of commission of infamous crimes through official channels, or on being called to answer an indictment? They did not. At least one first learned of Miss Bentley's testimony through a call from a newspaper reporter. They already had been broadcast to the world. How substantial are these charges?

Before appearing before the House Committee on Un-American Activities Miss Bentley testified before a Federal grand jury in New York City that was investigating wartime espionage activities. Presumably she gave the same testimony there that she did in Washington. Did the grand jury indict the men against whom she made the charges? It did not. Before appearing before the House committee Miss Bentley also gave the same testimony before an executive session of the Senate subcommittee headed by Senator FERGUSON that is conducting a parallel inquiry. Did they make public her testimony or allow her to give it in open hearing? They did not. Yet a day later Chairman THOMAS of the House committee calls her to the witness stand and lets her make the charges openly.

To grant Mr. Remington, Mr. Currie, Mr. White, and others named by Miss Bentley an opportunity later to confront her in the committee room and answer her charges does not rectify the basic wrong that has been done. Many will read, and perhaps believe, the charges but not the rebuttal. There is even no guaranty that these accused will ever have their day in court. Dr. Edward U. Condon was accused a year ago by the Thomas committee of being "the weakest link in our atomic energy set-up" and he has yet to be given an opportunity to answer before the committee.

There undoubtedly were, and still are, agents of the Soviet Government, and of other governments, in this country seeking information on military matters that is not available to them through official channels. They should be sought out, brought to trial, and punished, if they are found guilty. There are legal ways of doing that, such as the Royal Commission used in Canada in investigating the leakage of information on atomic research. It conducted its hearings in private, weighed the evidence, and only then made public the charges.

We have a precious heritage in this country of protection of the innocent against false accusation, of a fair trial even for the guilty. What price a few headlines if those rights are compromised or violated? A dubious security purchased by those means would be bought far too high.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am glad Mr. Truman has denounced this proceeding, but I would remind him that it was his own Attorney General who started this thing, worked for 3 years, and spent half a million dollars trying to "get something" on a group of outstanding public servants who had long ago been judged "guilty" in the eyes of the Chicago Tribune, the New York Daily News, the New York Sun, and the Washington Times-Herald, of the high crime of being New Dealers. Also, I cannot understand how the Republican-controlled House committee on un-American propaganda activities got hold of the records it is now using to smear these people, unless those records were turned over by Mr. Truman's Democratic Attorney General. For that reason I regard this whole proceeding as a thoroughly bipartisan affair, aimed at discrediting Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal and the new Progressive Party, while at the same time serving as an excellent cover-up for the bipartisan failure to do anything about high prices, housing, and civil-rights legislation.

In ring No. 2 we have had the Senate Subcommittee on Executive Expenditures, its star witness the confused Mr. Remington, who says Miss Bentley is wrong about him, but right about everybody else she accuses. I am not a psychiatrist, Mr. President, so I cannot say which committee would have a more difficult problem on its hands if it wanted to get to the bottom of this nonsense.

In ring No. 3 we have had the House Labor Subcommittee investigating whether the Taft-Hartley Act is tough enough and whether perhaps it is too soft on labor. I believe that committee has not been able to compete for the headlines won by the other two, but I am sure that in the long run it intends to do just as much harm—singling out progressive trade-unions for its smear attack.

v

It seems to me the reaction of the average, decent, honest American citizen to these shenanigans in Congress, this farce of circuses without bread, must inevitably be, "A plague on both your houses." That is the reason a new party, the Progressive Party, has come into being and has met with interest, enthusiasm and support from millions of Americans who formerly found in Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal a government sincerely interested in bettering their lot.

At the close of our founding convention, the Progressive Party delegation to Congress announced to the press what we thought this special session should do. It was a minimum program on the most urgent issues—price and rent control, housing, civil rights, minimum wage, old-age pensions, repeal of the draft, and the Taft-Hartley laws, and an end to the "cold war" policies which underlie inflation.

When we compare even this minimum list with the accomplishments of this session, it should be obvious that it is not President Truman who has put the Republicans on the spot, nor the Republicans who have put the Democrats on the spot, but both old parties which have put themselves on the spot with the American people. And this time the people have an alternative to turn to—the new Progressive Party.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Was there more than one amendment submitted by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MURRAY. I submitted two projects, but only one amendment. The amendment included the Hungry Horse project and also the Fort Peck project.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming, which is open to amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to submit an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, which would include the amount cut by the Appropriations Committee for the Columbia Basin project in Washington, the sum of $1,473,000.

This is one of the items referred to by the President of the United States in his message to Congress on July 28 of this year, at the special session, asking the Congress to approve it. It is not a new item, but was included in the budget. I shall in a moment read from the supplemental estimates. What the amendment does is to restore the amount, in order to avoid delay in construction and installation of additional generators at Grand Coulee Dam.

The President in his message said all such delay would accentuate the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest. Like the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Montana, I have no criticism of the treatment given the western power projects by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the chairman and members of the Appropriations Committee. I think I had as many projects provided for in my State as were provided for in any other State of the Union. I felt we should have had the full budget amount. It was not at any time a matter of playing politics. Here is a great project in the State of Washington, the greatest project ever built by man, the greatest hydroelectric project in all the world. On it the Government has expended well over $200,000,000. The original project provided for a certain number of generators. The dam was built. Obviously, as the Senator from Nebraska has pointed out, the generators could not all be installed at once. Neither could the entire project be built all at once. The project was undertaken in order to cope with a very serious power shortage in the Pacific Northwest. The dam is already built, there being now an investment in the project of hundreds of millions of dollars. The money is to be paid back. As the Senator from Montana pointed out, it is not necessarily a matter of generosity on the part of Congress in making the appropriations. The money will be repaid. In fact, the project has already, under the contract with the Federal Government and the Treasury, repaid the money invested to an amount far exceeding expectations. Grand Coulee has already repaid from the money coming from the sale of power more than $8,000,000 above what it was expected to repay. Generators are of course necessary, and power cannot be developed until they are installed.

Reference was made today to a certain project which was expected to begin repayment within a year. In the case of Grand Coulee, the minute the generators are installed and the minute water goes through them, that minute the money invested in the project begins to flow back to the United States Treasury. Time is required for the building of generators. Contracts have to be made. As Senators know, they are of immense size. A great deal of engineering work is involved.

When the regular session ended without action upon the project, I did not complain, but we have been called back into special session. The President in his message to Congress stated this was one of the items which should be considered by the Congress at the special session. It is well within the purview of what was intended to be done. It is not a new item. I talked with the President of the United States about the items. He stated to me at that time that he did not expect Congress to make the appropriation, or to discuss anything new, but he stated that he hoped the Congress would restore the budget estimates, particularly on the power projects, in view of the serious power shortage.

I hope the $1,000,000 will be restored. I do not ask to have it restored at the expense of other projects throughout the country, but this relates to a project which can immediately begin repayment of moneys invested. The money is needed for generators in a dam already built. The Hungry Horse project in Wyoming, when constructed, will speed it up.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. In agreeing to it, I do not think the Senate would be doing anything out of line.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I share my senior colleague's enthusiasm for the Columbia Valley. It is, has been, and will be a fantastically great project. Its results will be of immeasurable benefit not only to the western slope of the country but to the remainder of the country as well. However, with reference to the problem before us, and speaking as one coming from the area in question, I feel that if equal consideration cannot be given to every request which has been laid before the Appropriations Committee, special consideration should be given to none. I shall, therefore, oppose the amendment submitted by my colleague.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington requests a division. Those in favor of the amendment will rise and remain standing until counted. Those opposed. The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who would vote "yea" if present, is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—32

Barkley	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Connally	Langer	Pepper
Ellender	Lucas	Sparkman
Feazel	McClellan	Stennis
Fulbright	McFarland	Stewart
Green	McGrath	Taylor
Hatch	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Murray	Tydings
Holland	Myers	Umstead
Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor	

NAYS—49

Aiken	Gurney	Revercomb
Baldwin	Hawkes	Robertson, Va.
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bridges	Ives	Smith
Brooks	Jenner	Taft
Butler	Kem	Thye
Byrd	Knowland	Tobey
Cain	Lodge	Vandenberg
Capehart	McCarthy	Watkins
Capper	McKellar	Wherry
Cooper	Malone	Wiley
Cordon	Martin	Williams
Donnell	Millikin	Wilson
Dworshak	Moore	Young
Ecton	Morse	
Ferguson	Reed	

NOT VOTING—15

Ball	Eastland	Maybank
Buck	Flanders	O'Daniel
Bushfield	George	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Wagner
Downey	McCarran	White

So Mr. MAGNUSON's amendment to Mr. O'MAHONEY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on that amendment, to save time, I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the point of order is justified, and is sustained.

Are there further amendments?

Mr. BRIDGES. There is one minor amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 2, before the period, it is proposed to insert a semicolon and the words "and the sources of the funds for such administrative expenses shall include the housing investment insurance fund created by the Housing Act of 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington offers an amendment, which will be stated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is the amendment relating to the appropriation for disaster relief.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert at the proper place the following:

BUREAU OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Disaster relief, public facilities: For expenses necessary to alleviate damage or hardship caused by flood, tornado, fire, or other

catastrophe respecting which the President has heretofore made a determination under the Act of July 25, 1947 (Public Law 233), by grants, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Federal Works Administrator, to local public agencies to assist them in defraying the cost of (1) the repair, restoration, replacement, or reconstruction of local public facilities damaged or destroyed by such catastrophe and (2) the construction, maintenance, and operation of schools necessary for children of families from Vanport City, Oreg., including personal services in the District of Columbia, $35,000,000, to remain available until June 30, 1950: *Provided*, That no grant shall be made to any local public agency unless the Administrator determines that other Federal funds are not available for such facilities and that such agency needs the grant and cannot otherwise defray such cost without creating an excessive tax or debt burden: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 4 percent of this appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses required in connection with such grants.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is an amendment which was offered to a bill which passed the Senate at the end of the last session. It involves the question of disaster relief. The conference saw fit to eliminate the amount. Together with the senior and junior Senators from Oregon, and I presume my colleague, I thought that the amount should have been restored.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate. I appreciate that these things probably might well have been brought up, if we had had the chance, in the committee. At the beginning of the special session I wrote the chairmen of both the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Appropriations asking for the right to appear with other witnesses on this specific item which the House cut out. In the wisdom, or whatever the reason was, of both committees, they decided not to have any hearings on any of these matters.

Mr. President, this is an emergency matter. The damage from the flood will amount to well over $250,000,000. Most of the damage was to small towns, counties, and cities which have no taxing power to take care of broken streets, damaged water systems and sewage systems. The Senate has once approved this amendment. It provides that the Federal Works Administration may make grants-in-aid to enable the cities, counties, towns, and municipalities, where it is proven they have no taxing power, to repair the damaged facilities. I merely bring this up because I hope we can do something about it.

The urgency of the matter is apparent to anyone. It may be that the committee of the Senate may wish to reiterate the stand which it took once before, and have the matter sent to the House, in the hope that they will agree to this amount, which is so vitally needed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as the Senator from Washington well knows, in the previous session the Senate Committee on Appropriations reported this item favorably, the Senate took favorable action on it, and it was lost in conference. The issue was thrashed out at the time. The amendment has merit. The Senator knows how the Senator from New Hampshire stands on it. But we cannot open the bill up, and therefore I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have one further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am somewhat troubled by the point of order and the ruling of the Chair, both as to this and the previous amendment. I understand this is an amendment providing for an appropriation to carry out an existing law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The provisos in the amendment carry it beyond that basis.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is upon the basis of the provisos in the amendment that the ruling is made?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator from Washington whether he has this amendment before him, and whether in the amendment there are any provisos which change the law?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The proviso, if it can be called that, was a direction that the money should be spent only in a disaster area; we set out where it should be spent. That may be a proviso, but it is an appropriation. The language is no different from the language that has been in hundreds of appropriation bills passed by the Senate and the House. That is the only proviso I know of in the amendment I have submitted, and it was passed and approved by the Senate once, and no point of order was made against it then.

I appreciate what the Senator from New Hampshire has said regarding this matter. I appreciate that the Republican policy is not to open up the bill. But that should not mean I am denied the right to submit the amendment, and I should not get all the glum looks from the Republican side because we are keeping them after 6 o'clock, and it should not prevent me, or at least foreclose me, from standing up and talking about the power projects in my State, and money we need to repair the damage caused by the Columbia River flood. I still think this action should be taken. I do not quite like all those glum looks I am getting on the other side. There is no hurry. It is not necessary to adjourn the Congress because it is 6 o'clock Saturday night. These are matters the President brought up, and they are within the scope of the call of the special session. It seems to me that they are entitled to consideration. This happens to be an emergency matter.

I say to the Senator from Wyoming that the only proviso is that the money shall be spent only for the relief of disaster victims in one particular area.

Mr. TAFT. Was there a Presidential estimate at this special session, or any mention of this by the President?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; this is not a Presidential estimate, because this is a matter that has never been before the budget, and the Senator from Ohio well knows that obviously it could not be. I do not think the budget was clairvoyant enough to anticipate a flood on the Columbia River when they were making up their estimates. I wish it had been in the estimates.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to disabuse the mind of the Senator from Washington as to the reason and the cause of the so-called glum looks he sees around the Chamber. He has misinterpreted the facial expressions on this side. The real reason is this: We know that this is the closing hour, almost the closing minute, of the last session, we hope, of the Eightieth Congress. We have in mind that there are many faces that will not be with us at the next session, and I call the Senator's attention to that classic phrase, "Parting is such sweet sorrow." [Laughter.] That is the real reason.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the Senator from Ohio asked whether this was sent in by the President. It was included in a special message after the flood.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Washington know of any good reason why the Congress has to adjourn this evening?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know of any reason.

Mr. HATCH. We might remain in Washington and attend to a little important business of the people of America.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the second amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON.]

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 is hereby amended by striking out, in the third line of subsection (c) of section 2, the phrase "December 22, 1945," and in lieu thereof inserting "April 21, 1947."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. BRIDGES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is recognized.

Mr. BRIDGES. On that amendment I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to reserve the point of order until I may explain the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Obviously the point of order is not only sustainable, but unavoidably sustainable. The Chair is very happy to recognize the Senator from Washington for any statement he wishes to make.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Again I wish to say, in order that the record may be clear with respect to all these matters, that the amendment deals with legisla-

tion concerning displaced persons, one of the pieces of legislation for which the President called the Congress into session.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a news dispatch from the New York Daily News of today, from which I read, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 6.—Governor Dewey personally intervened with the special session of Congress to liberalize the displaced persons law, but a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee gave him a deaf ear. It decided today against any changes at this time.

The President of the United States has also made a similar recommendation. I was hoping Congress would back up the two recommendations.

Mr. President, this is a serious matter. All my amendment does is to change the date from December 22, 1945, to April 21, 1947, because investigation has shown that a great number of the Jewish people in Europe, and other people, but mainly Jewish people, were not in so-called DP camps prior to the first date, and therefore cannot be admitted.

I was going to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary if he proposed to call the committee into session on this matter, because as I understand the vote on this subject in a subcommittee of that committee was a tie. I thought possibly the full committee might want to do something about the matter. I assume, however, it is the intention not to hold such a meeting, in view of the fact that it is desired to adjourn quickly.

I think the RECORD should show, however, that nothing was done respecting the subject of displaced persons, despite the fact that the President of the United States asked for action on the matter, and despite the fact that the Republican nominee had seen fit personally to intervene in the matter, according to newspaper reports—and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] confirmed it whereas he did not see fit to intervene on other matters involving housing and the high cost of living. The reason the Republican nominee intervened is to my mind perfectly obvious. There are many people of the Jewish race in the State of New York. There are people of that race in other parts of the country, but they are particularly in New York, and New York is vitally interested in this matter. Therefore I had hoped that the date would be extended.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if it has not often been publicized that the able Governor of New York, the Republican nominee, believes in team play between the Executive and his legislative or congressional counterpart, and if that be true, then is it not already evident that in this case, when the captain of the team called upon the team to perform, the team did not perform very well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They did not make a first down on this matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Washington to the fact that the Senator who raised the point of order against his amendment, the very able and affable chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, himself only an hour or two earlier offered a legislative rider upon this appropriation with respect to the Motor Carriers' Claims Commission Act. The legislative rider which the Senator from New Hampshire offered changed the law by extending for 6 months the period within which claims may be filed. So the record is clear now that the Senator from New Hampshire, who was willing to submit an amendment, against the rules of the Senate, to extend for 6 months the period within which motor carriers may file their claims, is unwilling to waive the point of order when the Senator from Washington asks that a change may be made in the law with respect to displaced persons—a change requested by the Governor of New York, the Republican candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that what prompted me to offer the amendment was the very fact that the Senator from New Hampshire had offered the amendment to which reference has been made. I went to the Parliamentarian and asked him if that was legislation on an appropriation bill. He said it was. In view of the fact that the genial Senator from New Hampshire offered such an amendment himself in the last hours of the session, I thought we were sort of liberalizing our viewpoint on the strict rules respecting the offering of amendments. I thought the amendment should be offered also in view of the fact that, with the exception of perhaps a few Senators on this side of the aisle, all were in favor of such legislation, although the Members on the Republican side of the aisle are not. I realize that it is desired to adjourn quickly, but I thought we could accomplish the purposes sought to be accomplished by my amendment at this time because it deals with one of the subjects which formed the reason for the calling of the special session.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Wyoming knows perfectly well, and no Senator knows it any better than he does, why I offered the motor-carrier amendment. I did it because of a vote taken in the Appropriations Committee. I so stated to the Senator from Wyoming and the other Senators who were interested in the matter. The amendment was unanimously agreed to in the committee. The Senator knows that. I appreciate the fact that he has called attention to that situation, but the Senator knows in his heart perfectly well the reason why it was done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that it did not satisfy me. The legislative rider which the Senator offered was merely a device to prevent the appropriation of $100,000 to carry out a law which was enacted last July by Congress.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission established by the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 880), including personal services in the District of Columbia; traveling expenses; printing and binding; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $100,000:

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, the amendment seeks to provide money in the sum of $100,000 so that the act passed at the regular session may be administered. The purpose of the act was to give relief to 131 motor carriers in the western part of the country, whose properties were taken over by the Government during the war. During the regular session we declared it to be our intention adequately to compensate them, by setting up the proper machinery, and declaring that they were entitled to compensation, but we provided no money with which to administer the law. The amendment merely shows our good faith in this matter by providing $100,000 for the administration of the law.

On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the matter was considered in the Appropriations Committee. An amendment has already been adopted by the Senate today which takes care of this situation, by extending the time 90 days for the filing of claims. Again I object to opening up the bill further, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. Is it the Senator's intention that this law shall not be allowed to operate for 90 more days?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. My intention is, and it is the purpose of the amendment previously adopted, to extend for 90 days beyond January 3 the period for filing claims, which will give adequate time for the filing of claims.

Mr. McGRATH. And until an appropriation is made the motor carriers will have to go without compensation? Is that the Senator's intention?

Mr. BRIDGES. These claims have been pending for some time now. A matter of 4 months will not make any difference.

Mr. McGRATH. The claims have not been pending at all. There has been no forum before which the claimants could be heard. At the last session of the Congress we provided a forum where they could be heard. Now by my amendment I propose to provide the money for the payment of the claims.

On my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the bill which was passed in June, I believe, which allowed 6 months for the trucking

companies to file their claims. I followed it through from the start, about 2 years ago. I know that there was an oversight, due to the rush in closing the session in June, because the bill was passed so late that it was impossible to get an appropriation bill through in time to have the Commissioners appointed. The President has not yet appointed the Commissioners authorized under the bill to pass on the claims.

I feel that the 131 trucking companies interested in this bill in the Western States surrounding my State of South Dakota would be perfectly happy with the 90-day extension. I would, of course, like to vote for the amendment. I do not see how it would operate any better, however, because the Commissioners are not appointed. The 90-day extension will take care of the problem in very good shape.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—31

Barkley	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Connally	Lucas	Pepper
Ellender	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McFarland	Stennis
Green	McGrath	Stewart
Hatch	McKellar	Taylor
Hayden	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Holland	Murray	Tydings
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	
Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor	

NAYS—50

Aiken	Ferguson	Revercomb
Baldwin	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Brewster	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoey	Smith
Brooks	Ives	Taft
Butler	Jenner	Thye
Byrd	Kem	Tobey
Cain	Knowland	Umstead
Capehart	Langer	Vandenberg
Capper	Lodge	Watkins
Cooper	McCarthy	Wherry
Cordon	Malone	Wiley
Donnell	Martin	Williams
Dworshak	Millikin	Wilson
Ecton	Moore	Young
Feazel	Morse	

NOT VOTING—15

Ball	Eastland	O'Daniel
Buck	Flanders	Reed
Bushfield	George	Russell
Chavez	McCarran	Wagner
Downey	Maybank	White

So Mr. McGRATH's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to comment briefly on what has happened here in the Senate with respect to the failure to include the appropriation provided for by the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH]. It seems to me that it is a very unhealthy sign in the Congress of the United States when we pass laws and take credit for the passage of such laws, and fail to appropriate the money to carry them out.

The only reason I mention this point is that the other day the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], in making a speech on the question of national health insurance, took particular pride in stating what the Republican-controlled Congress had done in the passage of the national heart bill. However, he failed to say that in the face of a minimum budget of $6,000,000 necessary to carry out the purposes of that act, the Congress appropriated the small sum of $500,000. In the same address the distinguished Senator from Missouri took particular credit on behalf of the Republican-controlled Congress for the national dental bill, which was passed; and I presume they will go to the country and will tell the people what they have done in connection with the passage of these bills. Yet not a single dime was appropriated to carry out the provisions of the national dental bill.

So I mention these two bills, along with the one we have just acted upon, to show what is going on here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois realize that in the regular appropriation bill, more than $2,000,000 was appropriated, in addition to the $500,000, for the Heart Institute?

Mr. LUCAS. I have just been telling the Senator what I understand to be the facts of the case.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was indicating to the Senator that he is wrong in his facts, and I am sure he wants the RECORD to be correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If I am wrong, I always want to be corrected. I should like to have the Senator explain that to me again.

Mr. BRIDGES. The National Heart Institute bill was one which I, together with various other Senators, including the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], sponsored.

Prior to the time when that basic legislation was passed, the Federal Security Administration appropriation which was made, included funds for the Public Health Service, of course. There has been appropriated something more than $2,000,000—I do not have the exact figures here—for heart work.

That is in addition to the $500,000 which was appropriated after the Heart Institute bill was passed. So there is substantially more than what the Senator has spoken of—sufficient for a good beginning.

I am hopeful that the next Congress will carry on adequately the fine work this Congress has begun.

Mr. LUCAS. My informant may be wrong in regard to this matter. It intrigued me, the other day, when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] spoke about what had been done. I made an investigation of the situation. Either my figures are wrong or the figures supplied by my informants are wrong, or what the Senator from New Hampshire has said is wrong.

It is my understanding that there was a request for $6,000,000 as the minimum necessary to carry out the purpose of the act, but the Congress appropriated the token sum of $500,000. I do not know anything about any other money the Senator from New Hampshire mentions. If I am wrong I wish to be corrected.

The Senator from Florida is on his feet, and I yield to him.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, both Senators are generally correct in what they have said about this matter, if I may say so.

Beginning last year, the first substantial appropriation was provided, in the appropriation bill, for heart research in the Public Health Service. That was approximately $500,000, and that originated in the Senate.

In the succeeding appropriation bill the House added to it approximately $1,000,000. I believe the total amount was somewhat in excess of $2,000,000, in the regular appropriation bill.

Then there came along the Heart Institute legislation, to which reference has been made, which was bipartisan-sponsored legislation. Then a request for appropriations was made by the Public Health Service. Witnesses appeared and advocated that additional sums of money be appropriated. As a matter of fact, it was stated that it was necessary to have at least $12,000,000 or $15,000,000 with which to get that program appropriately under way, including the program of the making of grants-in-aid to the States, and the like. It was in the late stages of the regular session, and the appropriation which was allowed was for only half a million dollars.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Insofar as the appropriation under the Heart Research Act

itself is concerned, the Senator from Illinois is correct in stating that the amount for that purpose—and the Senator from New Hampshire stated nothing to the contrary—in furtherance of the National Heart Institute Act was only, I believe, a net appropriation of $500,000—which was a disappointment to all of us who wanted to see a more adequate program authorized and appropriated for.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that the original money appropriated for heart research work—the first money provided for heart research work in this country—was put in by the Senate Appropriations Committee last year. We started it. Before the Heart Institute bill providing authorization legislation was passed, there was provided in the regular Public Health Service appropriation bill more than $2,000,000 for heart research work. When the Heart Institute bill was passed, additional help was provided.

It is natural now that we have the basic legislation, that all work of this sort should be coordinated under that head. I know that the Senator from Illinois wishes to be fair, and so I know he wishes to state the total amount.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to be fair with the Senator from New Hampshire, as I always wish to be.

What I am complaining about is that the Republican majority in the Congress is attempting to take the credit for the passage of that act; but when those who are interested in the Heart Institute request an appropriation of $6,000,000, only $500,000 is provided. It may be that the $2,000,000 the Senator is talking about is another part of this fund.

Mr. PEPPER. No; it is additional.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Florida says it is not a part of the fund. Of course, under the law they cannot mingle different funds.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I should like to call attention to the fact that a part of this legislation comes under the Public Health Service, and a part of it comes elsewhere. The Public Health Service got over $200,000,000 this year, so the Senator can see that this work is not neglected.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Heart Institute program get the benefit of any of that money?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; under the research provision it can, I believe.

Mr. LUCAS. I seriously doubt that it can, unless the money is earmarked for that purpose. I am talking about a specific appropriation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is worried about the transfer of funds. I have had a little experience, in the last 24 hours, with Mr. Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, as to the transfer of funds. He has taken a Negro cook from St. Elizabeths Hospital and has had him do his private chef work in his office—transferring funds—and now he is defying Congress about it.

So if the Federal Security Administrator can transfer the No. 1 cook from St. Elizabeths Hospital, where they need cooks very badly and where they want additional help, and can use him to cook meals for the big-shot guests he brings into his office, certainly they can transfer other funds.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am surprised that the Senator from New Hampshire is more interested in the question of a Negro cook than he is in this heart work. Certainly he will not put me off the trail by talking about Oscar Ewing. The Senator from New Hampshire can talk about Oscar Ewing and the Negro cook from now until midnight, but let us stick to the subject.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am sticking to the subject. What the Senator from Illinois has been talking about comes under the Federal Security Act; and Mr. Ewing is the head of the Federal Security Administration. If he can go to the length of transferring the outstanding cook from the kitchen of St. Elizabeths Hospital, where more than 2,000 patients are provided meals and where more than 200 diets are maintained, and can bring him to his office, to bake and cook and serve meals for himself and his "big-shot" guests, why, of course he would not be troubled at all by transferring funds between different projects.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President my friend the Senator from New Hampshire is making a wonderful speech about a $2,000 cook who is being transferred from one place to another. I do not pretend to know much about that matter; I am not on that committee. But I know the Senator from New Hampshire is doing that in the interests of economy, certainly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say he is a $3,200 cook. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator from New Hampshre is speaking in the interest of economy about the $3,200 cook, who occasionally is used in Ewing's office to cook some meals for what the Senator from New Hampshire calls "big shots." I myself never have had any of those meals. I am sorry I have not been down there. The Senator from New Hampshire gives what amounts to an open invitation to go there. Perhaps the Senator has eaten some of those meals.

But I know the only reason why the Senator from New Hampshire brings this matter before the Senate at this late hour is to tell the people of the country that he is interested in having that $3,200 spent efficiently.

When he is talking about efficiency, he can look on the Republican side of the aisle and can look at some of the chairmen of committees where, since the Republicans have been in control of Congress, funds have been spent for the employment of committee investigators and committee staffs from time to time, and the Senator might find that some of those investigators or other committee employees have been doing work other than the work they are paid to do. A great number of these investigators who are, strictly speaking, being paid out of funds appropriated by the Senate for special committee work, may be found doing a lot of private work for Senators and other work that is not special committee work. If the Senator wants to do some investigating along that line, he might start investigating some of the special committees that have been established in the past 2 years, on which hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent for that very purpose.

Now, let me get back to this heart case. [Laughter.] I know Senators on the other side of the aisle do not like to hear this. They would like to get away and go home. We are not going to let them go home for a little while, because we are going to do just a little talking on this side of the aisle. Senators on the other side of the aisle have held the floor for 2 weeks. They have farmed out the time on that side of the aisle, times without number. They have prepared and have had others prepare for them political speeches which they have delivered. At least 12 or 15 vicious political speeches against the administration have been made on the other side of the aisle. Senators on this side of the aisle who were doing the filibustering were perfectly content to let them make those speeches. It was helping them filibuster on the poll-tax issue. The majority party never had any intention of passing the anti-poll-tax bill. Senators know that to be so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No, I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question. I do not want any long speeches. The Senator wants to get home; I know that. He wants to get back to Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that he wants to get home, or that I want to get home?

Mr. LUCAS. I mean the Senator from Nebraska wants to return to his home.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator want to get me to remain here another week?

Mr. LUCAS. I want to stay here another week, if the Senate will do something, but if the majority party is not going to do anything more than it has done so far, they had better go home tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean, if we are not going to do anything more than we have done, or does he mean, more than the Senators on the other side of the aisle are doing?

Mr. LUCAS. I mean, more than the majority party has done until now.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator means, more than what he is doing now?

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no. I mean what the majority party has done until now. This is really the first chance I have had to obtain the floor. I had to wait until all the legislation was passed before I could get the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. But we have not yet passed the pending bill. If the Senator would allow us to proceed we would get a vote on the pending bill and then he could speak as long as he liked.

Mr. LUCAS. This is the first opportunity I have had to speak.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I should like to talk to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BRIDGES] for a minute.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand the Senator's statement. It is simply and completely untrue. If he wants to make an argument I think he ought to confine himself to the truth. He could have spoken any time he wanted to speak. No one has at any time been shut off. Nobody has at any time shut off any motion that I know of. Every Senator has been perfectly free to say anything he wanted to say.

Mr. LUCAS. That is, providing he could obtain recognition from the Chair and could get the time. I am surprised that my friend from Ohio would become a little disturbed at what I am saying, because he is usually very calm, cool, and collected. He now almost charges me with being untruthful. I think that is what he said. That is perfectly all right with me. I shall not take offense at this late hour. But the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and I do not know how many other Republican Senators, have made one political speech after another in the past week or 10 days. I charge it was deliberately done for the sole purpose of trying to keep Senators on this side of the aisle from talking a little politics. I make that charge. It was difficult to obtain the floor. Senators on the other side of the aisle would not yield. At any rate, they very seldom yielded. They said, "Oh, no, wait. We have a limited time in which to speak, and we do not want to yield until we finish." Well, of course, by the time they finish, everybody has gone out of the Chamber, and nobody wants to ask them anything.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield, if the Senator is going to talk about the heart program.

Mr. HATCH. No; I want to talk about something else.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for an observation or a question.

Mr. HATCH. My observation simply is that I have been standing on the floor here for about 30 minutes, myself, trying to obtain recognition. I wanted to serve notice that at the conclusion of the remarks by the Senator from Illinois, I intend to seek recognition.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope the Senator gets it. I seriously doubt whether the Chair will recognize him, especially if some Senator rises on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that is exactly the reason I made the statement.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the other day, in making his able address on socialized medicine, during which he got caught between two fires, when he found out for the first time that the Governor of California was strongly endorsing the compulsory insurance features of the health measure, continued his address on the national dental bill. "Oh," he said, "what a great thing it is. What a great thing the Republicans have done, in passing the national dental bill." But not one dime was appropriated for the dental bill. Members of the majority party in the House of Representatives used the economy hatchet on everything, including the dental bill and the heart bill. They almost used it on the European recovery program. They used it on the United Nations organization, in the establishment of its headquarters, until they came back to this special session. When a measure gets to the House, it goes by the wayside. But why do Senators on the other side of the aisle make the kind of speeches they do? It is for the sole purpose of enabling them to go to the country and say, "This is what we did. This is what we did." And yet there is no appropriation of money with which to carry out the measures they passed. It is a sham, that is all. I resent the playing of politics of that kind.

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I have the floor, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question, but I submit to him that there will be plenty of time.

I should like very much if the Senate would allow us to have a vote on the pending bill. After the vote has been had, we can agree on an hour of adjournment, if possible. We shall then have all night in which to debate, and all the time we want.

Mr. HATCH. I do not seek recognition through the courtesy of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I said I was not yielding. I asked the Senator to withhold his request to be recognized until we could get a vote on the bill.

Mr. HATCH. I am seeking recognition in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico will be recognized in his own right at the first opportunity.

Mr. WHERRY. I am simply asking the Senate if we may not proceed to a vote on the bill. It has been read the third time. It is ready for the vote. After the vote has been had, we shall be perfectly willing to remain here, and we will not adjourn until Senators have had an opportunity to say everything they want to say. I simply make the request.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois yielded to me for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized. Does he yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HATCH. Do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has been recognized in his own right.

Mr. MURRAY. But, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] yielded to me, to permit me to ask a question, before the Senator from New Mexico sought the floor. Is that not right?

Mr. LUCAS. I endeavored to.

Mr. HATCH. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Montana, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to apologize for not having known of what appears to have been an arrangement between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Montana. The oversight was unintentional. The Chair has recognized in his own right the Senator from New Mexico, who has most graciously agreed to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. Before the Senator from Montana begins, I want to disabuse the mind of the Presiding Officer with reference to any arrangement that I had with the Senator from Montana. The Senator from Montana merely asked me to yield, and I thought I had yielded. The Presiding Officer recognized the Senator from Nebraska before the Senator from Montana could begin.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. In the course of his remarks a few minutes ago he referred to the fact that, among other bills, the Senate has passed a bill setting up a dental research bureau. My understanding is that no funds have been appropriated for the purpose of carrying the act into effect.

Mr. LUCAS. That is my understanding.

Mr. MURRAY. So that nothing can be done with reference to that important program, which is so valuable to our country. The bill was advocated by the American Dental Association.

That bill was proposed by the American Dental Society. It has been before the Senate for many years. I introduced it at least 3 or 4 years ago. It was passed by the Senate at the last session, but when it reached the House it was held up there. It now comes up again at this session. Nothing has been done toward effecting that very important program which means so much to the health of the American people. Nothing can be more important than a program for the study of the causes of dental decay. It is one of the most important things in the province of medicine. It seems to me that some appropriation should have been made for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. I wanted the RECORD to show that there was no appropriation made, and yet the Republicans are claiming credit for the passage of the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New Mexico will yield in order that I may correct the RECORD in connection with the statement made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I think the Senate would be interested to know just what was done.

Mr. HATCH. I yield, if I may do so, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be understood.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, since the question has been raised, I think both the Senate and the country will be interested in the factual information as to what was done by the Eightieth Congress at the last session in regard to appropriations for public health.

The RECORD shows that in connection with venereal diseases Congress appropriated $17,230,000; for tuberculosis, $9,291,000; for assistance to States, general, $13,865,000; for communicable diseases, $7,490,000; for hospital construction—grants—$40,000,000; for administrative expenses, hospital construction, $1,300,000; for hospitals and medical care, $21,443,000; for foreign quarantine service, $3,000,000; for employee health service programs, $392,500; for National Institute of Health, operating expenses, $13,670,000; National Cancer Institute, $14,000,000; construction of research facilities, $5,000,000; commissioned officers, pay, and so forth, $1,866,300; for training for nurses, $350,000; for salaries and expenses, $4,047,700; for Office of International Health Relations, $285,000.

That makes a total of $153,230,500.

In addition to that, Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact that in Public Law 639, of the Eightieth Congress, it is provided, on page 9, as follows:

> For construction of a combined hospital and research building, together with a power plant and distribution facilities, garage, storage facilities, and roads and walks, for the National Institute of Mental Health and for general medical research, including research in cancer and cardiovascular diseases, and for the alteration and repair of existing research facilities and the construction of temporary structures for radioactive research, including acquisition of site or sites and preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the appropriation of $2,650,000 under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1948, and the appropriation of $850,000 to the Public Buildings Administration under the head "National Institute of Mental Health" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948.

In addition, there were contract authorizations in the sum of $25,630,000 for the building of facilities, including the facilities that will be available for heart work.

I also call to the attention of the Senate the fact that in the field of heart diseases alone, in connection with a question raised by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] on page 413 of the hearings before the House Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security, it is shown that the total amount for heart work, in addition to the facilities available, was $1,519,580.

Furthermore, Mr. President, over and above what was provided by the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security, there is also, for cancer research, provided in the funds allotted to the Atomic Energy Commission an additional $5,000,000 in that field.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to say something about a question which seems to me to be of great importance. I am told that the pending bill should be acted upon and should go to the House, and I am perfectly willing to cooperate with the acting majority leader and let the bill be disposed of, if I may be recognized after that has been done.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from New Mexico for his courtesy, and I ask unanimous consent that after the vote on the bill has been taken, the Chair will recognize the Senator from New Mexico without prejudice to the right he now has with regard to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution having been read three times the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) was passed.

PROCEDURE OF THE SENATE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the principal reason I rose and sought recognition was to protest against the procedure of the Senate in meeting, as we have done, under a special call of the President of the United States, to meet a great emergency, and then to be confronted with having to remain in session until 7 o'clock, or perhaps all night long, as we did at the close of the last regular session——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I only want to say that there is no reason to stay here all night long, because, so far as I know, there is no more legislation to be passed by this session of Congress. I understand there is a resolution to be considered, but there is nothing to keep us here unless Senators desire to talk. Of course we are glad to stay and listen to them, but certainly not all night.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Ohio.

I have heretofore expressed my regard for the Senator from Ohio, the high esteem in which I hold him as a man of integrity and honor. If I were to speak at length tonight I think I would choose for a text, if that were proper to be done on the floor of the United States Senate, words from the Republican platform adopted at Philadelphia, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present." Those words appear in the Republican platform of this year, the platform adopted at Philadelphia. Let me repeat them, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present."

Those words were spoken by the Great Emancipator, by the founder, I may say, of the Republican Party, in his annual address to the Congress on December 1, 1862.

I wondered, when I read those words from the Republican platform, if the honorable gentlemen at Philadelphia who adopted those words of the leader of their party understood what they meant, if they knew where they came from, if they knew the occasion upon which they were uttered.

Mr. President, from the actions in this special session of Congress I am utterly convinced that the men who wrote the platform at Philadelphia had no conception and had no idea or understanding of the words of the great founder of their party, who said, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present." Those words were uttered on the occasion of the delivery of his second annual message to the Congress of the United States on December 1, 1862, when he proposed to the Congress a complete solution for the great question of slavery and civil strife which then tore this Nation.

Abraham Lincoln in this message, as great a message of statesmanship as was ever sent to the Congress, talked to his own divided party, and proposed in the message the articles by which he expressed the sincere and fervent hope that civil strife might be ended.

Mr. President, he did not quit there; he continued and said, "The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion." When I read those words, and remembered the circumstances under which they were uttered, and realized that in his day and time—and I hope the Republican Members of this body will listen to me—he said "The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion," I knew that the Republican Congress controlled by his party, had failed to rise high, failed to meet the occasion, and as a consequence of failure to follow the advice of Abraham Lincoln civil strife in this Nation continued for long years, followed by the reign of the carpetbagger in the South.

True it was that in that message Abraham Lincoln proposed a compromise. He said it was a compromise, but he said, "If adopted it will shorten the war, it will end civil strife." Had his advice been heeded, all the terrors and horrors of continued civil strife and of the carpetbag era which followed in the South would not have been experienced.

I ask the Republican Members of the Congress to go back and read the words of Abraham Lincoln which they so glibly quote in their platform, but to which they did not then and they do not now adhere. The Republican Congress then failed to rise to the occasion, it did not meet the occasion, and as a consequence this country suffered further long years of civil strife. They have not risen to meet the occasion today, they have failed to meet it. On every point the majority party of the Congress of the United States has failed as utterly and as miserably as they failed in 1862.

How have they failed? Will anyone on the other side of the Chamber say that they met the housing situation? I listen; I am waiting, and I shall be glad to yield for any Senator on the other side of the the aisle to say, "We have honestly and conscientiously met the housing situation."

Mr. President, there is no response. There is no response because there can be no response, because the failure is here.

Oh, they may smirk, and they may smile, and they may say that the President of the United States was moved by political considerations, and political considerations alone. Very well. Suppose he was. What have they done that was better? Nothing.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] today said he was reminded of the theme I Got Plenty o' Nothing. I was reminded, too, of something else. The Senator from Kentucky is older than I am, but I recall quite well some 25 or 30 years or so ago there was a song, a popular ditty of those days that ran like this:

> You look like nothing.
> You talk like nothing.
> You act like nothing.
> Nothing from nothing leaves you.

Mr. President, the record of this special session of the majority party is that nothing from nothing leaves nothing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to my good friend from California, of whom I am very fond.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the able Senator from New Mexico, who I regret is not going to be with us at the next session, who has retired of his own volition, I believe, that I take it this speech is somewhat in the nature of his swan song to the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, no, not at all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say that I am sure that in the time I have been in Washington the Senator has tried to be eminently fair on the floor of this body. During the time I have been in the Senate I have tried not to be a narrow partisan. But when the Senator, in the eloquence of debate, permits his enthusiasm to run away from him and says that the record of this Congress is—I believe he said "nothing from nothing adds up to nothing"——

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator on reflection realizes that that is not a fact. This Congress cooperated, I believe, more than any other Congress has ever done with a President of the opposition party in the field of foreign affairs, because we recognized there was a great crisis facing the world which transcended narrow partisan lines. We have tried to the best of our ability to let partisan politics stop at the water's edge.

The record of the Eightieth Congress from the day it met up to the present time is replete with instances in which we have cooperated in the field of foreign affairs so that we might present a united American front to the world, and that no group overseas might drive a wedge between us and disrupt this Nation. I do not believe that even in his enthusiasm here tonight the Senator from New Mexico will deny that fact.

Mr. HATCH. Has the Senator from California concluded?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have concluded for the moment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am very happy the Senator from California interrupted me and propounded the question which he did. I am glad indeed that he did so. I am glad of it, Mr. President, because I do not suppose there has been a stronger advocate in the United States Senate, or in the country, of a unified bipartisan program than I have been. I have spoken all over the country in behalf of a united program by which America, your country and my country, sir, would stand with just one front to all the rest of the world.

Mr. President, of course, I have served on the Committee on Foreign Relations and I have cast a favorable vote in that committee every time the committee voted to report out a matter. We have reported out every bill, every measure, every treaty, every agreement by a vote of 13 to 0.

Mr. President, I am happy to say that under the leadership of the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]—and I am sorry the Senator from Michigan as well as the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] are not both present in the Chamber at the moment—we have stood forthrightly and squarely together, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as Americans. And I pray God that that may always be.

I trust I have answered the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely want to say that I think at least the Senator will admit then that in the field of foreign policy the Congress has had a record of substantial achievement, one that not even the Senator now himself feels that he is able to criticize so far as foreign policy is concerned.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not criticize; I brag of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that at the proper time—and I do not now want to interrupt the Senator—we can demonstrate that in the field of other legislation the present Congress has had a substantial record.

I am quite willing to agree with the able Senator from New Mexico that there have been some bills passed by the Senate which the other House in its judgment did not feel it could pass. There have been some such bills which I have personally voted for and spoken for on the floor of the Senate of the United States. But under our constitutional system, in order to pass a law it must have the approval of both Houses of the Congress, and the approval of the President, or if he vetoes it, Congress can pass it over his veto. I would far rather have some legislation fail in the Eightieth Congress, or the Eighty-first Congress or the Eighty-second Congress, and have the Congress of the United States carry out its constitutional duty, than to have a Congress which would blindly follow as a rubber stamp and pass everything the Executive might send to the Congress under a "must" program, saying, "You have to pass it," because that is how countries have lost their liberties, and their peoples have found themselves no longer able to maintain themselves as freemen in a free world. That is the path they have followed. Our legislative process may take time. Some of us may become impatient, as I have often become impatient, but in the long run I believe that our constitutional system, with its separation of powers, with its representative system of government, is far better than any other.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I must again completely agree with my friend from California. There is no difference between us at all respecting what he has said. I agree perfectly with what he has just said. But, Mr. President, that is one of the reasons why I have sat here in shocked amazement and listened to Republicans on the other side of the Chamber, such as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], who made a statement upon which I should now like to comment. Is the Senator from Connecticut present in the Chamber? I wish the officers of the Senate would call the Senator from Connecticut to the Chamber. I want to comment just a little bit upon his assertions here that the Congress of the United States did not have information upon which to act; that the Congress had passed a bill with respect to which the President was obliged to make recommendations to us.

Mr. President, may I ask the Secretary to call to the Chamber the Senator from Connecticut?

I have been extremely shocked, Mr. President, when Senators on the other side of the aisle have risen on the floor, as they have done repeatedly, and tried to place blame on the President of the United States in such a manner. Where is the integrity, where is the independence, where is the ability of Senators, that they cannot act, that they cannot draft legislation until the President recommends it to the Congress?

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] the other day made a statement of the kind I have just mentioned. He made such a statement again today. He spoke of some insignificant, some futile bill the Congress passed at the last session, with which I am quite familiar. And then, with regard to another measure, he said the President had not made recommendations with respect to it, and therefore the Congress of the United States was helpless, and the Congress could not possibly act.

I see that the Senator from Connecticut has now entered the Chamber. I was just saying that the Senator had said, with respect to a certain measure, that the President of the United States had not recommended what the Congress should do. So it would seem that all the pitifully weak, insignificant, Republican majority can do is to say, "We cannot act; we do not know how to act. We do not have enough information on which to act."

Why, Mr. President, there is not a housewife in America who does not have information respecting the high cost of living. There is not a man who pays a grocery bill who does not know about the high cost of living. Yet the distinguished Senator from Connecticut says that we must have a special investigation; we must authorize a special committee to go forth and study and bring back a report sometime next February or next March or some other time next year.

I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut wish to have the Senator from New Mexico yield to him?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to be fair. Let me say that I have been criticizing the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I am grateful to my distinguished friend for giving me this opportunity. I remember very well that at the adjournment of the regular session in 1947 I had pending in the Senate a resolution calling for an investigation of the price situation and inflation in the United States. I do not recall that any Senator on the Democratic side of the aisle had introduced any such resolution. I do not recall that in the regular session of 1947 there was any action whatsoever from the other side of the aisle looking toward dealing

with the subject of high prices. I remember the extreme difficulty I had in getting that resolution through.

It was finally adopted. The best, the broadest, and the most effective grass-roots study possible was made on the subject of inflation by the committee appointed under that resolution. We went at it in a completely bipartisan way.

At the end of the hearings which we held all over the country there were many recommendations as to how to deal with the subject of inflation, and in the special session of 1947 the President, in his message, adopted as his own 10 of the recommendations of that committee; and as I recall, seven, and part of the eighth of those recommendations, were put into effect in anti-inflation legislation.

I recall that we enacted a bill which outlined the procedure by virtue of which the administration could lay before the Congress the specific facts and demand action within 15 days. That was the law of the land. Perhaps my friend did not like it; but I do not understand that it is the privilege of the Executive or of any official of the Government to observe only those laws, and operate only under those laws, which he or his party may like. I understand that when legislation is enacted by Congress it becomes the law of the land, and until it is changed everyone from the President down is supposed to observe it, under his constitutional duty.

The other day I stated in my speech, and I reiterate, that the act which was passed in 1947 was a good act. It had some very helpful features. I say again that the President has failed to observe the provisions of that act. Perhaps he has his own good reasons for so doing. I said in my speech, and I reiterate, that had he done so it would have been most helpful to this Congress. Nevertheless, he did not see fit to act upon it. But he comes to us with a message with very general suggestions as to how to deal with inflation.

I believe that if my good friend will examine the Appendix of the RECORD he will find an editorial from the New York Times which I think deals very effectively and very conclusively and ably with the President's program to combat inflation. I refer the Senator to that excellent editorial. The whole effect of the editorial is one of disapproval of the President's recommendations.

Certainly the New York Times is not a Republican newspaper. It is recognized throughout the world as one of the leading newspapers in the world, and its editorial comment has often been quoted by my distinguished friend from New Mexico.

I have no desire at this time to get into an argument with the Senator from New Mexico, much as I would really enjoy it; but since he has raised this point I merely wish to make this comment. I greatly appreciate the opportunity which he has afforded me. He was very desirous of obtaining the floor and keeping it. It is an extremely generous act on his part to yield to me to make this brief comment, and I thank him from my heart.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am most happy to have the remarks of the distinguished and able Senator from Connecticut. I hope he will understand that there was nothing personal in what I said. I have a high respect for the Senator, and I have a very great respect for the New York Times. I presume that I have placed in the RECORD several of its editorials. I do not now recall what editorials I have placed in the RECORD, but I am sure I have placed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times. I am familiar with the editorial to which the Senator refers, in which the President's program was criticized.

I want Senators on the other side of the aisle to understand that perhaps the President's program was all wrong. What better do they have to offer? Have they offered anything better? The silence is painful, Mr. President. The only thing they have offered is this weak, ineffective, insignificant bill which was passed today.

This is not a challenge from me. It is a challenge from the American Republic, from the people of America. Perhaps the President was wrong on his program when he first proposed it at the call of the special session last year. For the sake of argument, let me agree with the Senators on the other side of the aisle. Perhaps he was wrong in January this year, when he again urged the program. Have they offered anything better? Again the silence is painful, Mr. President.

There was one thing, Mr. President, about which the President was not wrong, and that was that the continued inflationary spiral could bring disaster to all the country. What have Republican Senators done about that? Are they going to adjourn this special session as they adjourned the regular session, without any effective action? Will they go home to the American people and say, "We will let nature take its course?" That is what they are doing. They may offer all the resolutions they wish to provide for a further study. They may beg the question on the platform by saying that Harry Truman killed OPA. Who killed Cock Robin? They will not deceive the American public.

Mr. President, on the 9th day of January of this year, in an effort to get away from partisanship and from party politics, I stood here on the floor of the United States Senate and literally begged Senators on both sides of the aisle to forget party politics. I told them that this was a campaign year; but I said that the American people were more interested in the cost of living than they were in the success of the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. I pleaded with Congress to get together through the policy committees—that was the only thing I could think of—and devise a nonpartisan program.

Then as now, then as on December 1, 1862, when Abraham Lincoln addressed the Congress, the words fell upon deaf ears. Mr. President, Lincoln in that immortal address uttered the words which I have already quoted. I wish Senators would read it, because Abraham Lincoln was one of the greatest Americans this country has ever produced. The wisdom; the philosophy, the sincerity, and the honesty of those words which he addressed to the Congress, had they been heeded, would have meant so much to this country. But he went on, and said:

> As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew.

In 1862 the Congress did not think anew and it did not act anew. As a result, the long years of civil strife continued, and this country was plunged into an era from which it has only in more recent years emerged.

Mr. President, do Republican Senators know what else Abraham Lincoln said at that time? They will be terribly surprised if they will read the words of their own leader, for after he had pointed out all those things, and after he had said:

> The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew.

He added another sentence, the concluding sentence of that paragraph, although it does not appear in the Republican platform of this year. I wonder how many of the Senators on the Republican side of the aisle know what that sentence was. I wonder whether their platform makers knew what it was. I wonder whether they really understood what Abraham Lincoln was talking about, or whether what they said was just glib political baloney—for Abraham Lincoln said in the next sentence, which they did not quote:

> We must first disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country.

The Republican platform committee in Philadelphia did not see fit to add those final words of Lincoln's. They did not see fit to say, "We must first disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country." The Republicans did not disenthrall themselves in 1862, and the Republican Party has not disenthralled itself in 1948. They still cling to "the dogmas of the quiet past," which are "inadequate to the stormy present."

Mr. President, a very good friend of mine came to me just now and said that I should not make these remarks. All I have to say on that point is that I have a deep conviction of the truth of what I am saying. I believe that we must rise to meet the occasion, and I believe the Republican majority has failed to do so. So long as I have breath to speak, regardless of what may occur in the future, I shall stand here on the floor of the Senate of the United States and shall condemn the action of a political party which fails to rise to meet the occasion. I say it regretfully, because the Republican Party does have a great past and it has much to rise to. I say to the Senators on the other side of the aisle that they should stay in session here—I protest against an adjournment—and should give these men an opportunity to come before the Banking and Currency Committee; they should give that opportunity to the labor groups about whom the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] spoke. Who is more interested in the cost of living than the laboring men of America? Yet the committee slams the door in their faces, and says, "We will not hear a word you have to say."

So, Mr. President, I ask the Senators on the other side of the aisle, "Are you rising to meet the occasion?"

Mr. President, I shall not speak longer.

Mr. MURRAY and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

Mr. HATCH. I yield first to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have been listening with great interest to the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico. I agree with him fully that this Congress has failed to do many things that should have been done to meet the situation which confronts our country at this time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield right there, let me say in conclusion—and then I shall yield to any Senator who wishes to be yielded to—that inasmuch as the Senator from Montana has said that this Congress has failed to do some things it should have done, I am reminded in this connection of the Episcopalian Prayer Book, I believe, which says:

> We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done; and there is no health in us.

I yield now to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHERRY, Mr. FERGUSON, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has yielded to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in connection with the saying that many things which should have been done have been left undone, I am reminded that in 1947 there was introduced in the Senate a bill identified as Senate bill 1652, known as the Veterans' Economic Development Corporation Act. That bill purported to set up a corporation which was to aid the veterans of the country to get into business, and to provide opportunities for them in this country, after their return from the war.

Mr. HATCH. Let me interrupt the Senator from Montana for a moment. I know what he is talking about. I yield now to myself.

Mr. CAPEHART and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, no, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would point out that the Senator from New Mexico has the floor. He yielded at the request of the Senator from Montana, but the floor remains in the right of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MURRAY. But I have not concluded the remarks which I had to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair point out that as between the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Montana, the Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana; but I have not yielded the floor.

Mr. President, if there is any question about that——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no question. The Senator from New Mexico yielded to the Senator from Montana. Later, the Senator from New Mexico said to the Senator from Montana, "I yield now to myself."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, just in case any question is raised, I yield to the Senator from Montana for any observation he may care to make, provided that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not like to interrupt, but as I understand the rules, the Senator from New Mexico may only yield to the Senator from Montana for a question. Is that not correct?

Mr. HATCH. Oh, certainly, if the Senator from Ohio wants to insist on the rule. That is the reason I was inquiring.

Mr. TAFT. I was only interested in not having the Senator from Montana make an entire speech in the time of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I am interested only in straightening out the situation. If I can yield to the Senator without being taken off the floor, I shall do so; if not, I shall reclaim the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from New Mexico making a unanimous-consent request that he be permitted to yield to the Senator from Montana without losing the floor?

Mr. HATCH. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I feel we probably should not observe a very strict interpretation of the rules. I do not object to the distinguished Senator asking the Senator from Montana a question, and he may answer it. The Senator from Montana is my good friend.

Mr. HATCH. No; the Senator from Montana is asking me a question.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no intention here to farm out the time. If there were, I should have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MURRAY. I could have finished long ago.

Mr. HATCH. I reclaim the floor in my own right. I decline to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to conclude the statement I started to make.

Mr. HATCH. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may state that he has no authority to permit the Senator from Montana to conclude a statement, a portion of which the Senator from New Mexico permitted to be made. The Senator from New Mexico having reclaimed the floor, he now holds the floor in his own right and can yield only for a question; which he declines to do.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield for any purpose.

Mr. MURRAY. For any purpose?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I happen to know what is in the mind of the Senator from Montana, so I think I can explain to the Senate exactly what the Senator from Montana is thinking about. Where is the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]? I do not want him to leave. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] will return. I trust someone will see that he is notified.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] placed in the RECORD several months ago a short letter from a distinguished and able resident of my State, Gen. Patrick J. Hurley. General Hurley is a candidate for the United States Senate. I would cast no reflections whatever upon the good general. But the Senator from New Hampshire placed in the RECORD a very interesting letter he had received from General Hurley, in which the general espoused, endorsed, and agreed to support until the end of time, as I recall, a bill which had been introduced in the Senate by the Senator from New Hampshire and several other Senators, including the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. There was no partisanship; it was sponsored by both Republicans and Democrats. It is a good bill. It is a bill, as stated in the letter, to set up for the veterans of America a small RFC by which the veterans could go to an organization financed by the Federal Government, without taxation, to obtain loans. I am not clear about how that could be done without taxation, but it is so asserted. It is a very worth-while measure. When it was called to my attention that the Senator from New Hampshire had inserted in the RECORD the letter from General Hurley, it was stated that he had also included a lengthy dissertation on industrial rehabilitation, farm improvement, parks, highways, and every form of internal improvement in management, including in New Mexico river and harbor development and boat transportation. That was a little amazing to me. Nevertheless, I should like to ride by boat from my town of Clovis to the city of Albuquerque and possibly disembark at a pier in the harbor on the Rio Grande.

I was a little amazed when I read that, and I checked up on the record. I found that previously, quite some time before, Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, who has recently been nominated by his State for the United States Senate, had inserted in the RECORD the same identical matter. He called it the Tennessee plan. I am glad the Senator from New Hampshire is now present. I must say for Representative KEFAUVER that he very frankly disclaimed any credit for originating the plan himself. He stated where it originated. It was set forth in detail in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page after page, as a description of the Tennessee plan. It was the same identical plan which the Senator from New Hampshire had received from my friend, General Hurley, of New Mexico, and which he had placed in the RECORD as the New Mexico plan. That was interesting.

Mr. MURRAY. Also the Montana plan.

Mr. HATCH. I repeat, the bill sponsoring this plan is a good bill. The bill which the Senator from New Hampshire introduced, along with the Senator from Kentucky and other Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, is a very good bill. It was introduced early last year. It went to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have inquired about hearings. None have been held by the committee, none have been asked for. Not a single witness has appeared in behalf of the proposed bill for the veterans of America, the Tennessee plan, and the New Mexico plan.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I am not through. I am a long way from it.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. No; I do not yield. In the House of Representatives, not only did Representative KEFAUVER introduce the bill, but I may say at least eight or ten other Representatives introduced the same identical bill. The bills all went to the committee. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there is the letter, which Senators may read if they look it up, inserted by the Senator from New Hampshire, which contains the most enthusiastic praise for that bill by Representative WOLCOTT, chairman of the committee which considered it, I have ever read in my life. According to the chairman of that committee, this particular bill will solve all the problems of the veterans. Yet, the committee, with eight or ten bills pending before it, has not heard a single witness.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. I decline to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a point of order. I want to call the Senator's attention——

Mr. HATCH. I decline to yield for a point of order or for any other purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico continues to decline to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MURRAY. Would it be correct for me to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the bill was sent to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, not to the committee to which he has just referred, and that a few days ago——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must point out that the Senator's observations on that point are not in order. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor, unless he wishes to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. So, Mr. President, it is not possible to call attention to a mistake being made, in order to correct the RECORD.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing for the Senator from Montana to correct my misstatements. I may be wrong regarding some of the details. I shall proceed quickly.

After the Tennessee plan had been introduced, and after the New Mexico plan had been introduced, Senators introduced the Wyoming plan, in the same identical words; they introduced the Delaware plan, in the same identical words, and with the same enthusiastic phrases; and only recently the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] introduced the Montana plan. That is what has aroused the interest of my friend from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in regard to a man who is running for the Senate against the Senator from Montana and who says, with enthusiasm, that the plan is a solution of all the problems of the veterans in the United States.

I am not being facetious, because the Senator from New Hampshire recently introduced the New Hampshire plan, in almost the identical language.

I have never heard so much talk and seen so little accomplishment as there has been in connection with the subject. I had not intended to raise the question——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is speaking about all of these plans——

Mr. HATCH. I do not think I have named all of them. I think there were some others.

Mr. LUCAS. He has talked about a number of plans introduced by various Senators. Did the Senators claim that the plans were their own original plans?

Mr. HATCH. I may say to the Senator that, as a matter of fact, I understood that each Senator who proposed the plan indicated, as will be shown in the RECORD, that it was a magnificent conception which he had dreamed up alone, without any help from anyone else. It is strange, Mr. President, that the idea that the Montana plan, the New Hampshire plan, the New Mexico plan, and all the other plans were couched in identically the same language.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Nash, one of his secretaries.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS (S. CON. RES. 63)

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask that it be read and that it receive immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, August 7, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the concurrent resolution debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not debatable.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Murray
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Russell
Brooks	Jenner	Saltonstall
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stennis
Capper	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Ecton	McGrath	Tydings
Ellender	McKellar	Umstead
Ferguson	McMahon	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Magnuson	Watkins
Green	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	Wiley
Hatch	Millikin	Williams
Hawkes	Moore	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is detained on official business and has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Kansas

[Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] has a general pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

I announce also that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FEAZEL], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—54

Aiken	Gurney	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bricker	Hill	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoey	Smith
Brooks	Holland	Sparkman
Butler	Ives	Stennis
Cain	Jenner	Stewart
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Capper	Knowland	Thye
Cooper	Lodge	Tydings
Cordon	McCarthy	Umstead
Donnell	McClellan	Vandenberg
Dworshak	Malone	Watkins
Ecton	Martin	Wherry
Ellender	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Williams
Fulbright	Morse	Young

NAYS—18

Barkley	Langer	Magnuson
Connally	Lucas	Murray
Green	McFarland	Pepper
Hatch	McGrath	Taylor
Hayden	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Kilgore	McMahon	Thomas, Utah

NOT VOTING—24

Ball	Flanders	O'Mahoney
Buck	George	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Downey	Maybank	Wagner
Eastland	Myers	White
Feazel	O'Daniel	Wilson

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until December 31, 1948; and

H. Con. Res. 223. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signing of enrolled bills and joint resolutions following adjournment.

ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask the Chair to lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 222.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 222, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, August 7, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators I will say that this concurrent resolution is identical to the Senate concurrent resolution just adopted by the Senate. It has just come over from the House, and in order to expedite matters I ask now that the Senate concur in it, and after it has been approved I will ask to have reconsidered the vote by which the Senate concurrent resolution was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 222) was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate Concurrent Resolution 63 was just agreed to. That is the concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move to lay Senate Concurrent Resolution 63 on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask that the Presiding Officer lay down House Concurrent Resolution 223.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 223, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses until December 31, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS OR COMMITTEES AND TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

On motion of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until December 31, 1948, the President pro tempore be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

Ordered further, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives subsequent to such adjournment.

ADDITIONAL MILEAGE FOR SENATORS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I ask unanimous consent to report favorably an original resolution and request its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 272) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1949, to Senators their additional mileage for the second session of the Eightieth Congress convened in pursuance of the proclamation of the President of the United States of July 15, 1948.

INSERTIONS IN THE APPENDIX OF THE RECORD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have asked me whether opportunity will be afforded to make insertions in the final copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will be printed some time after the Congress adjourns.

I now ask unanimous consent that memorial addresses respecting the late Senator Bankhead, of Alabama, may be submitted for insertion in the final copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and also that other memorial addresses may be printed in the final copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is made.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in light of the discussion this afternoon concerning the appropriations for health activities by the Eightieth Congress I have had a statement prepared by the clerk of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which I have also had carefully checked

by the clerk of the Appropriations Committee; which gives the over-all figures of the activities covered. The statement is as follows:

Appropriations in the amount of $282,000,000 were granted to the Public Health Service by the Eightieth Congress. In addition, the Public Health Service was granted in excess of $187,000,000 in contract authorizations. These sums cover the wide range of health programs administered by the Public Health Service, including grants for assistance to the States in the control of venereal diseases, tuberculosis, communicable diseases, mental health activities, cancer, and other health-control activities.

The funds also cover grants for the construction of hospital facilities, and provide funds for the construction of research facilities and the conduct of research in heart disease, cancer, mental health, dental health, communicable diseases, and other diseases by the Public Health Service. The funds also cover training of nurses and the salaries and expenses of Public Health Service personnel throughout the United States.

The figures cited above do not, of course, include the appropriations, well in excess of $1,000,000,000, made by the Eightieth Congress to provide proper health facilities and medical care for our American veterans and for the members of our armed services.

NOMINATION OF MAURICE J. TOBIN TO BE SECRETARY OF LABOR

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri on the condition that I do not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield to me without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent to the Senate the nomination of former Gov. Maurice J. Tobin, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor, a position which has been vacant since the death of former Senator and former Secretary Schwellenbach. Of course, we all recognize the fact that unless there are extraordinary circumstances which militate against it, any President has the right to choose the members of his own Cabinet. In that spirit I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination of Governor Tobin to be Secretary of Labor, without the nomination having been referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to which it would ordinarily go.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, while it is usual, of course, to confirm the members of the Cabinet of the President, it is not always done. There is no rule that members of the Cabinet shall be confirmed without their nominations being referred to the committee. Therefore I feel constrained to object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not invoking any rule. I do ask unanimous consent, because the rule provides that a nomination must be sent to a committee, but now that we are about to adjourn until January it seems to me not improper nor out of the ordinary to ask unanimous consent that this nomination to the President's Cabinet, to fill a vacancy which will remain vacant unless the President makes a recess appointment, should be confirmed without referring the nomination to the committee.

Mr. TAFT. I may point out that the President can make a recess appointment. If Congress had not now been in session, he could have made a recess appointment. He can make a recess appointment on Monday. I see no reason to set aside the rule of the Senate in the manner the Senator from Kentucky has suggested.

Subsequently,

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Maurice J. Tobin, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

WARNING BY DR. WILLIAM A. WIRT, OF GARY, IND., OF COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IN 1934

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield, without losing the floor, for an insertion in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the time has come to vindicate a great Indiana educator who gave his life in an effort to warn the people of this Nation of the infiltration of communism into this Government.

His effort was made futile and his life miserable by a faulty and unfair attempt to refute his evidence.

I speak of the late Dr. William A. Wirt, of Gary, Ind.

In 1934 Dr. Wirt warned the Nation of the presence of communism in our Government and his warning was investigated by a special committee of the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks the minority report of the committee.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We cannot join in the majority report. The committee has not met its responsibility as directed by the House in House Resolution 317, enacted by the House of Representatives on March 29, 1934. On the contrary, we report that the committee has by a studied effort deliberately refrained from obtaining the information which it was directed to obtain by such resolution. We further report that the committee has not only deliberately refrained from obtaining such information but has deliberately suppressed the obtaining of such information.

The information which the committee was required to obtain by House Resolution 317 is set forth in section 2 of said resolution. By this section, the commitee was required by the House to ascertain two things: First, who told Dr. William A. Wirt that there is a deliberately planned revolution and that certain employees of the Government are attempting to thwart the program of national recovery in the United States; and second, who is connected in any way with said activities, to wit, carrying on a deliberately planned revolution and attempting to thwart the program of national recovery.

The committee, by the vote of the three majority members, deliberately ignored and refused to consider this second requirement. In support of our statement that there were these two requirements upon the committee, we here set forth section 2 of the resolution In doing so, we shall divide this section into subsections A and B. The section is as follows:

"SEC. 2 (subsec. A). The committee is authorized and directed to summon Dr. William A. Wirt, of Gary, Ind., before it, and to require him to reveal the source of statements he has made to the effect that the United States is in process "of a deliberately planned revolution," and to the effect that certain officials or employees of the Government are attempting to thwart the program of national recovery in the United States; and the committee is authorized and directed to bring before it all officials or other persons alleged by Dr. Wirt to have given him said information; or

"Subsec. B. To be connected in any way with said activities, and to examine them as to the truth or falsity of the statements made by Dr. Wirt; and to summon and examine such other witnesses and make such further investigation in connection with such statements and the reasons and persons actuating the same as the committee in its discretion may deem advisable."

The majority members of this committee, by their votes and conduct in the holding of the hearings and by their majority report, deliberately ignored and refused to consider subsection B of section 2 of the resolution. There can be no question but that the committee was required to subpena and call in witnesses to ascertain what, if any, public officials were connected with said activities, to wit, "carrying out a deliberately planned revolution or attempting to thwart the program of a national recovery." Whether or not such people had talked with Dr. Wirt was entirely immaterial.

As proof that our construction of the resolution passed by the House as to the responsibility of the committee to call not only witnesses who talked with Dr. Wirt, but to call any and all others in order to ascertain the true information as to whether or not there is anyone in the Government connected with such said subversive activities, we cite the proceedings in the House of Representatives on pages 5815 to 5817 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29, 1934.

When this resolution was before the House, Mr. McGugin, of Kansas, took the position that the resolution was ambiguous, and that the committee would use it for the purpose of suppressing truth rather than for the purpose of ascertaining truth. Mr. McGugin said:

"This resolution is a 'cover-up.' It is a cowardly effort to smother the issues presented by the Dr. Wirt letter. This letter of Dr. Wirt does not present a mere personality. It presents the broad issue of whether or not there are those connected with the administration who are committed to philosophies of government wholly contrary to the Republic under the Constitution."

In answer to this statement of Mr. McGugin on the floor of the House, Mr. Byrns, Democratic leader in the House, scorned the statement by Mr. McGugin that the resolution restricted the inquiry to the mere statements of Dr. Wirt. Mr. Byrns, in speaking of the resolution, said:

"It undertakes to direct the committee to bring before it all officials or other persons alleged by Dr. Wirt to have given him this information: 'or to be connected in any way with said activity.'" In addition to that it provides:

" 'And to summon and examine such other witnesses and make such further investigation in connection with such statements and the reasons and persons actuating the same as the committee in its discretion may deem advisable.' "

"How much broader could this resolution be made? Talk about its being cowardly. A Democratic Congress, a Democratic committee, I say to the gentlemen, has proposed this investigation to find those persons, if they exist in this administration, who are acting treasonably toward our Government.

"There is no disposition to cover up anything. On the contrary we want brought to the attention of the public and the country those persons who are guilty of that sort of conduct. We want to bring them into the open so that they can be dealt with as the law provides, and also dealt with by the administration as seems necessary and proper under the circumstances.

"Mr. MAPES. Just as a matter of interpretation of the language which was discussed somewhat in the Committee on Rules, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee if it is his interpretation of the last clause of section 2 that this committee will be empowered under that clause to call anyone it sees fit to call, who may have information as to whether or not there are men answering the description of the charges made by Dr. Wirt, in the Government services?

"Mr. BYRNS. I do not think there is any question about it, because it distinctly says, 'such other witnesses and make such further investigation in connection with such statements and the reasons and persons actuating the same as the committee in its discretion may deem advisable.' I do not see how the resolution could possibly have been made broader in its scope."

After the Democratic leader in the House placed this interpretation upon a resolution, introduced by a Democratic Member and presented to the House by a Democratic Rules Committee, the House of Representatives had a right to and did accept and pass the resolution believing in the sincerity of this interpretation by Mr. Byrns.

As soon as the resolution was passed and the committee was appointed by the Speaker, the first act of the committee by the vote of three Democratic members, over the protest and votes of the two minority members, was to pass a resolution limiting the first day's hearing to the testimony of Dr. Wirt with Dr. Wirt's testimony limiting to the specific question of naming the people with whom he talked and setting forth their specific conversation. Thereafter the majority members of the committee, over the protest and vote of the minority members, limited the second day's hearing to the bringing before the committee the six specific witnesses with whom Dr. Wirt talked at a particular party and refused to call any other witnesses that were named by Dr. Wirt in his testimony.

Following the Byrns interpretation of the resolution, to wit, "it undertakes to direct the committee to bring before it all officials or other persons by Dr. Wirt to have given him this information," the committee respected this part of the Byrns' interpretation of the resolution and then at all times completely ignored and disregarded the following part of the Byrns' interpretation which is verbatim a part of the resolution "or to be connected in any way with said activity."

As further evidence that the majority members of the committee used this hearing for the avowed purpose of discrediting the witness, Dr. Wirt, and suppressing the truth with no reasonable desire or effort to obtain the truth, we point out the following:

First. Dr. Wirt was denied the opportunity in his own way to make his opening statement. When the majority members denied to Dr. Wirt this opportunity they denied to him a right and a privilege which has been enjoyed by all of the hundreds and thousands of witnesses who have ever appeared before congressional committees, House and Senate.

Second. It denied to the minority members the right to call a single witness whom they designated or chose to call before the committee. In doing this the committee again repudiated all the precedents of congressional investigations. In doing so the majority members made it inevitable that the proceedings would be a suppression of the truth rather than an uncovering of the truth. As an illustration, what would the Teapot Dome investigation have amounted to if the majority members of the committee investigating those transactions had denied to Senator Walsh, a minority member, the right to call before the committee to examine under oath any and all witnesses whom he chose to call?

The proceedings of a congressional hearing which limit the calling of witnesses to the majority members of the committee exclusively will inevitably suppress justice and truth just as a proceeding in court which would permit only one litigant to call witnesses would produce a perversion of truth.

Not only did the majority members refuse to permit the minority members to call witnesses to determine whether or not there were those in the Government service who were connected in any way with such subversive activities, but they refused to permit the minority members to call witnesses specifically named by Dr. Wirt, which witnesses could give the true testimony as to whether or not Frederick Howe, a high official in the Government, was doing everything within his power to retard the recovery program.

Dr. Wirt specifically said that General Westervelt, a former official in the Agriculture Department had told him (Wirt) that Frederick Howe had made the following statement to him (Westervelt):

"Is there any way by which we can stop feeding them? We are going too slowly. If we could stop feeding them, we would make greater headway toward what we are trying to accomplish."

Of course, this statement standing before the committee upon the testimony of Dr. Wirt that he was told this by General Westervelt is mere hearsay. However, the testimony on this subject directly from General Westervelt and Frederick Howe would be direct testimony and would not be hearsay. The majority in its determined effort to suppress truth chose to leave it as hearsay testimony and refused to call or permit the minority members to call General Westervelt and Mr. Howe before the committee.

There is only one interpretation which can be placed upon this statement of Mr. Howe by General Westervelt and that is "so long as the Government feeds the hungry it will be impossible to accomplish a violent overthrow of Government." It is an axiom of the revolutionist that the people must be made hungry in order to goad them into a violent overthrow of established order.

The refusal of the majority members to permit the minority members to call either Frederick Howe or General Westervelt before the committee to prove or disprove that this statement was made by Mr. Howe leaves but one logical conclusion as to the motive of the majority members of the committee. That conclusion is that they were fearful or believed that the complete truth of this statement would be established, and having been established, every citizen of the land would know that it was the designed purpose of Frederick Howe, consumers' counsel of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, to retard recovery for the purpose of bringing about a revolution. Such proof would have completely substantiated the original statement made by Dr. Wirt.

The minority members made their appeal to the majority members to have Arthur Morgan, H. A. Morgan, and David Lilienthal, Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority; Harold Ickes, Public Works Administrator; and Harry Hopkins, Federal Emergency Relief Administrator, subpenaed to appear before the committee. By their votes the three majority members refused to permit these five public officials to be brought before the committee. The minority members informed the majority members that if they were permitted to bring these witnesses before the committee that they would show the following:

First, that the three Tennessee Valley Authority directors had organized subsidiary corporations with the stock in said corporations to be owned by the Government of the United States and the corporations chartered to engage in the business of producing, processing, and selling farm crops and livestock; manufacturing and selling goods, wares, and merchandise of every description; lending money to any person, firm, or corporation with or without security; borrowing money without limit as to amount and speculating and dealing in the stocks and bonds of any other corporation. The minority members further informed the majority members that it would be disclosed that these three directors in organizing these corporations are proceeding without any authority of law.

The minority members further informed the majority members that if Harold Ickes were subpenaed before the committee that it would be shown that he had taken money from Public Works funds and used it to purchase the stock in such a corporation, and that Harry Hopkins had taken money from the Federal Emergency Relief Fund and used it to purchase stock in another such corporation.

That it would be further disclosed that Harold Ickes and Harry Hopkins with the purchasing of stock with such funds were acting without authority of law. That when it was disclosed that these five Government officials were doing these acts without authority of law that it would then be established that here were five high officials in the executive branch of the Government who were overthrowing the Republic under the Constitution so far as these acts are concerned, because they were deliberately proceeding without any regard for laws enacted by the Congress in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

Dr. Wirt in his direct testimony brought to the attention of the committee various public statements of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Prof. Rexford G. Tugwell. Among such statements were the following:

"We have a century and more of developments to undo.

"It is, in other words, a logical impossibility to have a planned economy and to have business operating its industries just as it is also impossible to have one with our present constitutional and statutory structure. Modifications in both, so serious as to mean destruction and rebeginning, are required."

He also brought to the attention of the committee that it was the publicly expressed theory of Professor Tugwell that a planned economy required three great changes: first, breaking down the present statutes and constitutions of the Government; second, destroying private business; and, third, destroying the sovereignty of the States, and that Professor Tugwell after setting forth these three requirements in one of his public speeches boldly stated:

"All three of these wholesale changes are required by even a limited acceptance of the planning idea."

These expressed theories of Professor Tugwell were brought to the attention of the committee by Dr. Wirt when he cited to the committee the professor's speech before the American Economic Association on December 28, 1931.

The minority members requested that Professor Tugwell be subpenaed before the committee. Their request was voted down by the three majority members. It is our belief that all will concede that the AAA and the NRA are at least a "limited acceptance of the

planning idea." We wanted to ascertain from Professor Tugwell under oath the information as to whether or not as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, he is administering his duties in keeping with his previous expressed ideas, as to the requirements for a limited acceptance of planning. If so, we wanted to know if in the administering of his duties, he is, in fact, doing what he can to break down the present statutes and constitutions of government, to destroy private business as it has heretofore existed, and to destroy the sovereignty of the States. We wanted to know from him if in the administering of his present duties he is attempting to modify business and our present Constitution and statutory structure so as to mean destruction and rebeginning of both business and Government.

The minority Members insisted that they had the right and that it was the duty of the committee to call such officials before the committee under the mandate of the House set forth in subsection B of section 2 of the resolution and as the resolution was interpreted by Mr. Byrnes, the majority leader of the House.

Before the hearings of the committee, Dr. Wirt first appeared and named six people who were with him at a dinner party in Virginia. He related the conversation which was had with these other six people. Thereafter, these six people were called before the committee. They denied that any of them had made the statements which Dr. Wirt had quoted them as having made. These six witnesses told the committee under oath that in a conversation which lasted from 4 to 5 hours Dr. Wirt did all the talking and that the only statement made by any of the remaining 6 was that 1 of the 6, Miss Kneeland, uttered the one sentence which was in substance that she did not believe in restoring the 1926 price level. It must be remembered that it was relatively easy for these six people to tell the same story when that story was confined to the repeating of one sentence offered by one person. Likewise, it must be remembered that it would have been exceedingly difficult for each member of the party to have told exactly what was said by various members present unless their testimony was confined exclusively to the truth.

The majority Members in their report find that the statements made by Dr. Wirt were untrue. For two reasons, we cannot join in this finding of the majority report:

First, we do not believe that there was a 5-hour conversation among seven people in which one person did all the talking with the exception of one of the remaining six uttering one sentence. We believe, that the remaining six in testifying that nothing more was said than one sentence by one of them forces the logical conclusion that they must have said that which Dr. Wirt quoted them as having said. Otherwise, they would have told what they actually did say at this party instead of giving the preposterous and unreasonable testimony that of the entire six all that was said by any of them was one sentence by one person.

Second, that the one sentence which was in substance that Miss Kneeland said that she opposed returning to the 1926 level is in and of itself proof of a determined effort on the part of some connected with the executive department of the Government to thwart the recovery program of the administration. It will be remembered that times without number the President and others high in the administration have offered as the goal of recovery the 1926 price level.

The majority members of the committee in accepting the testimony of these six witnesses and denouncing the testimony of Dr. Wirt disclose their determination in this proceeding to protect and exonerate those who were not in sympathy with traditional American Government under the Constitution.

Be it remembered that from the testimony of these witnesses, it was disclosed by a part of them that they had been members of and contributors to the American Civil Liberties Union. Further it was brought out at this hearing that this was an organization about which the New York State Legislature in 1928 made the following report:

"The American Civil Liberties Union, in the last analysis, is a contributor of all subversive movements. Its propaganda is detrimental to the interests of the State. It attempts not only to protect crime but encourages attacks upon our institutions in every form."

In 1931 a special committee of the House of Representatives made a report which was signed by two Republicans and two Democrats. In this report this House committee quoted this finding of the New York State Legislature and reported the following:

Your committee concurs in the above finding.

It was further disclosed from said witnesses that one of them, Robert Bruere, who now holds an important Government position in the NRA, in connection with the cotton-textile industry, was in 1918 and 1922 an avowed defender of the IWW and a severe critic of the Department of Justice under the Wilson administration for its conduct toward the IWW during the war.

It was further disclosed that another one of these witnesses, David Cushman Coyle, an important official in the Public Works Administration, frequently in public addresses refers to Al Smith and other similar personalities as mere "intellectual casualties of the depression."

Be it further remembered that another one of these witnesses has for years been a news correspondent with Communist newspapers in the United States among the users of his writings; that he is now in the employ of the Soviet Government as a Washington correspondent for the Tass News Agency; and that this agency is owned, controlled, and operated by the Soviet Government.

Yet these are the people—whose preposterous story that in a 5-hour conversation their sole statements consisted of one sentence uttered by one of them—who are protected by the majority report. Not only does the majority report protect them and their statements by placing upon them the stamp of truth, but upon that statement the majority report places the stamp of falsehood upon the testimony of Dr. Wirt.

As further evidence of the determined effort of the majority members of this committee to disregard Dr. Wirt and his testimony even at the cost of defending communism, I refer to this statement in the majority report.

Lawrence Todd is a correspondent for the Tass Agency in Washington, which is the "Associated Press" of the Soviet Union.

This statement in the majority report shows that the majority members are not only determined to protect this writer, who for many years wrote for Communist newspapers in the United States and who is now employed as correspondent for the Soviet Government, but are willing to do so by boldly taking respectability from the Associated Press of the United States and lending it to the subversive communistic propaganda agency of the Tass Service.

The evidence disclosed that the Tass Agency is owned and financed by the Soviet Government. Such was the testimony before the committee by Mr. Todd, yet the majority members in their report would undertake to draw a similarity between the Tass Agency and the Associated Press. Here is the difference. The Associated Press is privately owned and operated by various newspapers of the United States. It is a news agency entirely independent of the Government of the United States and operates under no governmental censorship. It operates under the freedom of the press guaranty of the Constitution of the United States, while the Tass Agency, owned and controlled by the Soviet Government, is in no sense an honest news agency but is a mere communistic propaganda agency of the Soviet Government.

The majority report of this committee is in perfect keeping with what apparently was a determined effort throughout the entire proceedings to discredit Dr. Wirt and to suppress the truth.

In support of this statement, we offer the following:

First, the Speaker of the House was reported in the press as having said that if Dr. Wirt would not testify that he would be put in jail. That statement was made before Dr. Wirt appeared before the committee and when he had made no statement that he would not testify. We submit that such a statement could serve no purpose other than either to intimidate or discredit the witness previous to his appearance before the committee.

Second, the statement was made on the floor of the House by the chairman of the committee that Dr. Wirt had been in jail for disloyalty during the war. This statement was not true and was not retracted until 5 days after the statement was made.

Third, a day or two after Dr. Wirt testified, the Secretary of the Interior was reported in the press as having stated that Dr. Wirt had endeavored wrongfully to obtain Public Works money for his own selfish benefit. The statement was refuted by Dr. Wirt. It was refuted by those who made application for the loan with the statement that Dr. Wirt has no interest whatever in the making of the application or obtaining favorable consideration of it.

An effort has been made to discredit this hearing and the testimony of Dr. Wirt by inferring that the people with whom he conversed were minor personalities and of no consequence in the administration. This is not true. Five of them hold important key positions in various Departments of the Government and are the oracles of those who are controlling Government. The sixth one is an important and direct employee of the Soviet Government. It is significant that these five people holding key positions in our Government should be in such close social relationship with Lawrence Todd, one of the foremost propaganda agents of the Soviet Government in America. Let us call the roll of these five who hold key positions in the Government.

First, Miss Barrows is an educational expert in the Department of the Interior. It is through the schools that frequently insidious propaganda is disseminated.

Second, Miss Kneeland is head of the Bureau of Home Economics in the Agriculture Department. Her department puts out scores of bulletins which furnish the ideal means of disseminating propaganda. From her own testimony she is bitterly opposed to returning to the 1926 level. Supposedly the Agriculture Department is to work for the welfare of the American farmers. There is not a farmer in a thousand but who would be immeasurably pleased to trade present conditions for 1926 conditions. Wheat was then $1.40 a bushel. It is now worth 75 cents a bushel. While it is supposedly her duty to work for the interest of the farmers, yet Bulletin 296, published by her department, advocates a reduction in the consumption of wheat. This bulletin has been given wide publicity. Everyone who reads it is being propagandized to consume less wheat which is produced by the American farmers. From her testimony, it is obviously her primary interest to socialize America rather than to increase the prosperity of the farmers.

Miss Taylor, from her testimony, is editor in chief of a publication which is put out by the office of the Consumers' Counsel of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. From her testimony, she admitted that this magazine contained propaganda advocating planned agriculture. It is significant that

while this publication advocates planned agriculture nothing is said in the publication about the fact that Dr. Tugwell has expressed the views that we cannot have even a "limited acceptance of planning" without changing constitutions and laws once and for all, destroying business as we have known it, and destroying the sovereignty of the Government. On the contrary, these requirements for a planned agriculture are insidiously kept away from the farmers in this publication while the farmers are being propagandized with the thought that they will receive profits from a planned agriculture.

It is perfectly obvious that Miss Kneeland and Miss Taylor, in charge of these propaganda agencies, are merely reflecting the true views of Secretary Wallace, Assistant Secretary Tugwell, Jerome Frank, counsel for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. These men whose thoughts they reflect are in complete control of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Another witness was Robert Bruere. From his testimony, it was disclosed that he was a defender of the IWW and a critic of the Department of Justice under the Wilson administration for its attitude toward the IWW and their war conduct. He is now in a key position in the NRA. In his position he has much control over the cotton-textile industry.

The fifth witness, David Cushman Coyle, holds an important key position in the office of the Public Works Administration. He is obviously an oracle of the Public Works Administrator, Secretary Ickes. He is constantly making public speeches propagandizing for the New Deal. His views are reflected in his recent speech in Washington before the Nurses' Association. In that speech, among other things, the press reports him as having said:

"Everything which we were taught in school is actually wrong. Thrift is no longer a virtue. Saving for a rainy day makes it rain all the harder."

Considering the positions which these five witnesses hold, it is obviously clear that they typify and reflect the views of superiors who are in direct control of the Government. This is a fact which would have been completely substantiated by direct testimony except that the majority members of the committee voted down the request of the minority members to call before the committee their immediate superiors, to wit, Secretary Wallace; Assistant Secretary Tugwell; Jerome Frank, counsel for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration; Frederick Howe, consumers' counsel of the AAA; Secretary of the Interior Ickes; and Donald Richberg, counsel for the NRA.

The charges of Dr. William A. Wirt, which formed the basis of this inquiry, may be summarized as follows:

Certain persons in positions of influence and authority in the administration hold these beliefs:

The depression demonstrates that the political, economical, and social organization of our country, heretofore accepted as the embodiment of American traditions and ideals, is inadequate to insure the temporal well-being and security of the people. The concept that American men and women constitute a free people must be scrapped.

In its stead must be erected a planned economy wherein the everyday activities of American citizens in agriculture, industry, transportation, merchandising, and other pursuits, including labor, are controlled and regimented by the Government, functioning through numerous bureaus. It necessarily follows that remuneration for such activities and the wealth invested therein likewise are in the control of the Government, even if the naked title to such properties is left in the present owners.

Inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States is the keystone of the arch supporting the concept of a free people, its provisions must be disregarded and allowed to fall into desuetude.

Dr. Wirt further charges that these persons holding the opinions above set forth are using their positions in the administration to draft measures, ostensibly temporary in character and purported to accelerate present recovery, which in effect operate to further the regimented economy plan. Such measures necessarily retard immediate economic improvement, which is all right with the economic planners, because the more serious the plight of the people the more readily will they submit to the proposed new order.

No suggestion was advanced that any such persons contemplate physical violence or that the established agencies of the Government be forcibly overthrown.

This, in substance, is the contention of Dr. Wirt, the truth of which this committee was created to probe. The committee limited its activities to an attempt to ascertain the sources of information upon which Dr. Wirt based his statement.

This was an utterly futile proceeding. Every well-informed person knows from the speeches, published writings, and radio addresses of Government officials constituting what is commonly known as the "brain trust" that their political, economic, and social philosophy is substantially as set forth by Dr. Wirt.

This committee is not authorized to sit in judgment upon the relative merits of the old order of a free people or a Government-regulated mode of American life. Under a broad, common-sense construction of the resolution creating the committee, we were commissioned to investigate whether Government officials, believing in a socialized American order, were so functioning as to facilitate its establishment. In short, what are the purposes of the "brain trust" and what are they doing about it?

This the American people are entitled to know. This it was not only the privilege but the duty of the committee to ascertain.

Unfortunately, the committee booted away its opportunity.

We therefore take the position that the committee has not performed its duties under the resolution and that the committee should be directed by the House to proceed to complete its duties under the resolution.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have concluded the reading of the minority report and I should like to suggest to the able Senator from Michigan that upon the resumption of public hearings by his committee on the matter of the loyalty program in our Government that he summon those named in this report as witnesses.

Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. MALONE, Mr. GURNEY, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to Senators who are now on their feet, for insertions in the RECORD, without losing the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I object.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I decline to yield. There has been an objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Michigan may yield to me, without losing the floor, in order that I may present certain routine Army nominations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

THE IRON CURTAIN AT HOME

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to speak this evening on The Iron Curtain at Home.

The case of William W. Remington and the recent hearings of the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, has brought into bold relief certain fundamental issues which I believe deserve the attention of the Senate at this time.

The subcommittee, as Members of the Senate know, is charged with the responsibility of examining into the efficiency of governmental operations in the executive departments. In the course of one such examination undertaken some months ago into the Government's export-control program, it was brought to our attention that one William W. Remington, a high official in the Office of International Trade, which administers the strategically vital export-control program, had been under surveillance by the FBI, and in fact had been called before a Federal grand jury which was investigating subversive elements in this country.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Am I to understand, Mr. President, that the Senator desires to make this speech without yielding at any point?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I decline to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. That information, and the development of other information including the fact that Remington had held other governmental positions of trust while under surveillance, and the fact that dismissal proceedings ultimately were brought against him under the loyalty program, suggested to our committee a question as to how the program of loyalty checks, designed to weed out of Government service persons suspected of subversive activity or associations, was working out in practice.

It seemed inconceivable that in an efficiently operating loyalty program an individual whose loyalty was apparently suspected could have held three important governmental positions, and been elevated to one which involved the regular handling of secret and vital information and data.

The committee was unanimous in the belief that the circumstances under which such a thing could occur should be brought to light and examined fully to determine, first, the efficiency with which the loyalty-check program for which $11,000,000 had been appropriated was being carried out; and second, whether existing law and present rules, policies, and procedures of administrative departments are adequate and sufficient to protect the public interests in enabling administrative officials to prevent the infiltration into the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal to it.

I should observe that the committee approached its inquiry into the loyalty program, Mr. Remington being a case in point, with certain fixed conceptions regarding that program. The theory upon

which the committee assumes the loyalty program to be based does not contemplate as necessary to its operation the indictment or conviction of an individual under law for a disloyal act. A special category of responsibility is set up under the loyalty program, and any individual failing to meet its tests is declared ineligible to hold Federal governmental office of trust.

An analogy with the operation of grand juries is apt. A grand jury may return an indictment if it believes a person should be tried for a specific crime. It may also issue presentments which do not call for prosecution, but advise the public of any facts developed in its investigation which may show the public interest to have been threatened. Dismissals from public service under the loyalty program amount to a presentment, since they do not require the evidence of criminality upon which an indictment is based.

Incidentally, the fact that dismissal proceedings eventually were brought against Remington suggests the possibility that the grand jury before which he appeared would have been justified in making a presentment on its own behalf concerning him.

I wish to emphasize that our committee did not feel a responsibility to determine for itself the loyalty or disloyalty of Mr. Remington. The facts in that respect were incidental to the fact that his loyalty was admittedly suspect while being retained and advanced in governmental office, and to the question of how such retention and advancement was possible under an efficiently operating loyalty program.

It was necessary to place in the record the nature of the charges which had been made against Mr. Remington and presumably were known or should have been known to the department in which he was employed. In fairness to Mr. Remington, the committee provided him with a forum in which to reply to the charges. Beyond the facts which were incident to his case the committee conscientiously sought to avoid the incrimination of any individual for alleged subversive activities. Revelations of that nature are the proper province of other authorities.

In pursuit of its inquiry into the operation of the loyalty program as it affected Mr. Remington, the committee requested from various executive departments certain information relating to him. It was seeking to determine whether, and when, information bearing upon his loyalty had been received by any of those departments, had been communicated to other departments for their guidance, or had been acted upon. Among the departments requested to provide that information were the Navy Department, which had requested Mr. Remington to relinquish his Reserve commission on grounds incompletely stated but now presumed to concern his loyalty; the Commerce Department, in which he was employed; and the Justice Department, which had been investigating his alleged espionage activities in the same period that he was moving about and advancing in governmental service.

Each of these departments has refused to comply with the committee's request on the ground that it would violate a directive from the President.

The committee was not unaware of the directive in question at the time it made its requests for information, nor of the directive's purpose "to preserve the confidential character and sources of information." The committee specifically requested that it not be furnished with information which might compromise confidential sources of information or investigative techniques. It was concerned only with the question of how and when checks made upon Remington under the loyalty program had been acted upon.

Notwithstanding those facts, the position of the departments has been affirmed in a remarkable public statement by the President, which involved the unusual permission for direct quotation.

That refusal of cooperation has brought the committee to a point at which it can no longer proceed with public hearings in this case.

This does not mean that the committee has closed the case. The existence of a ruling which permits any departmental subordinate to withhold from a duly authorized committee of Congress necessary information in the cloak of loyalty restrictions will not prevent our committee from proceeding further.

It is our unanimous determination to attempt, by every legal means, to obtain the true facts regarding the administration of the loyalty program, which is the vital concern of every American citizen.

The significance of the case does not rest at that point, either. It is a significant case because the elements which have presently brought public hearings by the committee to a standstill are by no means a new or unique development in the recent history of governmental operations.

What I have just related is not an isolated instance. It is only the most recent and immediate of a long series of deliberate blockages. I may say here that the immigration subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in the last day has been denied papers and proceedings and records of the State Department. So when I say the case I have been discussing is the most recent one, actually there is another of equally recent date. Throughout the entire executive branch there is, and long has been, an increasing tendency on the part of officials to conduct their affairs in secret, and to regard information as something to be withheld from the public, the press, and the Congress of the United States, including both Houses. Only those who work in Washington and whose daily task requires a free access to information, can grasp the lengths to which this obsession for executive secrecy has gone.

I want, here and now, to analyze this development and show something of the spread of this day-to-day practice of strangling information. And I say also, here and now, that if the Congress does not meet this situation head on, and press the issue until it is resolved, then the future of free, representative government is dark indeed. People must be able to trust their Government. In some way the facts must be available to the public. Somehow the truth must be told. And the truth is not being told now.

How is it possible that suppression of information on such a wide scale can be accomplished? The reason is the enormous accretion of power in the executive branch. Let me show briefly how this came about.

More than a generation ago, Congress began delegating powers to independent agencies. The reason for this was the growing complexity of our economic and social life. There was simply too much for any Congress to keep up with. The delegation of this power was not made without apprehension; and, in many instances, as in the case of the Tariff Commission, various housing and financial agencies, and many others, Congress sought to perpetuate the system of checks and balances by making direct report by the agencies to Congress a statutory obligation.

Then came the crash of 1929 and the depression. The emergency was so acute, the pressure was so intense, that grants of power and great sums of money were voted to the Executive simply because somebody had to act, and act quickly. Large sums of money were appropriated directly to the President, so that he might use them without any record whatever.

Now began the era when multitudes were living on doles, where subsidies became the instrument of experiment and manipulation of Federal policy extending to the most distant village and farm. To administer this policy, executive agencies multiplied and the number of executive employees mounted into the millions. That had to be. Today, 14,200,000 persons are receiving regular checks from the Federal Government. Every time you impose a regulation of Nationwide scope, you must see to its enforcement, and enforcement always means more money, more technicians and administrators, and more clerks by the thousands. I do not say that all of these regulations were evil. I do say that there was doubly a necessity for Congress to know what was going on.

Now comes the first obstruction to information. A sizable contingent of the New Dealers were committed from the start to the idea of a planned economy. There was no such unanimity of mind in Congress, however uncertain individual Senators and Representatives might be about the problems of the hour. So, very early, there came a difference between the Executive and the Legislature of a very different nature than that of traditional rivalry. The New Dealers were going to accomplish a peaceful revolution, and they did not want to answer any more questions than they had to—either to Congress or anybody else. Coincidental with this development came the installation of public relations and publicity men on an enormous scale, for the agencies had made the obvious discovery that secretaries for information were just as useful for twisting information and keeping it back as they were for giving it out. Eventually more than 45,000 of these publicity people went on the executive pay roll at a cost of $74,000,000, as of 1947. Since then we have

not been able to obtain the figures. Gone were the days when a cub reporter could buttonhole anybody in sight. All sorts of mazes and catch-alls for news and information were set up, and it took an experienced and industrious reporter to master the bypaths in this labyrinth.

In the wake of the first New Dealers came people with every sort of panacea and program, the Communists included. From the information available, I deduce that the Communists got their first foothold in the Department of Agriculture, and spread from there to other agencies. Power was accumulating fast, and the Communists were eager to get their hands on some of it, not overlooking the advantages of a Federal meal ticket, also. I do not want to imply that the Communists are the only problem. They are a real problem, all right; but they are only a part of a bigger one. Somehow or other we shall find a way to get the Communists and the fellow travelers out of the Government, but a much greater problem is that of the concentration of power in the Executive.

Gradually, here a little, there a little, now a big chunk, now a small piece, this great power was built up. As the power grows, the question becomes more pressing on the Executive: How much shall Congress and the people be told?

At this stage, after the middle 1930's, the picture in Washington began to be colored by the situation abroad—the aggressions of Hitler, the invasion of Ethiopia, the Spanish civil war, and the military expansion of Japan. I do not propose to go back to the old debate over intervention. I simply want to recall a fact which all will concede: That the division of opinion in the country over this issue was very broad and deep. Because opposition to Mr. Roosevelt was so intense, he adopted a devious course in carrying out his objectives in his foreign policy. Many of his supporters freely admit this now but maintain that he had no other choice. That is the defense. They say that he saw what the country must do where others could not see it, and that, because of their obtuseness, he had to work his will by strategem and maneuver. So the practice of withholding vital information grew. This policy of concealment was maintained consistently up to Pearl Harbor. Then, with our entry into the war, secrecy in many things became military necessity.

Now observe for a moment: The President had already acquired many new powers during the depression years. The addition of the special war powers and the constitutional power of the Commander in Chief sufficed to turn the White House into the GHQ of the world. The enormous economic resources of the United States and the President's power to control them made his decisions practically final in a great part of the Allied world.

The war and the necessary drive for victory provided the centrifugal force that kept the power firmly centered, however widespread the delegation of the power had to be.

The result was that a sort of political-military hierachy was built up, an entirely new bureaucracy that tended to bypass many of the executive agencies and center itself in the White House, the State Department and Military Establishment. The Bureau of the Budget was taken from the Treasury in 1939 and attached to the White House. It became a master planner of new types of executive machinery. The State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee served to bind foreign policy and the military ever more closely to the President and an ever-increasing number of confidential agents and functionaries, of whom Mr. Harry Hopkins was the chief, made their headquarters and did their daily work in the White House. What these people said and did was secret, to be revealed to Congress, the press, and the people only if it seemed expedient.

If an increase in the power of the Executive was inescapable, if administrative law was to crowd the courts to an increasing degree, it stood to reason that the only check to maintain the balance of power lay in Congress and that Congress would have to have a day-by-day access to information about what was being done. Such access was not provided. The executive branch grew and the tendency to suppress information grew with it.

Suddenly, in April 1945, President Roosevelt died and Mr. Truman succeeded him. Four months later the fighting stopped. Some people supposed that the era of secrecy would end with the fighting. But it just did not. Undertaken in peace and consolidated in war, the concentration of power and the secrecy to protect it remained. Mr. Truman, while a Senator, had been intensely critical of this secrecy. I have some personal knowledge of that, having served on the War Investigating Committee. I knew how he felt about it. But when he became President he became the willing prisoner and mouthpiece of this power clique. The hierarchy which had carried out the decisions made in the White House were still in their jobs and they did not propose that either their actions or those of the President should be looked at or scrutinized.

The perfect illustration of this was the congressional investigation of Pearl Harbor which began in the autumn of 1945 after the fighting was over. I was a member of that investigating committee and I shall never forget the experience nor the roadblocks that were put in our way. Hearings were held for 70 days and a record of 10,000,000 words was accumulated, but from beginning to end vital documents were withheld, crucial witnesses declined to appear and, under pressure, other witnesses altered their testimony—everywhere secrecy and suppression.

Presently, when the soft policy toward Russia was abandoned and the get-tough policy adopted, the arguments for secrecy were reenforced. A strange picture. There stood this political-military hierarchy, centered in the White House, there was the labyrinth of agencies with all the functionaries, Communists, and fellow travelers included, using information for their own purposes, keeping it from others.

Mr. President, let me show you a piece of this labyrinth. I have spoken of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee. Back in November 1944, Secretary of War Stimson complained to Secretary Hull that State Department officials were going directly to the Joint Chiefs of Staff on questions with military implications. Mr. Stimson thought such matters should be handled through the War and Navy Department offices. Mr. Hull suggested that the three secretaries get up a committee and a staff to handle these matters. This was the genesis of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee and, with the addition of Air Force representation it exists today. It has been a powerful policy arm. One of its creations was the Security Advisory Board, an office now housed in the State Department. A little over a year ago this Security Advisory Board became involved in an attempt to impose the most elaborate rules of secrecy this Government has ever known.

Early in 1947 a young man named Hamilton Robinson was appointed Chairman of this Security Advisory Board. Who was Robinson? He was a young Wall Street lawyer with a most socially correct background of education at Princeton and the Yale Law School. During the war he rose to the rank of colonel as a management engineer under General Somervell. After the war was over, Robinson looked around, as he said, for something constructive to do. He found this constructive work in the State Department and was promptly made Chairman of the Security Advisory Board and put to work in the administration of the loyalty order. Now, I want to show you how constructive Mr. Robinson could be in systematizing the suppression of information.

President Truman issued the loyalty order on March 21, 1947. Buried down in the order is a section labeled "Miscellaneous." Let me read it to you:

> The Security Advisory Board of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee shall draft rules applicable to the handling and transmission of confidential documents and other documents which should not be publicly disclosed and upon approval by the President such rules shall constitute the minimum standards for the handling and transmission of such documents and information and shall be applicable to all—

Observe the phrase, to all—

> departments and agencies of the executive branch.

The statute on which the President based the loyalty order is the Civil Service Act which permits him to draw up rules for determining the fitness of candidates for civil-service jobs. You will search the statute and the Constitution in vain for any clause or phrase which permits the President to initiate a censorship, yet that is exactly what he did.

Robinson was assisted in his task of drawing up consorship regulations by two men from the Military Establishment. Col. Charles Blakeney of Army Intelligence, and Commander Lichliter, of Navy Intelligence. In making a draft of rules for secrecy the collaborators draw heavily on already existent service regulations for the handling of confidential matter. In other words, the instructions which are supposed to guide a mil-

itary commander in keeping military secrets were turned to civilian use.

Eventually an elaborate code was drawn up and distributed to the heads of the more than 50 executive departments and agencies. Let me read the heading. It is very explicit:

Preliminary draft: Minimum standards for the handling and transmission of classified information in executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government. (Issued pursuant to Executive Order 9835.) Purpose: These rules constitute minimum standards for the handling and transmission of confidential documents and other documents and information which should not be publicly disclosed and are applicable to all departments and agencies of the executive branch.

Permit me to read one more section, the most remarkable of all:

The term "confidential" as used herein applies to information the unauthorized disclosure of which, although not endangering the national security—

I want to stress those words—

would be prejudicial to the interests or prestige of the Nation or any governmental activity thereof—

Mark you, Mr. President, I am reading these words from that order—

or would cause unwarranted injury to an individual or would cause serious administrative embarrassment or difficulty, or would be of advantage to a foreign nation.

Administrative embarrassment. What a prospect for a bureaucrat. Every executive employee, from the humblest clerk to the most powerful administrator, would be free thereafter from any fear of prying or discovery. At long last the executive branch would be impregnably buttressed against Congress and the people.

I have found no record of any department or agency entering a protest at this "constructive work" of Mr. Robinson's. I can find no record anywhere of any official suggestion that, if certain documents had to be kept confidential, the problem be taken to Congress and there thrashed out. No intimation of any kind was made public, save for the original publication of the President's order in the Federal Register. No one knew anything about it until early in October last year, 1947. Then a reporter named Nat Finney, of the Washington bureau of the Minneapolis Tribune, overheard some employees of the Veterans' Administration discussing a censorship order which had just been imposed in their agency. Finney followed up the lead, discovered Robinson, and asked for a copy of the censorship rules. Robinson refused to give it. Finney got hold of a copy elsewhere, wrote a series of stories and published them.

This exploded the works. Under Secretary of State Robert Lovett authorized the publication of a memorandum saying that "these standards merely represent a codification of existing practices." This could only mean that by a sort of unofficial understanding a censorship was already in force. The State Department's "Directory of Committees," which listed Robinson and his board, a manual seemingly as innocuous as a phone book was labeled "Restricted."

Right at this point Representative KEATING wrote to President Truman about the press exposure and asked for details. The President made a strange reply. "I have seen the article to which you refer," he wrote, "but have never heard of the program to which the article refers." In other words, the President all but denied that he had ever read the Executive order which he had signed. It also revealed a strange lapse of memory in the White House offices, if Mr. Finney's testimony at the investigation by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is to be taken seriously.

My first feeling—

Said Mr. Finney—

about what I uncovered was that it was the result of the misguided zeal of relatively subordinate members of the administration. With that in mind, I took the information I had, documents and all, to Mr. Charles G. Ross, the President's press secretary, and Mr. Ross agreed to call the matter to Mr. Truman's attention. Mr. Ross told me that, so far as he knew, the President had no close knowledge of the matter. I sent Mr. Ross a one-page memorandum, presumably for the President's attention, stating the objections to the proposal. Frankly I expected that Mr. Truman would put a stop to the thing and that would be the end of it.

But it was not the end of it. When the question was put to the President at a press conference last November, he was enraged. What did reporters mean, he asked, by taking fragmentary bits of information to build straw men and then knocking them down?

Last Thursday the President denounced the congressional investigation into loyalty as a "red herring," and he allowed himself to be quoted, to distract people's attention, and said that "The public hearings now under way serve no useful purpose." But he will not surrender the records that would give the answer "Yes" or "No." Nine months ago he pushed aside all questions of his censorship scheme. That was a straw man. Now, another instance is a "red herring." Who thought up the idea of this streamlined gag rule? We do not know. What is the true reason for withholding the records in the loyalty investigation? We do not know.

Mr. Robinson was summoned to testify before the House committee. His testimony was far from clear. Mr. Finney, the reporter who testified later on March 10, 1948, observed this fact.

I note—

Said Mr. Finney—

that he says he did not say that public officials should have the power to decide what the public was to be told and what it was not to be told. He did not tell the truth about this on your record. He plainly said to me that he believed public officials should have such power to give or withhold information, deciding what the public should be told, and what it should not be told, and that the formal establishment of such power for public officials was the purpose of the so-called minimum standards by the Security Advisory Board.

The Board maintained that the draft had been distributed for inspection and suggestion only. It was said that the phrase about administrative embarrassment had been struck out and that, anyhow, the censorship could not be in force until the President approved the final draft. Why then did Mr. Lovett say that the draft merely codified existing practice?

Under these rules of secrecy who, outside, could tell what was secret and what was not? No one, no Senator, no Member of Congress, nor any reporter could know all the types and kinds of information the agency might have. By a stroke of magnificent irony, Mr. Robinson found it expedient to resign from the State Department, so great was the storm of disapproval, while Mr. Finney was awarded the Pulitzer prize for his fine scoop, but these developments do not solve the mystery nor the threat of this censorship. The Secretary of the Security Advisory Board assured the House Committee that action on the regulations would be suspended until the investigation was complete. The Eightieth Congress is about to adjourn; the House investigation is over. Are those rules now in force? Has the President approved the draft? We do not know, nor will we know until some problem arises in Congress and needed information is withheld or until some reporter comes up against a blank wall in his search for facts.

What is at the bottom of all this? Within the space of 30 days Dr. Studebaker, the recently resigned Commissioner of Education, has declared—and it is now in the official record of the Senate and the Congress—that pressure was put on him to tone down a speech on communism. Almost simultaneously Luther Evans, Head of the Library of Congress, wrathfully told the National Association of State Librarians that the Government was trying to dragoon him into restricting library material heretofore free to all.

Dr. Evans said:

There seems to be a tendency among bureaucrats, particularly bureaucrats who are concerned with the armed services, to keep away from the public, and even scholars, information which might in any way be misconstrued if published, or which might by any chance make it more difficult to have their way free of the annoyances of public opinion or the constituted representatives of the people in Congress.

Secrecy, suppression, restriction on every hand. The Executive withholds from Congress FBI reports on Communists in government while the Library of Congress is urged not to let the Russians have access to what everybody else can see.

The attempt to impose a censorship on a wholesale basis has been underscored again and again by secrecy and censorship in individual instances. This was the case with the renewal of the President's authority to make reciprocal trade agreements.

Before an agreement with any country is made the President must give public notice of what he is about to do so that any interested American businessman, manufacturer, or exporter whose interests are affected shall have a chance to present his figures and plead his case.

A committee appointed by the President analyzes the testimony given by

these businessmen and then makes recommendations to the President. This committee keeps a record of its discussions in a secret minute book.

Now in the past the authority to make tariff revisions has been limited to terms of 3 years. At the end of such a term the President must come back to Congress for a renewal of the power. The 3-year term expired this year and a few weeks ago, in May 1948, a bill for renewal came before the Finance Committee of the Senate.

While deliberating on the case the chairman of the Finance Committee asked Mr. Clayton, the special adviser to the Secretary of State, to produce the minute book—that is the minute book of this committee. He refused. Why? Because, said Mr. Clayton, these minutes "have considerable confidential material in them, which business interests furnished on the understanding that the material would be kept confidential because it is private information which they do not wish their competitors to see."

Well, could the clerk of the Senate Finance Committee see the minute book? "I don't think so," said Mr. Clayton. Could the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee see the minute book? "I am not authorized to make it available," said Mr. Clayton.

Well, why not? Mr. Clayton wrote a letter on May 5 saying why not. "The President," said Mr. Clayton, "is the one responsible for decisions on tariffs under the act and is entitled to the opinions of his advisors expressed fully and freely without the constraint which would inevitably come from the knowledge that they might be made public."

The President's committee may hear in confidence something which the President refuses to let the Senate committee know in confidence, yet this same Senate committee must pass upon the question as to whether the President shall have the authority to make any tariff concessions at all.

Mr. President, just a few days ago a lawyer for a department came into a committee and refused to answer a question as to his conversation with a Cabinet officer. What did he give as his excuse? He said, "I am a lawyer. I am a lawyer for that branch. The Cabinet officer is my client. Under the law I should not communicate to anyone my confidential communication with my client." Can any Senator imagine such feeling upon the part of lawyers who are employed and paid by American taxpayers? The committee was so shocked that instead of citing him for contempt they took a recess, giving him sufficient time to call up the Cabinet officer. He returned and apologized to the committee, saying he was wrong; and he did answer the question.

Congress came up against the same stone wall when it attempted to deal with the security problem in respect to atomic energy. It was of vital importance that members and employees of the Commission met security standards.

The Senate had a responsibility in this matter because it had to confirm the President's appointments. In attempting to fulfill this responsibility the Senate formally requested the President to supply them with the information gathered by the FBI on persons nominated to the Commission. This information the President refused to give on the ground that Congress was not entitled to the information. On June 3, 1948, Congress passed an act, S. 1004, providing that the FBI make a report to Congress on any future nominations to the Atomic Energy Commission. Twelve days later, on June 15, the President vetoed the bill. No matter how acute the problem, no matter how grave the responsibility of Congress, Congress was not to be given essential information.

Another example of the President's flagrant disregard of his duty to execute the laws and to inform Congress concerns the procedures dealing with inflation. Last November we provided a means for the President to cooperate with Congress in this respect. If he found any commodities in such short supply that the economic stability of the country was endangered, he was to have presented the relevant facts and figures to Congress together with his recommendations.

The President totally ignored his duty to present this information to Congress. Instead he simply demanded from Congress more executive power to fix prices, fix wages, and impose controls wherever and whenever he saw fit. This is just another instance of executive disregard of law and of executive intent to accumulate powers and exercise them without responsibility to Congress.

Where, then, are we heading?

If every Communist and fellow traveler were discovered and expelled from the Government today, we would still have this problem of executive secrecy on our hands tomorrow. Where the power is, there will secrecy be also.

There has been an attempt to impose a censorship on every single department and agency in the executive branch. The Military Establishment has attempted to get the press, the radio and the movies to deliberately censor themselves. American newspaper men in foreign countries have been dragooned at the behest of their own Government. The Library of Congress has been tampered with. Congress has been thwarted in its effort to get information on Pearl Harbor, on appointees to the Atomic Energy Commission, on reciprocal-trade operations and now on the loyalty program affecting the vital security of the Nation.

A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary investigating the immigration problem has been also denied access to the records. How can the Senate and the Congress legislate upon the great problems before them if they cannot obtain vital information?

I ask, Mr. President, how far must this trend go before Congress and the people must use drastic means to put a stop to it?

In all these instances the President has taken the position that the specified information sought by congressional committees are matters confidential to the President in his conduct of the executive department and that the executive officials cannot divulge them without his approval.

He relies upon the prerogatives of his high office, the constitutional powers vested in him, the principle of separation of powers, and upon historical precedents supporting his position on one or more of these grounds. I say that is his defense. The general ground of the President's refusal to give papers, and information to congressional committees is that it would not serve the public interest. In specific instances he has maintained that to divulge such information would either violate the confidence in which he acquired the information or hinder his agents in the future acquisition of confidential information necessary to the proper exercise of the public business. What Presidents have claimed as sacred and secret in their own persons as the Chief Executive they have also sought to extend to all subordinate officers in the executive department.

Mr. President, the power is delegated to a counsel, to a lawyer in the Bureau, to a Cabinet officer, to anyone who might be asked to bring the information before a Senate or a House committee. In sum, the President claims the right to don the cloak of absolute executive immunity whenever in his sole discretion he desires to do so, and to extend it as he pleases to cover all other officers and operations of the executive branch. Those who defend this extreme position maintain that he is accountable only to his country in his political character and to his own conscience.

I am well aware of the constitutional powers and prerogatives of the President. I have reviewed with great care the historical precedents in official conduct and in law through which many Chief Executives of our country have pressed for absolute independence in office. I have respect for the principle of separation of powers through which our country has been protected from too great concentration of powers in our governing process. I do not intend in this late hour to review this long and complicated background.

I merely wish to point out that the number of occasions in which Congress has met with Executive rebuff has greatly increased in recent years. Not only are these examples increasing but the range of subject matter over which the executive department claims immunity from congressional investigation is also increasing.

There has always been a blur in the line between the claims of congressional jurisdiction and the President's claim to executive independence. But I should like to point out that under the pattern of executive domination now developing, Congress is rapidly being pushed into the intolerable position of having either to legislate through a blind spot or compel the President to answer for his conduct in an impeachment proceeding. Those are the only two remedies. We do not want representative government reduced to such a ridiculous position.

It does not seem reasonable to me that American government should be forced to function in this dilemma. What is more, I am sure that there is nothing in the Presidential office, his powers or the historical precedents which by any latitude of free construction justifies the

placing of Congress in such an extreme position.

On the contrary, I think the scheme of our government, the Constitution, our statute law and practices, and the nature of the times—all combine to reject emphatically the President's attempts to override Congress and to impede Congress in the performance of its constitutional powers and responsibilities.

In the distribution of powers of government the Constitution recognizes Congress as of first concern. It vests Congress with specific powers covering the entire range of government.

It vests the President only with the general power of the executive office and pledges him to execute faithfully the laws of the land. In a test of supremacy between the executive and the legislative, the Constitution clothes Congress with the final word. It can make laws notwithstanding the President's vetoes. And if he carries the powers of his office to unconscionable extreme, the Congress can dispose of him by impeachment proceedings. The President, on the other hand has no powers vested in him that would permit him to dispose of Congress.

The attempt of the President to have the executive department refuse to give Congress information necessary to its duties also flies in the face of the fact that all the executive departments are themselves creatures of Congress. They were set up by Congress, vested with powers and duties prescribed by Congress, can be altered at will by Congress, and by hundreds of statutes they are compelled to report to Congress.

It is all the more important that they respond to Congress because in modern times administrative government has been extended so widely. The recent Congressional Reorganization Act recognized fully this new development by expressly affirming the congressional power to oversee and to investigate the executive agencies of the Government.

By modern conditions, the Federal Government now extends its concern to every detail of national life and to almost every crossroad of the world. It would be strange indeed, if at this juncture of affairs, Congress was blocked in its legislative function by the iron curtain of Executive refusal to supply Congress with the facts on which it must legislate.

Moreover, the nature of one of the dangers to our security forces Congress as a representative of the people to be far more alert to conditions in the executive department than was necessary in the days of narrowly limited Federal Government. The Communist menace today is not that governments will be seized by forcible means. It is that they will be undermined and taken over by the insidious infiltration of Communists into high government offices.

Congress, no less than the President, is charged with the security of our Government and our national life. Congress, no less than the President, must meet the new methods of subversion in our governmental household. Congress is charged with the responsibility of protecting the security of our people through legislation. But if, when it tries to do so, the President can deny to Congress the information it needs to legislate intelligently, then the President has gone beyond the prerogatives of his office and threatens the very foundations of representative government.

Mr. President, I do not intend to try my case against Presidential arrogance now. Some day we shall have to meet the issue head-on because the trend to Presidential arrogance is becoming intolerable. I point these things out so that we may give serious thought to them. I invite the study and suggestions of all who hold free government sacred. I myself hope to study the problem intensively in the months to come. I devoutly hope we shall find a solution fair to the President and to his high office, and to Congress and the people. Unless we find a way to reinvigorate Congress' power to secure all the information it needs to legislate properly and intelligently—unless we keep the President within bounds in his attempt to put an iron curtain between Congress and the public business and the people—unless we succeed in that endeavor, constitutional and representative government will be transformed before our very eyes into centralized, executive dictatorship.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TYDINGS. Can the Senator from Nebraska yield for any other purpose than for a question, without losing the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. To satisfy the acting minority leader, I will ask unanimous consent to yield only for the purpose of an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sorry, but the Senator has no more right on the floor than has any other Senator. If there is to be a special rule made for the Senator from Nebraska, much as I should like to accommodate him, there must be the same rule for all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken.

PERMISSION TO INSERT MATTER IN THE RECORD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

On behalf of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], I ask unanimous consent that three letters may be printed in the final edition of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION BY APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE IN MEXICO

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a subcommittee has been appointed by the Committee on Appropriations to investigate the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. This investigation was approved by the full committee. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was asked to call together the members of the subcommittee this afternoon to determine which Senators would go on the investigation. I was asked to take charge of the subcommittee. It is contemplated that the last week in September the subcommittee will proceed to Mexico, in accordance with the action taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee. Any Senator who is a member of the Appropriations Committee and who would like to go should give his name to the Senator from North Dakota or myself, and we shall see that arrangements are made for him to accompany the group.

Mr. President, I am glad to yield to my colleague [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I object. The Senator cannot yield to any other Senator. He must obtain recognition from the Chair.

ARMY NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have been asked by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. GURNEY] to see whether or not it would be possible to confirm certain routine promotions in the Army. I understand that if those promotions are not confirmed there is some question about pay. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from South Dakota has asked me to request unanimous consent for that purpose only, in order that the nominations may be confirmed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask who will have the floor afterward. Are we Democrats to have an opportunity to get the floor before the motion to adjourn?

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator like to have me yield to him for any purpose?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. I wish to obtain recognition in my own right. I should like to obtain recognition now, if there is a unanimous-consent proposal pending. Reserving the right to object, am I recognized?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for the purpose of stating his position on the unanimous consent request.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think I have to confine it to that at all. If I am recognized, I can speak on any subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The opinion of the Chair is that a request for unanimous consent is not debatable.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I shall have to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland objects.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska moves that the Senate adjourn. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. HATCH, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. McMAHON, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McMAHON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators need not be disturbed. The Chair will protect all their rights, and there is no need of a riot. The yeas and nays are requested on the motion to adjourn. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

Mr. McMAHON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the request as soon as this order is completed. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

Mr. McMAHON. I am glad that the chair recognizes some rights. No one else seems to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McMAHON. I most certainly do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can do so very peacefully and get results. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. McMAHON. I propose to suggest it in my own way, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Murray
Baldwin	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Brewster	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Holland	Saltonstall
Butler	Ives	Smith
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Capehart	Kilgore	Stennis
Capper	Knowland	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Taft
Cooper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Lucas	Thye
Donnell	McCarthy	Tobey
Dworshak	McClellan	Tydings
Ecton	McFarland	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Feazel	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Young
Hatch	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to adjourn. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is detained on official business and has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator for Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are detained on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] has a general pair with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, if all who wish to vote have voted, in view of the exigencies of the hour, before the vote is announced, may I have 30 seconds in which to make a statement about one of our colleagues?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That would be against the rule.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask unanimous consent that the rule be suspended, to allow me to speak for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. TOBEY. I think not. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears none.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, all I wish to say is that this is the closing minute of the session. The portcullis will fall in a moment. One of the finest things about this body is the fellowships among the men who make up the Senate. We differ about issues and we have our party designations; but underlying it all is the common denominator of fellowship.

There is one man in this body, who sits on my left, who has had 30 years of honorable service in the Senate of the United States. He has just cast his last vote in this body, after 30 years of honorable service in the Senate. I would be derelict in my duty and privilege in this closing minute of this last session of the Eightieth Congress if I did not ask for a rising vote in tribute to ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas. May God's rich blessings follow him all the rest of his days.

[Great applause, Senators rising.]

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 39, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—39

Aiken	Ecton	Morse
Baldwin	Ferguson	Revercomb
Brewster	Gurney	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hawkes	Smith
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Taft
Butler	Ives	Thye
Cain	Knowland	Tobey
Capehart	Lodge	Vandenberg
Capper	McCarthy	Watkins
Cooper	Malone	Wherry
Cordon	Martin	Wiley
Donnell	Millikin	Williams
Dworshak	Moore	Young

NAYS—29

Barkley	Holland	O'Conor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Ellender	Kilgore	Russell
Feazel	Langer	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lucas	Stennis
Green	McClellan	Stewart
Hatch	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	McMahon	Tydings
Hill	Magnuson	Umstead
Hoey	Murray	

NOT VOTING—28

Ball	Jenner	Reed
Bricker	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	McCarran	Taylor
Byrd	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Downey	Maybank	White
Eastland	Myers	Wilson
Flanders	O'Daniel	
George	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote the yeas are 39, the nays are 29, and the motion is agreed to.

In accordance with the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 222) previously adopted, the Senate now stands adjourned until December 31, 1948.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 222, to December 31, 1948.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 7 (legislative day of August 5), 1948:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Elmer H. Wene, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Maurice J. Tobin, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named pedsons to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June ¼, 1948, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate (reappointments):

Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio.

Miss Marion J. Harron, of California.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

John H. Alsmiller, of Louisville, Ky., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky., in place of Harry M. Brennan, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, AUGUST 7, 1948

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. C. H. Lambdin, pastor of St. Luke's Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

We bow before Thee, O God, in quietness and reverence, and with our inner thoughts upon those things which are right and good. As we meditate with Thee for this brief moment, we hear Thee say to us: "Fight the good fight with all thy might," and so we ask Thy help that we might attain the victory in our fight for right.

May we have the best good of our Nation at heart as we ponder the grave situations which face us; may we realize that we are the servants of many peoples who are counting on us to try to make life less confusing for them; may we feel keenly our personal responsibility in the performance of our work and bravely take our stand on the side of right.

The great world looks to us for leadership; here we are, individual leaders, knowing the interests of our Nation and of the world are at stake, in this the beginning of our day's session, ready to conscientiously consider our problems, but we feel a need; a need for strength; a strength which will hold us steady through this day; strength which comes from Thee, O God; strength of wisdom and courage of spirit; this we pray for, knowing that Thou wilt not fail us.

We ask Thy richest blessing to rest on us all, not only today, but through all the days of our lives. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, Facts About Inflation and The Republican Congress Makes Good.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUCK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a paper.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some extraneous material.

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROSS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a bill which he introduced today.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials of different date from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include supporting data.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Res. 709) which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H. R. 6959) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby, agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important proposition, and I think the Members ought to be here to hear the discussion. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Allen, Ill.	Gallagher	Nixon
Andrews, N. Y.	Gore	Norrell
Bakewell	Gregory	Norton
Barden	Gross	O'Konski
Bates, Ky.	Harless, Ariz.	Peden
Bell	Hébert	Pfeifer
Bloom	Hendricks	Phillips, Tenn.
Boggs, La.	Hess	Powell
Bolton	Jackson, Calif.	Priest
Canfield	Jenkins, Pa.	Regan
Carroll	Jennings	Richards
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Riley
Clark	Kefauver	Sarbacher
Clason	Kennedy	Scoblick
Clippinger	Kerr	Spence
Cooley	Lesinski	Stigler
Coudert	Lucas	Stockman
Courtney	Ludlow	Teague
Cox	Mathews	Thomas, N. J.
Cravens	McCormack	Trimble
Cunningham	McMahon	Vail
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	West
Dawson, Ill.	Meade, Ky.	Whitaker
Domengeaux	Meade, Md.	Whittington
Dorn	Mitchell	Wood
Elliott	Morton	
Evins	Murray, Tenn.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 347 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Justice Jackson.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one, to include a revised compilation of Virginia laws affecting veterans' benefits and in the other, to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include an editorial.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ISACSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. FORAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARDY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address which he will make at Waverly, Va., on August 26.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REEVES asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include excerpts in each.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. HUGH SCOTT, Republican national chairman, delivered in Hartford, Conn., Wednesday, August 4.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on pending legislation.

Mr. KEEFE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Mr. George Reedy.

Mr. KEATING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in several instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. SHORT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two or three newspaper articles.

Mr. POULSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the last issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SABATH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SIKES asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorial material.

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I do not want this Congress to close without my saying a word or two about the remarkable record which has been achieved in the past year and a half by our colleague, Congressman JAMES T. PATTERSON, of Connecticut. It is seldom that a young man in so short a time can accomplish so much for his district—and for that matter, for the country. He was not here 4 months before the Congress had passed and the President had signed the Patterson bill, now Public Law No. 42, of the Eightieth Congress. Let me review a few of the facts in connection with this measure, which was referred to our Committee on Ways and Means, upon which I have the honor to serve.

Congressman JIM PATTERSON comes from the Naugatuck Valley in the Fifth Congressional District in Connecticut. Copper is probably the most essential of the raw materials going into the brass products manufactured in Waterbury and neighboring cities. I suppose it was but natural that he early became acquainted with the acute copper shortage which confronted the country when the Metals Reserve Company, a subsidiary of RFC, ceased commitments for the importation of copper in November 1946. All during the war, since our domestic production was so short, we had to import copper from abroad to meet our wartime needs. It was brought in without the payment of the excise tax of 4 cents a pound by the Government itself. In January 1946 we had a stock pile of more than 500,000 tons of copper but continued high postwar demand reduced this stock pile at a steady rate.

Congressman PATTERSON introduced a bill which would have the effect of repealing the 4-cent import tax. He went right to the heart of the problem, for he realized perfectly well that American industry could not pay $80 per ton duty without bringing about an enormous increase in price, not only for foreign copper, but for domestic copper as well. Such a result would have greatly increased the price of copper for brass, for wire, for refrigerators, for automobile radiators, for thousands of manufactured items in everyday use. The Patterson bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee where hearings were held. The very leading industries in the United States submitted evidence to the committee.

After consideration of the problem, our committee reported the Patterson bill with an amendment which had the effect of suspending the import excise tax of 4 cents per pound until March 31, 1949, the form in which it finally passed the House, and later the Senate.

The Members of this Congress also may take special pride in the promptness with which they met the emergency which confronted the country.

During 1947 after the Patterson Act became law American copper users imported copper at the rate of approximately 40,000 tons per month. The price of copper has been stabilized throughout the entire period at a price of approximately 21½ cents a pound which means a saving to the American people of at least $100,000,000 in the past year.

Throughout 1948 the domestic consumption of copper has continued at the rate of about 118,000 tons per month. The mine production in the United States over the same period has been running at the rate of about 73,000 tons a month. Obviously the difference represents a deficit which simply had to be made up by imports from foreign producing countries.

Copper is being sought for stock-piling purposes for our national defense. It is in strong demand by the participating nations under the European recovery program. The extent of the stock-piling demands and of the European requirements cannot yet be known and has not been reflected in the figures I have mentioned.

It becomes apparent that our Nation will continue in short supply so far as the production of copper is concerned for many years to come. In the meantime, there are thousands of articles in daily use which have been produced because of the initiative of Congressman JIM PATTERSON. There are tens of thousands of employees who have not missed a day's work because of a copper shortage due to Congressman JIM PATTERSON's foresight. Yes; he had the help of many of us who became aware of the critical nature of the problem because of representations made to us from our own districts. No man can do these things all alone, and the entire Congress cooperated and got back of Congressman PATTERSON's bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in giving credit where credit is due, and I want the record to show my own personal appreciation and thanks to Congressman PATTERSON.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House today for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may be permitted to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the alleged purpose of calling this session of Congress was to pass legislation to check inflation. Yesterday we passed the gift loan bill for constructing a palace for the UN in New York City, which is inflationary.

Now we are considering a so-called housing bill which would greatly intensify inflation. Not one additional house will be built because of the passage of this act. It will not add a nail or a piece of building material or increase the available amount of labor for the erection of dwellings.

It will only create more credit to bid up prices on a definitely tight and lim-

ited supply of building materials and labor, thus not only forcing the prices of houses higher, but living costs in general as well.

The yield-insurance provision in this bill involves the basic principle of totalitarianism—fascism, nazism, communism—that is, political expropriation and disposition of private property.

This compromise measure may help to reelect some of us to Congress, but we should remind ourselves of what Euripides said: "The gods visit the sins of the fathers upon their children."

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I expect to support the motion of the gentleman from Michigan. This bill, H. R. 6959, as amended by the Senate, will be helpful in the home-building field though it is not altogether satisfactory to many of us. It is either this or nothing because, under the rules of the House, it cannot be amended. Especially unsatisfactory is that section of the bill with reference to a secondary market for GI loans. As I understand, under the Senate amendment, the amount of GI loans to be purchased is increased from 25 percent to 50 percent. While this is an improvement, it is certainly not adequate in this and many other respects.

Upon extension of the life of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on July 1, 1947, the Congress eliminated the authority theretofore existing in the corporation to purchase loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Immediately GI home loans took a downspiral, to such an extent that in June 1948, such loans had fallen off 43 percent. In the last hours of the last session of the Eightieth Congress, Public Law 864 was passed, reestablishing this authority in the Federal National Mortgage Association, but on an extremely limited basis. This law amounts to a mere drop in the bucket. Under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, without an adequate secondary market in the Federal Government, the home loan guaranty provision amounts to a mere hunting license.

Under the present authority of FNMA to purchase GI loans, the Association interprets the law to provide that no GI loan may be purchased if guaranteed before April 30, 1948. Under H. R. 7120, a bill I introduced a day or two ago, any GI loan may be purchased, even if guaranteed before April 30, 1948. This is necessary in order to give the small lending institutions, particularly in the small communities, the necessary liquidity to continue to make 4 percent GI loans. This is similar to the amendment I had placed in the act of 1946 extending the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Under the present authority, in addition to the limitation that the loans must be guaranteed after April 30, 1948, it is provided that only 25 percent—now 50 percent under Senate amendment to H. R. 6959—of such loans may be purchased by FNMA. Under my bill, 66⅔ percent may be purchased, regardless of the date on which they are guaranteed. It is necessary that the volume of allowable purchases be substantially increased in order that the GI home-loan program may be fluid.

Under the present authority, FNMA can purchase loans not exceeding $10,000. Under my bill, it is provided that loans guaranteed before September 1, 1948, not exceeding $12,000, can be purchased; and loans guaranteed after that date, not exceeding $7,500, can be purchased. We must not be unreasonable in limiting the purchase of loans made in the past because those loans cover homes which have already been constructed and which are now owned by the veteran; moreover, the lending institution needs a market for such loans in order to make new loans at the low-priced level.

Under the present authority, all loans must meet the requirements of FHA construction standards. Under my bill, it is provided that only those loans hereafter made must meet such standards. It is not possible to go back and reconstruct the homes already guaranteed, and now occupied by veterans, and therefore there is no purpose in ruling out loans guaranteed in the past because of any such requirement.

Under the present authority, there is no specific provision as to the rate which may be allowed the seller of the mortgage for servicing the loan. However, under recently issued regulations of the FNMA this service fee has been set at not more than one-half of 1 percent. Under my bill, it is proposed to set the maximum service, within the discretion of the Association, at not more than 1 percent. This is the going rate for such servicing charges, and is necessary for the small lending institutions to come out even in servicing these loans.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM].

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, in passing H. R. 6959, this Congress can be proud of the action it has taken on housing at this special session.

The bill relies on private enterprise and initiative to get the housing job done. It involves some major steps forward in housing finance and production—steps which I believe will mean not only a larger volume of housing for rent and sale, but also housing at lower costs that people of average means can afford.

Thus, there are several programs in this bill which will produce more rental housing, with special emphasis on programs to get lower rentals. There are several programs in this bill which will keep up our high production of houses built for sale, again with special financing incentives for lower-cost housing.

These programs have received considerable attention in the discussions of this bill so I will not dwell upon them. My main purpose in rising to speak is to call attention to those programs in this bill that are directed toward a reduction in the cost of housing by applying modern industrial methods, with all the economies resulting from such techniques. Housing is still the only major field in which we have not fully utilized the mass production and machine methods that have made American industry the greatest example of production efficiency in the world.

This bill contains the tools for the industrial production of housing at the lower costs which have typified all other machine methods, as contrasted with handicraft methods. It also contains aids for those large-scale site operations that will produce at lower costs. Besides the loan assistance to companies and builders and the mortgage financing for home purchasers, the bill contains a most significant provision to promote economy through the standardization and improvement of building codes and methods.

The effectiveness of all these provisions depends on sympathetic and vigorous administration to carry out the purpose and intent of the law. The Congress has met in special session to pass this housing law. It is now up to the Government agencies to have some special sessions to get these laws into operation quickly and effectively.

As a sponsor of the provisions relating to financing of factory producers of lower-cost housing, I would like to make a few comments for the RECORD as to the intent of some of the provisions in the law.

The bill contains provisions to aid housing manufacturers, both by FHA insurance of working capital loans and by loans directly by the RFC. The purpose behind these provisions is not merely to have two separate sources of financing. It is also to assure that there is no gap in meeting the needs of the housing manufacturers. Thus, the RFC loan can cover plant and machinery, which cannot be covered by a 609 loan. It is contemplated that the RFC loans would be made or modified in such a manner that a housing manufacturer would not be precluded from utilizing the insurance of loans under section 609. Therefore, it is expected that security and contract arrangements will take a form which will enable a housing manufacturer to assign his purchase contracts and borrow against them under the provisions of section 609. Moreover, it is my understanding that the bill is drawn in a way which will not preclude the loan from being made by the RFC if it should develop that private banks are unwilling to make the loans at the established interest rates or under the terms of the insurance contract which is offered.

So far as section 609 is concerned, it is my understanding that it now incorporates all the amendments that the FHA desired in order to make this provision fully and completely workable. As presently drawn, it is intended to eliminate the unworkable requirements that a purchase contract could qualify only after the purchaser had acquired land and arranged all of his financing. In view of the fact that the suggestions of the Government agencies have been accepted, and in view of the shortness of time that this law has to run, it is imperative that it be made immediately operative through a set of simple regulations and contracts that can be expeditiously administered.

This legislation necessarily requires a coordinated approach within the Government so that one agency does not defeat the purposes of the law which another agency is seeking to carry out. For example, the policy of the War Assets

Administration on its war plants must necessarily take into account the objective of the Government to encourage more housing at lower costs. Likewise, the FHA must encourage the use of the modern materials and methods that promise cost reductions. There cannot be discrimination against these new approaches or we will not be able to make progress. We must give the people a chance to buy and accept the houses produced by new methods and materials, and not assume that they will reject something just because it is made from different materials or methods.

In addition to moving toward standardization of building codes, we must make sure that there are no restrictions and variations imposed by the FHA through its local offices, which defeat our efforts toward mass production and standardizing dimensions and methods. Any variations for which there are not climatic or other comparable justifications should be eliminated.

Congress has done its job in giving the Government agencies the tools they require to help private enterprise meet the housing needs. It is up to the Government agencies now to do their job of carrying out the purposes of these laws effectively and expeditiously.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, what is in this bill has been dismembered from the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and we have for separate treatment a number of its component parts.

The incentives to private enterprise are here in very much liberalized form.

First. The FHA is permitted to insure loans up to 95 percent on homes costing $3,000 or less. The present limit is 90 percent.

Second. On homes costing $4,500 that are eligible for loans under title I of the National Housing Act the present limit is $3,000. The amount of money available for title I loans is increased by $35,000,000.

Third. An additional $800,000,000 is made available for rental housing loans under title VI of the National Housing Act. Loans are limited to $8,100 per apartment or per family unit. The present limitation is on rooms instead of units.

Fourth. Construction loans up to 80 percent are authorized on loans costing $7,500 or less in projects of at least 25 family units.

Fifth. Loans to prefabricated home manufacturers are liberalized.

Sixth. The Federal National Mortgage Association is authorized to provide a secondary market for 50 percent of all loans to veterans. Under FHA insured loans the present limitation is 25 percent. This provision applies to loans made since April 30, 1948.

Seventh. A new division is created in the Housing and Home Finance Agency to seek standardization of building codes and measurements.

Eighth. The bill guarantees a rate of 2.75 percent interest on equity investments in rental property.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is the tax amortization provision in this bill which would give a tax subsidy?

Mr. BUCHANAN. This bill does not include the tax amortization plan to which the gentleman refers. It does have a plan on yield insurance, but not the fast tax amortization plan the gentleman has in mind.

Eighth. The bill guarantees a rate of 2.75 percent interest on equity in rental property.

Mr. SADOWSKI. What does that mean?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is under the yield insurance phase. There is a rather lengthy dissertation there. It is covered from page 76 on throughout the section. It would take me much longer than I have the time to explain fully but there is where it will be found in the particular bill.

What it does in brief is guarantee a return of 2.75 percent interest on equity in rental property.

It is a very liberal provision and it is not restrictive in any sense, the gentleman may be assured.

There is not anything in this bill that you could object to. It is what is not in the bill that you can object to for not including those provisions.

Ninth. There is a provision requiring all apartment-house builders, who apply for FHA insurance on loans, to swear that they will not discriminate against families with children in renting their apartments. This is a pious hope.

Tenth. On page 67 of the bill there is a provision which allows a return up to 5 percent, as the Administrator finds necessary to meet the mortgage market.

Eleventh. On page 70, lines 16 to 20, is the provision that the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located. This is the so-called present cost formula.

Twelfth. On page 100, section 503, is the so-called Lodge amendment relative to any low-rent or veterans' housing project. This section is meaningless in view of the absence of any such sections in this bill.

What the bill does not contain are those provisions in the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which provide for rural housing, farm housing. It has no urban redevelopment or slum-clearance section, no public housing or no Government research section. It does contain a section that deals with the standardization of building codes and materials. But, the real criticism of this measure lies in the things that are omitted—incentives to cities and low-cost housing and slum clearance.

Certainly it is a liberal bill; a very liberalized form of title VI financing and title II financing aids. It really is a great spur and offers increased incentives to private large-scale home builders and real-estate developers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership in the House has made a grave mistake—a serious political mistake in its failure to give the Members of the House their democratic right and opportunity for full consideration of the T-E-W bill on the floor of the House.

Think of this. Our cities and people unable to buy their own homes are forgotten. Our large metropolitan areas are not only congested but are decaying near the core from blight. Although blighted areas make up about 20 percent of metropolitan residential areas in the United States today, they account for 33 percent of the towns' population, 35 percent of the fires, 45 percent of the major crimes, 55 percent of the juvenile delinquency, and 60 percent of the tuberculosis victims.

Consequently, the average city must spend 45 percent of all its funds available for police, fire, health, and other city services on these blighted areas, while receiving back from the areas only 6 percent of the revenue provided by the property tax. Blight is not only an eyesore, but a terrible drain on a city. And in hundreds of towns the area of blight is spreading unchecked every year.

Until these blighted areas and slums are wiped out we will continue to be faced with major problems in city government.

Members of the Congress, this bill is a splintered version of a really adequate housing bill and a long-range housing program. It is a sop. The cities and the people of this Nation who need decent, adequate housing, are forgotten. This bill is a complete surrender to political expediency and a gift to the real-estate lobby and the very powerful interests that have denied you the right to express yourselves fully upon the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. In spite of its inadequacies and its shortcomings, I ask that you support this bill, regardless, because there will be some accrued benefits. Some of these benefits may trickle down and benefit those who are without any housing whatsoever. Volume production will be sustained at high-price levels and in the resulting inevitable shrinkage bound to take place in the real-estate market, additional housing will be made available.

This bill on housing certainly points up the difference between Republican and Democratic Party policy on housing. It is—private interests triumphant over the public interest.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, my remarks apply to many ventures which the Federal Government may make into new fields or additions it may make to its present activities in old fields.

Mr. Speaker, the per capita Federal debt is estimated at about $1,784. The average per capita State debt is $16.31. It ranges all the way from 31 cents per capita in Idaho to $67.18 in Louisiana. Hence, the States are in far better con-

dition to finance various undertakings than is the Federal Government. There is a direct affiliation between the United States debt and the value of our money; there is not any direct affiliation between the State debt and the value of our money. This is a fundamental economic question. Only the United States Government has the power to coin money and regulate its value. The States and localities have no such power. So there can be no effect upon the value of money from the creation of debt by the local and State governments. State and local governments in issuing debt create purchasing power for themselves, but in the sale of these obligations to investors they absorb purchasing power from the purchasers of their securities. There is no over-all addition to purchasing power and there is no creation of additional money or credit.

On the other hand, the issuance of Government bonds pumps money and credit into the monetary stream of the country. This is obvious in the case of deficit spending. Secretary Snyder has stated that we are again approaching an era of deficit spending unless Government expenses are curtailed. Our Federal Reserve System as it now operates on a fractional reserve system permits a credit expansion of five to six times the amount of reserves acquired by the System. These reserves in part are in the form of Government obligations. The ratio of Government obligations to total reserves is directly affected by the Federal Government's borrowing operations. The dollar bill in your pocket today is backed, to a large degree, not by a tangible asset but by another promise of the Government to pay—this promise being in the form of a Government bond. Since increases in the Federal debt increase the volume of money in circulation, and since the fiscal and monetary policies of the Government can turn the Government debt into money and credit, the net result is an over-supply of money in relation to the availability of goods. Therefore, there is a decrease in the value of money and an increase in the value of goods which expresses itself in an inflationary increase in prices.

It is true you can turn private debt into money. But there can be no objection to that as long as the debt created is increasing production and employment. But when you monetize debt created by Government borrowing which does not create goods, then you add to the supply of money without any corresponding increase in the supply of goods. Therein lies the danger.

We are indeed fortunate in this country to have State and local governmental units which can conduct financing operations without any direct effect on the value of money. Unless the purpose for which funds are borrowed is a direct function of the National Government, the borrowing power of the States should be utilized, and the danger of further monetary depreciation lessened.

If we go into a long term of Federal obligation to build houses and subsidize rents, we are not only taking a step which will increase directly the cost of housing through competition for scarce materials and manpower, but we are also starting a program which will indirectly increase the cost of every item of goods and commodities sold in this country. As shown above, the indirect effect of the Federal expenditures is to lessen the value of money, thereby increasing the cost or value of goods. We have seen this illustrated steadily during the past 16 years.

This is a fundamental fact. It should be kept in mind in every decision as to whether the States and localities or the Federal Government should undertake certain functions. Federal housing subsidies will not only make the prices of houses higher than they otherwise would be; they will also keep higher the price of automobiles, refrigerators, grains, and other items.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the motion to suspend the rules and pass this bill. However, I could not let this opportunity go by without again protesting the gag system used in bringing this bill and other housing bills into this House, to prevent the Members from having an opportunity to vote on slum clearance, public housing, and farm housing.

This bill will do some good. It will help continue the present private housing boom that is going on in this country and giving us about 900,000 new units each year. The only difficulty about these new units is that they are not reaching down to the level where the greatest urgency in the housing shortage is occurring.

The continuing increase in the cost of building materials and the accelerated increases in labor costs have raised the prices of new housing largely beyond the reach of the average veteran.

In passing this bill, which I admit will give us more housing, we fail to give help to the people we need to help, namely, the veterans who must have low-priced housing, or low-rent housing.

There is plenty of subsidy in this bill. You Members who have been railing against public housing as being subsidized, ought to know that the Government is subsidizing private building and larger and more expensive houses under this bill.

Yet you are refusing at the same time to give any help or attention to the most pitiful, the most hopeless group in this country, the hundreds of thousands of people in our slums who must look forward to a life condemned by unsanitary, uncomfortable, and unhealthful conditions in the slums.

You thus pass up another year's effort to try to cure this cancerous slum growth on the body politic.

I resent also the fact that the Congress after passing this bill will have appropriated or authorized $10,000,000,000 for Government-insured housing loans for city dwellers without making one thin dime available for farm housing.

You Members who come from the farm districts had better start looking at your instructions from your people, because sooner or later the farmers are going to find out that they are being discriminated against and denied this wonderful opportunity to get Government-insured loans on farm housing.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Is not the gentleman mistaken when he says that we have given not a dime for farm housing?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not know of a single dime that has been spent under any legislation brought out by the Committee on Banking and Currency in the past 5 years which would be available for farm housing.

The gentleman will remember the testimony before our committee to that effect.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. The gentleman will recall that they are included in this particular bill and if the people in the farming areas do not take advantage of it, it is their responsibility.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman well knows that the neighborhood restrictions and requirements concerning subdivisions and plumbing, and so forth, of the FHA make it absolutely impossible for the farmer to get one thin dime for housing out of this legislation, and the record is filled with testimony to that effect.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. They can do it very easily under title I.

Mr. MONRONEY. You cannot build a house under title I. You can improve only your home under title I, if you already have a home. I would like to see the gentleman try to improve a one- or two-room shack in that way.

I want to take this opportunity to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if he will announce on the floor that the $3,450,000 required to put this bill into operation will be provided either under a deficiency appropriation bill now, or whether he will arrange through a resolution or in some other way for the FHA to accelerate the spending of its current appropriation. Without this money this bill does not mean anything, and the FHA cannot carry on this new and larger program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, this measure provides hundreds of millions of dollars of Government credit for speculative building. By so doing, the bill effectively prevents low-cost housing. It makes it impossible for genuine private enterprise to compete in the housing field. The foregoing consequences result automatically when the Government makes the taxpayers assume the risk of loss for building operations.

Under this measure speculative builders can bid top prices for labor and material, knowing that if price levels go down the loss is transferred to the taxpayers. If prices go up it is the speculators' gain. To call this kind of operation "private enterprise" amounts to

labeling socialism with the title of free enterprise.

Congress has been told again and again that the unrestricted supply of Government credit in the building industry is highly inflationary. As far back as last December the Federal Reserve Bulletin declared:

> One of the most inflationary factors—perhaps the most inflationary single factor—in the present situation is excessively easy mortgage credit for housing.

In the face of this warning this legislation is reckless and irresponsible. When the Congress apes the executive branch by voting inflation while talking anti-inflation the dollar is on the skids. Those who are investing in dollar obligations are, in the language of the street, "being sold down the river."

Mr. Speaker, those who are relying on the value of Government obligations are being betrayed. No other language accurately describes this legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us proves conclusively what I stated the other night on the radio; that this special session of Congress would give the people no housing legislation. Here, we have the living proof. With the need for low-cost housing, public housing, veterans' housing, and slum clearance so urgent, what do we have in this bill? No public housing, no low-cost housing, no veterans' housing, and no slum clearance. We are here again given the same old Republican-Democrat merry-go-round of free enterprise. More money for houses for those who can afford to pay rentals of $100 a month or more. Money to the real-estate and mortgage interests. Not one cent for houses and homes that the plain people of this country can afford.

Let us see what the story is about housing. The Republicans have repeatedly killed housing legislation. This Congress has refused to pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill which would provide housing and give some measure of relief to the suffering millions who find themselves without homes. This bill before us is worse than a poor substitute for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The Republican leader, Senator TAFT, the other day, disowned his own bill, and stated that it would not be passed at this session. The Democratic record on this score is no better. In the Seventy-ninth Congress it was a combination of Republicans and Democrats that killed the housing bill in committee. In the Eightieth Congress, with a few exceptions, the Democrats with the Republicans in the House have given aid and comfort to the real-estate trust in sabotaging the public housing program. I shall oppose adjournment of this special session until this Congress enacts a genuine housing bill providing housing for all, for low- and middle-income groups, for public and low-cost housing, for veterans' housing, and slum clearance.

As for housing for veterans it is to be recalled that it was President Truman himself who scuttled the Patman law by lifting controls and yielding completely to the free enterprise boys of the real-estate trust. So, here again, we have the same old merry-go-round; the Republican-Democrat merry-go-round.

I wish that this special session of Congress could have been on television. The American people would have witnessed a most revealing spectacle. It would have convinced Americans that there is no real difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties. For instance, if the Senate proceedings of the last few days had been on television, they would have seen an Alphonse-Gaston act performed by the Republican and the Dixie Democrats on the issue of civil rights. Americans would have seen the politest filibuster that has ever been put on in Congress. Newspapers tried to give the impression that there was a real fight going on here between the Dixie Democrats and the Republicans. However, television would have shown that they were both shadow-boxing and hitting each other with powder puffs.

The Republicans were pretending to get passed legislation abolishing the poll tax. The Dixie Democrats were putting on a filibuster. The Republicans did nothing to break the filibuster. After a few days of this sham battle the anti-poll-tax bill was buried. Yes, the people would have witnessed a phony fight if the special session had been televised.

Where were the Truman Democrats who, with Truman, have been going around proclaiming their friendship for civil rights? They were where they have always been; far, far away from the fight. Television would show you that they were not even near this fixed fight. They have never fought for civil rights; no more than Harry Truman has ever fought for them. President Truman talked big at the Democratic Convention about civil rights and his last two Executive orders proved exactly what we Progressives have always said about his big talk; that is, that when it comes to action the Negro people get nothing. His last two Executive orders proposed some more commissions and investigations. The Negro people are tired of being commissioned and investigated. General Bradley has since announced that segregation will continue to be the policy of the armed forces. This announcement exposes the emptiness of President Truman's Executive orders. Yet the Truman Democrats, relying on this last gesture of the President, played their usual role in the Senate. They did not lift a single finger to break the filibuster of their Dixie colleagues. Yes, television would have shown the Nation the amiable and friendly cooperation of the Republicans with the Dixie Democrats, and with the Truman Democrats nowhere in the scene. The tragic result is that we have no civil-rights legislation out of this Republican-Dixie Democrats, and Truman Democrat Congress. It is the same old merry-go-round; the Republican-Democrat merry-go-round.

How about the high cost of living? The American housewife is now paying $1.30 a pound for meat, $1 a pound for butter, and 24 cents a quart for milk. I charge that this special session of Congress has done nothing about it. Why? First of all, we must remember that both parties are controlled by the same big monopolies that destroyed price controls 2 years ago and who do not want price control now.

President Truman has asked for standby price controls. Anyone who knows anything about the subject knows that this will not do the job, for what is needed is roll-back of prices to January 1947 levels and real price control with teeth in it, with power given to the Government to seize any industry that refuses to produce at Government-fixed prices. Further, President Truman's record is a bad one on this score. In 1946, he removed controls on meat, and in early 1947, he removed all price controls. The Republicans demanded the removal of controls, the National Association of Manufacturers beat the drums against price controls and Truman surrendered. He has asked Congress to undo the damage that he himself helped cause. Prices have been going up and up since price controls were removed. Remember who did it. The Republicans and Democrats in Congress and President Truman in the White House. How could anyone have expected this same combination in this special session to have done anything to bring down prices? They have blamed each other, but done nothing. The so-called Republican anti-inflation bill does not even scratch the surface of the problem of inflation. It provides for no price controls in any manner, shape, or form. It is a fake and a delusion. The result is that prices will continue to rise. American housewives demand cheap groceries. This Republican-Democratic Congress gives them red herrings. It is the same old merry-go-round, the Republican-Democrat merry-go-round.

Mr. Speaker, there is a much more fundamental reason why this Congress or any other Republican-Democratic Congress has not been able to give the people of our Nation housing and relief from inflation. No country can make any progress as long as it exists on an imperialist war economy basis. War economy means high prices; war economy means Taft-Hartleyized labor; war economy means no civil rights; war economy means no housing; war economy means no social progress. You cannot have housing, you cannot have effective price controls as long as the economy of a nation is geared to war. There will be no housing program and there will be no control of inflation as long as the Republican-Democratic policy of cold war continues. President Truman himself stated on March 17 when he asked for the draft and universal military training that we must prepare to pay the price. Yes, the price that the people are now paying is the high cost of living, ever-spiraling inflation, no housing, enslaved labor, and no civil rights.

We are now spending for the present cold war almost twenty-one billions; six hundred and forty-two millions for Army civilian programs abroad; five hundred and fifty-five millions for so-called foreign aid and tax refunds; nine hundred and forty-nine millions for supplemental national defense, cash; two billion two hundred and seventy-five mil-

lions for supplemental national defense, contract authorization; six million seven hundred and forty-nine millions for national military, 1949; three billion seven hundred and forty-nine millions for Navy, 1949; and six billion thirty-one millions for the Marshall plan, 1949—Daily Digest of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 20, 1948.

It is impossible to say what the future costs will be for the next 2 years. Some estimates go as high as thirty billions a year from 1950 on. You can easily see that the country is being daily placed into a war strait-jacket.

On this cold-war program the Republicans and Democrats do not even make a pretense at disagreement. The record shows that they are in unanimous accord in placing our Nation in a war-economy strait-jacket. It is the program of the big trusts of Wall Street. It is Truman's program. It is Dewey's program. It is a program of Wall Street's Forrestal and Snyder, the two dominating figures of Truman's Cabinet. It is the program of Wall Street's John Foster Dulles and Chase National Bank, the masters of Dewey's Republican Party.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that this Republican-Democratic Congress has not given the American people housing and has not even attempted to control inflation? And all for what? Not for defense. We are in no danger of attack. Yes, in no danger of aggression from the Soviet Union, despite the tons of newsprint and the billions of radio words to the contrary. All this suffering and deprivation is for the Wall Street trusts who seek to control the world for profit and more profit, and at the American people's expense.

We, of the Progressive Party in the Nation and of the American Labor Party in New York, are united behind Henry Wallace on a platform of peace based on aid to the needy people of the world through the United Nations, and on peace with the Soviet Union. We propose to fight the big trusts who control both old parties, and defeat their plan to embroil this world into another war. The Republican and Democratic Parties stand for an imperialist war economy. I repeat this means no housing, no relief from high prices, and no civil rights. The record of this Congress is clear proof. We, of the Progressive Party, stand for peace. We recognize that only a peace economy will bring housing, low prices, freedom, and abundance. That is the big, big difference between us and the Republicans and Democrats.

Americans today have been put on the merry-go-round; on the Wall Street Republican-Democrat merry-go-round of boom, bust, and war. We, of the Progressive Party, fight to take them off this old merry-go-round, and no amount of smear, hysteria, and Red-baiting will deter us.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, day before yesterday Senate Joint Resolution 157 was before this body for consideration. At that time I strongly criticized the manner in which that resolution was brought before this body. We were limited to 40 minutes in our debate. We were denied the opportunity to amend or submit a motion to recommit. We, as members of the minority party, were denied our fundamental rights in properly opposing that important measure. At the time I warned that section II of that resolution was dangerous legislation, and could bring great harm to our people. Notwithstanding repeated warnings from the Members of the minority party, the resolution was passed. Today, however, I am happy to report that the Senate of the United States has had the wisdom and the judgment to strike out section II of that resolution.

I call this to your attention for the purpose of emphasizing the necessity of granting sufficient time within which to debate these important issues. Moreover, it should be crystal clear to every Member here that it is extremely unwise to attempt to gag the Members of the minority party from either debating, amending, or moving to recommit important legislation. So today, we again are called upon to act intelligently on legislation of national import, but again our efforts are limited under this gag rule.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the present housing bill is a great improvement and will provide greater benefits to veterans and others seeking homes than the bill which we passed in the last few days of the preceding session. However, it is also quite clear to me under the provisions of this bill the very forces who have been lobbying against the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill will be the principal beneficiaries under this legislation. That is to say, there is ample protection provided for them in the financing of homes for construction. Under the circumstances, recognizing the growing need for additional housing and dwelling units, almost any bill which aids materially in reducing the need for housing must be approved. There is no excuse, there can be no justification, however, for the refusal of the leadership of this body to meet the problems confronting low-income groups and I refer specifically to the slum clearance, public- and rural-housing features of the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

Again, under the gag provisions of the suspension of rules theory, we are being denied the right to amend this legislation or to move to recommit in order that the people know where each and every Member of this body stands on this important issue.

I shall vote for this bill for, as I have said before, it indicates we are winning ground in the battle for an adequate housing program. This does not mean, however, that we shall abandon or diminish our efforts in any respect for the total fulfillment of the other features of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill when the Congress reconvenes next January.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

PRICES AND HOUSING SHORTAGE—WHO IS TO BLAME?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, when the President recalled the Eightieth Congress the opponents of progress and social justice branded his action political.

When the President addressed the special session, asking for legislation to curb the cruelly high cost of living and provide homes for millions, the GOP cried "cheap politics."

Every man who holds public office or who aspires to win an election engages in politics. But, to my way of thinking, there is nothing political about steak at $1.30 or butter at 90 cents a pound.

There is not anything political about a week's wages that will not stretch from pay day to pay day. Nor is there any politics in cramped and improper housing or writs of eviction.

It is my opinion that the GOP has done worse than play cheap politics in this special session. It has willingly gambled the security of the country and the welfare of its citizens in order to indulge in its fondest pastime—waging war with the Democratic Administration.

Acknowledging only its loyalty to the special interests it has served throughout its history, the GOP has refused to do anything to check the wild inflationary boom which grows more perilous with every passing day.

There was another period in our history when everything seemed to be sailing along on the crest of an endless boom. Millions were being made in the stock market. Wealth was being piled up by the privileged few. The needs of the average family were ignored and powerful interests screamed that the boom should not be interfered with—that eventually prices would find their own level. All would eventually be right with our economy if only Government kept its hands off.

The sequel to the story of that wild era was the tragic depression of the thirties.

People can still recall that few voices were raised then to halt the mad march of wild money. Those voices went unheeded—and all America suffered as a consequence.

There are a few voices raised today at the peak of another boom, pleading that something be done before it is too late. Mingled in the voices which can be heard are the frantic pleas of the American housewife—at her wit's end—struggling to put on her table a diet that is adequate for her growing children; worrying over her inability to pay all her household bills as they come due; seeing her husband's wages shrink more and more as his dollars become less valuable.

The GOP—in Congress and out—has for many years heaped abuse on the New Deal and the Democratic Party. It has bleated for years about the improvements in our economy it would produce if it but could have the opportunity to dictate the policies of Government—if it could enact legislation to its own liking.

We all recall—all too sadly—the great promises which were made when the GOP moved for the wiping out of all controls—at the close of the war.

We are still familiar with the full-page ads—published all over the country at the cost of millions; of the lobbyists for NAM, NRDGA, and other manufacturers' agents—who spent money lavishly and poured out their canned arguments before Congressional committees.

Production would zoom, plenty would be placed on the market, prices would fall, prosperity would bless everyone and happy days would be here again—all this and heaven too—if price controls, material allocations, credit regulations, and taxes on excess profits would be thrown into the discard.

All this was done—and more. Special arrangements were made for manufacturers who no longer had fat war contracts; special tax-payment provisions were set up; lush refunds were handed out to industry; special guaranties were made to the farmers—millions provided to support a high price for his products.

In addition to all this for the benefit of industry and producers, the reins of the Federal Legislature were handed over by the sovereign American people to the Republican Party.

What has all this produced?

Confusion and chaos—worry which fast approaches despair.

Today, prices are higher than ever in history.

The general cost of living has increased over 40 percent.

The price of food in some instances is over 100 percent above that of 2 years ago, and in all foodstuffs the price increase ranges between 60 and 100 percent.

Is that an honorable redemption of the GOP promises of just two short years ago? Or is it a callous disregard of promises that were made solely to entice votes?

As the last war drew to a close it was apparent to everyone that there was insufficient housing accommodation for veterans who would soon return from battlefields around the world.

Families had been living doubled up. Boys and girls had sacrificed fruitful years and looked forward to early marriages. Families which had grown larger were in need of additional housing facilities—to rent and to buy.

During both regular sessions of the Eightieth Congress, the GOP, in complete control of legislation, refused to acknowledge there was need for any intervention in this crucial field by the Federal Government—even going so far as to repudiate the measure offered by the Senator who had been the principal GOP advocate during the entire life of the Eightieth Congress.

At the end of June Congressmen and Senators returned home. They must have been brought face to face with the crying need for housing. Families are still being evicted—with no place to turn to. Families—young and old—are still living in cramped and improper quarters. American family life is being threatened because of the impossible conditions under which many are forced to eke out survival. With the calling of the special session, the President appealed for prompt action on housing. The President appealed for the passage of the measure introduced by Senator TAFT, pushed through the Senate by Senator TAFT, and praised as good legislation by Senator TAFT.

The GOP leadership in the House has steadfastly refused to have anything to do with this bill and has instead brought forth a bill which completely misses the point—ignores the demand for slum clearance and public housing which is of vital concern to those in low income groups who are now so tightly strapped.

MINIMUM WAGE

On the fringe of our industrial economy there are hundreds of thousands of people still working for starvation wages. The present minimum hourly wage is 40 cents. Consider for just a moment the plight of any individual working 40 hours at 40 cents per hour. What in the name of everything just and proper can he hope to do to maintain any kind of a standard of living?

The GOP Congress was asked to raise this minimum to somewhere near decent levels. It bluntly refused—and thus again gave evidence of its complete lack of regard for the less fortunate of our citizens.

During the days of the New Deal, which the GOP condemns with such vigor and enthusiasm, a beginning was made on the task of freeing from fear and poverty our aged and the survivors of wage earners.

These unfortunate people, who have given years of their lives to the development of the country's present position are left with a mere pittance in the face of rising prices which they cannot hope to meet.

The Eightieth Congress refused to become interested in their welfare; ignored legislation which would have increased their benefits and brought millions now unprovided for under the coverage of our social-security system. Instead, serving selfish interests, the Eightieth Congress enacted legislation which effectively expelled hundreds of thousands from the protection afforded by social security.

Let me repeat—there were some voices raised in protest of the GOP record of performance in the roaring twenties. Those voices went unheeded and the GOP depression with all its attendant misery and suffering followed.

Voices are raised today protesting the GOP record and appealing for action—it is later than we think. There are many causes for fear. Now is the time when something should be done.

There were great promises of prosperity and plenty for all at fair prices if industry could have its head. Those promises and predictions have been proven so much hot air—as industry continues to pile up tremendous profits and grinds the consuming public between the millstones of rising prices and shrinking dollars.

The GOP predicted great things if it could but control the legislative branch of our Government. It has occupied that position for 2 years and it has failed miserably to redeem a single promise made to the American people.

The GOP met in a great convention just a few weeks ago and nominated its choice for President of the United States. Its platform promised still more rosy things for all Americans.

In this special session the GOP had an opportunity to redeem at least some of those promises. Through its leaders it refused to consider the party platform as an issue. Its candidate for President has refused to speak out on any pressing problem. It has demonstrated clearly that it has no concern whatever for the distressful plight of the American housewife.

It is my opinion that the GOP Congress has failed completely in discharging its obligations to the American people.

In promises the GOP resembles a cloudburst; in performance—a drought.

Soon its speakers will be addressing the American public in a great political campaign. No doubt still more grandiloquent promises will be trotted out for public consumption.

I sincerely hope these spellbinders will find some small place in their addresses for an explanation of the GOP record in the Eightieth Congress. I feel confident the bulk of the American people will place the GOP record of promises alongside its record of performance. That is the final and best test. Action speaks louder than words.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] 1 minute.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that this bill fails utterly to provide any aid to farmers in the construction of homes, despite the fact that it fails to provide any secondary market that is useable so that the GI loans for house building can be availed of, I am going to support the bill on the theory that it will provide a little crumb of help to meet the critical housing shortage.

Owing to the gag rule voted last Wednesday by the Republican majority, it is impossible for me or any other Member to offer any amendment. And 40 minutes, 20 minutes to the side, is allowed for debate. Consequently it is impossible properly to consider or even to debate this important measure. I just want to point out that FHA loans under the provisions of title 6 of the Housing Act will be available only for housing built in cities and towns which meet the many requirements for sewerage, fire protection, and so forth. The farm people will get not a dime of aid in building homes under this bill. And by failing to provide an assured secondary market for GI mortgage loans through RFC, all aid to farmer ex-servicemen in building farm homes is denied. Yes; it will extend some housing aid to people in the cities who badly need it and because of that I shall support it. There is no hope for anything better from this session of the Congress. But I want to register my protest against the failure of this bill to provide aid for farm home building and for loans under the GI bill. I want to protest its failure to do anything for the low-income people, now housed in miserable slums. And, above all, I want to protest against a procedure that denies the membership the opportunity to offer amendments extending aid to them or

even to plead their case in this House. Such arbitrary action can hardly strengthen the faith of Americans in their Congress as an instrument of Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." I hope the next Congress will be more conscious of public need, and more willing to face issues forthrightly and solve them in the public interest.

CANADIAN PRICE CONTROL LAW HOLDS PRICES DOWN—PRICES OF FOODSTUFFS, MEAT, AND MEAT PRODUCTS, AND BUILDING MATERIALS ARE FROM 25 TO 50 PERCENT LOWER THAN IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely sorry that I am again obliged to criticize the Republican action in refusing to give the people of this country a decent housing bill. It is to be regretted that the gag rule, which you forced through the House, under which this bill is being considered, prevents Members to exercise their prerogative and right to offer and vote upon amendments to broaden the bill to provide cheaper homes and cheaper rents for the most needy and deserving veterans and people of our country.

AVARICIOUS REAL-ESTATE LOBBY HAS ITS WAY

The avaricious real-estate, contractors, and builders lobby will have its way because this bill is purely in their interest and not in the interest of the nearly three million veterans and people of low income who have appealed, pleaded, and prayed for relief from the intolerable conditions under which they have been obliged to live because of their inability to purchase or rent homes at prices they can afford to pay.

The bill does not, in any way, provide for public housing or for slum clearance. It is to be regretted that the other body was obliged to yield to the reactionary big four leadership of this House—I may say the big five leadership—to include the leader who is responsible for the failure to give the country a decent and honest housing bill. It would seem that they are devoid of any feeling or regard for the millions of homeless people. But the bill will aid the bankers in the Government guarantee of their loans and the builders of apartment houses and homes, but will, in no way, help the people who wish to obtain low-cost homes. There are, however, a few minor provisions in the bill that have been agreed upon by both sides of the House, but the $800,000,000 that is provided will serve to bail out the bankers and big contractors and not one penny is appropriated or authorized for the construction of low-cost homes or reasonable rental homes. The bill in effect subsidizes the higher but not the lower cost homes. I am surprised and amazed that the other body that has given real, serious consideration for 4 years to the housing shortage has yielded as they have, for political expediency, to the reactionary big five leadership of this House. The action and position they have taken with respect to this needed housing legislation indicates, unfortunately, that they have been subservient for the last three years to the real-estate combinations who, through their vicious lobby, have expended $2,000,000 to defeat a real and honest program to provide homes at prices that the people or exservicemen with low earnings and income are able to pay.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ADJOURN

I still maintain that we should not adjourn until we—

First. Pass a decent housing bill.

Second. Pass a real anti-inflation bill.

Third. Pass a bill to reduce the high cost of living.

Fourth. Pass a bill increasing the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour.

Fifth. Amend the discriminatory Displaced Persons Act the Republicans enacted 6 weeks ago to permit the entry of 400,000 instead of 200,000 suffering displaced persons, and to allow the entry of 30,000 ex-Polish soldiers now stranded in Great Britain.

Sixth. Pass the fair-employment bill.

Seventh. Enact the corporation excess-profits tax bill and to amend the income tax act to reduce the taxes of the taxpayers in the lower-income brackets who are now carrying the greater share of the tax burden.

Eighth. Enact the oleomargarine bill to repeal the 10 cents a pound tax paid by the poorer class because they cannot afford to pay 90 cents for a pound of butter.

Ninth. Pass a bill to broaden the Social Security Act, and to increase the monthly compensation of the aged persons now on the rolls who do not have enough to live decently.

Tenth. Pass a bill to place price controls on foodstuffs, necessaries of life, and scarce building materials that would reduce the outrageously high prices.

Eleventh. Pass the anti-poll-tax bill.

HIGHER PRICES—HIGHER PROFITS

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to point out that in Canada, where they have a price-control law, the prices of foodstuffs, shoes, wearing apparel, other necessities of life, and building materials are from 25 percent to 40 percent cheaper than in the United States. The Republicans forced the repeal of our price-control law and despite the demands of the consumers and the recommendations of President Truman that it be reenacted, they have failed to act, and are responsible for the American consumer paying these higher prices than the Canadian consumer. Compared with the Canadian prices, the prices charged by the Oil Trust, the Steel Trust, the Lumber Trust, and all other American trusts have enabled them to increase their profits during the first 6 months of this year to a greater extent than the huge profits they enjoyed in 1946 and 1947. The promise of the National Association of Manufacturers and the Republicans that, if price controls were removed and industry were allowed to voluntarily adjust and fix prices, the increase in prices would be arrested, and even lowered, did not come to pass, and the people will call you to account by defeating you in November.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this makeshift housing bill before us as it may leave to some small degree—and I say small degree—a few crumbs to the homeless veterans and people. This on the theory that it is better to have a little than nothing at all.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this House know, I have been supporting the Veterans Homestead Act since December 19, 1947, when I introduced this measure at the request of the American Legion's legislative representative. I have felt during all this period that the Veterans Homestead Act would go further toward providing immediate relief, and toward remedying the housing shortage than any other proposed legislation. It is my opinion now that the Veterans Homestead Act would go further toward providing relief than House bill H. R. 6959, upon which we are about to vote.

However, this bill contains many features which will relieve the present critical housing shortage.

It does provide for veterans cooperative housing projects. On page 70 of this bill an amendment to section 207 (c) of title II, provides for the formation of nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations, whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II, and provides that mortgages on houses built by such nonprofit cooperative organizations may be insured in an amount up to 95 percent of the replacement cost of houses erected for members of such organization. This provides for insurance either in a maximum amount of $8,100 per unit or maximum amount of $1,800 per room.

Provisions of this bill contained on page 62 in section 611 (a), page 73, paragraph 2, facilitate the construction and financing of low-cost homes, ranging in price from $4,500 to $6,500 each. These provisions will afford relief to a segment of our population who are most urgently in need of relief in the housing situation at the present time. This bill also provides for both an immediate and long-range rental housing program. It provides for the production of low-cost multifamily rental housing, provisions being contained on pages 69 and 70 for a rental-housing program to be provided for by continuance of section 608, on pages 55 and 56, and on page 76, wherein a new title, title VII, is added to the National Housing Act, the purpose of which is to supplement the existing systems of mortgage insurance for rental housing by a special system of insurance designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing at rents within the capacity of families of moderate incomes.

This bill also broadens the Government's secondary mortgage market in the case of GI mortgages, and Lanham Act permanents, and also rental projects. It raises the maximum amount of mortgages which may be sold by lenders and

banking institutions from 25 percent to 50 percent.

While this bill is not all that I would like to see enacted in the way of housing legislation, nevertheless it will be a considerable contribution on the part of the Government toward relieving the housing shortage, providing immediate relief, as well as a long-range rental-housing program. One of the features of this bill, with which I am in hearty accord, is the fact that it contains a provision that owners of section 608 rental housing projects, in selecting their tenants, will not discriminate against families with children. This bill provides a $500 penalty for any violation of that section. I am especially glad that this provision is in this bill.

I shall, therefore, for the above reasons, support and vote for this measure.

LET US STAY ON THE JOB

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, if we were to listen to the dictates of our consciences, we would not go home today. We would stay right here on the job until we did something about stopping the inflationary spiral, and something to give to the country, public housing or housing for the low-income groups, and something for slum clearance. You may go home today and tell your constituents that you passed a housing bill and that you did something for the veterans in connection with housing. It will be a half truth. The words "veterans" and "housing" are in this bill, but you are really doing very little for them.

There is no public housing in this bill. There is no slum clearance provided for in this bill. There is no farm housing provided for in this bill. There is no veteran's help of any consequence in this bill.

It is tragic that you are allowing yourselves only 40 minutes to talk about the needs of this country and what to do about the housing situation that confronts us.

This Congress spent $100,000 for a joint housing committee investigation. Since 1944 bills have been before the Congress to help cure this situation. They were debated in the Senate for days. You now find time to spare all of 40 minutes to talk about it, and you preclude yourselves from offering a single amendment that might be adopted or might be voted upon, regardless of the outcome. There are 47 pages of printed matter making up the text of this bill. The prints were not available until late yesterday. Very few Members of this House have had an opportunity to read the bill. I dare say that there is not a Member of this House who has read the bill who could explain its terms in 40 minutes, no less to argue its merits and demerits.

After all the time and effort that has been put into the public hearings conducted by a joint housing committee and by the standing committees of the two Houses of this Congress, it is nothing short of an insult to the citizens of this country to attempt to pass this bill under a suspension of the rules, with such limited debate and without an opportunity to offer amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this bill can very aptly be termed "a rich man's housing bill." It does nothing for the fellow who needs any help. You provide insurance for the man who wants to make a mortgage investment, you provide a guaranteed income to the man who wants to build. You provide for the real-estate big-business man who wants to build so that he can get the money and make practically no investment of his own. All of that benefits the fellow in the upper brackets.

If you want to know how badly the veterans need help and how little help they are getting, I suggest that you carefully read the statement of Teel Williams, president of the Basic Builders Corp., of 140 Nassau Street, New York City, which was circulated yesterday by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], and which I understand he has included in the Appendix of the RECORD. He tells about a project designed solely and primarily to provide for 600 families of veterans which cannot be built for lack of financing. The project has been approved and acclaimed as a good economic and provident venture, yet it has been abandoned because private capital will not finance it. It cannot be financed under the terms of this bill because the cost of construction must necessarily far exceed the $8,100 per unit limitation contained within this bill.

Do you know the meaning of the limitation in this bill of $8,100 a unit? It means that you can erect a building with four-room apartments provided the cost does not exceed $2,000 a room. There is not a metropolitan area in the country where, in today's market, multiple-dwelling units can be built unless the cost per room far exceeds that. When you put up a multiple dwelling at a cost of even $2,000 per room or $8,000 per unit for a four-room apartment, the rents must be so high that anyone who needs help in this critical housing situation cannot get the help.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I wish to thank my colleague from New York for yielding to me at this point. If it were not for his generosity, it would be impossible for me to express my views.

The question of housing is one of the principal thoughts in the minds of the American people. Over 5,000,000 of our people are either without housing or are improperly housed. Experts have testified before the committees of this House and through the media of the public press that lack of housing and faulty housing are the principal causes for the clogging of the divorce calendars of the courts of our country, the increased juvenile delinquency and a general break-down in the moral fiber of our people.

For the Republican majority which controls this House to bring this bill out under a gag rule that precludes all amendments and limits debate of the proponents of improved housing to 20 minutes is a travesty on the parliamentary system of government. The Republican leadership well knows that this is not a true housing bill and will not give a bit of relief in housing conditions in a single large city of our country. The bill is the dream of the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and dishonest and corrupt builders. It does not provide the large-scale housing so essential to hundreds of thousands of our low-wage earners in the great cities. It absolutely prohibits the erection of one- and two-family units in those same communities, because of its limitations upon costs. It guarantees not only the continuation of high cost, low grade housing, but will create an ever-mounting spiral of increasing prices in the realty field.

The bill is born of deceit and conceived by political conniving. It is a deliberate attempt on the part of the Republican leadership to hoodwink the people of our country.

Gentlemen of the Republican Party, you are perpetrating a fraud upon the American people. You are pretending that you are endeavoring to create more housing and homes in this country, whereas you know you are doing nothing more than rigging the present high prices and guaranteeing further increases at the expense and discomfort of millions of our people. The responsibility is yours and you must face the consequences.

Later today you intend to call up another fraud. A bill that is supposed to attack the question of the high cost of living. Again the Republican leadership allows the opponents of the high cost of living but 20 minutes of debate. No Member of this House can go back to his district, to his people, without the question of the high cost of living being brought up within 2 or 3 minutes—$1.30 a pound steaks, 97-cent bacon, 96-cent eggs, 93-cent butter, 24-cent milk, $60 men's suits, $5.95 infants' shoes—everything at a level so high that the working man and woman is hard pressed to buy even the necessities of life.

You told the people of this country when you removed controls that prices would go down. Well, prices for food, clothing, and the other necessities of life have gone up 60 to 110 percent in the 2 years since you have lifted controls and in the 2 years that you have controlled this Congress of the United States. You charge that high costs are due to Government spending. Well, my friends on the other side of the aisle, I will take you at your word. During the past 2 years since you have controlled the House every single dollar that has been appropriated and spent by this Government of ours has been appropriated and expended through and by your party. It is time for sham, pretense, and lies to be swept aside. It is time that the American people be informed and made to realize that it is the Republican Party that has controlled the purse strings of this Nation for the past 2 years. It is time that the people be made aware of the fact that never in the history of this country has there been so much lobbying in

Washington and never in the history of this country has there been a party so responsive to this lobbying.

For some unknown reason you seem to doubt the intelligence of our people. You seem to feel that through sham and pretense you can hide the truth. Gentlemen, you are dealing with a literate, free public who have access to the radio, to the press and to other media of information. You have not fooled them, you are not fooling them. They know that they are paying the bill for your perfidy and they know that they can hold you to a strict accounting on November 2.

If you are sincere in your efforts to assist the people of this country, I ask you to join with me and the other 40 Members of this House who have banded ourselves together to oppose adjournment until such time as this Congress will honestly and sincerely attack the problems of housing and the high cost of living I ask you to forget party policy and party loyalty. I remind you that your first obligation is to the Nation and to its people. I ask you to stay here in the Capitol until we can work out legislation that will make it possible for our people to live within their incomes and to have decent and proper housing. The request is a simple one. Have you the courage and the intellectual honesty to bear with me?

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Mr. Speaker, the people will not long be fooled by what we do not do here.

Residential construction may well reach an all-time high in 1948, but the number of those who can afford to buy these new homes is becoming smaller and smaller, and the demand of those most urgently in need of new housing—the low-income families—is not being and will not be met by private construction.

What is happening in Philadelphia, Pa., is typical of what is happening all over the United States.

Of 3,972 new one-family row-houses, 1.2 percent sold for $7,000–$8,000, 48.5 percent sold for $8,000–$9,000, 27 percent for $9,000–$10,000, and 23.3 percent for $10,000 and more. The average sales price was $9,625.

At the same time, 23 percent of all families had annual incomes of less than $2,000, 43 percent had incomes from $2,000 to $4,000, 13 percent had incomes from $4,000 to $5,000, and 21 percent had incomes of over $5,000.

Under accepted standards, no family should pay for a house more than twice its annual income. Sixty-six percent of all families cannot afford to pay more than $8,000 for a new house, yet 1.2 percent of all new houses built in Philadelphia are available for sale at less than $8,000.

These people are asking this Congress: Where shall we live? Where shall we provide the homes for our children, the citizens of tomorrow, in which to implant in them the traditions of a good America?

Mr. Speaker, we are doing the country an injustice, an immeasurable injustice, if we do not stay right here on the job and give the people a housing bill that is a housing bill, one that will help clean up this desperate situation that confronts us.

Those who say there will be time enough to take care of this problem in the Eighty-first Congress may find that their shirking of their duty today may well be the cause of keeping them out of the Eighty-first Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, this bill in substance excludes from consideration with respect to new housing 36 percent of the population of the United States, who have annual incomes of less than $2,000 per year; hence I shall stick by the principles which induced me to introduce the Taft-Ellender-Wagner comprehensive housing bill in March 1947, and vote "present" on this resolution as I voted on the Wolcott bill when it was before us in June.

The last-ditch opponents of public housing have won this round, but the people want public housing and the people will get it in the next Congress.

The real record on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, Mr. Speaker, is engrossed on the discharge petition, completed to a very substantial extent, and signed by Members on both sides of the aisle; those Members can best account to their constituents in that way.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6959, as amended by the Senate, is an honest attempt to furnish aids to provide more and lower-cost housing—both for rent and for sale.

What will H. R. 6959 do?

First. Facilitates the construction and financing of homes in the $5,000 to $6,500 price range.

Second. Provides for both an immediate and long-range rental housing program.

Third. Provides for the production of low-cost multifamily rental housing.

Fourth. Facilitates the purchase by veterans of low-cost Government-owned rental housing, the lowest possible priced housing in today's market.

Fifth. Provides for liberalized financing in localities and metropolitan areas where there is a need for new dwellings for families of lower income.

Sixth. Aids the production of mass-produced prefabricated houses, and the economies of on-site mass production of conventional houses.

Seventh. Provides for veterans' cooperative housing projects with 95 percent mortgage financing, as well as other cooperatives and nonprofit corporations with 90 percent.

Eighth. Provides for the development of standardized codes and measurements of building materials.

Ninth. Broadens Government secondary mortgage market in the case of GI mortgages and Lanham permanents—which have veteran preference—and rental projects.

Tenth. Rental housing program provided for by continuance of section 608, yield insurance, veterans, and other cooperative ownership housing corporations as well as other section 207 type programs.

Eleventh. Provides that the owners of section 608 rental housing projects in selecting tenants will not discriminate against families with children, and provides $500 penalty for any violation thereof.

Mr. Speaker, I believe H. R. 6959 is a fine, comprehensive housing bill, and I intend to vote for it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the many years I have been in the House I have never seen a bill which was perfectly satisfactory to every Member. That undoubtedly is the case in respect to this bill. Some Members are keenly disappointed that the provisions in which they were most interested perhaps are not included in the bill; but this bill generally will be of material benefit to those who want to build and those who want to buy low-cost housing, statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

The bill is designed to encourage the construction of low-cost housing and advantages are given in that field. It is designed to accelerate the production of apartment houses in the big cities and if the bill is administered as we hope it will be administered, it will result in building thousands and thousands of rental units in cities where this housing is most needed. It will not necessarily build any more houses than would otherwise be built this year because if we build over a million units we are going to have to use almost all of the available material and labor in that effort; but it will adjust the demand in such a manner—and it will follow if this bill is passed—that building material and labor will be channeled into the low-cost housing field and into the construction of apartment units in cities where they are needed the most.

The Housing Act of 1948 is designed to attack the existing housing emergency as well as to provide a broadened long-range program of low-cost housing in the home ownership and rental fields. It will encourage now, an accelerated production of low-cost homes. It will encourage now, an expanded production of rental housing units. It will immediately liberalize home financing for veterans. From a long-range point of view, the bill modernizes and broadens FHA housing insurance programs. The bill seeks the economies in construction costs attendant upon improved and standardized building codes and standardized dimensions for building materials. The bill encourages cost reductions through mass production of prefabricated houses as well as homes of conventional construction.

LOW-COST HOUSING

The bill will facilitate the financing of homes in the $5,000 to $6,500 price range. The FHA title I mortgage insurance maximum is increased from $3,000 to $4,500. According to a survey of construction costs by the Bureau of Labor

Statistics last year 20 percent of the new housing construction in the country fell within a price range that would be covered by the new mortgage limitation in title I. A new provision is added to mortgage insurance under FHA title II under which 90 to 95 percent loans are permitted up to a mortgage maximum of $6,000. According to the survey abovementioned 43 percent of new housing construction fell within the authorized mortgage limitation of this provision. Mass production of prefabricated houses will be encouraged by the financial assistance afforded by certain provisions of FHA title VI. Another provision of title VI is designed to encourage on-site mass production of homes of conventional construction.

RENTAL HOUSING

One of the acute problems in the housing emergency is the shortage of rental housing. To stimulate the immediate production of rental-housing accommodations $800,000,000 of title VI FHA mortgage insurance is authorized for such housing construction. A longer term approach to this problem is provided under a $1,000,000,000 yield-insurance program. Rentals charged under the yield-insurance program would be FHA approved and so set that they will meet the needs for dwellings of families of moderate income. Each of these insurance programs are supported by premiums charged so that the amounts involved reflect only contingent liabilities of the Government. Provision is made for the production of rental housing units for families of lower income in localities or metropolitan areas where there is a need for new dwellings at such rental. Projects of nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporations and nonprofit corporations can likewise be financed in this field under a mortgage which may be insured up to 90 percent, and in case the cooperative is a veterans' cooperative up to 95 percent—section 207 amendments.

VETERANS' HOUSING

The bill makes eligible for purchase by the Government secondary market in the Federal National Mortgage Association, insured mortgages covering Government war housing. By regulations of the Housing and Home Finance Agency veterans are given first preference in the purchase of this housing. This housing constitutes probably the lowest cost housing available for veteran ownership, and the provisions of this bill should stimulate the acquisition of this housing by veterans. The Government secondary market is also broadened with respect to GI home loans in that 50 percent of the lender's portfolio of such loans insured after April 30, 1948, are made eligible for sale to the Federal National Mortgage Association. As noted in the preceding section veterans' cooperative housing projects are accorded a preferential 95 percent insured mortgage. While not involved in this legislation, attention may be called to the fact that the housing and rent act of 1948 gives veterans a priority for the purchase of all newly constructed housing and priority for occupancy in all newly constructed rental housing.

CONCLUSION

This country is experiencing a housing boom which promises to reach over a million units this year, a building record never before equaled in this or any other country. The provisions of this bill are designed to keep this momentum going. While a full use is being made of existing supplies of labor and materials it is believed that the financial incentives offered in this bill will attract labor and materials into an even greater production of housing units through emphasis on lower cost construction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point the Senate amendment to the bill H. R. 6959 may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

That this act may be cited as the "Housing Act of 1948."

TITLE I—FHA TITLE VI AND TRANSITIONAL PERIOD AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

TITLE VI AMENDMENTS

(a) Section 603 (a) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$5,350,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,750,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate amount may be increased to not to exceed $6,150,000,000";

(2) By striking out the second proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That no mortgage shall be insured under section 603 of this title after April 30, 1948, except (A) pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before April 30, 1948, or (B) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under section 603 of this title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage, and no mortgage shall be insured under section 608 of this title after March 31, 1949, except (i) pursuant to a commitment to insure issued on or before March 31, 1949, or (ii) a mortgage given to refinance an existing mortgage insured under section 608 of this title and which does not exceed the original principal amount and unexpired term of such existing mortgage: *Provided further*, That no mortgage shall be insured under section 608 of this title unless the mortgagor certifies under oath that in selecting tenants for the property covered by the mortgage he will not discriminate against any family by reason of the fact that there are children in the family, and that he will not sell the property while the insurance is in effect unless the purchaser so certifies, such certifications to be filed with the Administrator; and violation of any such certification shall be a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not to exceed $500:".

(b) Section 608 (b) (3) (B) is amended by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That the principal obligation of the mortgage shall not, in any event, exceed 90 percent of the Administrator's estimate of the replacement cost of the property or project on the basis of the costs prevailing on December 31, 1947, for properties or projects of comparable quality in the locality where such property or project is to be located; and".

(c) Section 608 (b) (3) (C) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$1,500 per room" and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,100 per family unit"; and

(2) By striking out the colon and the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(d) Section 609 is amended—

(1) By striking out all of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding purchase contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator providing for the purchase and delivery of the houses to be manufactured, which contracts shall provide for the payment of the purchase price at such time as may be agreed to by the parties thereto, but, in no event, shall the purchase price be payable on a date in excess of 30 days after the date of delivery of such houses, unless not less than 20 percent of such purchase price is paid on or before the date of delivery and the lender has accepted and discounted or has agreed to accept and discount, pursuant to subsection (i) of this section a promissory note or notes, executed by the purchaser, representing the unpaid portion of such purchase price, in which event such unpaid portion of the purchase price may be payable on a date not in excess of 180 days from the date of delivery of such houses;".

(2) By striking out the first and second sentences of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost, exclusive of profit, of manufacturing the houses, which are the subject of such purchase contracts assigned to secure the loan, less any sums paid by the purchaser under said purchase contracts prior to the assignment thereof. The loan shall be secured by an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts and of all sums payable thereunder on or after the date of such assignment, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses then owned and in the possession of the borrower."

(3) By adding at the end of subsection (f) the following new sentence: "The provisions of section 603 (d) shall also be applicable to loans insured under this section and the reference in said section 603 (d) to a mortgage shall be construed to include a loan or loans with respect to which a contract of insurance is issued pursuant to this section."

(4) By adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) (1) In addition to the insurance of the principal loan to finance the manufacture of housing, as provided in this section, and in order to provide short-term financing in the sale of houses to be delivered pursuant to the purchase contract or contracts assigned as security for such principal loan, the Administrator is authorized, under such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe, to insure the lender against any losses it may sustain resulting from the acceptance and discount of a promissory note or notes executed by a purchaser of any such houses representing an unpaid portion of the purchase price of any such houses. No such promissory note or notes accepted and discounted by the lender pursuant to this subsection shall involve a principal obligation in excess of 80 percent of the purchase price of the manufactured house or houses; have a maturity in excess of 180 days from the date of the note or bear interest in excess of 4 percent per annum; nor may the principal amount of such promissory notes, with re-

spect to any individual principal loan, outstanding and unpaid at any one time, exceed in the aggregate an amount prescribed by the Administrator.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to include in any contract of insurance executed by him with respect to the insurance of a loan to finance the manufacture of houses, provisions to effectuate the insurance against any such losses under this subsection.

"(3) The failure of the purchaser to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or notes executed by the purchaser and accepted and discounted by the lender under the provisions of this subsection, shall be considered as a default under this subsection, and if such default continues for a period of 30 days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance, as provided in subsection (d) of this section except that debentures issued pursuant to this subsection shall have a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan plus interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of default to the date the application is filed for the insurance benefits.

"(4) Debentures issued with respect to the insurance granted under this subsection shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date application is filed for the insurance benefits and shall bear interest from such date.

"(5) The Administrator is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this subsection, in addition to the premium charge authorized under subsection (h) of this section. Such premium charge shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 1 percent of the original principal of such promissory note or notes and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator."

(e) Section 610 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Administrator is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any of the so-called Greenbelt towns, or parts thereof, including projects, or parts thereof, known as Greenhills, Ohio; Greenbelt, Md.; and Greendale, Wis., developed under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, or of any of the village properties under the jurisdiction of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and any mortgage executed in connection with the first resale, within 2 years from the date of its acquisition from the Government, of any portion of a project or property which is the security for a mortgage insured pursuant to the provisions of this section."

(f) Title VI is amended by adding after section 610 the following new section:

"SEC. 611. (a) In addition to mortgages insured under other sections of this title, and in order to assist and encourage the application of cost-reduction techniques through large-scale modernized site construction of housing and the erection of houses produced by modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure mortgages (including advances on such mortgages during construction) which are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a mortgage shall—

"(1) have been made to and be held by a mortgagee approved by the Administrator as responsible and able to service the mortgage properly;

"(2) cover property, held by a mortgagor approved by the Administrator, upon which there is to be constructed or erected dwelling units for not less than 25 families consisting of a group of single-family dwellings approved by the Administrator for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided,* That during the course of construction there may be located upon the mortgaged property a plant for the fabrication or storage of such dwellings or sections or parts thereof, and the Administrator may consent to the removal or release of such plant from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may approve;

"(3) involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(A) not to exceed 80 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the completed property or project, exclusive of any plant of the character described in paragraph (2) of this subsection located thereon, and

"(B) not to exceed a sum computed on the individual dwellings comprising the total project as follows: $6,000 or 80 percent of the valuation, whichever is less, with respect to each single-family dwelling.

"With respect to the insurance of advances during construction, the Administrator is authorized to approve advances by the mortgagee to cover the cost of materials delivered upon the mortgaged property and labor performed in the fabrication or erection thereof;

"(4) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time: *Provided,* That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest, not exceeding 4½ percent per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, if he finds that the mortgage market demands it. The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property from the lien of the mortgage upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the mortgage may provide for such release.

"(c) Preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for veterans of World War II and their immediate families and for hardship cases as defined by the Administrator shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Administrator.

"(d) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 608 shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

TITLE II AMENDMENTS

(g) Section 203 (b) (2) (B) is amended by striking out "$5,400" and inserting in lieu thereof "$6,300."

(h) Section 203 (b) (2) (C) is amended—

(1) By striking out "$8,600" and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,500";

(2) By striking out "$6,000" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$7,000";

(3) By striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,000."

(i) Section 203 (b) is amended by striking out in paragraph numbered (3) the following: "of the character described in paragraph (2) (B) of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "on property approved for insurance prior to the beginning of construction."

(j) Section 203 (b) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) (C), inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or," and adding the following new paragraph:

"(D) not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 90 percent of the appraised value, as of the date the mortgage is accepted for insurance (or 95 percent if, in the determination of the Administrator, insurance of mortgages involving a principal obligation in such amount under this paragraph would not reasonably be expected to contribute to substantial increases in costs and prices of housing facilities for families of moderate income), of a property, urban, suburban, or rural, upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a single-family residence which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction: *Provided,* That the Administrator may by regulation provide that the principal obligation of any mortgage eligible for insurance under this paragraph shall be fixed at a lesser amount than $6,000 where he finds that for any section of the country or at any time a lower-cost dwelling for families of lower income is feasible without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability: *And provided further,* That with respect to mortgages insured under this paragraph the mortgagor shall be the owner and occupant of the property at the time of the insurance and shall have paid on account of the property at least 10 percent (or 5 percent, in the case of a 95-percent mortgage insured pursuant to this paragraph (D)) of the appraised value in cash or its equivalent, or shall be the builder constructing the dwelling in which case the principal obligation shall not exceed 85 percent of the appraised value of the property."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph numbered (3), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 30 years in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(3) By striking out the period at the end of paragraph numbered (5), and adding a comma and the following: "or not to exceed 4 percent per annum in the case of a mortgage insured under paragraph (2) (D) of this subsection."

(k) (1) Section 203 (c) is amended (1) by striking out in the last sentence the words "section or section 210" and inerting in lieu thereof the word "title"; and (2) by striking out in said sentence the words "under this section."

(2) Sections 203 (c) and 603 (c) of such act are amended by striking out in the last sentence and in the next to the last sentence, respectively, the following: "and a mortgage on the same property is accepted for insurance at the time of such payment,".

(l) Section 204 (a) is amended—

(1) By striking out, in the last sentence, the following: "prior to July 1, 1944,";

(2) By inserting between the first and second provisos in the last sentence the following: *"And provided further,* That with respect to mortgages which are accepted for insurance under section 203 (b) (2) (D) or under the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2) of this act, there may be included in the debentures issued by the Administrator on account of the cost of foreclosure (or of acquiring the property by other means) actually paid by the mortgagee and approved by the Administrator in amount, not in excess of two-thirds of such cost or $75, whichever is the greater:".

(m) Section 207 (b) is amended by amending paragraph numbered (1) to read as follows:

"(1) Federal or State instrumentalities, municipal corporate instrumentalities of one or more States, or limited dividend or redevelopment or housing corporations restricted by Federal or State laws or regulations of State banking or insurance departments as to rents, charges, capital structure, rate of return, or methods of operation; or."

(n) Section 207 (c) is amended—

(1) By amending the first sentence to read as follows:

"(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section a mortgage on any property or project shall involve a principal obligation in an amount—

"(1) not to exceed $5,000,000, or, if executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, not to exceed $50,000,000;

"(2) not to exceed 80 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the property or project

when the proposed improvements are completed, including the land; the proposed physical improvements; utilities within the boundaries of the property or project; architects' fees; taxes and interest accruing during construction; and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Administrator: *Provided*, That, except with respect to a mortgage executed by a mortgagor coming within the provisions of paragraph No. (b) (1) of this section, such mortgage shall not exceed the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the cost of the completed physical improvements on the property or project, exclusive of public utilities and streets and organization and legal expenses: *And provided further*, That, notwithstanding any of the provisions of this paragraph No. (2), a mortgage with respect to a project to be constructed in a locality or metropolitan area where, as determined by the Administrator, there is a need for new dwellings for families of lower income at rentals comparable to the rentals proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project (or, in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation the permanent occupancy of the dwellings of which is restricted to members of such corporations, or a project constructed by a nonprofit corporation organized for the purpose of construction of homes for members of the corporation, at prices, costs, or charges comparable to the prices, costs, or charges proposed to be charged such members) may involve a principal obligation in an amount not exceeding 90 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed, except that in the case of a mortgage with respect to a project of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II, the principal obligations may be in an amount not exceeding 95 percent of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the value of the project when the proposed improvements are completed; and

"(3) not to exceed $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use, except that in the case of projects of the character described in the second proviso of section 207 (c) (2), if the Administrator finds that the needs of the members of any such corporation could more adequately be met by per room cost limitations, the mortgage may involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed $1,800 per room for such part of such project as may be attributable to dwelling use."

(2) By striking out the period at the end of the second sentence, inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and adding the following: "except that with respect to mortgages insured under the provisions of the second proviso of paragraph No. (2) of this subsection, which mortgages are hereby authorized to have a maturity of not exceeding 40 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage, such interest rate shall not exceed 4 percent per annum."

(3) By adding the following additional sentence at the end thereof: "Such property or project may include such commercial and community facilities as the Administrator deems adequate to serve the occupants."

(o) Section 207 (g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the number "2" appearing in clause (ii) and inserting in lieu thereof "1."

(p) Section 207 (h) is amended by striking out, in paragraph No. (1), the words "paid to the mortgagor of such property," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund."

(q) Section 204 (f) is amended by inserting in clause No. (1), immediately preceding the semicolon, the following: "if the mortgage was insured under section 203 and shall be retained by the Administrator and credited to the Housing Insurance Fund if the mortgage was insured under section 207."

(r) Section 207 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(q) In order to assure an adequate market for mortgages on cooperative-ownership projects and rental-housing projects for families of lower income and veterans of the character described in the second proviso of paragraph No. (2) of subsection (c) of this section, the powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association and of any other Federal corporation or other Federal agency hereafter established, to make real-estate loans, or to purchase, service, or sell any mortgages, or partial interests therein, may be utilized in connection with projects of the character described in said proviso."

TITLE I AMENDMENTS

(s) Section 2 is amended:

(1) By striking out "$165,000,000 in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$200,000,000";

(2) By striking out "$3,000" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,500";

(3) By striking out the first proviso in the first sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided*, That insurance may be granted to any such financial institution with respect to any obligation not in excess of $10,000 and having a maturity not in excess of 7 years and 32 days representing any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase made by it if such loan, advance of credit, or purchase is made for the purpose of financing the alteration, repair, improvement, or conversion of an existing structure used or to be used as an apartment house or a dwelling for two or more families;";

(4) By striking out the last sentence of subsection (b).

SEC. 102. In order to aid housing production, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make loans to and purchase the obligations of any business enterprise for the purpose of providing financial assistance for the production of prefabricated houses or prefabricated housing components, or for large-scale modernized site construction. Such loans or purchases shall be made under such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Corporation may determine: *Provided*, That to the extent that the proceeds of such loans or purchases are used for the purchase of equipment, plant, or machinery the principal obligation shall not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of such equipment, plant, or machinery: *And provided further*, That the total amount of commitments for loans made and obligations purchased under this section shall not exceed $50,000,000 outstanding at any one time, and no financial assistance shall be extended under this section unless it is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

SEC. 103. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of section 500 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"And provided further*, That the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe by regulation a higher maximum rate of interest than otherwise prescribed in this section for loans guaranteed under this title, but not exceeding 4½ percent per annum, if he finds that the loan market demands it."

TITLE II—SECONDARY MARKET FOR GI HOME LOANS AND FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION INSURED MORTGAGES

SEC. 201. Section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "which are insured after April 30, 1948, under section 203 or section 603 of this act, or guaranteed under section 501, 502, or 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "which are insured after April 30, 1948, under title II, or title VI of this act, or guaranteed after April 30, 1948, under section 501, or section 502, or section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended."

SEC. 202. Paragraph (E) of the proviso of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause numbered (2) the figure "25" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "50."

TITLE III—STANDARDIZED BUILDING CODES AND MATERIALS

SEC. 301. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall undertake and conduct technical research and studies to develop and promote the acceptance and application of improved and standardized building codes and regulations and methods for the more uniform administration thereof, and standardized dimensions and methods for the assembly of home-building materials and equipment.

SEC. 302. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Administrator shall utilize, to the fullest extent feasible, the available facilities of other departments, independent establishments, and agencies of the Federal Government, and, notwithstanding any other law, shall appoint a Director to administer under his general supervision the provisions of this title.

SEC. 303. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE IV—EQUITY INVESTMENT AIDS

SEC. 401. The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new title:

"TITLE VII—INSURANCE FOR INVESTMENTS IN RENTAL HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF MODERATE INCOME

"AUTHORITY TO INSURE

"SEC. 701. The purpose of this title is to supplement the existing systems of mortgage insurance for rental housing under this act by a special system of insurance designed to encourage equity investment in rental housing at rents within the capacity of families of moderate income. To effectuate this purpose, the Administrator is authorized, upon application by the investor, to insure as hereinafter provided, and, prior to the execution of insuance contracts and upon such terms as the Administrator shall prescribe, to make commitments to insure, the minimum annual amortization charge and an annual return on the outstanding investment of such investor in any project which is eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided in an amount (herein called the "insured annual return') equal to such rate of return, not exceeding 2¾ per centum per annum, on such outstanding investment as shall, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, be fixed in the insurance contract or in the commitment to insure: *Provided*, That any insurance contract made pursuant to this title shall expire as of the first day of the operating year for which the outstanding investment amounts to not more than 10 percent of the established investment: *And provided further*, That the aggregate amount of contingent liabilities outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts and commitments to insure made pursuant to this title shall not exceed $1,000,000,000.

"ELIGIBILITY

"SEC. 702. (a) To be eligible for insurance under this title, a project shall meet the following conditions:

"(1) The Administrator shall be satisfied that there is, in the locality or metropolitan area of such project, a need for new rental dwellings at rents comparable to the rents proposed to be charged for the dwellings in such project.

"(2) Such project shall be economically sound, and the dwellings in such project shall be acceptable to the Administrator as to quality, design, size, and type.

"(b) Any insurance contract executed by the Administrator under this title shall be conclusive evidence of the eligibility of the project and the investor for such insurance, and the validity of any insurance contract so executed shall be incontestable in the hands of an investor from the date of the execution of such contract, except for fraud or misrepresentation on the part of such investor.

"PREMIUMS AND FEES

"SEC. 703. (a) For insurance granted pursuant to this title the Administrator shall fix and collect a premium charge in an amount not exceeding one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year for which such premium charge is payable without taking into account the excess earnings, if any, applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment. Such premium charge shall be payable annually in advance by the investor, either in cash or in debentures issued by the Administrator under this title at par plus accrued interest: *Provided*, That, if in any operating year the gross income shall be less than the operating expenses, the premium charge payable during such operating year shall be waived, but only to the extent of the amount of the difference between such expenses and such income and subject to subsequent payment out of any excess earnings as hereinafter provided.

"(b) With respect to any project offered for insurance under this title, the Administrator is authorized to charge and collect reasonable fees for examination, and for inspection during the construction of the project: *Provided*, That such fees shall not aggregate more than one-half of 1 percent of the estimated investment.

"RENTS

"SEC. 704. The Administrator shall require that the rents for the dwellings in any project insured under this title shall be established in accordance with a rent schedule approved by the Administrator, and that the investor shall not charge or collect rents for any dwellings in the project in excess of the appropriate rents therefor as shown in the latest rent schedule approved pursuant to this section. Prior to approving the initial or any subsequent rent schedule pursuant to this section, the Administrator shall find that such schedule affords reasonable assurance that the rents to be established thereunder are (1) not lower than necessary, together with all other income to be derived from or in connection with the project, to produce reasonably stable revenues sufficient to provide for the payment of the operating expenses, the minimum annual amortization charge, and the minimum annual return; and (2) not higher than necessary to meet the need for dwellings for families of moderate income.

"EXCESS EARNINGS

"SEC. 705. For all of the purposes of any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, 50 percent of the excess earnings, if any, for any operating year may be applied, in addition to the minimum annual return, to return on the outstanding investment but only to the extent that such application thereof does not result in an annual return of more than 5 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year, and the balance of any such excess earnings shall be applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization of the outstanding investment: *Provided*, That if in any preceding operating years the gross income shall have been less than the operating expenses, such excess earnings shall be applied to the extent necessary in whole or in part, first, to the reimbursement of the amount of the difference between such expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and such income, and, second, to the payment of any permium charges previously waived hereunder.

"FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

"SEC. 706. With respect to each project insured under this title, the Administrator shall provide that, after the close of each operating year, the investor shall submit to him for approval a financial and operating statement covering such operating year. If any such financial and operating statement shall not have been submitted or, for proper cause, shall not have been approved by the Administrator, payment of any claim submitted by the investor may, at the option of the Administrator, be withheld, in whole or in part, until such statement shall have been submitted and approved.

"PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

"SEC. 707. If in any operating year the net income of a project insured under this title is less than the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return, the Administrator, upon submission by the investor of a claim for the payment of the amount of the difference between such net income and the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return and after proof of the validity of such claim, shall pay to the investor, in cash from the housing investment insurance fund, the amount of such difference, as determined by the Administrator, but not exceeding, in any event, an amount equal to the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge and the insured annual return.

"DEBENTURES

"SEC. 708. (a) If the aggregate of the amounts paid to the investor pursuant to section 707 hereof with respect to a project insured under this title shall at any time equal or exceed 15 percent of the established investment, the Administrator thereafter shall have the right, after written notice to the investor of his intentions so to do, to acquire, as of the first day of any operating year, such project in consideration of the issuance and delivery to the investor of debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year. In any such case the investor shall be obligated to convey to said Administrator title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and, in the event that the investor fails so to do, said Administrator may, at his option, terminate the insurance contract.

"(b) If in any operating year the aggregate of the differences between the operating expenses (exclusive of any premium charges previously waived hereunder) and the gross income for the preceding operating years, less the aggregate of any deficits in such operating expenses reimbursed from excess earnings as hereinbefore provided, shall at any time equal or exceed 5 percent of the established investment, the investor shall thereafter have the right, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, to convey to the Administrator, as of the first day of any operating year, title to the project which meets the requirements of the rules and regulations of the Administrator in force at the time the insurance contract was executed and which is evidenced in the manner prescribed by such rules and regulations, and to receive from the Administrator debentures having a total face value equal to 90 percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(c) Any difference, not exceeding $50, between 90 percent of the outstanding investment for the operating year in which a project is acquired by the Administrator pursuant to this section and the total face value of the debentures to be issued and delivered to the investor pursuant to this section shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Administrator to the investor from the housing investment insurance fund.

"(d) Upon the acquisition of a project by the Administrator pursuant to this section, the insurance contract shall terminate.

"(e) Debentures issued under this title to any investor shall be executed in the name of the housing investment insurance fund as obligor, shall be signed by the Administrator, by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. Such debentures shall be dated as of the first day of the operating year in which the project for which such debentures were issued was acquired by the Administrator, shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the insurance contract was executed, but not to exceed 2¾ percent per annum, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature on the 1st day of July in such calendar year or years, not later than the fortieth following the date of the issuance thereof, as shall be determined by the Administrator and stated on the face of such debentures.

"(f) Such debentures shall be in such form and in such denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and may include such provisions for redemption as shall be prescribed by the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be issued in either coupon or registered form.

"(g) Such debentures shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by any Territory, dependency, or possession of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, shall be payable out of the housing investment insurance fund, which shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed, as to both the principal thereof and the interest thereon, by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof. In the event that the housing investment insurance fund fails to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of or the interest on any debentures so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holders the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon, to the extent of the amount so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such debentures.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real and other property by the United States, the Administrator shall have power, for the protection of the housing investment insurance fund, to pay out of said fund all expenses or charges in connection with, and to deal with, complete, reconstruct, rent, renovate, modernize, insure, make contracts for the management of, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash or credit or lease in his discretion, in whole or in part, any project acquired pursuant to this title; and, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator shall also have power to pursue to final collection by way of compromise or otherwise all claims acquired

by, or assigned or transferred to, him in connection with the acquisition or disposal of any project pursuant to this title: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any contract for hazard insurance, or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of any project acquired pursuant to this title if the amount of such purchase or contract does not exceed $1,000.

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 709. The investor, after written notice to the Administrator of his intention so to do, may terminate, as of the close of any operating year, any insurance contract made pursuant to this title. The Administrator shall prescribe the events and conditions under which said Administrator shall have the option to terminate any insurance contract made pursuant to this title, and the events and conditions under which said Administrator may reinstate any insurance contract terminated pursuant to this section or section 708 (a). If any insurance contract is terminated pursuant to this section, the Administrator may require the investor to pay an adjusted premium charge in such amount as the Administrator determines to be equitable, but not in excess of the aggregate amount of the premium charges which such investor otherwise would have been required to pay if such insurance contract had not been so terminated.

"INSURANCE FUND

"SEC. 710. There is hereby created a housing investment insurance fund which shall be used by the Administrator as a revolving fund for carrying out the provisions of this title and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. For this purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make available to the Administrator such funds as the Administrator shall deem necessary, but not to exceed $10,000,000, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, inspection and other fees, service charges, and any other income received by the Administrator under this title, together with all earnings on the assets of such housing investment insurance fund, shall be credited to said fund. All payments made pursuant to claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, cash adjustments, the principal of and interest on debentures issued under this title, expenses incurred in connection with or as a consequence of the acquisition and disposal of projects acquired under this title, and all administrative expenses in connection with this title, shall be paid from said fund. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all approved claims of investors with respect to projects insured under this title, and, in the event said fund fails to make any such payment when due, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the investor the amount thereof, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Moneys in the housing investment insurance fund not needed for current operations under this title shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of said fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed by, the United States. The Administrator may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under this title. Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"TAXATION PROVISIONS

"SEC. 711. Nothing in this title shall be construed to exempt any real property acquired and held by the Administrator under this title from taxation by any State or political subdivision thereof, to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 712. The Administrator may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this title, including, without limiting the foregoing, rules and regulations relating to the maintenance by the investor of books, records, and accounts with respect to the project and the examination of such books, records, and accounts by representatives of the Administrator; the submission of financial and operating statements and the approval thereof; the submission of claims for payments under insurance contracts, the proof of the validity of such claims, and the payment or disallowance thereof; the increase of the established investment if the investor shall make capital improvements or additions to the project; the decrease of the established investment if the investor shall sell part of the project; and the reduction of the outstanding investment for the appropriate operating year or operating years pending the restoration of dwelling or nondwelling facilities damaged by fire or other casualty. With respect to any investor which is subject to supervision or regulation by a State banking, insurance, or other State department or agency, the Administrator may, in carrying out any of his supervisory and regulatory functions with respect to projects insured under this title, utilize, contract with, and act through, such department or agency and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 713. The following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) 'Investor' shall mean (1) any natural person; (2) any group of not more than 10 natural persons; (3) any corporation, company, association, trust, or other legal entity; or (4) any combination of two or more corporations, companies, associations, trusts, or other legal entities, having all the powers necessary to comply with the requirements of this title, which the Administrator (i) shall find to be qualified by business experience and facilities, to afford assurance of the necessary continuity of long-term investment, and to have available the necessary capital required for long-term investment in the project, and (ii) shall approve as eligible for insurance under this title.

"(b) 'Project' shall mean a project (including all property, real and personal, contracts, rights, and choses in action acquired, owned, or held by the investor in connection therewith) of an investor designed and used primarily for the purpose of providing dwellings the occupancy of which is permitted by the investor in consideration of agreed charges: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting the inclusion in a project of such stores, offices, or other commercial facilities, recreational or community facilities, or other nondwelling facilities as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary or desirable appurtenances to such project.

"(c) 'Estimated investment' shall mean the estimated cost of the development of the project, as stated in the application submitted to the Administrator for insurance under this title.

"(d) 'Established investment' shall mean the amount of the reasonable costs, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, carrying out all works and undertakings for the development of a project and shall include the premium charge for the first operating year and the cost of all necessary surveys, plans and specifications, architectural, engineering, or other special services, land acquisition, site preparation, construction, and equipment; a reasonable return on the funds of the investor paid out in the course of the development of the project, up to and including the initial occupancy date; necessary expenses in connection with the initial occupancy of the project; and the cost of such other items as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the development of the project, (1) less the amount by which the rents and revenues derived from the project up to and including the initial occupancy date exceeded the reasonable and proper expenses, as approved by the Administrator, incurred by the investor in, and necessary for, operating and maintaining said project up to and including the initial occupancy date, or (2) plus the amount by which such expenses exceeded such rents and revenues, as the case may be.

"(e) 'Physical completion date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which the Administrator determines that the construction of the project is substantially completed and substantially all of the dwellings therein are available for occupancy.

"(f) 'Initial occupancy date' shall mean the last day of the calendar month in which 90 percent in number of the dwellings in the project on the physical completion date shall have been occupied, but shall in no event be later than the last day of the sixth calendar month next following the physical completion date.

"(g) 'Operating year' shall mean the period of 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date and each succeeding period of 12 consecutive calendar months, and the period of the first 12 consecutive calendar months next following the initial occupancy date shall be the first operating year.

"(h) 'Gross income' for any operating year shall mean the total rents and revenues and other income derived from, or in connection with, the project during such operating year.

"(i) 'Operating expenses' for any operating year shall mean the amounts, as approved by the Administrator, necessary to meet the reasonable and proper costs of, and to provide for, operating and maintaining the project, and to establish and maintain reasonable and proper reserves for repairs, maintenance, and replacements, and other necessary reserves during such operating year, and shall include necessary expenses for real-estate taxes, special assessments, premium charges made pursuant to this title, administrative expenses, the annual rental under any lease pursuant to which the real property comprising the site of the project is held by the investor, and insurance charges, together with such other expenses as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for the proper operation and maintenance of the project, but shall not include income taxes.

"(j) 'Net income' for any operating year shall mean gross income remaining after the payment of the operating expenses.

"(k) 'Minimum annual amortization charge' shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment, except that, in the case of a project where the real property comprising the site thereof is held by the investor under a lease, if (notwithstanding the proviso of section 703 (a) hereof) the gross income for any operating year shall be less than the amount required to pay the operating expenses (including the annual rental under such lease), the minimum annual amortization charge for such operating year shall mean an amount equal to 2 percent of the established investment plus the amount of the annual rental under such lease to the extent that the same is not paid from the gross income.

"(l) 'Annual return' for any operating year shall mean the net income remaining after the payment of the minimum annual amortization charge.

"(m) 'Insured annual return' shall have the meaning ascribed to it in section 701 hereof.

"(n) 'Minimum annual return' for any operating year shall mean an amount equal to 3½ percent of the outstanding investment for such operating year.

"(o) 'Excess earnings' for any operating year shall mean the net income derived from a project in excess of the minimum annual amortization charge and the minimum annual return.

"(p) 'Outstanding investment' for any operating year shall mean the established investment, less an amount equal to (1) the aggregate of the minimum annual amortization charge for each preceding operating year, plus (2) the aggregate of the excess earnings, if any, during each preceding operating year applied, in addition to the minimum annual amortization charge, to amortization in accordance with the provisions of section 705 hereof."

SEC. 402. Sections 1 and 5 of the National Housing Act, as amended, are hereby amended by striking out "titles II, III, and VI" wherever they appear in said sections and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, VI, and VII."

TITLE V—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. (a) Effective upon the date of enactment of this act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of $16,500 per annum, and the members of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner shall each receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

(b) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, is amended by inserting "Federal Housing Administration;" immediately after the semicolon which follows "United States Housing Corporation": *Provided*, That, as to the Federal Housing Administration, the audit required by section 105 of said act shall begin with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1948, and the exception contained in section 301 (d) of said act shall be construed to refer to the cost of audits contracted for prior to July 1, 1948.

SEC. 502. In carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties—

(a) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Administrator may make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out such functions, powers, and duties and for administrative expenses in connection therewith. The Administrator may delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees as he may designate, and may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. The Administrator shall cause to be prepared for the Housing and Home Finance Agency an official seal of such device as he shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal. The Secretary of Commerce or his designee shall hereafter be included in the membership of the National Housing Council.

(b) The Public Housing Administration shall sue and be sued only with respect to its functions under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, as amended. The Public Housing Commissioner may appoint such officers and employees as he may find necessary, which appointments, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall hereafter be made hereunder, and shall be subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; delegate any of his functions and powers to such officers, agents, or employees of the Public Housing Administration as he may designate; and make such rules and regulations as he may find necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. Funds made available for carrying out the functions, powers, and duties of the Administration (including appropriations therefor, which are hereby authorized) shall be available, in such amounts as may from year to year be authorized by the Congress, for the administrative expenses of the Administration. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law except provisions of law hereafter enacted expressly in limitation hereof, the Public Housing Administration, or any State or local public agency administering a low-rent housing project assisted pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937 or title II of Public Law 671, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 28, 1940, shall continue to have the right to maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it where such action is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such housing accommodations are administered, and, in determining net income for the purposes of tenant eligibility with respect to low-rent housing projects assisted pursuant to said acts, the Public Housing Administration is authorized, where it finds such action equitable and in the public interest, to exclude amounts or portions thereof paid by the United States Government for disability or death occurring in connection with military service.

(c) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board (which term as used in this section shall also include and refer to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board), the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, may in addition to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities conferred elsewhere in this act—

(1) with the consent of the agency or organization concerned accept and utilize equipment, facilities, or the services of employees of any State or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization and, in connection with the utilization of such services, may make payments for transportation while away from their homes or regular places of business and per diem in lieu of subsistence en route and at place of such service, in accordance with the provisions of 5 U. S. C. 73b–2;

(2) utilize, contract with, and act through, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, any Federal, State, or local public agency or instrumentality, educational institution, or nonprofit agency or organization with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, and any funds available to said officers for carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties shall be available to reimburse any such agency or organization; and, whenever in the judgment of any such officer necessary, he may make advance, progress, or other payments with respect to such contracts without repard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes;

(3) make expenditures for all necessary expenses, including preparation, mounting, shipping, and installation of exhibits; purchase and exchange of technical apparatus; and such other expenses as may, from time to time, be found necessary in carrying out their respective functions, powers, and duties: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase or contract by said officers (or their agencies), respectively, for services or supplies if the amount thereof does not exceed $300: *And provided further*, That funds made available for administrative expenses in carrying out the functions, powers, and duties imposed upon the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner, respectively, by or pursuant to law may at their option be consolidated into single administrative expense fund accounts of said officers or agencies for expenditure by them, respectively, in accordance with the provisions hereof.

ACT CONTROLLING

SEC. 503. Insofar as the provisions of any other law are inconsistent with the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall be controlling.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 504. Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this act, all powers and authorities conferred by this act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. Notwithstanding any other evidences of the intention of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the controlling intent of Congress that if any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act or its applications to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provisions of this act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the question as to what should be done to provide adequate housing is one that has created distinct differences of opinion. However, there is no difference of opinion as to the need of more housing.

The difference of opinion that does exist centers largely around the question of whether the housing bill should contain a provision for public housing or low-rent and slum-clearance projects. It is difficult for me to understand why there should be any difference of opinion on a subject of this character. The need for this type of housing is so great that in my opinion any comprehensive housing program must make provision for it.

The bill now before the House is exceedingly worth while as far as it goes. I intend to vote for it, but, like many others who will do so, I regret that it does not go further, and include a public-housing program for the low-income group.

Opponents of this type of housing claim that it is contrary to the free-enterprise system for either the Federal, State, or local government to engage in public housing. It is my studied opinion that this objection is not well founded.

The free-enterprise system is based upon the profit theory. It does not engage in activities where there is little or no possibility of profit. We would not

expect nor suggest that it should be otherwise. Therefore, where the public interest requires that the Government step in and do what private enterprise, for lack of assured profits, is unwilling to do, it cannot rightfully be said that Government is invading the field of private enterprise.

Private enterprise during the years 1947 and 1948 has done a fine job in its efforts to build homes and dwelling apartments. It is estimated that upward of 1,000,000 additional housing units will be constructed during the present year. The building industry should be commended for what it has been able to accomplish under adverse conditions. The shortage of material and labor has prevented even a greater record from being made. But no matter how commendable the record of private industry has been in this respect we must acknowledge that practically all of the dwelling units provided by it during the past 2 years have been of a kind and character that only those with substantial incomes could buy or rent. It has been beyond the reach of the low-income group. It does not represent types of construction of which they can take advantage. They have neither the financial ability to purchase nor sufficient income to pay the high rents necessary for the homes and dwelling units now being constructed. The price is far beyond their ability to pay.

Therefore, if private industry is not justified from a profit standpoint in constructing dwellings for the low-income group, or to engage in slum-clearance projects, and I do not see how they can be expected to do so, then the only alternative is for some agency of government to step in and do the job. And, in this connection, it is my judgment that the State or local government is best equipped to construct and operate such projects.

As previously stated, I think the bill should have made provision for a program of public housing to bring homes within reach of the low-income group. However, I shall vote for the bill because it is good, very good, as far as it goes. Furthermore, I am encouraged to believe that a more comprehensive bill will be enacted at the next session of Congress convening in January next.

THE SPECIAL SESSION AND 1949

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the present bill because I am convinced that it will prove to be helpful in relieving the housing shortage. After all, in essence this bill does take substantial parts of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and enact them into law. It does exclude—and I think unfortunately—the provisions of that bill for the public construction of low cost rental housing and for slum clearance.

I wish to go on record once more, as I have repeatedly done in the past, that I favor properly guarded legislation providing aid for the municipal construction of low cost rental units, with an accompanying slum-clearance program. I am not impressed with the argument that this is a socialistic measure. I have observed the actual operation of low cost housing projects in my district, particularly in Atlantic City. The administration of those projects is good. The overwhelming percentage of the people living in them are paying all the rents they possibly can afford, and paying them promptly. The net results of these operations have cost the Government very, very little. The social benefits derived from slum clearance and decent housing units in Atlantic City have been inestimable. Mayor Joseph Altman of that city, who has made a continuing and careful study of this problem, is firmly convinced that the housing units have been directly responsible for a marked decrease in juvenile delinquency, and a general reduction of fire hazards and police problems.

In our economic system there will always be many people who despite their best efforts, and despite hard work will be unable to afford houses of minimum decency. These people cannot afford to purchase houses at their present inflated values, and they cannot afford to pay rents that private capital would be obliged to charge them. This is a problem which in my judgment must be solved, and I intend to continue my efforts to solve it.

At this special session, we were not afforded the opportunity to consider and vote upon public housing. I hope and believe that the issue will come up and be disposed of early in 1949.

HIGH COSTS

Mr. Speaker, present high costs have many causes. Among them is a high level of wages, and a very particular villain is extravagant government spending. Mr. Truman's $40,000,000 budget, and his general inflation program will be curtailed by a strong Republican President with a united Republican Congress.

Even without these causes, the huge and necessary expenditures on rearmament, and the billions of dollars worth of commodities that are being poured into Europe will still create high prices. It is, therefore, even more necessary that Government extravagance, and every other unnecessary cause leading to inflation should be controlled. It will not be done under the direction of a spending Executive, and it cannot be done at a special session, conceived as a political maneuver, and not for the benefit of the people.

I greatly regret that the Senate would not modify the displaced persons bill, and remove features that are discriminatory. I repeat that the bill passed by the House was a sound approach to the problem. This too, I think we will have the time and opportunity to correct at the regular session.

And to conclude by repeating what I said yesterday, and on many previous occasions: A Republican President and a Republican Congress will amend the Senate rules to prevent filibustering, and pass an adequate and an American civil rights program.

The special session was, of course, unable to function. The Government was divided against itself, and the Congress has no confidence in the executive department. One thing alone, the exposure of the infiltration of communism into high Government offices has been sufficient to destroy that confidence. I look forward to the early months of 1949 when a reunited government, purged of subversive and incompetent influences, will be able to do the job required of us.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the people are demanding congressional action to encourage the availability of reasonably priced homes and low-cost rental units, because they are desperately in need of them.

I am glad that we are being allowed today to take a step, however feeble and inadequate it may be, in recognition of the critical need.

I appreciate that on many of the measures proposed for consideration at this special session, the Members can find reason for doing nothing by a plea there is simply not time enough for the study and investigation that would be required. One subject, however, is an outstanding exception; that is housing.

This problem, however, has been already exhaustively investigated by both Houses of Congress. At least three congressional committees have conducted full-scale hearings on housing relief, and one committee traveled all over the country gathering evidence. There could be no excuse for adjourning this session without enacting remedial measures in correction of the admitted housing shortage crisis.

We have been genuinely concerned with the difficulties of peoples all over the world, and have passed substantial relief measures to help them overcome their difficulties, but we have done little or nothing for the relief of our people here at home.

Too many persons in this country are acutely suffering because of the housing shortage and the high prices of available houses and apartments to have this problem dismissed with a shrug of the shoulders. One of the greatest travesties of justice and duty, in modern times, has been visited upon the American people in this matter of providing housing relief. The results are visible on all sides, in the continuing scarcity of homes, particularly in the low-cost field. Veterans who returned to the accompaniment of promises that homes would be found for them are still living doubled up in the houses of their parents and relatives. Rental dwellings are practically impossible to locate in almost all sections and home seekers are too frequently compelled to buy houses priced above their means, simply because they have no other choice.

You will recall that during the first session of this Congress, a joint committee on housing, consisting of Members from both the Senate and this House, was created. May I read an extract summary of the findings and recommendations which that committee made after holding hearings over a period of many weeks in various parts of the United States:

This committee was set up as a joint committee of both the Senate and the House at the end of the first session of the Eightieth Congress in July 1947 to make a thorough study and investigation of all phases of the housing problem. This committee, beginning with September 10, 1947, and continuing through January 28, 1948, held 51 days of hearings in 23 cities and heard 1,286 wit-

nesses. The testimony alone takes up 6,100 printed pages. In addition, various members as subcommittees of the committee conducted special investigations on basic housing problems, and made detailed reports on such topics as the high cost of housing, slum clearance, building materials, and the effects of taxation upon housing. The final report of the committee filed March 15, 1948, essentially represented an endorsement of the basic programs contained in S. 866. More specifically, the report recommended the prompt enactment of comprehensive housing legislation, including a program providing a direct attack upon the basic problem of high housing cost through a program of housing research, and special FHA and RFC insurance and loan aids for modernized methods of construction both on site and through the prefabrication process; a secondary market for FHA and GI loans; revision and improvement of FHA's insurance programs to meet the needs of lower-income families and veterans; a yield insurance program; a program of Federal loan and subsidy assistance to urban redevelopment; a program to extend public low-rent housing; and a program of Federal loans and subsidy aids for farm housing.

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to go into prolonged details on a subject that has been so extensively debated on this floor, but I submit it is not superfluous to discuss the housing situation in the terms in which it is regarded by our people—terms of their need for homes in which to live as Americans should, in which children can get a fair start in life, and which will provide the inspiration which all of us must have to make life worth living.

I call your attention to the needs of nearly 3,000,000 families who do not have any homes at all, but are living with their in-laws and other families and of the 500,000 living in trailers, rooming houses, temporary housing, and other makeshift accommodations. I call your attention to the needs of more than 5,000,000 families in cities and surrounding areas, whose homes fall below decent living standards. May I direct emphasis also toward the families on the farm whose homes are shacks which should be replaced, or, at minimum, need major repairs in order to make them livable. I am not going to recount the vast number of farm homes which do not have the sanitary facilities which have become so essential for safe living in our cities.

These are the reasons why a comprehensive housing bill should be of paramount consideration in this House today; these are the reasons why I deeply regret we are not being permitted to enact an adequate housing relief measure; these are the reasons why I earnestly hope that the early days of the next Congress will see proper action taken to encourage the all-out production of homes and rental units for the people of the United States, at prices they can afford.

In the meantime, I shall support this present measure, and urge my colleagues to do so, because it contains a few provisions of moderate assistance toward the eventual cure of our housing crisis.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for H. R. 6959, an amendment to the National Housing Act of 1948, as proposed by the substitute amendment offered by Senator MCCARTHY and which passed the Senate yesterday, as it gives incentive and protection to private industry in the construction of apartment houses, small homes, and to invest funds in big rental projects. The principal provisions of the McCarthy bill, as I see it, are as follows:

First. Low- and middle-income families would be allowed 95 percent insured mortgages on houses costing $6,000 or less.

Second. Construction loans would be provided for builders of low-cost homes, with an 80-percent insured mortgage for builders of 25 or more units priced under $7,500 each.

Third. Owner-occupied homes would be eligible for more liberal loans, such as a 90-percent insured mortgage for single-family units costing up to $6,300 instead of the present $5,400.

Fourth. Large-scale rental projects would be allowed 90-percent insured mortgages. The $1,350 cost limitation per room would be removed and a family unit maximum of $8,100 substituted.

Fifth. A minimum return of 2¾ percent a year on investment, plus 2 percent for amortization, would be guaranteed by the Government to those making investments in construction of rental property for lower- and middle-income groups.

Sixth. Prefabricated-housing manufacturers would be allowed more liberal loans.

Seventh. An additional $35,000,000 would be provided for insuring loans for home modernization and improvement.

Eighth. A new division in the housing and home-finance agency would be set up to work toward the standardization of building codes and measurements.

Ninth. To discourage apartment-house signs reading "no children" by requiring the apartment-house beneficiaries of Government financial help to take an oath that they will not discriminate against youngsters.

I regret very much that the proposed housing bill does not include any provision for public housing, slum clearance, and rural housing. I reiterate my stand on this matter as appears in my remarks made on the floor of the House on June 18, 1948, at the time H. R. 6959 was under consideration. I have not changed my mind nor my position on this matter.

In Connecticut we have a severe housing problem primarily because of our greatly increased population, particularly in the defense industrial areas, and this is particularly true in New Haven in my congressional district. The need today in Connecticut is estimated at some 40,000 housing units. In New Haven alone there are some 1,500 families seeking shelter in low-rent housing units. While private industry has done a remarkable job, it has not been able to produce houses in sufficient number and at a price which the ordinary individual could afford to purchase or rent.

Under the bill providing for public housing it is permitted only when it definitely appears that private industry has been unable to cope with the situation and the particular community votes in favor of it, and specifically provides that there shall be no interference or competition with any private construction, and certain guaranties are made to local housing authorities set up under the laws of the States involved.

I am of the opinion that provision should be made now for assistance to local communities for the provision over a period of years of a maximum of at least 500,000 units of low-rent public housing for families of low income with additional safeguards written into the act to increase local responsibility and avoid any competition with private housing. If subsequent events demonstrate that this program is no longer required, I am sure that the Congress would take the necessary action to repeal such legislation as no one wishes the Government to inject itself into any situation where private enterprise can operate.

Provision should be made now for Federal aid to local communities to enable them to undertake the clearance of their slums and blighted areas so as to make such areas available for redevelopment with the active participation of private enterprise.

Such legislation would be extremely helpful to the people of the State of Connecticut in their effort to relieve the intolerable housing conditions which now prevail.

I do not find any fault with what is contained in the bill as presented, but am concerned with what is left out of the bill. I am satisfied the legislation as written, however, will have a very beneficial effect for it liberalizes loans for low-cost housing and veteran cooperatives and increases the so-called secondary market, and the whole spirit of the bill tends toward encouraging private industry in its endeavor to solve this troublesome problem.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL] is unable to be present today due to the fact he is convalescing from an operation. He had asked me to have him paired in favor of this housing bill, H. R. 6959. Inasmuch as I am unable to pair him for the bill, due to the fact there is no one desiring to be paired against it, I use this means of recording in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VAIL] desired to be paired for the bill.

THIS SOMEWHAT HOUSING BILL

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am not voting for this bill because I like it, or because it will even start to do the job we need to do in housing, or because I condone the absolute and tragic failure of this Congress to come to any constructive housing legislation—or to come to any constructive legislation, period.

This is a time when the real-estate lobby takes the cake, and the people take the crumbs, and I am forced to the unwelcome position of voting for the crumbs because I find myself in a minority so small we cannot even make our voices heard.

But, Mr. Speaker, I warn the majority, and now I am speaking not alone of the Republican majority, but the majority of the Members of this House who have been deaf to the cries of the people for housing, that this one issue alone is likely to be enough to change the constituency of this House next January.

My enthusiasm for decent American housing for decent American citizens is not an aimless and casual enthusiasm.

This is a problem which lives with me and the people I represent 24 hours a day. I believe, and my people believe, that houses, yes, and butter and chops and clothes for our back, should come before guns and cantonments. We do not believe that the problem of shelter is solved by merely calling names. We do not believe that the two-ring circus of character assassination staged here in Washington the last 2 weeks is going to make up for the loss of action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner long-range housing bill.

BREAD AND CIRCUSES

Some forgotten Roman politician invented the age-long slogan, "Give the people bread and circuses."

The Republican Party learned that lesson imperfectly; your party has forgotten the bread, and circuses alone are not diverting enough to make the people forget their deep anger at the failure of this Congress to do something positive about critical problems like housing, not to mention high prices.

I am speaking now, Mr. Speaker, about the housing problem which faces the American people; and yet I call your attention to the fact that it is difficult to confine myself to construction problems alone. The ruinous inflation about which you also have done nothing effective is so deeply intertwined with the shortage of housing in which people of small means can live without bankruptcy that it cannot be separated.

This was a time for bold and drastic measures.

This Republican majority has responded to the crisis with timid exclamations.

You have tried to solve the vital problems pressing down on our people by declaring rapidly that no problem exists.

You are wrong; and I foresee that an aroused electorate will give its verdict at the polls next November.

THESE MADE THE FIGHT

One of the things which we want to have clear and sharply defined is this: This abject surrender to special privilege and vested interest is the direct responsibility of the Republican leadership in the House.

When discharge motion No. 6, to bring the T-E-W bill to the floor was initiated more than a year ago, the list of names at first grew slowly. My own name is there early in the list.

Names were added more rapidly after the second session began. Republican Members who dared risk the displeasure of the leadership boldly signed the petition.

When, in this brief unhappy session, our own leader added the prestige of his honorable service, seniority, and leadership by signing the petition, the Republican leadership "turned on the heat." No more Republicans signed; and I understand that some who had signed, under the lash of party pressure, withdrew their names.

Do they believe that their constituents will admire this display of pusillanimity? Will the people who can neither pay fortunes for palaces nor exorbitant rentals for hovels place party conformity above their own needs?

I doubt it, Mr. Speaker, I doubt it.

No. The only Members of this Congress who can or will get any credit for making the hopeless fight are those who put their names on that discharge petition and kept them there.

Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, a well-known builder and reputable businessman whose office is in my district, an easy walk from my own New York office, enlisted my aid 4 months ago in trying to solve his financial problems. The interest strike of the banks, the limitations written into the authority of the RFC by this Congress, and the quadrupled cost of metropolitan construction had him just about licked.

I gave him every possible cooperation; but our combined efforts could not overcome the failure of this Congress to enact new, long-range, comprehensive housing legislation.

He finally decided to come to Washington to plead for himself and for the veterans who had pledged their corporate cooperation in the erection of a 152-unit veterans' cooperative housing project in New York.

That gentleman is Mr. Teel Williams, president of the Basic Builders Corp., a former housing official and a former newspaperman. With him in his door-to-door legislative canvass of the majority leaders was Mr. John Rega, president of the Cooperative Engineers Co. of Cleveland, a firm which proposed to construct similar cooperative projects in four Ohio cities.

Teel Williams, himself a veteran of World War I, and the father of a veteran of World War II, speaks eloquently in his own right. Out of the rage and frustration he felt after 5 days of fruitless work here on the hill, he sat up all Thursday night, writing a statement which, with my help, reached the Members last night. Mr. Williams is addressing himself to only a small, specific sector of the core of the housing problem; but his reputation and his project give his words weight.

I am inserting his statement at this point because I think it is a proper part of the record of this mousy legislation:

Disillusioned, discouraged and disgusted with the attitude of the present Congress, Teel Williams, president of Basic Builders Corp., today announced the abandonment of a 600-family New York City $11,000,000 veteran cooperative housing project with the prediction that over 1,000,000 veteran families in our larger cities will be deprived of housing over the next year to 2 years by failure to pass legislation at this session to enable fully organized and veteran approved cooperative projects to proceed.

Concerned by petty, partisan considerations, veterans' cooperative housing (developed at many thousands of dollars' cost in full cooperation with and the approval of the Veterans' Administration, supported by exhaustive review and certified loan commitment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation) is being allowed to wither on the vine in the present unsightly scramble for political advantage, declared Mr. Williams.

Apparently Veterans' Administration cooperative housing projects are considered outcasts, "unclean, untouchables" by either our largest insurance companies or private banking institutions and also by the Congress in the present arguments over the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill.

After 2 years of painstaking development with the Veterans' Administration, our Great Oaks project in Riverdale, New York City has received full approval and a $1,800,000 commitment from Reconstruction Finance Corporation only to find that no private lending institution in New York will touch it "because it is a veterans' cooperative project."

Confidently expecting relief from the present special session of Congress, "we naively came to Washington thinking the Banking and Currency Committee would welcome full documentation of this first large veterans project of its kind to emerge with full approvals ready to break ground. Instead we have encountered indifference and worse in the cat-and-dog fight over the question of public housing."

Two years ago we started the planning of Great Oaks with the Veterans' Administration as one part of a program to meet the housing needs of veterans of New York City, as disclosed by a careful survey. Great Oaks was only one project so planned. Another totaled over $60,000,000. We were to be the pattern for hundreds of thousands of veterans' apartments in all of our major cities.

Great care was exercised by the Veterans' Administration to avoid any possible criticism and to set up a practical, workable program. It is estimated that $15,000 was spent by the Veterans' Administration alone and many times that by ourselves as builder sponsors in the months of tedious technical and legal studies and revisions of the Great Oaks plan. Every contract and lease form was especially drafted. The Veterans' Owning Corporation was formally organized, the charter and bylaws written and rewritten, and veteran officers elected. On April 14, 1947, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, then Administrator, affixed his official signature to a voluminous Veterans' Administration approval. This in turn set up such extraordinary conditions for the protection of the veteran as the almost unheard of requirement of a 100-percent bond to completion. The Treasury Department only requires 50-percent bonds for post-office buildings and National Housing Administration requires none at all. The builder's profit on his firm and bonded contract figure to the Veterans' Corporation also was limited to specific construction items amounting to less than 8 percent or to an estimated 3.8 percent after taxes. Topping off the approval was the requirement that the itemized and audited estimates of the builder's contract figures should be submitted to an independent committee of appraisal experts to be appointed by the Veterans' Administration but at the expense of the builders.

Without even the privilege of meeting with the panel of distinguished appraisers, chairmanned by S. Edwin Kazdin, of New York City, twice president of the American Appraisal Association, we were required to place $5,000 in escrow to guarantee payment to the panel, win, lose, or draw. Fortunately, the independent studies of these appraisers arrived at figures within 2.2 percent of our own, or at a fair selling price to the veteran of $2,700,000 for each of four 12-story modern fireproof apartment buildings of some 3,030 rooms of 3-, 4½-, 5½-, and 6½-room apartments. Great Oaks thus emerged as the first big city veterans' cooperative project so fully approved and expected to be the model for a vast national program for veteran residents of all our major cities.

But there developed at this point an unexpected and to date an insurmountable financial road block. The approval of the Veterans' Administration was intended to carry a guaranty of $4,000 for each veteran purchaser of an apartment under the home loan provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Act, or the so-called GI bill of rights. But the drafters of this act had never con-

ceived anything beyond small homes for which a deed and individual mortgage would be delivered. How could individual deeds and mortgage be given for apartments one above the other and over the same plot of ground? Obviously only one deed and one master mortgage is practical for an entire apartment building. Therefore, ruled the Solicitor's Office of the Veterans' Administration, 100 percent of the apartments in an entire building must be sold and a single deed and mortgage executed before the guaranty of $4,000 for each apartment can be effective.

In other words, at this late date it was necessary to sell all of the apartments, not 50, or 100, or 149, but all 150 in each building from blueprints, pictures, and pretty words, before even beginning construction and before any assurance could be given to a veteran of when he might move in. It cost $23,000 in advertising and sales effort to prove this to be an utter impossibility although 14,000 veterans responded and 1,400 filed written applications for apartments as soon as we could start actual construction.

Answer to this problem finally was sought with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Thomas H. Hickey, Chief of Home Loans Division of the Veterans' Administration, personally presenting an appeal before a hearing presided over by Harvey J. Gunderson, chairman of the Board of Directors, for a loan to start Great Oaks.

Unfortunately for us, Reconstruction Finance Corporation had been taken out of mortgage financing by Congress a year before, but Great Oaks was adjudged eligible for a temporary business loan. After 14 weeks of intensive and exhaustive review and investigation of the entire project, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation finally on July 9 issued a certified commitment of $1,800,000, which with $412,000 additional cash equity from the builders plus the investment to date would complete the first of the four buildings. Of course Reconstruction Finance Corporation retained the Veterans' Administration condition also of a 100-percent bond, and just guarantee that their loan could not become a permanent mortgage loan and thus involve them with possible explanations, they insisted that a permanent financing commitment first be obtained from an acceptable lending institution to bail out their loan on completion of the building.

Quite confident that at last we would quickly be cleared to begin construction, we called in one of the most eminent mortgage brokerage houses in New York to handle the loan application. With beautifully collated portfolio on the project in hand, and the expressed confidence that within 2 weeks the required permanent financing commitment would be obtained, these brokers proceeded to make application with one of the most prominent insurance firms in America. To their and our astonishment and dismay, the application was refused not only by this but by approximately 20 of the largest insurance and banking houses of America. Without saying so in so many words, we were quietly given to understand that it had become the adopted and firm policy of all such institutions to have nothing whatsoever to do with the financing of veteran cooperative projects.

Reporting back to the Veterans' Administration, T. B. King, Director of Home Loans, told us "that this attitude had become universal; that the insurance companies and large savings banks visualize picket lines around their counting rooms in the event that buildings might have to be foreclosed. There is even a squeeze on," he told us, "by these institutions to obtain higher interest rates on veteran small-house loans, and that such lending also has almost come to a standstill." No other alternative is now left but Government underwriting.

We knew that while our negotiations were under way with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, measures had been introduced before the Eightieth Congress to give relief in this veteran housing financing emergency. The 95-percent 40-year guaranty passed in the last few minutes before adjournment as an amendment to the National Housing Act of 1941 seemed to be the answer. But an innocent section of this act limited its benefits to housing costing $1,350 per room. This limitation made the act, though signed by the President, wholly inoperative even for lowest-cost housing, as was quickly recognized. When the special session was called we were given assurances by Members of both Houses of Congress that elimination of this inadvertent ceiling would be a certain and first matter of business.

To our consternation, however, the first move toward correction of this act was reported in the press last Monday as a bill of Senator IVES, providing not for elimination of the $1,350 ceiling, but for its increase to $1,800 per room. For big city fireproof construction such a ceiling would be just as futile as $1,350. This ceiling is now part of Senator MCCARTHY'S proposed bill.

It was amazing to us that there could be so much misconception of the housing problem after all of the fumbling of Wilson Wyatt and almost continuous agitation and investigation since. Apparently housing is still just a matter of "pigs is pigs" even to the members of the housing committees of the Senate and the House. If $1,800 per room is comfortably sufficient to finance all housing needs in Fond du Lac, Wis., it seems blandly accepted as sufficient for New York City. Although there is as much difference between semi-fireproof, 2 to 6 story minimum housing and masonry and steel multi-story fireproof construction on high-priced land under restrictive zoning and rigid city building codes, as there is between a Kiddie-Kar and a Cadillac, this fact has never seemed to occur to our legislators.

Naively thinking that the facts would be welcomed and adequate action, free from partisan considerations, might be taken to relieve this emergency for our veterans, we rushed off explanations and figures by telegram and special-delivery mail to all members of the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees. Then we followed up in person loaded with fully documented records to expose ourselves to any questions. We can hardly say that anybody rolled out the plush carpet for us. In most cases it was a brusk if not totally indifferent brush-off. Where we persisted, astonishment and outright disbelief were expressed at facts we presented such as the average cost of $14,834 per apartment, or over $3,700 per room for the Alfred E. Smith fireproof, slum replacement, tax-exempt project in downtown Manhattan. Fortunately, these were not our figures but the published report Thursday, July 29, 1948, of New York State Commissioner of Housing Herman T. Stichman, and we had been foresighted enough to bring photostated copies.

We suggested that no rigid ceilings should be attempted for our large cities but that these should be left to expert and certified appraisals under the Veterans' Administration. We suggested that low-cost financing of rental as well as cooperative is the real solution to our veterans' housing problem and presented figures to demonstrate that 2½ to 3½ percent, 40- to 50-year 90-percent direct Government loans, approved by the Veterans' Administration and disbursed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, would make apartments costing $18,000 self-liquidating at rentals as low as $16.75 per room per month. We thought our legislators would be delighted at such a simple solution for the public-housing problem. Why subsidized slum-replacement housing of minimum standards when good housing can be provided for the lowest-income GI Joe if financed as we suggest?

One legislator asked, "Why should we be interested in doing anything for New York City or for your firm's selfish interests?" We answered that there were other projects totaling many millions also approved and ready to go and the need for 1,000,000 such apartments or more in all of our big cities. We admitted to being guilty of selfish interest after 2 years of effort and an investment of thousands of dollars for which we offered to show audited statements.

Another, after challenging Stichman's record of New York City's public-housing cost, declared before a number of his associates "that perhaps it is the wrong time to build any big-city housing and we should drop anything but Federal Housing Administration title 6 insurance."

No interest was expressed in the idea of good housing for veterans through direct low-cost Government financing. No interest was shown in the Veterans' Administration cooperative or rental-housing program in general, or our project in particular. No concern was evinced over the abandonment of this and other projects in New York City totaling over $70,000,000 and ready to go, intended to provide the pattern for more than 1,000,000 veteran apartment homes in our large cities. You can say that we are sick, discouraged, and disgusted. The real answer is direct Government financing for veteran cooperatives such as Great Oaks. We doubt that the larger lending institutions will even be interested in 95-percent guaranties at 4½-percent interest. But we don't even have hope for such a guaranty for big-city fireproof housing. And we are left no alternative than to abandon the project, "if Congress now runs away and refuses to face this problem of homeless city veterans."

TEEL WILLIAMS,
President, Basic Builders Corp., New York City.

LAST APPEAL

Mr. Speaker, to complete the record, I include also a last-minute telegraphic appeal made by Mr. Rega, supplementing Mr. Williams' public statement; and I call upon the people of this Nation, and especially upon the veterans, to take note that nothing happened:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August 7, 1948.*

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT,
Senator JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
Representative RALPH A. GAMBLE:

Isn't it possible to save Veterans' Administration cooperative housing?

The Veterans' Homestead Act would do this with ceiling adjustable to certified appraisals of experts for major city fireproof projects.

Two hundred thousand veteran residents of Ohio badly need apartment homes and veteran administration projects similar to Great Oaks and Forest Gate in New York City have been planned for Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton, and Youngstown; but they are impossible to build under limitations of McCarthy bill.

Everybody will applaud your action in saving this worthy emergency veterans' cause.

JOHN REGA,
President, the Cooperative Engineers Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the present bill, while it marks a definite improvement over the previous measure adopted by the House, does not, I conceive, constitute a complete or adequate answer to the critical housing problem now confronting the Nation.

Many American communities are seriously suffering from shortages of housing

accommodations. Construction is proceeding at a remarkably high rate in many places, but it is still lagging behind the cumulative needs of the war and postwar years. Many veterans are still without proper accommodations and are forced to live with their relatives under crowded, and frequently, unwholesome and unpleasant conditions.

Other veterans who are unable or unwilling at this time to undertake the building of a home of their own, which of course is the ideal objective of every citizen, are unable to find reasonably priced, suitable apartments or homes for rent. Indeed, the principal pressing need in the current housing situation would appear to be small houses or apartments that could be rented at reasonable monthly rates. In fact, low-cost rental units are the most urgent need of the veteran and his family at the present time.

To be sure, there is real danger in projecting elaborate housing programs which would be additionally inflationary in their effects, or which would augment existing shortages; high prices and skilled labor and mechanical deficiencies. But the Congress must nevertheless provide an over-all plan—and now—for coordinating the various programs and implementing further construction in necessary categories.

This bill will provide some substantial relief in the present contingency. It broadens credit, insurance, and financing opportunities. It lays a base for easing the position especially of our veterans and low-income groups so that they may be assisted with their housing problems and needs. The bill has many shortcomings which I will not enumerate now. But it is a step in the right direction. It will provide ad interim, temporary, stopgap relief until another session of Congress may be able to tackle the housing problem more comprehensively.

For these reasons, I will support this measure with the hope that it will prove beneficial to those who are in urgent need of low-rental housing accommodations, particularly our veterans who must never be forgotten or overlooked by the representatives of the people.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to add more oil to the inflationary flame by still another over-issue of Government currency to build houses deepens the debacles ahead of us.

WATERY MONEY HAS CAUSED OUR HIGH PRICES

There was a time when the American dollar was a dollar. Its value was stable and dependable as a means of exchange for any transaction in the free market, as a medium of exchange for a bushel of wheat, a suit of clothes, or a house. Today, however, so many dollars have been printed and floated around that it takes more than $2 to buy almost any commodity one would buy before. Commodities do not double in value. But dollars are cut in two by increasing the amount of money in circulation without increasing the values behind them. In earlier days it was the monetary policy of our Government to issue money only equivalent to the value of gold and the products of agriculture, commerce and industry. The money value would not exceed the amount of the gold and the products of agriculture, commerce, and industry. It could never be issued in excess of such values.

However, beginning with 1933 the United States Government began to print money for spending by Government itself without regard to the amount of physical production and services. It continued that policy of printing money without limiting it as exchange for goods. Thus we now have behind our Government-increased currency Government bonds which do not represent real goods but merely promises to pay out of taxes to be collected sometime in the future, whereas our production needs justify the issuance of only about one-half the money now in circulation. That leaves about twice as much money in circulation as there are goods behind it. The balance is pure water. The effect of having $2 floating about for every dollar's worth of production and services leads to the disastrous rise in prices we are now experiencing.

Let us illustrate by a church supper. Food and places have been provided for 200 persons and no more. Then the church committee prints and sells 400 tickets. When the 400 tickets are presented there is naturally confusion, scrambling, and a lot of scolding. What can be done? The church has no money to redeem the excess tickets. It cannot double the food—there is no more. The only way to treat all ticket holders alike is to divide the food into half portions. That means the expected value of each ticket has been cut in two.

It is such a situation that we are facing today. In 1933 when the dilution of the dollar started we had real gold or goods behind every dollar in circulation, a real meal for each ticket. By 1940 the Federal Reserve banks held $2,000,000,000 of Government bonds as reserves against deposits or dollars outstanding. These dollars or deposits were used to pay for Government projects and Government deficits in all of which there was little or no productive value.

Then came World War II when money was continuously printed against a production of war commodities that were blown to bits. The money was printed to meet a national emergency. Instead of taxing we borrowed left and right throughout the war. That is our wartime inflation. By 1945 the Federal Reserve banks had issued billions of dollars. That is why it now takes more dollars to buy a 1939 dollar's worth of production or services.

Prices have about doubled. Since 1939 general wholesale prices have more than doubled, and the cost of food has more than doubled. Thus in 9 years the value of the dollar has dropped to less than half its 1939 value. Yet, inasmuch as our monetary supply against Government bonds is 12 times greater than in 1933 the prices have, as of today, gone only part way up the spiral which will continue until present policies are changed or a bust develops. At first we had a steady, creeping adjustment process of prices rising. Now the creeping has changed to a walk. Soon it may be a run. All of our citizens are in a scramble to get real value for their commodity, production, or services. To get that real value they must get about twice as many dollars today as would have given the same value in 1939. That means that it is the money inflation which is the cause of our trouble. The changing prices only reveal how utterly cheap our dollar has been made by the Government itself.

The President wrongly accuses the terrible people who ought to be regulated and controlled and have their prices fixed, because they are the inflationists. The Government is the culprit, because it alone can over-issue currency or checking accounts. According to Webster, that is inflation. Nothing else.

It is impossible for the people—however terrible—in a free economy of competition to create inflation. The so-called spiral of higher prices is not caused by people or business in the first place but by the Government permitting its printed promises to be used as money before the spiral of higher prices ever started.

Higher prices are the effect, not the cause. Prices for production cannot be too high until the money no longer exists with which to buy them. As long as the goods produced find markets they are not overpriced.

There is therefore no way by which we can bring down prices or stabilize the prices of commodities such as food and clothes as long as potential customers have the watery money and desire to buy more of them than are currently available. It is therefore utterly deceptive and untrue to say that rising prices are the cause of our debacle and to suggest that there can be any change in this critical situation by Government controls of the price of food or rents or houses, unless the watery money itself is first eliminated. This can be done by bringing the money supply down to the real level of national production. We cannot save our economy simply by manipulating the price of goods and services. If we try it they will dry up. We must deal with the money itself. To issue more Government credits for housing proposed must add more oil to the inflationary fires already running. More money forces prices still higher. We ought to force prices lower.

After the special session of the Congress convened, Mr. Marriner S. Eccles came before the House Banking and Currency Committee giving a presentation of the picture such as he saw it. The former Chairman of the Board of the Federal Reserve System warned the Nation that we are in the midst of an inflationary money flood completely unprecedented in our national history. The situation was regarded as so fantastic and dramatic that Mr. Eccles at one point in his testimony exclaimed, "I don't know where we are."

Facing a total national debt of over $250,000,000,000, $47,000,000,000 of which obligation will fall due over the next year, and with the Government spending at the rate of $40,000,000,000 annually, Mr. Eccles observed that if people could only appreciate the true state of facts they might be frantic about their Government bonds. There would be no chance on earth that our Government could honor

in 1939 values its obligations to its own citizens. In the words of Mr. Eccles, "The Federal Reserve System is our greatest engine of inflation." That is to say, the farmer, the laborer, the manufacturer, and the distributor are not the cause of inflation since the real culprit is the Government itself. Our citizens are in fact but the victims of this "engine of inflation"; namely, the Government itself.

The President, however, not only ignored all this but asked the Republican Congress to join with him in a bipartisan deception of the people by giving him additional billions of printed money and asking the Congress for other inflationary measures. On top of that, he proposed a further deception of the citizens by their Government by suggesting that it is possible to arrest the rising prices of goods and services by Government decree without reducing currency. Instead, he asked to continue in fact further inflating of the currency by spending more Government money for public housing, Federal aid to education, Government medicine, insurance, ERP, and the like. It is almost like asking that someone, please, to watch the horse in the barn and at the same time asking the robber to ride it away.

We must not forget, as Governor Eccles repeated, and has so often been pointed out, that wherever and whenever inflation crushes a nation's economy it inevitably wipes out the middle class and leads to widespread bankruptcy. In this connection, we should also remind ourselves of how the German inflation after World War I not only wiped out the middle class of the Weimar Republic but brought on nazism just as night follows day.

No less an expert than Lenin—in fact, all of the disciples of Marx—have taught that the easy and sure way to undermine a free society is to debauch its currency. When that time comes the confidence not only in the monetary system but in the whole order of self-government is destroyed. The people helplessly follow the promises of the demagogs of state socialism.

Can this wicked deception of the people by blaming one group as against another for high prices be stopped? Are not the American people ready courageously to face the fact that they must begin now to pay for the war and the New Deal printing of money. They must pay by accepting now the purchasing power of a depreciated dollar in exactly the same way they might have faced the cost of the war by taxing a greater proportion of the dollars they earned at the time.

Governments finance wars by a deception of the people which tempts them to believe that wars bring about prosperity, inasmuch as easy money flows through their fingers. We face today the same issue that we faced after the Civil War, when candidates ran for election on the basis of utter repudiation of the money issued by the Government to fight the Civil War.

Fortunately a President was elected who dared to tell the people the truth and face the facts. They took the water out of the greenbacks which had no goods behind them in their time. They endured terrific high prices resulting from their currency inflation, just as we are today. Knowing the facts they could not be fooled by such nostrums as price controls to cure a condition that could not be met except by rising prices. That is the challenge we face now and it is time the people understand that truth. If they know what it is they must face they will meet the challenge. If they do not know the facts they will put the blame in the wrong place and the situation will grow worse. They will insist on the wrong solutions. They will blame some political party for their suffering.

The watered currency can be reduced only by the most rigid reduction in the size, operation and expense of this utterly colossal and unmanageable government and by redeeming the currency. The more painful and inequitable course is the one which we are now following, namely suffering price rises which repudiate the value of the dollar by reducing still further its purchasing power. That process cannot come to rest until all the water in the present inflated currency is eliminated.

We can and we must now put our economic house in order, to pay on the home front for the war which our soldiers so magnificently won on the fields of battle. This is exactly what we should have done during the war and many of our fighting forces criticized severely the home front while they were in the battle, that we at home did not have the courage then to be equal to their valor.

If we can maintain our freedom, the inventive, creative, cooperative, and productive capacity of the American people, free from the compulsions, manipulations, and controls of the Socialist state, will once more surprise ourselves and the world. And we will have won the greatest economic victory of our national history. The dollar will, once again, be worth a dollar. Then only can we say that we have won the war.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the measure we are now considering, H. R. 6959, is a vastly improved measure over any housing proposals that we have had before us for a vote, heretofore, in this Eightieth Congress. May I, however, also point out for the RECORD that I signed the discharge petition on the Clerk's desk in a sincere desire and effort to bring out the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill to the floor. I wanted to vote on the provisions of that legislation. The procedures did not bring about such an opportunity, but a study of the pending bill, as amended, upon which we shall shortly come to a vote indicates to me great encouragement for low-cost housing, the need for which is so great in my State of Connecticut. And, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this housing act, if properly administered, will provide many thousands of necessary housing units. A further attestation of this belief, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, will be made by the overwhelming affirmative vote that the Members of this House will give H. R. 6959 when the vote is recorded later today.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the rules be suspended and the resolution be passed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 351, nays 9, answered "present" 4, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—351

Abbitt	Durham	Kearns
Abernethy	Eaton	Keating
Albert	Eberharter	Kee
Allen, Calif.	Ellis	Keefe
Allen, La.	Ellsworth	Kelley
Andersen, H. Carl	Elsaesser	Keogh
	Elston	Kersten, Wis.
Anderson, Calif.	Engel, Mich.	Kilburn
Andresen, August H.	Engle, Calif.	Kilday
	Fallon	King
Andrews, Ala.	Feighan	Kirwan
Angell	Fellows	Klein
Arends	Fenton	Knutson
Arnold	Fernandez	Kunkel
Auchincloss	Fisher	Landis
Bakewell	Flannagan	Lane
Barrett	Fletcher	Lanham
Bates, Mass.	Fogarty	Larcade
Battle	Folger	Latham
Beall	Foote	Lea
Beckworth	Forand	LeCompte
Bell	Fuller	LeFevre
Bender	Fulton	Lemke
Bennett, Mich.	Gamble	Lewis, Ky.
Bennett, Mo.	Garmatz	Lewis, Ohio
Bishop	Gary	Lichtenwalter
Blackney	Gathings	Lodge
Bland	Gavin	Love
Blatnik	Gearhart	Lusk
Bloom	Gillette	Lyle
Boggs, Del.	Gillie	Lynch
Boggs, La.	Goff	McConnell
Bonner	Goodwin	McCowen
Boykin	Gordon	McCulloch
Bradley	Gorski	McDonough
Bramblett	Gossett	McGarvey
Brehm	Graham	McGregor
Brooks	Granger	McMillan, S. C.
Brophy	Grant, Ala.	McMillen, Ill.
Brown, Ga.	Grant, Ind.	Mack
Brown, Ohio	Griffiths	MacKinnon
Bryson	Gwynne, Iowa	Macy
Buchanan	Hagen	Madden
Buck	Hale	Mahon
Buckley	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Maloney
Bulwinkle		Manasco
Burke	Hall, Leonard W.	Mansfield
Burleson		Martin, Iowa
Busbey	Halleck	Merrow
Butler	Hand	Meyer
Byrne, N. Y.	Hardy	Michener
Byrnes, Wis.	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Calif.
Camp	Harness, Ind.	Miller, Conn.
Cannon	Harris	Miller, Md.
Carroll	Harrison	Miller, Nebr.
Carson	Hart	Mills
Case, N. J.	Hartley	Monroney
Case, N. Dak.	Harvey	Morgan
Celler	Havenner	Morris
Chadwick	Hays	Morrison
Chelf	Hedrick	Muhlenberg
Chenoweth	Heffernan	Multer
Chiperfield	Herter	Mundt
Church	Heselton	Murdock
Clason	Hill	Murray, Wis.
Coffin	Hinshaw	Nicholson
Cole, Kans.	Hobbs	Nodar
Cole, Mo.	Hoeven	Norblad
Cole, N. Y.	Hoffman	O'Brien
Colmer	Holifield	O'Hara
Combs	Holmes	O'Toole
Cooper	Hope	Pace
Corbett	Horan	Passman
Cotton	Huber	Patman
Crosser	Hull	Patterson
Crow	Jackson, Calif.	Peden
Cunningham	Jackson, Wash.	Peterson
Curtis	Jarman	Pfeifer
Dague	Jenison	Philbin
Davis, Ga.	Jenkins, Ohio	Phillips, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	Jensen	Pickett
Dawson, Ill.	Johnson, Calif.	Pioeser
Dawson, Utah	Johnson, Ill.	Plumley
Deane	Johnson, Okla.	Poage
Delaney	Jones, Ala.	Potter
Devitt	Jones, N. C.	Potts
D'Ewart	Jones, Wash.	Poulson
Dingell	Jonkman	Preston
Dolliver	Judd	Price, Fla.
Dondero	Karsten, Mo.	Price, Ill.
Donohue	Kean	Rains
Doughton	Kearney	Ramey

Rankin	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Thompson
Rayburn	Scrivener	Tibbott
Redden	Seely-Brown	Tollefson
Reed, Ill.	Shafer	Towe
Reed, N. Y.	Short	Twyman
Rees	Sikes	Van Zandt
Reeves	Simpson, Ill.	Vinson
Rich	Simpson, Pa.	Vorys
Riehlman	Smathers	Vursell
Rivers	Smith, Kans.	Wadsworth
Rizley	Smith, Maine	Walter
Robertson	Smith, Va.	Weichel
Rockwell	Smith, Wis.	Welch
Rogers, Fla.	Snyder	Wheeler
Rogers, Mass.	Somers	Whitten
Rohrbough	Stanley	Whittington
Rooney	Stefan	Wigglesworth
Ross	Stevenson	Williams
Russell	Stockman	Wilson, Ind.
Sabath	Stratton	Wilson, Tex.
Sadlak	Sundstrom	Winstead
Sadowski	Taber	Wolcott
St. George	Talle	Wolverton
Sarbacher	Taylor	Woodruff
Sasscer	Teague	Worley
Schwabe, Okla.	Thomas, Tex.	Youngblood
Scott, Hardie		

NAYS—9

Banta	Crawford	Sanborn
Buffett	Gwinn, N. Y.	Schwabe, Mo.
Clevenger	Mason	Smith, Ohio

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Douglas	Javits	Marcantonio
Isacson		

NOT VOTING—65

Allen, Ill.	Gregory	Murray, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gross	Nixon
Barden	Hébert	Norrell
Bates, Ky.	Hendricks	Norton
Bolton	Hess	O'Konski
Canfield	Jenkins, Pa.	Phillips, Tenn.
Chapman	Jennings	Powell
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Priest
Clippinger	Kefauver	Regan
Cooley	Kennedy	Richards
Coudert	Kerr	Riley
Courtney	Lesinski	Scoblick
Cox	Lucas	Sheppard
Cravens	Ludlow	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	McCormack	Stigler
Dirksen	McDowell	Thomas, N. J.
Domengeaux	McMahon	Trimble
Dorn	Mathews	Vail
Elliott	Meade, Ky.	West
Evins	Meade, Md.	Whitaker
Gallagher	Mitchell	Wood
Gore	Morton	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Canfield with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Priest.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Hess with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Whitaker.
Mr. Mathews with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Vail with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Nixon with Mr. Cravens.
Mr. Morton with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Gregory.
Mr. Phillips of Tennessee with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. McMahon with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. O'TOOLE changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

Mr. MARCANTONIO changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a report from the Committee on Public Lands and that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. BATES of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Passaic Herald-News.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CROSSER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Akron Beacon-Journal.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles and speeches.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY AND THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, namely:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Funds made available by the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, for administrative expenses of the constituent units of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the fiscal year 1949, shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with the Housing Act of 1948 in such amounts as may be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (but not exceeding in the aggregate $2,400,000) and the amounts so approved by the Director of the Budget may be transferred from funds available within such limitations as may be affected hereby for the last quarter of the fiscal year 1949 and obligated during the first three quarters of such fiscal year.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Housing investment insurance fund

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to make available to the Federal Housing Administration for credit to the housing investment insurance fund as provided in the Housing Act of 1948, $10,000,000 to remain available until expended.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

For an additional amount for "automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans," $5,000,000.

SEC. 2. The appropriations and funds herein made available shall be subject to section 402 of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948.

SEC. 3. This act may be cited as the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for $10,000,000 to be turned over to the Treasury Department to take care of the provision which is found just below the top of page 87 of the Housing Act which has just been passed. It also provides $2,400,000 to take care of administrative expenses for the operation of those functions of the Housing Administration which have been supplemented by that act. Authority is given to use this fund by the 31st day of March so that we can again consider the matter when the new Congress comes in in January.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to call to the attention of my distinguished chairman from New York that in section 502 of H. R. 6959, which was just passed by this House, there is a provision which permits the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or the Administrator, to lump the already made appropriation, and therefore permits promiscuously the transferability of funds.

I do not think there is any need of that, and I doubt very much whether the Committee on Banking and Currency had any such intention. I heard no such expression on the part of the committee in any of the discussion on the floor of the House.

Your Subcommittee on Government Corporations, which handles all of these appropriations, has very carefully worked out certain limitations on these various constituent agencies. The Budget as developed by that committee was unanimously developed and unanimously approved by the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and unanimously approved by the House. I think it is in harmony with the sincere objectives of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator. I think it should be made clear, therefore, in the necessary expedition given to this appropriation, that it is

still the intent of this House that they conform to those administrative limitations, except where the exception must come because of the emergency of the new legislation as it applies in the main to the Federal Housing Administration. Under this they could lump it for public housing. In this new bill there is no need for any additional funds. We are trying to clean up the despicable mess there has been in that administration, and we are getting cooperation from the new Administrator. To dump new funds in there now unnecessarily in any amount would defeat the purpose of this Congress.

Mr. TABER. We have tried by limiting the amount that might be available to bring that about. I know I personally feel that the restrictions the subcommittee placed in the Government corporations bill should be lived up to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I join the chairman of my committee and of the subcommittee of which I am a member in stating that I think it is the intention of the committee to carry out as far as can be done the limitations in the appropriation bill. In addition, I would personally like to see the funds that are provided in this bill handled in such a way that they will be traceable when this committee convenes next spring. I state that because over the past several years, not only when the Democrats were in control, but since the Republicans have been in control, we have given a world of time to trying to straighten out some rather unwholesome aspects of some parts of this program. We think we have done that fairly well. I appreciate the fact that the chairman of the committee has indicated it is their intention to go along and see that the Housing Authority goes along with those limitations.

Mr. PLOESER. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say that I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his statement, and I should like to add that this subcommittee will watch this thing closely and will meet again in January if we think they are not living up to that sort of instruction.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Do I correctly understand that the pending resolution calls for an appropriation of $10,000,000?

Mr. TABER. It calls for $10,000,000 to carry out the provision on page 87 of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That is to administer H. R. 6959?

Mr. TABER. Not to administer it, but to provide for the operations of title VII of the insurance fund.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. And that is H. R. 6959, the bill we just passed?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish to express my approval of what my chairman the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] and the gentleman from Mississippi have just said. As a member of the subcommittee on Government corporations, I agree perfectly with the position they take.

Mr. TABER. There is not any question but what the Housing Authority should be on its mettle and be very careful about the way they spend the money that is involved.

I want to call attention to one other thing. We have included $5,000,000 to provide automobiles for disabled veterans in accordance with the provisions of an act which was passed in the closing days of the session. This is the full budget estimate.

The other estimates that were before the committee were either estimates or items which had been considered by the subcommittees and in the conferences between the House and the other body and agreed to by the Congress, with the exception of a few items.

There is an item for motor-carrier claims. That can be taken care of by the President designating somebody with whom claims can be filed. It could not be done in any other way, unless he acted to appoint members to that Commission.

The other situation involved these war-damage claims which were authorized under a certain act passed in the last session of the Congress.

There is no limitation on the time within which claims can be filed. That can be taken care of when the Congress again convenes. There is really no other emergency legislation that should be considered at this time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the chairman also make a statement with reference to the operation of the Displaced Persons Act?

Mr. TABER. Two million dollars has been provided. That is more money than can honestly be spent by the Commission until the time that Congress meets again in January. There is no occasion for going into that any further at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. What did the Displaced Persons Commission ask for?

Mr. TABER. They asked for $4,000,000, and were given $2,000,000. That is plenty of money for them to get along with.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Would the gentleman at this time, if he is ready, and if not, will he please in an extension of his remarks, bring us up to date on the total budgetary situation?

Since the regular session ended, we have had a great deal of controversy about the matter. I have studied the gentleman's figures. I hope that he can bring us up to date on that.

Mr. TABER. I will put that in the RECORD in the extension of my remarks and I am sure that that will cover everything in connection with that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Has the gentleman discussed the proposed appropriations to implement the War Claims Act of 1948?

Mr. TABER. I have discussed that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman be kind enough to explain to the House his views on the need for transfer of funds to implement that act.

Mr. TABER. Substantial funds will not be needed until after claims are filed and adjudicated. Little more than filing can be accomplished before January 1, and that can be accomplished by the President by the designation of someone with whom the claims can be filed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is a motion to suspend the rules and pass an appropriation bill. It is a very unusual procedure, seldom resorted to in the consideration of major appropriation measures.

Of course, any motion to suspend the rules is a departure from normal procedure. That was the statement made by Speaker Longworth in passing on a point of order in the Seventy-first Congress. He prefaced his decision on that occasion with the statement that any motion to suspend the rules was not a normal procedure. Then, he went on to say that it was not only an abnormal procedure but it was not a fair procedure, because it gave no opportunity for adequate debate; it denied the right to amend; and was an arbitrary process, as he said, justified only in extreme emergencies.

Now, we have no emergency here. There is nothing to warrant a departure from the usual routine in the consideration of appropriation bills under the rules of the House. There is ample time. It is months before election. We have approximately 3 months in which to stay here and transact business that should be transacted in a leisurely and orderly manner. There is no occasion for us to omit the usual safeguards in keeping with the customary procedure of the House; no reason why full debate should be denied; and certainly no justification for denying the right to perfect the measure by amendment. There is no reason why we should not give ample and exhaustive consideration to this and the numerous other urgent problems awaiting disposition by Congress at this session.

There are various requisitions for appropriations as well as numerous legislative needs which the country expects Congress to take up at this time and which should be disposed of before adjournment.

For example, we have estimates of an urgent nature which have been transmitted from the Bureau of the Budget and on which hearings should be held with a view to submitting them to the House as a part of the pending bill or some more carefully considered bill of this character.

Most of them provide for needs which it is claimed have developed since the annual supply bills were passed and are therefore entitled to study.

For example, here is a request for an appropriation for the Department of the

Interior, for the expenses of power transmission facilities, which they say is urgently needed at this time.

Here is an estimate for construction, operation, and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Now, certainly these matters of operation and maintenance, not to mention matters of construction, should have at least cursory attention.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will permit me to complete my statement I shall be glad to yield.

Then, there is also a request here in the budget estimates for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Reclamation, which ought to be taken up in connection with any deficiency appropriation bill considered at this time.

There is likewise an estimate for an appropriation for construction of a project in Idaho. The Congress has authorized the construction of a dam there, and funds should be provided in this bill if shown to be needed. It is claimed that construction should be pushed as rapidly as possible in order to meet the seasonal condition which obtain there.

Then, here is an item, for operation and maintenance—not construction—but operation and maintenance of a project in California. Also, for the Columbia Basin project in Washington. And the estimates include provisions for the Shoshone project in Wyoming.

There is also said to be need in the general construction fund for construction of the Davis Dam project. The Congress passed legislation declaring it should be constructed and the committee should go into the matter of whether the entire amount is needed.

Likewise, the Central Valley Project in California is said to be in immediate need of $3,999,000 for transmission lines and for various other purposes on which I do not have time to go into in detail.

Also the Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado, the Hungry Horse project in Montana, the Columbia Basin project in Washington, and the Fort Peck project in Montana, all have been authorized by Congress after extensive hearings and due consideration but are said to lack sufficient funds.

Although gentlemen may insist that these needs are not warranted, or that they have been taken care of, the fact remains that these estimates here enumerated have been submitted to the Department and the Department after careful screening has submitted them to the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau of the Budget, after further estimate and consideration, has presented them to Congress for urgent and emergency action at this session. The House has referred them to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered them to be printed and they are available at the Document Room as House Document No. 735 and House Document No. 736. But the Committee on Appropriations refuses even to hold hearings on them, and although they are submitted as emergency matters which should be provided for during the vacation which we are shortly scheduled to take and which we are told will extend to December 31, the committee refuses to give them any study whatever.

Now, for the Missouri River Basin.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will permit me to complete my statement I shall be glad to yield.

This amount for the Missouri River Basin is reimbursable, and is estimated to be among the needed projects. The estimate is accompanied by a recommendation for funds for the Mississippi River Basin and the Canyon Valley project in Montana.

Then there is included here recommendations for appropriations for the Construction Division of the Bureau of Reclamation without which that work must necessarily be curtailed.

And estimates under the National Military Establishment are before the committee; certainly Congress should investigate needs for flood control. The annual losses due to inundation in this area reach into the millions of dollars and has materially interfered with the production of food products of strategic importance at this critical time. The over-all project for area control includes Bull Shoals project in Arkansas, Lakely Mountain Reservoir in Arkansas, Narrow Reservoir in Arkansas, Fort Gibson Reservoir in Oklahoma, the Quigley Reservoir in Texas, the Wolf Creek Reservoir in Kentucky, the Garrison Reservoir in North Dakota, and the Folsom Dam in California—and I may add, at the suggestion of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], although no specific estimates appear in this particular document, provision for the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway.

Also included in House Document No. 736 are estimates for funds to be appropriated for the Displaced Persons Commission. A task half accomplished is sometimes worse than none at all. They have asked here for $4,000,000. We propose to give them in this bill only $2,000,000. We should inquire whether this amount is inadequate.

Then under the Civil Service Commission funds are required for Panama construction annuity funds. This item should have attention and investigation before Congress adjourns.

Under the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act it is insisted there is an imperative need for funds to establish the new agency. Our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York, calls attention to the fact that the President may appoint other officials who are already in the Government employ to initiate this activity. I believe you will concede that all such officials have enough business of their own to require their entire time and attention. If they have not, they ought not to have the jobs. Their time is fully taken up with duties which have been entrusted to their care, yet it is suggested that they divide their interest and attention and slight their present work by assuming the further burden of the administration of the Motor Carrier Commission, the work of which will be particularly exacting at this time because they are establishing new activities and must start from the ground up. Either they must neglect their own duties or they must neglect the work of the new commission.

Now, we come to the War Claims Commission, and I have introduced a separate appropriation bill to take care of this agency, which, incidentally, has not received consideration by the committee.

The War Claims Commission has been authorized by act of Congress and provides for a variety of beneficiaries.

For instance, there are claims of prisoners of war who certainly have rights which should be taken care of and taken care of immediately. The longer we defer consideration, the longer we deny them justice. Who will say that those who went through the rigors of foreign incarceration under a ruthless enemy regime, who suffered grievously thereby, should go without prompt redress simply because the committee refuses to appropriate money for a commission which has been authorized by an act of Congress?

This item also provides for settlement of claims of internees, of employees of contractors and of religious organizations which sustained damages and injuries as a result of enemy action during World War II. Why should they be required to wait when it must be paid eventually, and we could as easily as not include the amount here? Why should funds not be included in this bill in order to compensate for these injuries where it is shown to be needed?

There is also the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, which has an estimate here for administrative expenses necessary for the proper discharge of the functions of the Bureau.

Then there is the provision for the mining experiment stations, particularly timely when we are trying to stock pile material for eventualities which may be precipitated unexpectedly.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether these appropriations are needed or not. But hearings should have been held and an opportunity given to justify them. No one can tell what should have been appropriated or whether anything should have been appropriated, but they should at least have had consideration.

Mr. Speaker, to pass a law recommending these appropriations and authorizing these activities, and then fail to provide the money is merely a gesture. Some might be unkind enough to say that it is a misleading and deceptive gesture to give the impression we are going to take care of these urgent needs, while denying the funds to implement the law.

The bill, as presented, may be inadequate. We had a Budget estimate for the Housing and Home Finance Agency of $3,800,000. The bill now before the House, under a motion to suspend, has had no hearings, no study, no real consideration. It only provides $2,400,000. That may be enough but nobody knows. No attempt has been made to give a reason why we should not appropriate $3,800,000 for housing.

After we have eliminated some of the most essential provisions of the bill—after we have reduced the program materially—we may now be further reducing its chances of successful operation by

reducing the amount of money to make it effective. That uncertainty is not surprising in view of the lack of study which has attended the submission of the bill. No hearings have been held on any of these estimates. No meeting of the Committee on Appropriations has been called. No authorization has been asked or given by the Committee on Appropriations for the submission of the bill in this form or any other form. And without hearings or study or authorization—and contrary to the accustomed practice in the consideration and disposition of appropriation measures—the pending joint resolution is thrust into the House on the last day and in the last hours of the session.

No explanation is given for this arbitrary and precipitate action. There is no need or necessity for adjournment, either today or any other day within the next 2 months. This is a very important measure. It is a matter of universal interest throughout the country. It is one of the principal objectives for which the session was called. Opportunity should be given for proponents of housing legislation, and any who are opposed to it, to be heard and it should be studied with some deliberation.

It is evident on the face of it that this meager appropriation is not intended to really solve the problem of houseless and homeless veterans awaiting action by the Congress. It is merely a token appropriation, and purely a makeshift to obviate as adroitly as possible the embarrassment of failing to carry out a party platform pledge.

I shall support the bill because it is this or nothing. But I want to again call attention to the fact that there is no reason why the subject of housing and homes for veterans should not have had more than the 40 minutes' attention this House has given it. There is no reason for Congress adjourning at this time. In fact, there is every reason for Congress not adjourning at this time or any other time until this and other pressing problems of the country have had reasonable consideration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by many Members of this House to make some report to them about my recent survey of conditions in Europe. On this day I have officially reported to the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. By leave granted me, I include this report as part of my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 6, 1948.

Memorandum for the chairman.

Re: Comments on activities and conditions in Europe.

In response to a request by the Secretary of State that his Department's operations in Europe be examined, the full Committee on Appropriations, on June 1, 1948, requested me to study activities arising from the passage of European recovery-program legislation and the increased activities of the Foreign Service. The committee further indicated it desired that I comply with the request of the Secretary of the Army that a survey of feeding in occupied areas by GARIOA (Government and Relief in Occupied Areas) be made. The Secretary of State requested that I look into the possible overlap or duplication by the ECA (European Cooperation Administration) and diplomatic missions, inquire into the effectiveness of the Voice of America program, and report on developments in Czechoslovakia.

Five weeks were consumed in the inspection of the Office of International Exchange in New York and in making studies in France, Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Switzerland. I left Washington on June 21, 1948, and returned on July 29, 1948.

To present a picture of what I was able to cover in the course of my trip, I have broken down my account into subjects which I feel would be of most interest to the committee. For convenience they are outlined below:

	Page No.
1. The Marshall plan	2
2. Crops in Europe	2
3. International Children's Feeding Fund	3
4. American activity in Austria	3
5. Providing food for persons in occupied areas	4
6. American activity in Berlin	4
7. Gen. Lucius Clay and Ambassador Robert Murphy	4
8. Displaced-persons camps	5
9. Expellee and refugee camps	6
10. Stabilization of the German mark	6
11. Dismantling of industry in the Ruhr	6
12. Reports on Czechoslovakia based upon reliable escapee informants	7

THE MARSHALL PLAN

I found the ECA, or Marshall plan, just beginning to operate in some of the countries I visited. The operation, however, was in such an infant stage that I cannot give to the committee any real report on preliminary results. I found Mr. Harriman, the roving Ambassador, very busy setting up his groups in the vaious countries. Mr. Harriman has secured space on two floors of a hotel in Paris where he is setting up his "overall headquarters." He has now selected the chiefs for the various countries and they are fairly well on the way to filling most of the positions. It was my privilege to attend the conference of 18 governments in Paris on Sunday, July 25, where Mr. Paul Hoffman, the ECA Administrator told the Prime Ministers and the representatives of the various countries what the ECA plan stood for—and what this country expected the various members of the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation) to do. It is my firm conviction that Mr. Hoffman made a deep impression on the representatives of these various governments. Both his prepared and extemporaneous speech contained straightforward statements to the effect that the United States Government was not in the relief business, and that the ECA was a 4-year recovery or rehabilitation program. He explained that the people of the United States wanted to help the people of these countries to help themselves. The replies to these statements by the epresentatives of the various governments invariably were to the effect that these representatives would endeavor to sell the idea to their people. They promised to cut down their statistics and give to the American people some actual results. This indicated to me that the entire program was still in the embryo stage and that it will be many, many weeks before real activity and results can be achieved.

After careful consideration and study, it is my sincere belief that amendments to the ECA Act will be necessary sometime in the future. Duplication, overlapping, and interference with orderly diplomatic and foreign-service activity cannot be avoided. As the program proceeds, I seriously recommend that studies be made as to what amendments should be made in order to safeguard the Marshall plan from failure due to possible bypassing of our regular diplomatic and political missions in foreign countries.

CROPS IN EUROPE

Farm crops throughout Germany, France, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Switzerland, will be record-breaking, in my opinion. Rains have been heavy everywhere, and for a time it was feared that too much moisture would cut the large crop prospect. However, there was more than a week of sun, and the drying days have resulted in saving the crop.

While there is a shortage of livestock in some of these countries, the stock that is on hand is in excellent shape and there will be a large amount of feed for fattening. I feel the committee was right in endeavoring to stretch out the ECA funds to 15 months instead of 12 months because it rightly based its judgment on newer crop figures than those submitted by the departments. I visited several hundred farms and talked with farmers who indicated that their yield this year cannot be compared with 1947 figures. In Normandy, some fields of wheat will average 90 to 100 bushels per acre. This statement has been questioned in various American agricultural circles, and also by some Government agencies. In order to substantiate this information, I submit for the information of the committee a letter written by Mr. Ben H. Thibodeaux, chief of the food and agriculture branch in the office of the United States special representative in Europe (ECA). Of course, the secret in this heavy yield of grain is the fact that there was an abundance of moisture and that it cost the French farmer approximately $60 per acre for fertilizer. Incidentally, there will be sufficient fertilizer in France, but that is not true in Germany and Austria.

I visited for some time with Chancelor Figel and Prime Minister Gruber in Austria. Chancelor Figel is a farmer and owns land adjoining the American airport 14 miles inland in the Russian zone. Chancelor Figel is a practical farmer, and he expressed great appreciation to the American people for the assistance given to Austria. He confirmed what many farmers in Austria, Germany, and France told me regarding their requirements. Chancelor Figel stated that the Austrian farmers needed most of all machinery and machinery parts drawn by oxen and horses. He indicated he was not interested in mechanization of small farms though perhaps mechanization would be very good for larger farms. He insisted that the No. 1 priority on Austrian farms was machinery and parts for machinery drawn by animals. He said that the No. 2 need for the Austrian farmers, which is true in Germany, was for fertilizer, and the third priority was for work clothing and work shoes. In talking to farmers in other countries, I find that these requirements are almost staple.

I visited two large farms outside of Paris with Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Harriman where the operator indicated he would like to have more tractors, but I noticed that the animal-drawn farm machinery was a must even in this locality. However, on these large farms ranging from 200 to 1,000 acres, mechanized farming is a necessity. Of course, there is a shortage of this kind of machinery throughout Europe. But emphasis must be centered on horse- or ox-drawn machinery for obvious reasons—return of fertilizer to the land, the high cost of gasoline, and the small acreage of the average farm in Europe

Bread in most parts of Europe (except in Switzerland, etc., where there is no rationing and where everyone seems to be rich) is rationed, and is of such quality that it is unpalatable. All over France, Germany, Austria people were hopeful that the wheat crop would be heavy enough to eliminate the rationing of bread. People in Europe want better bread. Agricultural experts tell me that they will require considerable bread grains from the Marshall plan, and every effort will be made to bring a better bread to

the people of Europe. Europeans will request a large amount of American corn for animal feeding.

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S FEEDING FUND

The committee appropriated $35,000,000 for this fund, and an effort was made to reduce this amount because of certain complaints made to the committee. After some investigation in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere, I find some of these complaints had a sound basis, and a reconsideration of the entire fund should be made when justifications are made for the next fiscal year's appropriations. I was able to witness the activities of this organization, and I feel that with conditions improved in Europe a resurvey will be necessary. I had a conference with Mr. Morris Pate, director of the organization, in Prague, Czechoslovakia. He indicated that some of the benefits of the fund will be spread to the children in occupied areas, such as Germany, where there is considerable malnutrition among children. This is especially true of those found in refugee camps.

AMERICAN ACTIVITY IN AUSTRIA

I cannot say too much in commendation for General Clay and his administration in the occupied areas of Germany, and General Keyes in Austria. In Austria, which has a central government, the task of rehabilitation is considerably less difficult. Minister Eberhardt and General Keyes' staff are an ideal team. They work exceptionally harmoniously with the Austrian Government, in spite of the fact that there is an unusual amount of military activity in Austria on the part of the Russians. I have been informed that the Russians have been holding maneuvers during which live ammunition is used by their ground forces and live bombs are used by their air forces, much to the discomfort of Austrian civilians.

AMERICAN ACTIVITY IN BERLIN

General Clay made it possible for me to fly from Frankfurt to Berlin in a plane participating in the air-food delivery by our air forces. I observed the loading and unloading of these planes. Throughout the time I was there, the weather was practically zero and I witnessed and participated in what I believe was one of the greatest air feats in modern aviation history. General Wedemeyer, whom I met in Germany, told me this air lift was comparable to flying over the hump during the war. This task brought American aviators from all parts of the United States, Hawaii, etc., to Germany. After only a few hours briefing, these aviators were flying to and from Frankfurt and Berlin through the most dangerous flying weather I have ever seen. I was told by Russians, Germans, French, Austrians, and Britishers, who witnessed this aviation feat, that they believed the American aviators were the greatest flyers in the world. This operation could not be as successful as it is without the unusual efficiency of the ground force, radio, and communication experts of the American Air Forces. Knowing something about the problems of aviation and being experienced in radio and telegraphy, I took particular interest in listening in and participating in some of the activities. In my opinion, this operation, although entailing a gigantic amount of expense, may be of great value because it provides unusual experience for our great aviation organization. However, I am hopeful that our diplomacy will be able to solve this Berlin problem in a more economical manner before winter and impossible flying weather sets in. In my opinion, it will be impossible to continue this feeding operation indefinitely.

PROVIDING FOOD FOR PERSONS IN OCCUPIED AREAS

The feeding in occupied areas and the general program of the American occupation, in my opinion, is conducted in a manner complimentary to those in charge of these problems. However, it is a tremendously expensive program and with better crop conditions in Europe and the plan of General Clay to civilianize the program future appropriations should be reduced drastically. Everything points to the conclusion that original estimates of grain needs for all Europe were greatly in excess of what, it now has been established, will be necessary. Our committee chairman and others sufficiently well informed to foresee that estimates of grain needs were exaggerated have again been proven correct. The number of civilian Americans and their dependents in occupied Germany should be reduced.

GEN. LUCIUS CLAY AND AMBASSADOR ROBERT MURPHY

I cannot speak too highly of the work performed by Gen. Lucius Clay, who is supreme chief of our occupation forces in Germany, and his political adviser, Ambassador Robert Murphy. I had the unusual opportunity to see these great Americans working together in a gigantic task in Germany. I also had the opportunity (because of my knowledge of German language) to listen to the unbiased statements made by Germans and other foreigners located in Germany. These statements indicated an unusual respect for both General Clay and Ambassador Murphy. No high commissioner of an occupied country could be called popular. No army of occupation can be really considered popular among the people over which it rules under occupation conditions. I have known both General Clay and Ambassador Murphy over a period of 14 years and my respect for both has not changed. I feel that the people of the United States are efficiently represented by these two Americans. The gigantic tasks they have already accomplished and the new crises which they face are no bigger than the men whom the American Government has selected to solve them.

General Clay's firmness without belligerency, coupled with Ambassador Murphy's finesse in handling difficult situations has made possible our remaining in Berlin under circumstances that under less skillful handling might easily have resulted in war.

DISPLACED-PERSONS CAMPS

(Maintained by the International Refugee Organization (IRO))

I visited a number of displaced-persons camps known as DP camps. The occupants of these camps should be differentiated from what is known as the ordinary expellees, persecutees, escapees, refugees.

The number of persons in DP camps is not known from day to day. I was given all kinds of figures in Europe, and the best I can figure is that they total approximately 650,000 people. The committee will recall that it is anxious that these camps be liquidated as soon as possible. My observations in Europe indicate it will be a long time before liquidation can be achieved because of the rather preferential status of these displaced persons. I went through the invoices of some of these camps and found the feeding in terms of calories varied from camp to camp. The maximum depends upon the management and the genius, you might say, of some of the camp traders. The cleanliness of these camps range from A No. 1 to a most degrading status of sanitation. Everything possible should be done to liquidate these camps and fit the people occupying them into the economy of the country in which they are located, or send them to countries which will take them. The IRO funds are supplemented by the funds, material, and food shipped into these DP camps by various relief organizations. This, together with the fact that some of the occupants are living off of the local economy, gives them a decidedly preferential status, and causes considerable complaint from other refugees, local and American officials, and naturally, from the natives at large.

Many of these DP's are there as the result of the war and many underwent great suffering. However, many of them told me of their appreciation for the anticipation of their possibly coming to the United States under the new DP legislation. Many are anxious to come to other countries of the Western Hemisphere. I feel a majority of these DP's are not satisfied with their lot and do not wish to remain in these camps. However, a large number of them are becoming institutionalized and will remain a great burden upon the American taxpayer unless some additional pressure is started to liquidate the camps.

EXPELLEE AND REFUGEE CAMPS

(These camps are separate and distinct from what are known as DP camps)

I visited a large number of what are known as refugee camps. These people are the expellees from Sudetenland, Yugoslavia, Latvia, Poland, Russia, and many other countries. There are millions of these expellees. They have now been enlarged by the escapees from Czechoslovakia of which there are 8,000 or more. Their plight is most pitiful. Many of them were the finest craftsmen of glass and textiles in the Sudetenland; many of them belonged to the various professions, some were merchants, tailors, bricklayers, carpenters, electricians, plumbers, painters, and farmers. Some of them are politicians. Bavaria gets the largest share. Up to this very moment, more than 600 come into Bavaria each day. They are a drain upon the local economy. There is no international organization to feed them. They talk many different languages. When they arrive, they are doled out to whatever housing is available. Local people must take them in and share whatever room there is in the towns, cities, and on the farms. They are in Germany in such large numbers that there is no longer room in the farm houses or in the city homes for them. As a result the overflow is cared for by local authorities in rough barracks. As many as 40 persons live in 1 barrack room. I have visited many of these barrack rooms in which men, women, both young and old, boys, girls, and children live in a common room. Two-deck beds, with corn husk mattresses and pitiful sanitation is the rule. Expellee doctors tell me that tuberculosis is the No. 1 disease. It is not uncommon for one TB case to come into one of these rooms and spread the disease through the entire group. The caloric ration for this pitiful humanity is less than 1,200 per day. I have retained a copy of the meager daily ration for these people.

As a result of the growth of these refugee or expellee camps, Bavaria is overpopulated by 4,000,000. The Secretary of Interior in Bavaria told me that if Bavaria could be relieved of its refugee and expellee population it could very well take care of its own economy. Bavarian local officials, guided by the American army of occupation are encouraging new industries on the part of these refugees. However, export orders far exceed production due to the lack of raw working material available for many of the experts included in the ranks of these refugees.

What the winter will bring in the way of suffering and death to these people is far beyond comprehension unless some additional aid is given to these expellees through the generosity of the American Government and American charitable organizations.

I have talked to hundreds of these expellees and asked them where they wished to go. Invariably the answer is, "We want to go home." Home to them is many countries, Sudetenland, Yugoslavia, Poland, Russia, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Latvia, Lithuania, and so forth. Most of these people have never known any other place as home. If they cannot go back "home" most of them would like to come to the United States of America.

STABILIZATION OF GERMAN MARK

German rehabilitation and recovery is being helped by the stabilization of the mark more than any other one thing. Everywhere in Germany I found the farmers coming into towns with their produce. Everywhere the shopkeepers were bringing out merchandise for sale which had, by tradition, been the black-market merchandise. Germans told me they were surprised at the quantity and source of this merchandise. Everywhere German housewives told me that never in many months had there been the vegetables, farm produce, and merchandise on legitimate sale. I was informed that in various communities I had visited, everyone knew the identity of the black marketeers. These individuals were now forced to go to work because consumers were able to buy in the open market merchandise and farm produce. It was no longer necessary for town people to go out into the country and barter with the farmer for his goods. In spite of this, there is a black market on the dollar. The rate is 3.30 for the dollar on the legitimate market, and runs as high as 10 marks per dollar in the black market. Some bank officials expressed concern over the possibility that there may be some trade in the counterfeit of the new mark. The rank and file of Germans told me that while there was plenty of merchandise on the legitimate market, the difficulty now is to get sufficient marks. There is a labor shortage in some sections but in parts of the country, especially in Bavaria where DP's and refugees are located in tremendous numbers, there is some noticeable unemployment. Bavaria is encouraging Sudetenlanders to manufacture glass, and so forth, for export.

DISMANTLING OF INDUSTRY IN RUHR

I found in the Ruhr of Germany much activity. Coal production is on the increase and the stabilization of the mark and the increase in daily rations (now over 1,800 calories) is real incentive for work on the part of the laboring man. However, there was much evidence of communistic growth in the laboring sections of the Ruhr, especially in and around Essen.

German officials in the Ruhr told me the greatest obstacle to recovery is the dismantling program under the reparations agreements. Our committee had been informed that most or perhaps all of the dismantling of industry had ceased at least temporarily. I discovered that this is not the fact. I presented 100 CARE packages to the city of Kamen in the Ruhr. The mayor of the city in accepting this gift which came from a humble farmer (Mr. Claude Canaday) of Nebraska—declared that it did not make "common sense" for Americans to "feed us" and at the same time dismantle industries which could not be regarded as "possible war plants." This mayor called my attention to the fact that in the city of Kamen a plant which had been in existence for many, many years was being dismantled. He stated that this plant manufactured parts for wheels on railroad cars. It manufactured other material needed badly for coal and steel production. The plant had provided jobs for hundreds of people for many years. He declared this plant was being dismantled or ordered to be dismantled. He believed Americans who are spending billions to help rehabilitate Europe perhaps do not realize what is being done. In order to get better information on this dismantling program I visited the Krupp residence near Essen. The Bipartite Control Office—United Kingdom-United States coal-control group is located there. I came in time to meet Mr. Estelle, our chief, following one of the group's morning meetings. Mr. Estelle indicated his discouragement in reaching any real results due to the dismantling program. He submitted to me for the information of this committee a list of 30 plants which are doomed to be dismantled. So inconsistent are the recommendations on some of these industries that I submit the entire 30 for your information. I suggest careful reading of some of these recommendations. No. 1 especially will enlighten you on the inconsistency. This recommendation is that because of the specialized products of the firm they should be continued in operation after dismantling. It is no wonder that Mr. Estelle threw up his hands and indicated to me that he was through and about ready to quit.

I visited a number of places in the Ruhr and everywhere I heard protests from the natives. My inquiry of officials in Europe as to who will pay for the operation after dismantling brought the explanation that perhaps "after dismantling" the machinery of these plants would be distributed around to various countries and that this machinery could be brought back again. By whom? Scanning the recommendations one is struck by the senselessness of the whole procedure. How can a sane and sober man devise a diabolical scheme whereby a plant is dismantled at the time it is trying to figure how to procure equipment to produce extremely essential goods. At the time when Europe must have coal the factories that have produced mining equipment are being destroyed. Only a blind, irreverent, unreasoning, ghastly spirit of revenge could be responsible for what must ultimately do much to defeat our attempt to cure Europe's economic ills.

I reported my findings to Mr. Paul Hoffman, the ECA Administrator, in Paris. He indicated that these plants and this entire matter had not been referred to him but did state that he felt these dismantling operations should be frozen in the name of "common sense" and for the best interests of European recovery.

Immediately upon my arrival in Washington I referred the list of 30 plants handed me by Mr. Estelle to the Department of the Army. I learned that some action is being taken toward the freezing of dismantling operations for some of these plants. A memorandum regarding this program is being furnished me by Colonel Cheseldine and will be furnished to the committee.

REPORTS ON CZECHOSLOVAKIA BASED UPON RELIABLE ESCAPEE INFORMANTS

Fortunately, because of my wide acquaintanceship in Czechoslovakia and my familiarity with the language, I was able to be in contact with exceptionally well-informed individuals who furnished me with intensely interesting information. These men were escapees from Czechoslovakia who had occupied high posts, were well informed, and felt I could be trusted.

One was able to recount in detail the procedure the Communists followed in taking over Czechoslovakia. It was a grim story, replete with instances of deception, treachery, and disloyalty. He recalled how loyal Czechoslovakians resisted nazism and sought to liberate their country from the beginning in 1939. He pointed out that Klement, Gottwald, and other Communists had, until 1941 when the U. S. S. R. was attacked by Hitler, collaborated with the Germans. He believed the Communist putsch took place in February 1948, because a public opinion poll estimated that in the 1948 spring elections, the Communists would get less than 30 percent of the votes. The Czechoslovak Institute for the measurement of public opinion (Gallup poll) had estimated the results of the 1946 election correctly within two-tenths of 1 percent. The Communists had officially declared many times their aim to achieve 51 percent of all votes, and could not afford a free election which would end the growth of their party and defeat their plan to take over Czechoslovakia.

I was informed that on July 6, 100,000 members of the Sokol Gymnastic Club who were in Prague for their traditional games, gave a stirring pro-Benes and pro-American demonstration. They demonstrated real courage by carrying tiny American flags for 6 hours under the eyes of policemen and security agents. As nearly as possible the account one observer furnished is set out in full:

"It may interest you that during the parade the President—i. e., Mr. Gottwald—and his Government staff tribune were completely ignored, in fact, in many cases insulted by the carrying of the standards on the shoulders of the bearers instead of in front or lowered. Immediately after all sections passed the tribune, and there were some 280,000 in the parade, every single section without exception started to cheer for Benes. You could hear all over the old town square the chants, 'We want Benes,' or just 'Benes' or 'We want President Benes,' for which thousands of people were later arrested. It was a spontaneous revolt if I ever saw one. Literally thousands of the people in the parade showed Masaryk and Benes pictures, and thousands and thousands of them waved only American flags.

"One particular group was led by a large American flag with only banners following. Even the absence of the Czech flag was very apparent. This particular group was called the Masaryk County (as you know, all the so-called organizations are divided into different counties either by the name of a leader or by the name of a city from where they come), and this group followed immediately upon the heels of the labor section of the athletic organization DTJ, which is definitely communistic. It was a very small group of several hundred comprising this labor athletic organization. All of the members cheered in order to obtain response from the onlookers, but only the grandstand with the Government officials stood up and clapped. Everybody else was just stone still and without emotion. Immediately following this group came the Masaryk group with the American flag in front, and the entire Staromeska Namesti, the old town square with the Jan Hus monument, went into a terrific ovation which could definitely be heard on the grandstand. It was unbelievable what courage the people really showed. Unfortunately, there was not the expected overthrow of the Government. Before my eyes I saw dozens of secret policemen making constant arrests of people, and it was very deplorable. The final day in the stadium, youths between the ages of 14 and 19, and there were 17,000 of them, right in the middle of their exercises, pulled out thousands of American flags and waved them in protest against the local regime. A terrific number of people were arrested for this protest."

A few hours after the parade many Czechs turned their radio dials to the Voice of America to hear a report of the pro-American aspect of the demonstrations. The first program to be heard did not carry the news, much to their disappointment. It was disheartening to many who felt that America did not care for the risks they were taking. Reportedly, accounts of the incident were broadcast on July 7 and 8. Voice of America officials explained the story was not carried on July 6, when the Czech listeners were eager to hear it, because the wire service available did not carry the story in time to include it in the July 6 broadcast.

CZECH URANIUM CITY

One very well-informed escapee told me a grim story about the famous uranium mines in Jackymov in Bohemia. Last February before the Communist putsch in Czechoslovakia, a Prague newspaper reported that the mines had received 22 trucks from the Ministry of Transport in spite of the scarcity of such vehicles. The journalist was charged

by the Communist-controlled Ministry of the Interior with a crime against the defense of the Republic for having revealed a very important military secret. Since May 1945, when the Soviet troops took over the mines, the name of Jackymov had become tabu in Czechoslovakia. The Soviet officers and officials who occupy and administer Jackymov do so as if it were a Soviet colony. All post cards and all propaganda literature describing the healing powers of Jackymov Spa which had a world-wide reputation were confiscated. Subservient Czech authorities had declared that to sell a post card of the famous resort hotel there constituted a crime against the security of the state. Practically all civil rights of the citizens of the town were abolished. Spa guests have been limited in their movements. When Jan Masaryk was minister he was, upon one occasion, expelled from the restricted area by Russian soldiers. The Russians went so far as to suggest to the Czechoslovakian Government that in geography lessons in Czech schools not a word be said about the existence of the town of Jackymov.

Its mines rival the uranium deposits of the Belgian Congo and yield other valuable ores. Prior to the Russian seizure of the mines, the yield of uranium amounted to approximately 60 tons per year. Now the Russians are producing approximately 200 tons per year. This increase, instead of being attributable to efficiency, is testimony of the absolute ruthlessness with which the mines are being plundered, and the way human beings are being treated.

Work in uranium mines, unless carefully managed, gradually kills the miner. For this reason all work in prior years was carried out with great care for the health of the workers. The Russians have made the mines forced-labor establishments using German prisoners of war. The slaves are worked till exhausted, or they die of exposure. The number of miners has been increased from approximately 350 to approximately 650.

For over 80 years cartographic researches have been going on in Jackymov, thus giving precise knowledge of the uranium beds and their capacity to the depth of 600 meters. The Russians, using this knowledge, have opened up a shaft in the 530–560-meter depth where no mining had taken place in view of the fact that work there was dangerous and very unhealthy because of its extreme radioactivity. The Russians, in spite of all warnings, started work there and endanger not only hundreds of lives, but also the whole mine and the whole region if the strong geyser of mineral water breaks loose.

The Soviet commander of Jackymov, Major Michajlov, and the Russian geologist, Mishinko, are deaf to warnings. They are certain that if and when the gigantic strength of the mineral waters will break the dam and flood the mines, nobody will ever hear of it.

The Russians care little about the cost of the mining operation as there is more than money at stake. The Soviet is trying to catch up with the United States on atomic bomb production.

At Freiburg in Saxony, a Soviet center for uranium research has been set up in the building of the Saxon Mining Academy. It is not the only one, because even in Prague in the borough of Zisker, the Czech Government has established a uranium research laboratory for the Soviets. Five to fifteen tons of uranium are brought there every month. It is difficult to estimate the value of the uranium ore that is being stolen from Czechoslovakia by the Russians, according to my informant. As he pointed out, Belgium sells uranium to the Americans whereas the Russians steal it from the Czechoslovakians.

Respectfully submitted.

KARL STEFAN,
Member of Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks in regard to the pending appropriation bill. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has pointed out some of its shortcomings.

On June 19 Congress gave final approval to a bill which was originally known as H. R. 4044 but which was materially modified before it was finally passed. The bill has become Public Law 896 of the Eightieth Congress and is known as the War Claims Act of 1948.

Among other things, this law provided certain benefits for men who were prisoners of war in World War II. Payment is to be made from enemy assets which are under our control. The act provides for the setting up of a War Claims Commission.

Congress in its unwise haste to adjourn on June 20 failed to provide funds for the setting up of the Commission. The present bill makes no provision for the Commission. This session will, therefore, twice adjourn without providing necessary funds for making effective the War Claims Act of 1948. This is inexcusable. In the subcommittee meeting this morning I voted to include the funds.

Mr. Speaker, this is only one of many pieces of legislation which could and should be acted upon at this session.

I take this means of urging immediate action. Veterans and veterans' organizations are much concerned about this matter.

I quote the following from the President's budget message of July 31:

"ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the War Claims Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia; travel expenses; printing and binding; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $470,000, to be derived from the war claims fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act: *Provided*, That transfers may be made from this appropriation to other Government agencies for use of their facilities and services in carrying out the functions of the Commission."

The language for payment of claims is required to authorize such payments from the war claims fund by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896) and solely on the basis of certifications by the War Claims Commission or Federal Security Administrator.

The estimate for administrative expenses of the War Claims Commission will provide funds for the organization of the Commission and its operations during fiscal year 1949. This Commission is created by the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 896, 80th Cong.) for the purposes of paying claims to internees, prisoners of war, and certain religious organizations which sustained damages or injuries as a result of enemy action during World War II. In addition to the payment of these claims, the Commission is charged with the responsibility of inquiring into and preparing a report to the President for submission to the Congress on or before March 31, 1949, with respect to war claims arising out of World War II other than those claims which will be immediately adjudicated under the War Claims Act of 1940.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] called attention to the fact that appropriations had not been made to begin the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway.

I call attention to the fact that the Ohio Valley Improvement Association has come out openly and positively in support of that great project.

I am assured that funds to begin its construction will be included in the appropriation bill in the next session of Congress.

I regret it could not have been done at this time.

From Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans, down the Mississippi River, then across to Mobile along the intercoastal waterway, and then up to the Tennessee River along the Tombigbee, and then downstream 262 miles back to Cairo—the round trip is 1,768 miles.

Of that 1,768 miles 1,131 of it will be downstream and the rest of it will be in slack water.

It will benefit everybody on all the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Tennessee, the Warrior, the Tombigbee, and every other stream in what is known as the great Mississippi Valley—extending from the Allegheny to the Rocky Mountains. Let me show you what it will do.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I suppose the gentleman knows that the President said last fall, "No new starts for flood control or reclamation in the 1949 appropriation bill."

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that the President has assured me that if the funds are available they will be allocated to this project, for the simple reason that it gives a direct connection from Oak Ridge, our great defense plant on the Tennessee River, to the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile.

It cuts the water distance from Oak Ridge to Mobile by 876 miles, and gives an additional outlet from Oak Ridge to the sea.

Let me show you what it will mean from the standpoint of traffic costs back up that waterway from the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile to Oak Ridge, Tenn. A 14,000-ton barge would save $30,000 on its fuel bill alone, going from the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile to Oak Ridge on the Tennessee River.

I will place the rest of this information in the RECORD, and let me say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] that it will greatly benefit his State, because you ship your grain down on these barges, and when those barges return, you will get the benefit of this low-cost transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a speech that I made in the House on July 1, 1947, on this same subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The statement referred to follows:)

THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY—BYPASSING THE SWIFT CURRENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI FOR UPSTREAM TRAFFIC

(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, July 1, 1947)

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to talk to you about the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway.

I shall offer an amendment at the proper time for funds to start the work on this, the most important inland waterway project that has ever been presented to the Congress of the United States.

As I pointed out to you a few days ago, for 200 years the American people have been virtually denied the use of the Mississippi River, because of their inability to stem the swift tide of that stream for up-bound traffic. Only recently the businessmen along the Ohio River were looking for an outlet to the Atlantic Ocean so they might escape the penalties of this devastating current.

For more than 100 years engineers have tried to develop a slack water route connecting the Tennessee River and the Gulf of Mexico by way of the Tombigbee River.

If you remember, the Tennessee River flows in a southwesterly direction to about Guntersville, thence westward to the Mississippi State line, then turns northward and flows 215 miles to where it empties into the Ohio River at Paducah. From Paducah the Ohio flows west, or southwest, 47 miles and empties into the Mississippi at Cairo.

Until recently the engineers were unable to find a way to connect the Tombigbee with the Tennessee without locks going up from the Tennessee and also locks going up from the Tombigbee. The two streams were separated by a sand ridge about 25 miles wide, and there was no water supply at the summit. You cannot operate locks to lift water traffic to a higher level unless you have a water supply at the summit. Those of you who have seen the Panama Canal remember that we changed the course of the Chagres River and turned it into Gatun Lake in order to provide a water supply at the summit of the Panama Canal project, 85 feet above sea level.

In 1938 the Tennessee Valley Authority built the Pickwick Dam on the Tennessee River, just below the mouth of Yellow Creek, where this proposed project joins the Tennessee. That raised the water level at the mouth of Yellow Creek about 55 feet. The Army engineers were called upon to make a new survey, and they came back the most enthusiastic group I have ever seen. They said, "We find now that we can cut through the sand ridge separating the Tennessee River from the Tombigbee 25 miles away, and put the summit of this project in the Tennessee River." That project was recommended by the Chief of Engineers, authorized by a vote of both Houses of Congress, and signed by the President.

The Tennessee River at one time probably flowed down the Tombigbee Valley. Hernando De Soto, who discovered the Tennessee River up near its source, followed it down to the present site of Guntersville, where he left it and went south. When he later discovered the Mississippi he thought it was the same stream. He published a map showing the Tennessee curving southward and flowing down the present course of the Mississippi. It never occurred to him that the Tennessee would turn north and flow in that direction for hundreds of miles.

Some upheaval in prehistoric times seems to have lifted that ground up and turned the Tennessee north, to where it flows into the Ohio River at Paducah.

The Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek is 100 feet above the Tombigbee, where it is formed by the confluence of Brown and Mackeys Creek less than 25 miles away. So by cutting through this sand ridge and building locks and dams from the mouth of the Warrior River up to the Tennessee, they can put the summit of this project in the Tennessee River and provide a slack-water route up the Tombigbee 481 miles from Mobile into the Tennessee and then a downstream route 215 miles on the Tennessee River to Paducah and then down the Ohio 47 miles to Cairo, Ill.

If you will turn to page 7911 of yesterday's RECORD, you will find a table showing what this means. My time is limited, so I am going to talk to you in terms we can all understand.

From Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans down the Mississippi River 869 miles, then 156 miles across to Mobile, along the intercoastal waterway, which is slack water, then 481 miles up this proposed Tombigbee inland waterway, through slack water, to the Tennessee River, then 262 miles downstream to Cairo, Ill., a vessel or a barge from Cairo, or Paducah, making the round trip would travel 1,768 miles. Of that 1,768 miles, with this new development, 1,131 miles of it, or approximately two-thirds of the way, would be downstream, and the rest of it would be in slack water.

General Robins said to the Senate committee that if he were to promise to provide a slack-water route all the way up the Mississippi to Cairo, just as if it were across the Gulf of Mexico, all the way up and back, they would throw up their hats and shout.

"But," he said, "this is infinitely better, because," he said, "we give you a slack-water route up to the Tennessee, and then a downstream route to Cairo, 262 miles, and save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic."

As it is today, your vessels cannot go back up the Mississippi River, except at tremendous expense.

I have here some photographs which were supplied me by the Army engineers. You will notice one of these barges is coming down from Pittsburgh, Pa., down the Ohio River. It is loaded with 14,000 tons of freight. When that barge gets to the mouth of the Mississippi River, or to New Orleans, with that stream raging as it is today, it is practically paralyzed so far as returning up the Mississippi River is concerned. The same thing is true of this 14,000-ton barge coming down from Chicago. Here is one from Detroit, loaded with automobiles and automobile parts. Here is one probably coming down the Missouri River, probably from Omaha or Kansas City or down the Mississippi from St. Paul, Minneapolis, or St. Louis loaded with 14,000 tons of freight.

If they desire to take back the raw materials, cotton, cottonseed, or cottonseed meal and hulls, oil, lumber, bauxite, sea foods, tropical fruits, or other raw materials, if they are so loaded and undertake to go back, here is the difference they would pay:

Let us take a 14,000-ton barge. We will say it is returning from New Orleans to Cairo. To go across along the slack-water route from New Orleans to Mobile, up this slack-water route to the Tennessee River, and then downstream to Cairo, Ill., the saving would amount to $9,800; and if it were just going to Paducah, or any point on the upper Ohio, it would save $11,760.

Such a barge load going from Mobile up the Tombigbee to the Tennessee and then downstream to Cairo would save $20,000 on its fuel bill alone.

If that barge were going from Mobile to Paducah, Ky., Pittsburgh, Pa., Wheeling, W. Va., Cincinnati, Ohio, or to any other point on the Ohio River, it would save $22,120 on its fuel bill alone.

There is not another project—and I am quoting the words of the Army engineers—there is not another project on the face of the earth, or a place where one can be constructed, where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so little cost, so much ease, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances. The nearest we have found is the connection between the Don and the Volga Rivers in Russia, and even that does not have the benefit of a downstream route for approximately two-thirds of the round trip.

In addition, we have right here on the Tennessee River the greatest defense project the world has ever known, Oak Ridge, covering 70 square miles, where our atomic bombs are made. That is the project on which we are going to have to rely for our national defense in case of attack probably for generations to come. Not a man in this House knows the number of thousands, or millions, of tons of raw materials that have to be brought in for that purpose. This short-water route will cut the water distance from Oak Ridge to Mobile by more than 800 miles.

Suppose you are going from Mobile with a load of materials for Oak Ridge; let us see how you would go. You would go along the intercoastal slack water route 156 miles to New Orleans, then you would have to fight the swift current on the Mississippi River all the way to Cairo, Ill., 869 miles, go up the Ohio River 47 miles to Paducah, and then up the Tennessee 215 miles to the mouth of the Yellow Creek, where this project intersects the Tennessee River which point you could have reached by moving 481 miles in slack water from Mobile up the Tombigbee along this new route.

I repeat, there is not another project like it on earth.

What we want is funds with which to begin this construction. With the devastating floods that periodically occur on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, with the need for their control and for the development of these waterways, I have no patience with this policy of pouring billions of dollars into the coffers of Europe, and denying funds with which to develop our own resources or protect our own people.

All we are asking is that you give us a reasonable amount to begin this construction in order that you may put us 1 or 2 years ahead of what we would be if we waited until the next Congress for this appropriation.

This project has already been approved. It was approved by the House in 1946. It went over to the Senate and it was approved by the Senate by more than 2 to 1—44 to 21 and signed by the President.

This project is just as sure to be constructed as night follows day. All the forces of the opposition could not take this project off the statute book and thereby deny this relief to the shippers in the great Mississippi Valley extending from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Sioux City, Iowa, from Chicago, Ill., to El Paso, Tex., and from Minneapolis and St. Louis to New Orleans, La., and Mobile, Ala.

The sooner this project is constructed the sooner your people will reap the benefits, and I am speaking of the people of Michigan and Illinois who shipped these boat loads of automobiles and other materials down the Mississippi River; I am speaking of the people of Pennsylvania whose vessels come down the Ohio River; I am speaking of the people of Minnesota whose material comes down from St. Paul and Minneapolis; I am speaking of the people of Iowa and Nebraska whose wheat we buy and with whom we exchange oil, lumber, and other products; I am speaking of the people of those great Middle Western States between the Allegheny and the Rocky Mountains, or the Cascades, and between the Great Lakes and the Gulf.

I urge you to join me when the time comes to adopt an amendment that will give us a start in building the greatest transportation project ever proposed on any river system throughout the entire world.

Mr. MCDOWELL. How much money is involved?

Mr. RANKIN. The cost of the entire project is estimated to be $116,000,000, to be spent over a period of 5 or 6 years.

The Army engineers testified before the Rivers and Harbors Committee that they ought to have $9,000,000 to begin with. But we have decided that to carry on this work until the next Congress, they can get along with $3,000,000. Therefore, I shall offer an amendment for that amount.

I am not for burdening the Treasury, I am not after piling upon a national debt, but I am tremendously interested in developing our national resources to take care of the American people now and for all time to time.

I am taking the same attitude I took on the construction of the Cape Cod Canal; I am taking the same attitude I took on the development of the Columbia River, and the Central Valley project in California. I am taking the same attitude I took on the developing of the TVA and the Arkansas and Missouri Rivers projects.

This is one project the construction of which we cannot afford to postpone; because the longer we delay the longer the American people will be denied its benefits.

Every year this construction is delayed will cost our people untold millions of dollars, to say nothing of the effect on our national defense. Let us start work on it now.

Here is the table showing what the saving of this great project would amount to for up-bound traffic.

From—	To—	Via Mississippi, per ton	Via Mississippi, per tow of 3,500 tons	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per ton	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per ton	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
Houston, Tex	Cairo	$2.34	$8,190	$1.94	$6,790	$0.40	$1,400	$5,600
	Paducah	2.42	8,470	1.88	6,580	.54	1,890	7,560
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.74	9,590	1.60	5,600	1.14	3,990	15,960
New Orleans, La	Cairo	2.02	7,070	1.32	4,620	.70	2,450	9,800
	Paducah	2.10	7,350	1.26	4,410	.84	2,940	11,760
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.42	8,470	.99	3,465	1.43	5,005	20,020
Mobile, Ala	Cairo	2.39	8,365	.95	3,325	1.44	5,040	20,160
	Paducah	2.47	8,645	.89	3,115	1.58	5,530	22,160
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.79	9,765	.62	2,170	2.17	7,595	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala	Cairo	2.96	10,300	.95	3,325	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	3.04	10,040	.89	3,115	2.15	7,525	30,100
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.36	11,700	.62	2,170	2.74	9,590	38,360
Demopolis, Ala	Cairo	2.68	9,380	.67	2,345	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	2.76	9,660	.61	2,135	2.15	7,525	30,000
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.08	10,780	.34	1,190	2.74	9,590	38,360
Columbus, Miss	Cairo	2.83	9,905	.51	1,785	2.32	8,120	32,480
	Paducah	2.91	10,185	.45	1,575	2.46	8,610	34,440
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.23	11,305	.17	595	3.06	10,710	42,940
Aberdeen, Miss	Cairo	2.88	10,080	.46	1,610	2.42	8,470	33,880
	Paducah	2.96	10,300	.40	1,400	2.56	8,960	35,840
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.28	11,480	.13	455	3.15	11,025	44,100
Fulton, Miss	Cairo	2.93	10,255	.41	1,435	2.52	8,820	35,280
	Paducah	3.01	10,535	.35	1,225	2.66	9,310	37,240
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.33	11,655	.08	280	3.25	11,375	45,500

As I said, it is the greatest project of its kind ever proposed, and the sooner it is constructed the better it will be for the people of the entire Nation.

I hope you will all support my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts from both party platforms.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in criticism of certain language in the platform of my own party. I do this not for the purpose of giving aid and comfort to the opposition, nor to add to the arguments advanced by certain political leaders of my section who believe that the Democratic Party which we have known as a vehicle of human service should be abandoned. I am proud of my party's history, and I believe that we have a mission, whether in victory or defeat.

The particular section of the platform which I want to discuss is that relating to foreign policy. I offer these comments in an effort to discharge a personal obligation which I assumed in the early part of my service in this House to contribute to the development of a foreign policy that might be characterized not as a partisan policy but as a continuing, predictable, American policy, making for the Nation's security and the world's peace.

My actions in 1943 when the official bipartisan policy began to unfold were not casual, but represented a strong conviction. In the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses I saw the Republican Party adopt an admirable role as the minority partner in the policy-making procedure. This was made possible because they were invited by a Democratic administration to share in decisions and to contribute to those intellectual and spiritual resources which the Nation required in the ordeal of war. The implications were clear. If the minority were to share in decisions they were also to share the credit for achievements and a proportionate measure of the blame for our failures. But one thing is clear, and both parties must stand by this standard: We cannot accept the minority contribution and then withhold from them their measure of credit. Neither party, in other words, can honorably make foreign policy an issue in this election. I do not assume that by the unfortunate language inserted in the Democratic platform in Philadelphia the party intends to do that. I would hope that enough Democrats feel as I do to make it clear that no advantage will be taken of the fact that the party was honored with control of the Government in the perilous days of the war and in the early period of the great transition through which we still move.

I am not condemning the entire foreign-policy section. It is no breach of the bipartisan commitments to speak glowingly of our party's determination to support the United Nations and, in other specific ways, to work toward peace. Our Republican opposition offered its own assertions and they were equally forthright. What I do deplore is that in moments of party exuberance we gave the impression in two paragraphs of the platform that the achievements in foreign policy were distinctly Democratic and that the official Republican policy is contrary to our program. This is not only unfortunate, it is untrue. This sentence, for instance:

> We advocate the grant of a loan to the United Nations recommended by the President but denied by the Republican Congress for construction of United Nations headquarters in this country.

The action of the House in approving the loan by a vote of 164 to 27 is indicative of the fact that this Republican Congress is not opposing a loan.

Actually the delay in authorizing the loan was caused by the House Foreign Affairs Committee's consideration of the bipartisan resolutions to strengthen the United Nations. The chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], was undertaking wisely, I think, to secure consideration of these resolutions as a part of a general measure covering all United Nations legislation. It should have been acted upon during the regular session, it is true, but the loan could have gone over until the Eighty-first Congress without the imputations in the Democratic platform statement. The bipartisan resolutions put those of us who collaborated on the Democratic side under the necessity of putting the record straight in this regard.

Another reference in the Democratic platform statement which might be subject to misunderstanding is that which refers to the United Nations. The language is as follows:

"Before the end of the war the Democratic administration turned to the task of establishing measures for peace and the prevention of aggression and the threat of another war. Under the leadership of a Democratic President and his Secretary of State, the United Nations was organized at San Francisco. The Charter was ratified by an overwhelming vote of the Senate."

Standing by itself, this statement does not affect the bipartisan policy, though the words "Democratic" might well have been omitted since the President, in leading the United Nations movement, acted in his capacity as Chief of State, not as chief of his party. I wish the platform makers might have included this simple addendum: "The United Nations Charter would not have been approved without substantial aid from the Republican minority and we pledge the party to continue the bipartisan handling of foreign policy." This is undoubtedly what the party intends to do. It should have said so.

Neither were Republican Convention proceedings entirely free from loose language on foreign policy. If we avoid damaging the bipartisan program there should be some healthy deletions from some speeches in both conventions. Fortunately, these errors were not adopted in the Republican platform.

At the same time, I recognize that the bipartisan policy has certain limitations, that it does not require withholding of criticism of administrative actions. As I interpret, the informal arrangement known as the bipartisan program means simply this: An honest effort is made by both sides to reach general agreement in directing American diplomacy. Decisions having been reached, the opposition party stands by them. At all times there must be consultation. It involves an honest effort by the opposition to perfect the policy and to accept whatever political handicaps are involved. Likewise, the administration is committed to respect the opposition's right to condemn administrative mistakes but, in any event, the administration must accept final responsibility under the Constitution for the policy.

Moreover, the bipartisan policy has always had certain specific exceptions. One of the notable participants in the policy, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has probably stated the Republican position on China much better than the official policy has stated it. This, in other words, represents an exception—a divergence.

It must also be recognized that each individual candidate stands upon his own record. Democratic candidates opposed by Republican candidates who have refused to accept the joint decisions are justified in making foreign policy matters an issue. This is an issue between individual candidates; it is not a party issue.

This whole experiment in party cooperation for the common good has elements of boldness. It is not the conventional way, politically speaking, but such experience as we have had confirms the impression that it is the best way.

We are still living in a dangerous world. We could not follow the usual political patterns without jeopardizing the Nation's safety. To forego advantages was the patriotic course. For the Democrats it meant renunciation. It precluded boasting of achievements which were the products of a common effort. For the Republicans it meant foregoing criticism and condemnation, even where they had not shared responsibility, though at times the temptation was great. Mr. Dewey was tempted in 1944 to make capital of the fact that the Japanese code was broken before Pearl Harbor. He was patriotic enough to pass up his advantage when General Marshall told him the consequences. Again, at some stages when the United Nations seemed to be unpopular, the Republicans might have capitalized its unpopularity. They did not. If politics rather than statesmanship dictated some Republican decisions, we Democrats must nevertheless stand by the early commitments.

Neither can we discharge our obligations by patting Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. EATON on the back. Neither of these good party men could have done their work without the support of Republican adherents. They had to convince their colleagues that they were right. In a sense, they have acted as Republicans as well as statesmen.

I wish to make it clear that I do not regard the unfortunate language of the Democratic platform as a serious breach. It is only because there are certain potential dangers to foreign policy in the political campaign of 1948 that I make allusion to it. It is to avert damage rather than to repair it that I make these remarks.

The difficulties are aggravated by the creation of the Henry Wallace party. Ordinarily, dissent of this kind would logically fit into our democratic procedure. It would give those who share in the dissent an opportunity to register their opposition. That is true in theory only, because it is obvious that Communist influences were present in the Wallace convention. The convention's refusal to adopt the motion of the Vermont delegate that criticism of United States policy does not imply blanket endorsement of Soviet policy confirms suspicions that most Americans had that the Wallace movement is strongly permeated with Communist influences. For this reason, the choice afforded is not between two American policies, but rather between a policy dictated by attachment to our own national interests and on the other hand those emanating from abroad.

I wish to echo the sentiment recently expressed in this Chamber by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who asserted that we cannot laugh off the Wallace threat. No one has any fears as to 1948, but, in my judgment, the Wallace party is planning its strategy for 1952. The next 4 years are therefore crucial ones. Much more than foreign policy is involved. The implied threat to our system of government and the stability of our democratic institutions is substantial enough to cause all of us, as Americans and as party men, to weigh our actions and to avoid all appearances of disunity. The world might misunderstand and misinterpret our disagreements, particularly if we magnify them for political advantage. The Wallace party creates the imperative necessity of continuing the bipartisan foreign policy of this Nation. The nominees themselves and the shrewd strategists who stand behind them are launching plans that could bring tragic consequences unless the older parties utilize to the fullest extent the resources at their command. Nothing less than our best will meet the challenge of the next 4 years.

I believe in the two-party system. For this reason, I shall also oppose the fourth party, the States' Rights Party organized at Birmingham. While agreeing with many of the declarations of the Birmingham group, I am convinced that withdrawal from the Democratic Party will work against the interests of the South and of the Nation. The experience of other nations with the multiple party system has been tragic. Let us avoid that misfortune here. One effective way to do it is to state clearly our differences on domestic issues and to pursue them vigorously in the American tradition. In the field of foreign policy, for the reasons stated, we must persist in efforts to occupy common ground and to maintain the bipartisan approach to peace.

WHY NOT A MARSHALL PLAN FOR THE AGED OF AMERICA?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extent my remarks at this point in the RECORD on four subjects and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, immediately on the convening of this extraordinary session of the Eightieth Congress, I wrote a personal letter to every one of the sponsors of the old-age legislation, H. R. 16, which I introduced on the opening day of the Eightieth Congress, urging that they exert every effort possible to secure the additional names required on the discharge petition to bring this bill on the floor for passage before this session adjourned. I have also written to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee urging that the committee report the bill out for action at this session in behalf of the urgent need of the old people of the Nation for some relief in these days of inflation and high cost of living. I include this letter as part of these remarks:

AUGUST 5, 1948.

Hon. HAROLD KNUTSON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KNUTSON: As author of H. R. 16, the so-called Townsend bill, providing for annuities for the elderly citizens of our country, I sincerely urge that the Ways and Means Committee, of which you have the honor to be chairman, report the bill out on the floor for action before this extraordinary session of the Congress adjourns. This extraordinary session was convened for the purpose of

considering emergency legislation, particularly on inflation and the high cost of living. The bill for the relief of the old folks qualifies on every one of these specifications.

There are 182 signatures on the petition to bring the bill on the floor, which evidences a great interest of the membership in this humane legislation. It is patent that the old people of America are not getting sufficient monthly incomes under the old-age Social Security Act to keep body and soul together with the high cost of foods and their low monthly incomes, which I understand, average $36.91 a month. It would seem not only fair but in the interests of good legislation to pass this bill or some bill giving sufficient annuities to the old folks that they may continue to exist in these days of high cost of food and the other necessities of life.

Your committee held long hearings on this legislation in the Seventy-ninth Congress so that there is a full record available for use when the bill comes on the floor. With the billions we have spent and are spending for the aid and relief of the peoples around the world under the Marshall program and other programs, there seems to be no justification now why we should not act during this session and pass this legislation. The old people of America are looking to the Ways and Means Committee and to the Members of this Congress to enact old-age legislation which is simple justice to our own old people who have, by their loyalty, perseverance and farsightedness built America and made it what it is.

I most sincerely urge that your committee heed this request and bring the bill up for immediate action.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my personal thanks to all sponsors and supporters of this much needed legislation for their loyalty and sincere support of the bill. My only regret is that the bill was not brought to the floor either by the Ways and Means Committee or by petition to discharge. As I have said since this session convened, I, for one, am willing that the Congress stay in session even if we have to remain here until Christmas to pass legislation not only for the old people of America but all necessary legislation for the control of inflation to curb the high cost of living and to provide adequate housing for the low-income groups of the Nation.

I want to repeat the arguments I made in behalf of this legislation in the House on February 2, 1948. I pose the question, Why not a Marshall plan for the aged of America? While we are considering tax measures and the Marshall plan for Europe, is it not time to adopt a Marshall plan for the old folks of this Nation? The proposal of the administration is to spend some $17,000,000,000 in aid to European countries under the Marshall plan in the next 4 or 5 years, with an allocation of $6,800,000,000 for the ensuing 15 months. This is in addition to the twenty-four billions that have already been expended for European aid since the war ended. I call attention to the fact that much of this huge expenditure will be made available for the needy of the European countries, including the aged. I maintain it is a decent thing to do, while we are expending such huge sums for foreign aid, to have a Marshall plan for our own old folks in America and give them some help in their distress. The Congress for years has been considering legislation for security for its elderly citizens. Throughout my legislative service here, covering some 9 years, I have urged that the Congress adopt a Federal old-age program which will do justice to the old folks of America.

On the opening day of the Eightieth Congress, I introduced H. R. 16, which is a bill providing benefits to the aged and the totally disabled. This bill does not provide any fixed monthly annuity for the recipients, but it does provide for a tax and the total amount raised thereby will be prorated monthly among those entitled to take part under the bill. The experts of the Congress on fiscal affairs and tax legislation should determine the tax formula necessary so that the bill, when enacted, shall provide an adequate annuity to maintain these old folks in decency and health. It would lie within the province of the Congress to change the tax from time to time as conditions warranted. This bill has been gathering dust in the pigeonholes of the Ways and Means Committee. Before we adjourned at the special session, I urged that every Member of the House interested in the welfare of our old folks, sign a discharge petition which I placed on the Clerk's desk. The Christmas season was then approaching and it seemed appropriate as an evidence of good will and sincere interest in the welfare of these old folks that we sign this petition and bring this bill on the floor for consideration. One hundred and forty Members have signed the petition. When 218 Members sign, the bill will come to the floor under an open rule and will be subject to any germane amendment, and the House will be able to work its will and to adopt any amendments it desires in order to make the bill acceptable to the majority of our Members. The exact terminology and provisions of this bill are not the important consideration, but it is important to enact some legislation making adequate provision for our old folks, with an assurance that they will have an ample monthly income during their old age to permit them to secure the necessary medical care, food, clothing, and shelter to protect them from want, hunger, and cold.

The existing social-security law for the aged is an ineffective gesture. Under it, as shown by the reports from the Social Security Agency, the payments the aged are receiving for old-age assistance through the States of the Union, average from $16.92 a month in the lowest State to $64.95 in the highest, as shown for the month of November 1947, with a national average of $36.91. Truly, such allowances to cover food, clothing, medical care, and shelter, represent a starvation program. As was recently pointed out by the Administrator, in some areas contributions by the State and Federal Governments are not enough to enable people to maintain an adequate diet and they are literally suffering slow starvation.

The United States Public Health Service recently reported the results of a long-range survey which shows that about 35 persons per 1,000 have some chronic illness or major physical disability. A gradual increase takes place to a rate of about 100 cases per 1,000 at 45. From this point on the curve goes up very rapidly. There are nearly 250 chronically ill per 1,000 at 60. In the next 10 years the rate goes up to 400 per 1,000. At 80 more than half of the group needs the regular care of a physician, and at 90 the rate is more than 900 per 1,000.

The critical problem facing our old folks in their endeavor to maintain a bare existence is tragically intensified by the high cost of food and other necessities of life in this inflationary period in which we find ourselves. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has recently announced that the cost of food bought by the average American family increased 25 percent in 1947 over 1946. Dorothy Bovee, Red Cross nutritionist, reports that the cost of a minimum adequate diet for a family of two in the Washington area at this time, is at least $11.60 weekly, and she lists the items which make up this minimum diet for two adult persons for 1 week, as follows:

Food and amount:	*Cost*
Whole milk, 7 quarts	$1.47
White potatoes, 10 pounds	.46
Peanut butter, 4 ounces	.09
Baked beans, 14-ounce can	.15
Oranges, 6 medium-sized	.12
Tomatoes, 1 No. 2 can	.16
Tomato juice, 1 No. 2 can	.10
Cabbage, 1-pound head	.06
Spinach or kale, 1 pound	.25
Corn, 1 No. 1 can	.17
Green pepper, 1	.08
Carrots, 2 bunches	.17
Lettuce, 1 head	.13
Celery, 1 stalk	.19
Onions, 1 pound	.12
Banana, 1	.07
Apples, 2 pounds	.19
Pears, 2 pounds	.20
Applesauce, 1 can	.14
Raisins, ½ pound	.10
Prunes, 1 pound	.19
Eggs, 1½ dozen	.98
Cottage cheese, 1 pound	.23
American cream cheese, ¼ pound	.15
Hamburger, 1 pound	.43
Beef liver, ½ pound	.30
Fresh lean pork, ½ pound	.26
Pork butts, ¼ pound	.17
Scrapple	.24
Dried beef, ¼ pound	.33
Fish, 1 pound	.29
Beef stew meat, ½ pound	.22
Bread, 7 loaves	.98
Rice, 1 pound	.22
Rolled oats, ½ pound	.07
Farina, ½ pound	.10
Flour, ¼ pound	.03
Macaroni, 4 ounces	.06
Margarine, 1 pound	.45
Lard, ½ pound	.15
Salad dressing, 1 jar	.23
Sugar, 2 pounds	.18
Cookies, 1 box	.18
Jelly or apple butter, ¾ pound	.25
Coffee, 1 pound	.49
Total	11.60

We all know old-age annuitants with their meager income would not be able to buy this diet, but would be limited to the essential staples only, eliminating the fresh fruits, canned goods, and fancy items. For them it would be a luxury diet.

In contrast to the foregoing minimum fare which old-age annuitants are unable to buy with their limited allotments, is the menu of a dinner recently given in the Statler Hotel here in Washington to 100 guests by Mr. Charles Luckman, who headed the President's meatless-eggless-

days program. Here is the menu: Shrimp cocktail, fried oysters, crabs, shrimp and lobster gumbo, curried chicken, roast turkey, baked ham, roast beef, string beans au gratin, fried apple rings, pickled walnuts, celery, olives, rye rolls, assorted finger rolls, ice cream, and coffee. Mr. Luckman's job was to conserve food for hungry Americans.

Mr. Speaker, how can an old person who must maintain himself on old-age assistance, according to the plan provided in the present social-security setup, meet his expenses, not only for food but for all other necessities, on an average monthly payment of $36.91? Is there any valid reason why this Eightieth Congress should not give the right-of-way and green light to legislation for old-age assistance while we are opening the Treasury doors wide for European relief?

We have been concerned in the Congress about the rising cost of living, the inflation spiral, and the added burden placed upon the millions of our workers and the low-income groups who must pay these increased prices for food, clothing, and shelter. Cognizant of these difficulties, the Congress has increased substantially the income of some groups of our citizens, but it has given the old people no consideration. Their meager monthly average of $36.91 remains the same, while the simple fare they must provide to keep body and soul together has risen in price by leaps and bounds. Many annuitants receive much less than the average $36.91. The miserable pittance they were receiving was wholly insufficient to care for their modest needs before the advent of high living costs.

According to statistics I received some time before the war with respect to the annuitants under the insurance provision of the Social Security Act, 252,000 past 65 years of age received an average of $23 a month; 74,000 wives of these pensioners 65 or over received an average of $12.25 a month; widows over 65, totaling 25,000, received only $20.16 a month; 28,000 parents received $13 a month; widows under 65, of whom there were 55,000, received $19.50 a month; and 159,000 children under 18 received $12.21. Of all persons 60 years of age or over, four-fifths received less than a minimum for decency and health. Before our entry into the war, it was estimated that of the persons 60 years of age and over in the United States, 54.9 percent were supported wholly or partially by public or private social agencies or were dependent on children, relatives, or friends for their subsistence and care. A considerable proportion of the remainder received part or all of their support from various pension systems—Federal, State, and municipal, industrial, or private.

At the beginning of the year 1946, nearly half of all civilian jobs were excluded from coverage under the Social Security program, and nearly 2 in 5 of all persons employed were neither fully nor currently insured. At best the social-security law we now have is a haphazard program which, in effect, is largely financed by the public generally, but the benefits of which are shared in by only a few selected groups. It encourages inflation by collecting a huge fund currently used for deficit spending. These difficulties would be overcome by the adoption of H. R. 16, which would cover all citizens falling within its provisions, and the obligations and benefits of the program would likewise be shared by all. It would be all-inclusive in its provisions and therefore would obviate the necessity of continuing many social-security laws now in existence and would, for the first time, set up in our country a Federal old-age-security program which would insure all of our elderly citizens 60 years of age or over against the hazards of old age. It would build up no reservoir for deficit spending, but the moneys collected would go back into the channels of trade each month, providing local markets for American production and buying power for aged citizens.

On December 31, 1947, there had been paid into the social-security fund approximately $10,524,681,961.55, and only $1,772,431,249.69 paid out to beneficiaries; the balance was spent by the Government for general governmental purposes.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress are engaged in a great adventure in human welfare. We are charged with the responsibility of planning and building for 140,000,000 Americans a social, economic, and cultural structure which will assure their welfare. If we omit from our plans the care and protection of the millions of aged citizens who are in want, we will build in vain. We will build a tower of Babel. We must not reject the guiding hand of Providence in our plans; we need spiritual understanding as well as political wisdom. As Benjamin Franklin said to the Constitutional Convention when the great charter of our liberties was drafted:

> We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writings, that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel; we shall be divided by our little, partial, local interests, our project will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byword down to future ages. And, what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing government by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war, conquest.

Daniel Webster, one of our eminent predecessors, said:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

We should not be unmindful of the fact that these senior citizens were the workers of yesterday. They helped build our cities, our roads, our industries and helped to clear our lands. They were the trail blazers, the pioneers. They built for us. Now that they are old, we cannot pass them by. They do not seek our charity. They only ask simple justice—a modest share in the fruits of American industry, to the production of which their labors in the past have contributed.

Let us prove to the whole world that these aged American citizens are entitled to and shall have vouchsafed to them by their country "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Let us prove that humanity is still on the march here in America by enacting an old-age-annuity plan that will provide for our old people an annuity sufficient to maintain them in decency and health.

I want to commend the local representatives of the Townsend organization for their earnest, sincere, and cooperative efforts in pressing for passage of H. R. 16. Those of us who are sponsoring the legislation in the Congress have found them ready at all times to assist us in our program for early enactment of much-needed old-age legislation.

I most sincerely hope and urge that if legislation for the aged is not enacted at this session that it be made the first order of business when the Eighty-first Congress convenes and that it be pressed to early and successful conclusion. We owe this to the old people of the Nation and no legislation will confront the new Congress which has greater merit.

SURPLUS SPUDS FOR THE POOR OR FOR THE DUMP PILE, WHICH?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it was recently brought to my attention that it is rumored that the Government will again embark on a program of destroying the surplus potatoes which it has acquired in order to support the potato market. I immediately wrote to President Truman urging that if there was any foundation to the rumor that instead of destroying the potatoes, they, as well as other Government surplus foods in the same category, should be turned over to the aged and needy of our country. The President promptly replied that he is investigating the matter.

My appeal has been given some publicity throughout the Nation and clippings have come to me with letters all the way from New York to Klamath Falls supporting my appeal. We recall that last year the Government did destroy thousands of tons of edible potatoes by dousing them in kerosene and destroying them in other ways rather than making them available to the needy of our country. I have just been advised, but have not had the opportunity to verify the correctness of the statement, that the Government dumped between 2,700 and 3,000 carloads of potatoes in Kern County, Calif., between May 30 and July 1 of 1948. I hope this rumor is unfounded. In these days of high food costs and with many of the aged and other needy groups without means with which to acquire food with which to keep body and soul together, it is indefensible that our Government should destroy edible foods and I urge that all Government officials heed the appeals from across the Nation that any surplus foods be made available for the needy.

I include as a part of these remarks an editorial which appeared in the Sunday News of New York on August 1, 1948:

> POLITICAL POTATOES STILL HOT
>
> Uncle Sam's big multi-billion-dollar program to feed the world hasn't quite got into high gear yet. But one of Uncle's grocery bills—for potatoes—has been added up tentatively, and the figures to date don't make pleasant reading for the long-suffering United States taxpayer.

The reason our potato bill came in first seems to be partly agricultural, but mostly political.

Last year, as President Harry ("Let's all eat potatoburgers") Truman and some 40,000,000 American housewives recall, there was all hell to pay about our New Deal subsidized potatoes.

The girls didn't like paying 6 cents a pound for grade B spuds. And when they saw pictures of Mr. Truman's economic geniuses piling high-grade potatoes to rot in fields, mashing 'em on airport runways, and blithely kerosening the rest, the ladies promptly and understandably blew their pretty tops.

COSTLY FLOUR

So, this year, Mr. T's global advisers decided to be brighter, or anyway more discreet, about their excess spuds. No cutting down payments to voting-age farmers or anything like that, of course. But, in this election year of 1948, the boys decided to eliminate crude, housewife-infuriating stuff like kerosening and dumping. Millions of tons of excess tubers will still be grown. But, this year, they'll be turned into potato flour and then shipped quietly overseas.

So what's wrong with our giving the Army approximately 200,000 tons of potato flour with instructions to hand it out to our overseas wards?

Well, some conscience-stricken farmers have been figuring that one out. Their indignant report is that this latest New Deal effort to get rid of its 1948 hot potatoes will cost the United States taxpayer the juicy sum of 110 to 130 million dollars.

About 1,500,000 embarrassing tons of Government potatoes will be gotten rid of by turning them into flour. But the farmer will collect about $1.55 per bushel for his useless spuds; Uncle Sam will spend another 45 cents to ship them to the flour mill; and then Uncle will sell them to the miller for a token 15 cents per bushel.

The cost of making potato flour—or hiding Mr. T's new excess potato crop—will add up to 24 or 30 cents per pound, all paid for out of taxes. If we would just forget about this potato comedy and ship wheat flour to Europe, Japan, or wherever, we could do the job for one-fifth the potato expense.

So why, a very innocent, politically naive citizen might ask, don't our Democrats just ship wheat flour to our international free-lunch counters and save our beat-up taxpayers that 110 or 130 million bucks? Why, even, doesn't Mr. T forget about election year, starch up his courage, and just tell our potato farmers there's no more use growing them by the excess ton, because Uncle Sap ain't gonna pay no more?

To our mind, these would be pretty sound, sensible questions. But we're warning you, if you start asking logical questions like those of any of our surviving New Dealers, in this desperate election year of 1948, you'll very probably be told to go eat worms or even drop dead, you nasty, whining little taxpayer, you.

DISASTER HOUSING FOR VANPORT

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, of the estimated 5,300 families residing in Vanport at the time of the great flood disaster on May 30, many of them are without proper housing. I regret that the Congress failed to take action on the several bills I and other members of the northwest delegation of Oregon and Washington have introduced, which would have made possible permanent housing for the flood victims who were housed in Government houses at Vanport when the flood took place. I realize in this extraordinary session the time was short but this problem was an emergency one and, in my judgment, should have received attention before we adjourned.

I include herewith as part of these remarks an article from the Oregonian of August 4, 1948, discussing this problem:

TWO THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINE APPLY FOR HOUSES AFTER FLOOD—LOCATION OF OTHERS PUZZLES AUTHORITY, MANY DOUBLING UP

Of the estimated 5,300 families residing in Vanport at the time of the May 30 flood, only 2,239 have applied for emergency housing, Portland housing authority officials said Tuesday.

Of this number, 1,106 have been placed in temporary housing, 698 applications are still on file, and 435 have been withdrawn or rejected, the officials reported.

Heads of the housing authority said they were at a loss to explain the whereabouts of the remaining flooded-out families, but believed many are doubling up with other families.

A total of 240 families have been placed in the controversial trailer camps, while 85 families are at Columbia Villa, and 781 in other Portland housing projects.

FALL RUSH VIEWED

Commenting on the statistical break-down of flood housing, which raises the question of how many of the trailer units will actually be needed, Harry Freeman, authority chairman, said, "Only time will tell."

Officials said the approach of the school year usually brought a rush to public housing, and for that reason they hope to have a picture of the actual demand by mid-September.

Both Freeman and Mrs. Katherine Walker, tenant section supervisor at Vancouver, say it is too early to prophesy that any large number of the 1,211 trailer units brought into the area will go begging for tenants.

An annual summer slump in demand for public housing may also be partly to blame for the present situation, officials said.

UNITS OCCUPIED RAPIDLY

About 720 trailers are scheduled for location in Portland, and at the present time families are occupying these units as fast as they are prepared. However, Vancouver has 488 new trailers, many of them in the $3,500 class, and these are going begging for tenants, as are apartments at Vancouver's Fruit Valley homes project.

Freeman said the rush to the Portland trailers is being made although the Guild's Lake project, where most are located, is a commercial site lacking stores, schools, and other advantages. The trailers there are used war trailers, but are being refurnished before occupancy.

The 217 new trailers allotted Portland are being installed in a 302-unit project on North Burgard Street across from Parkside homes and near the new Vanport College building at Oregon shipyard. These are expected to accommodate students if there are not enough flood applicants.

Vancouver housing spokesmen have indicated unofficially that Portland will be offered upward of one-half of the 488 new trailers allocated Vancouver if it is shown they will not be needed across the river.

BUS TRIP CITED

Authorities explained the opposition to the Vancouver location by stating that most of the prospective tenants work in Portland and the 45-minute bus trip to Vancouver appeared to discourage them.

"But," says Mrs. Walker, "while transportation seems to stop people from coming from Portland to Vancouver for housing, it hasn't stopped Vancouver people from getting jobs in Portland. A large percentage of McLoughlin Heights residents work in Portland."

Mrs. Walker added that there had been increasing numbers of withdrawals from McLoughlin Heights by people who said they were moving in with other families to cut expenses.

OUST REDS FROM GOVERNMENT BUREAUS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the President of the United States has not only failed to cooperate with the Congress in its determined action to drive Communists and other subversive individuals from our Government but in his public statement he apparently takes the position that he is opposed to the program itself. I include as part of these remarks a number of editorials which clearly disclose the sentiments of the country are in support of the Republican program to rid our Government of Communists and fellow travelers.

[From the Washington Post of August 7, 1948]

GOP FORBEARANCE

(By Mark Sullivan)

FOREIGN POLICY REMAINS UNIFIED

For understandable reasons, including a reticence which the most responsible leaders in Congress and of the Republican Party enforce upon themselves, the impression made by this special session of Congress and its intended early ending, is superficial and incorrect. It is not that congressional and Republican leaders are so much angry at President Truman as in despair about him.

The surface picture which portrays Congress as angry at President Truman because he called them back to Washington in hot weather, and because he denounced the body, and as further angy because he called the special session in a spirit of and for the purpose of partisan politics—all that is true enough so far as it goes. But Congress and the Republicans would regard that sort of thing as the give-and-take of politics.

What deeply concerns the Republican leaders, what they regard as their highest obligation, is the need for national unity in the face of the foreign situation. The Republican position on this, formulated on the highest level of party leadership, is in a statement given out July 24 by Governor Dewey in consultation with Republican Senator VANDENBERG and Governor Dewey's adviser on foreign affairs, Mr. John Foster Dulles. They were soberly aware of what they were doing; they devoted three painstaking hours to composing the statement. What they renounced was as important as what they pledged:

"The Berlin situation is critical. * * * The present duty of Americans is not to be divided by past lapses, but to unite to surmount present dangers. We shall not allow domestic partisan irritations to divert us from this indispensable unity."

What puts the Republican leaders in despair about President Truman is the course followed by him which shows either a lack of adequate concern about unity or lack of comprehension of the effects of his actions. It is the sober conviction of men in Washington who are at once the best informed and the most poised in temperament that the danger of war with Russia is at least 50–50. It is this condition that determines the course of Republican leaders.

In this condition President Truman, by his call for a special session and the manner of it, creates division between himself and Congress and between himself and the Republicans. Adding to his provocativeness he blames Congress and the Republicans for inflation. As put by the Democratic platform, often repeated in equivalent words by Mr. Truman: "The Republican Eightieth Congress is directly responsible * * * for high cost of living," that is, for inflation.

Now every Republican in Congress is conscious that they enacted two measures which make for inflation because they involve immense Government expenditures and divert industry from production of goods for domestic consumption—the vastly increased appropriations for national defense and the likewise vast appropriations for the European recovery program.

The Republican Congress passed these measures knowing that they increased the danger of inflation. They balanced this danger with the foreign danger, decided that the latter was the greater and were thereby forced to increase the former.

The Republican Congress did this at the request of President Truman, in willing and complete support of the foreign program laid down by the Truman administration, and in the spirit of unity in face of the foreign threat. Now, President Truman puts blame on the Republican Congress for inflation without a single mention of the inflationary acts and that they were his own program.

If the Republicans, and Congress, were to defend themselves from Mr. Truman's charge of responsibility for inflation, they must defend the inflationary measures, increased military appropriations and the European recovery program. To defend these would bring up foreign relations in Congress during the Presidential campaign. A "who-done-it" debate on inflation might become a "who-done-it" debate on responsibility for our foreign crisis, and that would go angrily into actions and policies of the Truman administration and even more the Roosevelt one. Hardly anything could be more disruptive. Avoidance of disruption would be helped by an early ending of the special session, and this the Republican leaders decided upon.

[From the Washington Daily News of August 6, 1948]

NOT FUNNY, MR. PRESIDENT

President Truman charged congressional hearings on Soviet spy activities are a "red herring" to hide the Republican Congress' failure on other matters. In doing so, he very foolishly accepted a measure of responsibility for an ugly and dangerous situation which previously could not have been charged against him.

Not many people who have followed the testimony in the current hearings will agree with Mr. Truman that the Communist problem in Washington can be laughed off as "Republican politics," in our opinion.

Moreover, the President has further placed himself, on the defensive on this issue by denying to the investigating committees information which is pertinent to their inquiries.

The failure of Congress to act upon the President's anti-inflationary program will not in any sense excuse him for his own refusal to cooperate in removing a very real threat to our national security. The issues are not in any way related. Today we are concerned with another problem.

Under Mr. Truman's own loyalty program, laid down by Executive order, it is the announced policy of the Government to bar from positions of trust in "sensitive" agencies any employee whose loyalty may be subject to question.

That policy broke down when William W. Remington was appointed Chairman of the Commerce Department's export license committee although it was known he was under investigation for association with a confessed member of a Russian spy ring. That is not something existing only in the mind of Representative KARL E. MUNDT, as Mr. Truman would have us believe. It is an undisputed, unexplained fact. And if the President's loyalty test was not applied in Mr. Remington's case, what reason have we to believe that it has been applied in any other case?

The two congressional investigations, particularly the one being conducted by Senator FERGUSON, have been extremely useful. But neither has more than scratched the surface, in our judgment.

We need a careful, searching inquiry that will give free access to all pertinent information, conducted by an agency with the ability and the power to purge the Government of all disloyal and unreliable elements. An unofficial civilian commission should be created for this purpose, as a safeguard against the subversion of the Government by enemy agents or dupes.

Such a commission, to command respect and confidence of the public and Congress, should be composed of persons of the caliber of Herbert Hoover, Bernard M. Baruch, Henry L. Stimson, Charles Evans Hughes, Owen D. Roberts, Robert M. La Follette, and James F. Byrnes—men who know government, who respect civil liberties, but who would resolve all doubts in favor of national security.

Let's forget politics when the issue is security.

[From the Washington Post of August 7, 1948]

FAULTY HIRING

The three-ring Communist circus on Capitol Hill has scored at least one important point—that Federal administrators were occasionally very naive or very reckless in their hiring of personnel. It is difficult to understand how a man with the record of Nathan Gregory Silvermaster could have obtained a job, let alone a succession of jobs which he held onto for more than a decade, anywhere in the United States Government. The account of his background made public on Wednesday when he appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities was certainly no revelation. It had been publicized long before by the old Dies committee. It was well known, as the records show, to the Civil Service Commission and to the Office of Naval Intelligence. The FBI must have been equally familiar with it.

Yet Mr. Silvermaster was able to secure the indorsement of usually careful and conscientious public officials, even of so indisputably patriotic and exacting an administrator as former Secretary of War Patterson, and to remain on the Federal roster until 1946, despite the fact that examiners and review officials of the Civil Service Commission—not the Commission, mind you—had declared him ineligible for any Government job as early as 1942 and the Dies committee had started denouncing him in 1938. Why were their warnings ignored? Perhaps it was because the investigators themselves desired to keep Mr. Silvermaster where his actions and associations could be observed. Perhaps it was in some measure because they had so debased the currency in which they were dealing as to make their warnings seem valueless.

The Government's investigating agencies cried "wolf" too frequently. They cried it about many Government employees and job applicants who were in no sense subversive, who had no affiliation whatever with communism and who were guilty of nothing save independence of mind and liberalism. They cried it about many men who nevertheless served their Government valuably and faithfully—men whose services would have been lost to the war effort if certain administrators had not manifested the courage and toughness to override the protests of those who confused conformity with patriotism. Sometimes the investigating agencies employed incredibly naive and absurd criteria in evaluating the suitability of persons for Federal employment—disqualifying them on shadowy grounds such as membership in innocent liberal organizations or because they advocated and practiced racial equality or because they read books and magazines supposed to be dangerously radical. Federal administrators who had jobs to get done had to hire workers in the teeth of such silly objections. And it is not altogether surprising that some of them came to disregard all objections, even valid ones, from these sources.

Today, the investigators have the upper hand. They completely control Federal personnel policy. Anyone at whom they point even the most wavering finger of suspicion is likely to be blacklisted so far as the Government is concerned. Great care in hiring Government employees is indubitably necessary in these times when Communists willingly serve as a fifth column for the Soviet Union. But great care is no less necessary to avoid the stigmatization of loyal Americans and the exclusion from the Government of honest men urgently needed to carry on its vital work. Zeal in keeping the Communists out should not be permitted to result in letting in only the ordinary, the sterile, the second rate.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D. C.]

MORE THAN A "RED HERRING"

It is unfortunate that President Truman should have seen fit to add his voice to the swelling, intemperate chorus of generalized denunciation of the so-called spy scare in Washington. He dismissed the whole business as a "red herring" to divert attention from congressional inaction on his legislative program. The Communist Party convention in Philadelphia has made substantially the same charge, in different words. So have several of those accused.

But the average citizen is not likely to be satisfied with Mr. Truman's evaluation of the current hearings at the Capitol. Nor will his anxiety over the disclosure regarding an apparent break-down in the loyalty safeguards—implicit in the Remington case, for example—be relieved by the President's peculiar reaction.

Mr. Truman told reporters he could see no useful purpose whatsoever in the inquiries being conducted by the Senate and House committees—that the same information had been known for a long time to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a Federal grand jury in New York. Is it not serving a useful purpose, however, to let the public know that, despite the availability of such information as that given by a self-confessed Communist spy against William Remington, this civil servant was able to obtain transfers to positions of high security at top pay? Mr. Remington himself told the committee he could not understand how this was possible.

The President would have been justified in criticizing the publicity-surrounded, name-revealing procedure of the House Un-American Activities Committee—a procedure fraught with dangers of injustice to innocent persons. A distinction should be drawn, however, between the methods of that committee and the more judicial processes of the Ferguson committee. The Senate group, while foregoing an indiscriminate publication of names of those accused by former Communists, is doing a thorough and necessary job of finding out why the loyalty program did not work for so long in the Remington and perhaps other cases.

Few persons, after reading the testimony received by the committees to date, will share Mr. Truman's opinion that the only Communist spy ring in Washington exists in the imagination of the congressional probers. It is apparently true that testimony similar to that at the hearings was given to the grand jury in New York and that no spy indictments have been returned. But it should be remembered that the insufficiency of legal evidence to convict under the narrowly drawn Espionage Act does not necessarily mean that with all the smoke there is no fire. It is hard to believe that Mr. Truman is so naive as to think that

Communist agents have overlooked Washington, of all places.

Mr. Truman is within his rights, however, in refusing to turn over to the Ferguson committee the confidential loyalty file in the Remington case. The FBI would be seriously hampered in its work if its private sources of information were to be exposed. The President has authorized his subordinates to give the committee nonclassified data in the Remington personnel file. He should not stop there. He should make it plain to Congress and to the public generally that he is willing to cooperate without stint in all reasonable efforts by Congress to rid the Government of subversive influences. For the President brusquely to brand such efforts with a "red herring" label is wholly unfair and suggestive of the same sort of apathy as marked the handling of the Remington case by departmental executives.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of August 6, 1948]

TRUMAN SEEN ADVISED BADLY IN STATEMENT ON "RED HERRING"—CALLED FORM OF APOLOGY FOR COMMUNIST ACTIVITY WITHIN GOVERNMENT

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman seems to be getting the worst kind of political advice—or else he is ignoring good advice and going off on his own.

The statement that the White House considers the congressional inquiry into Communist activity to be a "red herring" is a form of apology for Communist activity that will not sit well with the voters.

The statement, moreover, that the President will continue to refuse to divulge the records in his Executive agencies pertaining to the loyalty of persons publicly accused of disloyalty will not sit well with the voters either.

RESENTED BY PEOPLE

There is one thing that the people as a whole resent—and that's any effort at suppression of evidence of what is going on inside their own Government.

The possibility that someone who is innocent might be accused is small potatoes compared with the larger public interest, which is whether the President and his Cabinet officers and their subordinates are sufficiently vigilant in protecting the security of the United States.

Anyone who is innocent and wrongly accused can be given his chance to refute charges. But if the President, with all his power, hides the evidence, then suspicion is compounded with suspicion and the people are led to believe that high crimes and misdemeanors are being committed behind the scenes with official protection.

There comes a time when a President who is running for office must forget politics and do what the people of all parties want done in an investigation on loyalty and security—namely, have all the facts produced.

PULLED A "BONER"

Mr. Truman certainly pulled a "boner" when after several days of headlines from self-confessed spies he brushed it all off as just an attempt by Republicans to divert attention from legislation for price control.

Mr. Truman takes unto himself full responsibility for ignoring what the Communists and alleged Communists have done as revealed by the two congressional committees. He says in a public statement:

"No information has been disclosed in the past few days by congressional committees that has not long been known to the FBI."

But will the President say frankly that the FBI knows only what has been testified before the committees and nothing else? Will he permit the FBI to open its files confidentially to members of the congressional committees? Will he rescind his gag order which prevents the FBI from doing anything about the evidence it has collected and keeps the FBI even from discussing it with any Members of Congress?

GRAND JURY BROUGHT IN

These are the pertinent questions that need answering along with another vital point. Mr. Truman now has brought the Federal grand jury into the matter. He says:

"The Federal grand jury found this information insufficient to justify indictment of the Federal employees involved."

Will the President reveal what recommendations, if any, were made by attorneys of the Government as they appeared before the grand jury and what facts or evidence was submitted? It is well known that, as a rule, grand juries take their cue from prosecuting attorneys of the Justice Department. One press dispatch says, for instance, that the Department's representative felt that, because it couldn't be proved that the information actually got to Russia, there was no real proof that could be used to secure a conviction. No such solicitude was shown before indicting several leading businessmen of America in recent years on criminal charges under the antitrust laws.

GOES STEP FURTHER

The congressional committees, it might be thought, could investigate what did happen in the Justice Department but the President can forbid the Department to answer a congressional committee's questions. Mr. Truman has just reiterated his decree that no information from the loyalty records of Government departments may be furnished to Congress. He goes a step further. He adds:

"The public hearings now under way are serving no useful purpose. On the contrary, they are doing irreparable harm to certain persons, seriously impairing the morale of Federal employees, and undermining public confidence in the Government."

The American people will have to judge whether any useful purpose is served by ferreting out disloyalty in the Government and whether the vast number of Federal employees can possibly be disturbed by the revelation that a few among them have been questioned as to loyalty. What is being undermined is not "public confidence in the Government" but public confidence in the efficiency and competence of the Truman administration.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of August 7, 1948]

LOOK WHO'S TALKING

Speaking off the cuff at a press conference yesterday, High Tax Harry Truman opined that the current congressional investigation of alleged red and pink spy dupes, now or formerly on the New Deal's pay roll, is a red herring.

It's all a political plot, Harry insisted, to divert public attention from other woes like inflation, which he is trying to pin on Congress, though not on its Democratic Members.

Many of our sweltering Congressmen, of course, have been moaning for some days that Harry was doing a bit of political plotting himself, in dragging them back to Washington. To many a legislator's twitching nose Harry's maneuver to get free campaign publicity out of Congress smelled very much of herring itself.

BAD STEER

However that may be, we think one of Mr. T's brain boys gave him a sad steer on that "red herring" crack. We don't know how guilty some of those pinkish exhibits will turn out to be, but we think the American public is benefiting by this airing of their antics. And they're being allowed, as they should, to defend themselves and their reputations.

About that "red herring" phrase, though, Mr. President, the funny thing is: That's what the Communists have been screaming about those hearings ever since they started.

PAY OF THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have on two different occasions within the past 30 days called the attention of the Members of the House and the leadership of the majority to the fact that commencing next January every single enlisted man in the armed services of the country, that is, the Navy, the Army, the Marine Corps, and the Air Corps, will suffer what is in effect a reduction of wages.

Mr. Speaker, it is not too late today. We are going to recess for probably 3 or 4 hours this afternoon. We can still on this last day pass a resolution by unanimous consent which would continue the present pay scale of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Corps.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility for this reduction in pay of the armed services is squarely on the shoulders of the leadership of the majority party of the House of Representatives. I hope they will consider this matter and permit the passage today of a proper House joint resolution.

EXPORTS IN RELATION TO GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCTION

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that in the RECORD today I shall insert some facts and figures on exports in relation to our gross national production. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I think it is important for the entire membership to have the facts on exports. Our total exports, including foreign aid, are but a small percentage of the gross national production; they are not the cause of present high prices.

I shall also include in the RECORD some facts on the support price program.

The support price program is not the cause of present high prices, although these two reasons will be given in the coming months for the high price of meat, vegetables, bread, milk, and everything else people need to live. This special session of Congress is long on excuses and short on action.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROBLEM

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD some very pertinents remarks made by His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York. These remarks were made before the annual convention of the New York State Federation of Labor on August 2, 1948.

I am sure that a thorough reading of this distinguished address by all segments of our population will bring forth a clearer understanding, on all sides, of labor-management problems.

ADDRESS OF HIS EMINENCE FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN, ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK, AT THE OPENING OF THE EIGHTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW YORK STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR, HOTEL COMMODORE, AUGUST 2, 1948

"IF FREEDOM FAIL"

I come before you today a minister of God and a son of the soil of America, begot from the loins of sons of toil that have helped make our country great. I come to call not alone upon you, citizens of our own New York State, but upon every loyal citizen of every State within our Nation to unite in solving a most vital problem, a cause which in its consequences affects us all: the relationships between capital and labor, the cause of liberty and justice, the cause of America itself. Fortified by my feeling that you believe in my love of God and of my country, I come to ask that with friendly hearts and open minds you ponder my reflections founded on the sacred principles of my priesthood and my patriotism, and then to do what the soul of each man counsels him to do. For if each man to his own self be true, "it must follow as the night the day, he cannot then be false to any man." Thus will he live faithful to God and true to his neighbor, publicly avowing by his words and his works an eternal enmity to godless tyranny and evil and an everlasting loyalty to justice and democracy.

The burden and solution of the problem of unity and equity between labor and capital belong jointly to us all. It matters not where we live, or what position in life we hold, whether we be rich or poor, Negro or white, Protestant, Jew, or Catholic, employer or employee, by our works we must prove our faith in God, our country, and our fellow man. And I am confident that the majority of Americans have the determination, jealously to guard their country, their neighbors, and themselves against the wily power of foreign influence which history and experience prove is the most fearsome foe of republican government. I am confident that they have the determination to go forward together, to live and work together for the welfare and peace of themselves and their countrymen—a determination which I believe to be all important to the survival of each and every American and to the unity and survival of democratic America itself.

Citizens by birth or choice of a common country, we have in war and in peace fought together in common causes against common dangers, shared common sorrows and sufferings, triumphed in common successes, and the independence of liberty which we now possess are the works of combined councils and united efforts, resulting in benefits to all. This unity is the source of our strength, the core of our liberty, the foundation of our peaceful living. It is therefore a great and grave mistake to assume that any one class of Americans is naturally and inevitably hostile to any other class, that the wealthy and the workingman, employer and employee are destined to live in mutual conflict.

This morning I pray Almighty God, as every morning of my priestly life I have prayed, that every man living upon American soil, sharing American freedom, will forever be loyal to our democratic government founded upon the principles of faith in God and reason and justice. And what is this American democracy for which, over the youthful span of our Nation's life, millions of our sons have fought and died to preserve and protect? On the political side we all know the answer—by instinct perhaps, rather than by definition. We have learned and lived the magnificent phrases that symbolize and enshrine democracy's prime principles: The Bill of Rights; a government of laws, not of men; life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; government of the people, by the people, for the people.

Yes, of political democracy, we have full and familiar concept. But what about economic democracy? Totalitarians have their plan and their own purpose in economic matters, and a very great segment of the human race is ruled in accordance with their theory and practice that economic security and social welfare can be had only at the sacrifical price of freedom. America denies this heresy. "For what avail the plow or sail, or land, or life, if freedom fail!"

Down through the years America has lived to give lie to all who would deny that in unity and justice for all, reside the strength, wealth, and peace of our United States and all its varied peoples, who, living and working as one, have made and kept our country one. And upon our continued productive activity and efficiency depend the maintenance and the improvement of our standards of living. But there can be no mutually profitable productive activity without cooperation between employer and employee—cooperation motivated by the social and spiritual incentive of justice, based on the great commandment of the divine law: "To do unto others as you would have others do unto you." As capital and labor recognize and organize in accordance with this God-inspired principle, all Americans will benefit hundredfold in a rapid march of material progress in providing food and shelter for every citizen to maintain him in health and give him opportunities for the education of his children, and finally give to him the assurance that the blessing of children will not bring with it the hardships of poverty. These are each citizen's rights—all these, and freedom too.

But think you man can attain these rights without fulfilling his corresponding duties to the will of God and to society? I tell you "No." Show me a man who reveres and follows God's ways and I will show you the man who respects his fellow men and strives to do them service. And I beg of all men to seek guidance of God for the good of themselves and their fellow workers. The man who listens to God is inflamed of heart and enlightened of mind, for the Lord teaches knowledge without confusion and he who listens quickly becomes wise. Man is ensnared with many passions, held fast by many fears, worn with many burdens, tormented with want. He yearns to be freed from the bondage of these cares and trials, secure in liberty and peace. But if he is to enjoy freedom's gifts, first he must learn to obey God's laws and strive to help his neighbor—because it is in God himself that our rights and duties and our peace and our freedom are founded, for "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

Is it not a satisfying feeling for man to look upon the mighty, many-threaded works of labor and industry—lofty cathedrals and churches; unsurpassed skyscrapers, schools, homes, shops, and offices, all with equipment designed for efficiency and comfort; sturdy ships, trains, and automobiles; airplanes built to race the sun and carry man from clime to clime—is it not good to look upon all these and to know that employer and employee—engineers, architects, tradesmen, men of every profession, laborers all—shared their united efforts, and, insofar as is humanly possible, have kept apace with God's own handiwork to make man's life livable, peaceful, and prosperous. God alone can do anything, but men to build a peaceful prosperous world must enlist God's help and unite their efforts with one another's.

America's prosperity and happiness can be attained only through the full cooperation between labor and capital with full employment and fair wages. Yet millions of people are being taught—and tricked into believing—that the benefits of security fall like manna from heaven. I beg those people who are being deceived that they cease to be terrified, stunned, or confused by Communists or Communist-inspired agitators who, with sharp sickle-strokes seek to murder democracy, stifle free enterprise, and destroy world peace. I beg of them that with firm resolve and the might of free democratic citizens they unite in the common cause of the safety and survival of our country and the welfare of one another. I am confident that all true Americans believe with me and stand ready to live by the pure democratic credo: That property should be the servant and not the master of the Nation, and that every man born of woman should have a fair chance to make of himself all that in him lies to reach the highest point to which his capacities can carry him, and to receive for himself and his family substantially what he has earned. A nation that gives to each of its citizens equal chances to earn his own and his family's keep has its right to receive from each of its citizens the highest service of which he is capable. And any man or group of men who does not give full service for full pay contributes to the spiral of inflation, increases prices for his neighbor, and himself, jeopardizes economic stability, and invites corrupt communistic disruption.

The right to regulate the use of wealth in the public interest is universally admitted. But in the essential interest of the common good for the common man we must also admit the right to regulate the terms and conditions of labor, and in the interests of the workingman himself we need set our faces like flint against mob violence just as against corporate greed; against the lawlessness of workers, just as much as against the lawlessness of employers, remembering always that each must render justice to the other.

Democratic governments are established not for the aggrandizement of particular individuals or special groups, but for the general good of all citizens, and I contend that it is the duty of every loyal American to obey the Nation's Constitution and its laws, until through just democratic processes, they are amended or repealed. Obedience should be each citizen's principle and practice, since disobedience to a law because a man thinks the law is bad might be used to justify another man in the disobedience of a good law. This principle should hold true in all organizations set up within the framework of our democratic Nation. But I believe with the mighty poet Milton who inspired the deathless dream of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, that a disposition to controversy in a nation is no proof of sedition or degeneracy if in controversies which affect countless people, leaders exert every lawful means and pursue every reasonable avenue to effect peaceful decisions and just settlements.

Down through the years, as labor has struggled for its rights, an effective economic weapon has been evolved—the strike weapon—recognized in this and many other nations of freemen, as lawful. However, this powerful, legal, economic weapon should be

used less frequently as capital and labor continue to work out their problems and differences in mutual respect and enlightened understanding, following the principles of collective bargaining which jointly they have adopted for the well-being of all parties. In fair collective bargaining rests America's greatest hope for future peaceful labor relations, but in its processes men must guard themselves against selfish, domineering minority groups opposed to our democratic form of government, groups that refuse to solve their problems through this just device and use strikes as smokescreens to wage political war against America. In no business nor profession nor craft nor institution in America is there room for any man with a divided allegiance. Nor can we Americans afford to blind ourselves to the actual conflict which faces us today. The issue is obvious, and we must solve it or disintegrate. The hope of all mankind rests with us, and if it should be proven that our example of equitably settling problems between capital and labor through fair collective bargaining has become an argument against the experiment, and if we strike ourselves out of prosperity and peace, the knell of liberty and civilization would be sounded throughout the earth.

As I bring to a close these reflections for which I have begged your thoughtful and prayerful attention, may I express my personal and my official gratitude to the leaders and members of the Building Trades Union of New York City and of Westchester County with whom I have had continuous close and cordial contacts. When employment was slow and builders were hesitant in May of 1947, I promised to try to swim against the tide and to expend $25,000,000 for new construction in the Archdiocese of New York. In April of 1948, I was pleased to announce publicly that this promise had been fulfilled. At the time I made this commitment the Building Trades Councils of New York City and of Westchester County pledged "not to interrupt the work by stoppages due to disputes between unions or between union and employer, to give a day's work for a day's pay, and to supply sufficient mechanics to carry forward the work."

Fortified with these pledges I authorized work to commence on a number of projects, chief of which was a high school for boys in White Plains, N. Y., dedicated to Archbishop Stepinac, the persecuted victim of godless tyrants in Communist-conquered Yugoslavia. And I am happy and proud today to testify to labor's complete fulfillment of its pledges, and that on the 12th of next month, in record-breaking construction time, the Archbishop Stepinac High School, built at a cost of $4,200,000, will open its doors for 1,360 boys. I thank also the architects and builders of this school whose work has won first prize in a Nation-wide competition for America's best designed high school.

In New York City we are building an addition to St. Vincent's Hospital, dedicated to the memory of the late beloved Gov. Alfred E. Smith. As part of the work, we are completely renovating the older portions of the hospital, while the full routine of the care of the sick is maintained. This involves many difficulties for the workmen, the hospital staff, and the patients. The successful solving of all such difficulties is attested by the statement of the hospital administrators testifying to the courtesy and efficiency of the workmen and their care for the comfort of the patients. To these men also I express my heart's gratitude.

Yet, in contradiction to this proven program achieved only because all of us have worked in complete harmonious agreement, I quote William Z. Foster, who said:

"A program based on class peace would be a first-class disaster to the workers and the people generally, as well as to our party. * * * The aims of the trade-unions cannot be achieved by a harmonious agreement between labor and capital."

That is the Communist credo. It is not mine. And I know it is not yours, nor can it ever be the credo of any patriotic American. But I do here repeat the creed for capital and labor which is mine, and I believe and pray will be your creed and the creed of every loyal citizen for the security, survival, and peace of our America.

I believe in a system of government which encourages labor and capital to function freely under God, giving full measure of deed and devotion for the common good of the common man, in loyal, concerted service to our common country. Thus, I believe, taking God as my inspiration and God's laws as my guide.

Six days God labored for man, dividing the light and the darkness, studding the skies with sun and stars, stocking the forests with birds and beasts, sowing the plains with fertile seed, storing ore and oil in the earth. Then did God create man to His own image and likeness, and blessed him.

But in disobedience and defiance man failed God. Yet did a forgiving, merciful God bestow upon man his greatest blessing, investing His only Son in humanity, making the world livable and life lovable for man's own and his children's sake. In His great goodness God quickened the earth with riches for man's use, not for his abuse; for his rise, not for his ruin, and labor and capital can reap the rewards of God's goodness only if labor unstintingly produces with the skills with which God has so abundantly endowed it, and capital unsparingly distributes the produce of labor for all men's welfare.

Labor has the right and duty to expand its service and usefulness to the social body and to progress through orderly processes. Capital, too, has its right and duty to increase its usefulness to society through free enterprise, fair competition and reasonable profits. Thus may labor and capital together glorify God in this fair land bequeathed to man, fulfilling their debt to God and their duty to relieve man's needy estate.

God has gifted man with brawn and brain, with the good rich earth and the fruits thereof, opening before him widening avenues for service to all humankind. Possessed of these gifts, it is the sacred duty of labor and capital, faithfully to remain the repository and stronghold of God's trust, rendering unselfish service to society—service which can prosper and endure only by steady production and fulsome distribution.

By God's decree man labors for bread by the sweat of his brow, tilling fields and tending folds, working mines and sinking wells, manning machines and building homes. Thus by simple obedience to God and honest work with his neighbor, man himself is saved, enriched and ennobled.

Christ, who is God, sanctified labor by toiling as a carpenter and it is labor's duty to keep toil blessed, giving unbounded service for the happiness and prosperity of man as an avowal of his faith and trust in God. So too did Christ sanctify capital, by calling laborers to work in His vineyard, paying to them their just hire. Shareholder with labor, it is capital's duty also to preserve itself blessed by fostering human happiness and prosperity, for no man should be slave nor master to another, but each should be servant to God and helpmate to his neighbor.

If labor and capital are to thrive and survive, they must serve as members of one social body, with singleness of purpose and diversity of functions, united in the strong bond of service for the good of mankind, spirited by reverence and love of God, working together to do God's will on earth as it is done in heaven. For labor and capital are destined under God's plan to achieve and maintain standards of living harmonious with God's will, and only thus shall posterity glean its legacy of God's glory.

God in His infinite wisdom, mercy, and justice implements His plans for man's welfare through human efforts, and labor and capital are his especial instruments impelled by God's guiding hand to lead and to help man on the road to peace.

All this I believe, taking God as my model, for the law of His life is the law of love.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, each to include extraneous matter.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the action of a subcommittee in the other body seems to end any hope that the date in the Displaced Persons Act will be changed from December 22, 1945 to April 21, 1947, at this special session. For it was after the December date that tens of thousands from eastern Europe, most of whose kin had already been exterminated by the Nazis, escaped to the DP camps from violent political and religious persecution. These thousands still in the camps are barred by this law.

The failure to make this change will be considered as outright discrimination by thousands of American families who have friends and relatives in the DP camps, for it sets a wholly arbitrary standard and admits as immigrants DPs not according to the proportions of their elements actually in the DP camps, but according to the arbitrary standard set in a law which gives a preference to one element over others at least equally deserving. Those of us who have seen the DP camps and talked personally with hundreds of DP's and with their relatives in the United States, will realize vividly the personal tragedies involved.

Members may as well assure their constituents that the change will be made early in the next session for the protest will be so loud and clear, and so well justified that I believe the next Congress will have to make it one of its first acts. I only wish that this Congress could have had the privilege of righting this injustice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE PRESS AND HON. CARTER MANASCO

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise, as spokesman for the Alabama delegation,

to offer our profound thanks and expressions of gratitude to the fourth estate, our friends of the press, for the very gracious, and cordial testimonial they have just given to one of our distinguished Members, the Honorable CARTER MANASCO. The feeling back of that party and testimonial is shared by every Member of this House. Our distinguished Speaker honored us with his presence, as did our latest former Speaker, and so many of the ladies and gentlemen on both sides of the aisle. We of the Alabama delegation simply wish to express our appreciation of the signal and unique honor that they have chosen to bestow upon our beloved friend. We all know and love CARTER MANASCO. We honor him for the services that he rendered as secretary to our beloved Bill Bankhead. He served as his press secretary during the time he was Speaker. So, as a testimonal of the affection he won from the press, for his fairness and the fullness of his service in that regard, which meant much to them at that time, and which has been continued since, we of Alabama wish to express our lasting gratitude.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

INCOME-TAX EXEMPTION FOR SERVICEMEN

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] remarked on loss of pay which all members of the armed services will incur on the first of next year. I assume the gentleman referred to the fact that the services will lose the $1,500 exemption in income tax on that date.

I may say that the picture is not quite as dark as it might seem because some little time ago we did pass a measure to continue this exemption. It failed of passage in the other body, but I sincerely hope and believe that the next Congress will consider the matter again and will take care of it either by continuing the tax exemption or by increase of pay before members of the armed services involved are compelled to pay the income tax which will be due on this $1,500.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman, I think, will understand it will be impossible to get any action in time to prevent the withholding of these taxes from the privates in the Army or the seamen in the Navy, every single one of them without regard to any commissioned personnel exemption.

A master sergeant in the army will have $20 less pay for the month of January than he has during this year, and it affects other men in the service.

The leadership could very easily pass a simple resolution today, because every paymaster in the armed services will necessarily have to make up a new pay roll for every man in the service commencing with the 1st of January. That calls for mountains of work and will cost thousands and thousands of dollars.

Mr. BRADLEY. The gentleman is undoubtedly correct. I merely would indicate that I do not believe there will be any ultimate loss to the personnel involved.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It will definitely be a loss when the paymaster has to make up a new pay roll taking withholding taxes from every man in the service from the lowest private in the lowest rank in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Corps.

I submit that if the membership had an opportunity to vote on that bill it could be passed in 5 minutes. Really, it is an unjust thing to let this bill fail.

Mr. BRADLEY. I appreciate that there will be a lot of additional work involved and that there will be some inconvenience and distress due to the withholding of these taxes from the families of enlisted personnel, in particular.

The purpose of these remarks is merely to let armed service personnel know that the House of Representatives has not abandoned its efforts to continue present income-tax exemptions for the armed services, or to provide an equivalent increase in pay. We shall try again early in the Eighty-first Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

AU REVOIR, NOT FAREWELL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, unless the entirely unexpected happens, today will conclude for me 10 years of service in the House of Representatives, and so, in conformity with an ancient and established tradition in congressional circles, I take this opportunity simply to bid you what I hope will not be farewell but an au revoir.

As most of you know, I am about to embark on an attempted journey on what I presume is the shortest, the most expensive, and the most hazardous journey of all America's travel routes, the 500 feet which lead from the House of Representatives over to the Senate of the United States.

As an established Member of the House I hope you notice I said "over to the Senate," and not "up to the Senate," because I feel I am simply endeavoring to shift from one body to another.

Certainly I could not leave this great body of distinguished men without saying how much I have appreciated working with you and sharing with you the tremendous problems which have come before us in the past 10 years. I can assure you that, speaking as a country boy from South Dakota, this has been a great experience to me, a great series of contacts and associations. It has been one long succession of pleasant experiences, and I can truthfully say that while I have differed violently with some Members of the House, representatives of the third party especially, who are now pressing their Presidential campaign, I cannot say I personally dislike anyone in this great historic body.

Everybody is pursuing his objective with diligence and sincerity. I know of no institution in all the world, including the one in which I now seek membership, which is greater, or more important, or more able or patriotic than the House of Representatives.

So I say "salute and farewell." And if I am fortunate I hope to see you in January, thus making this just an au revoir instead of a firm farewell.

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, KARL MUNDT represents the eastern half of the State of South Dakota. My district borders his to the east. I, for one, deeply regret seeing this gentleman leave the House of Representatives, but I do know that there is a broader field available for his talents in the Senate of the United States, and with all due respect to that body I do think they need a gentleman of KARL MUNDT's fighting ability over there to lead the crusade against communism.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE WEST

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we listened a few minutes ago to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] express some very strange opinions, most of which were mistatements, regarding appropriations made by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress for western reclamation. The facts are that the Eightieth Congress appropriated more than twice as much money for the development of the West for irrigation, reclamation, and hydroelectric power than had any other Congress in the history of this Nation.

It is rather singular to see the administration under Mr. Truman and Mr. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, now send a budget up to this special session asking that additional funds be made available for a number of projects. This request comes about 30 days after the regular session and after the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations of which I have the honor of being chairman had had 11 solid weeks of hearings and 424 witnesses. If the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior cannot estimate their requirements any closer than they indicate they have by such a request, I would suggest they throw in the sponge now.

Of course, the truth of the matter is that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] knows exactly less than nothing about which he spoke, as the facts and figures prove; but like the President,

Mr. Krug, Mr. Straus, and company, all know they are on a bad spot and are all using the truth shamefully and recklessly for purely political reasons, hoping to keep the people fooled as usual, but that day is past forever, I hope.

It was Mr. Truman himself who placed a stop order against over half the 1947 money Congress appropriated for flood control and reclamation on August 2, 1946, the very day Congress adjourned. It was the same Mr. Truman who directed that there should be no new starts in the fiscal year 1949 for flood control and reclamation. No wonder they have red faces now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

THE HONORABLE KARL MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say to my friend, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], that if I am privileged to be a Member of this body in the Eighty-first Congress I shall miss his presence very much indeed. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs it has been my pleasure and privilege to work with the gentleman from South Dakota on a subcommittee of which he was chairman, on a select committee of which he was co-chairman and on the full committee. He was always tireless in his energies, he was patient and equitable in his approach to the problems which came before us, and his comments were illuminating and helpful.

Mr. Speaker, the other body will be fortunate in obtaining the participation of the gentleman from South Dakota in the important legislation which will face it next year. We in the House have lost a genial friend and a mighty contributor to the work of this great deliberative body.

I wish him good luck and Godspeed and I hope that our paths will cross often.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to add to the gentleman's remarks by expressing my view as majority leader. In my opinion the gentleman from South Dakota, KARL MUNDT, is one of the most able Members of the House and I join with the others in regretting the fact he has seen fit to move over to the other side of the Capitol; but since he has made that election, what is our loss will be their gain. I know he will perform both ably and admirably in his assignment to the other body.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, although I represent a district in California, a district of which I am very proud, it so happens that the portion of his State so ably represented by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], is the district in which I was born. So, I have more than a fraternal bond in my association with the gentleman from South Dakota in the House of Representatives. When a new Member comes to Congress, as you so well know, he is confronted with a very complex, a very confusing and a very difficult situation. KARL MUNDT has been in the past, during my association with him, a source of strength, and a source of constant help; always cooperative, and always willing to be of service. During the period of time I have had the honor to serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs with KARL MUNDT I have come to admire his fine qualities and to respect his judgment, and I should like to say with the others that the great loss of the House will almost certainly be the great gain of the Senate of the United States.

ROBERT BRUCE MATHIAS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD this week I included a letter from Gael Sullivan of New York calling attention to the fact that the month of September is Youth Month. Every American today, yes, every citizen of the world, marvels at the great feat performed by an American youth on yesterday in London, England, at the Olympic games, where a boy 17 years of age won the decathlon. We pause and wonder at the great achievement that he performed, the most outstanding in the history of the athletic world. As long as American youth can display such determined spirit and competitive challenge to the rest of the world like that young fellow did, America will always be the greatest Nation on earth.

Mr. Speaker, when this 17-year-old California school boy, Robert Bruce Mathias, won the decathlon he showed the world the stuff American youngsters are made of. It took long hours of training and application and stout courage to achieve this victory. It proved that American youth is not soft but that in competition—in both war and peace—it ranks with the best.

Bob Mathias is not only an honor and a credit to his school and his State, but he is also the epitome of American youth. All-American, yes, but primarily in the sense that he typifies the greatness of a country and the courage of its people. The Congress salutes him.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) entitled "joint resolution to provide for the regulation of consumer installment credit for a temporary period," with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. Henry A. Wallace. I understand it may exceed the limit. Notwithstanding that, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The regular order, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman is not going to make a speech on my request.

Mr. RANKIN. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker. How does it exceed the limit?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In size. It may require a page or two beyond the limit.

Mr. RANKIN. I just wondered how it exceeds the limit.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. For the information of the gentleman, may I say to the Speaker that it is exactly 10 mimeographed sheets.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes the gentleman will not object.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HILL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SOMERS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables, editorials, and extracts, notwithstanding the fact that it may exceed the allowable amount that may be included in the RECORD.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BUTLER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article from a Minneapolis paper.

Mr. POULSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include three editorials.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. How many days do we have in which to make any extensions following this session?

The SPEAKER. It is an indefinite period, but generally it is about 10 days.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping and four short letters and copies of replies thereto.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. GWINN of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PROTECTING THE NATION'S ECONOMY AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass a resolution, House Resolution 711, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 157, to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures, with Senate amendments to the House amendments, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendments to the House amendments be, and the same are hereby, agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, there is but one speaker on this side. I wonder if the minority wish to use their time.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question: Are State banks included in the Senate amendment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; they are not. State and nonmember banks are not included.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I expect to support the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this bill that any Member of the House need worry about supporting. There is so little in the bill that it is hardly worth having a vote on.

The dangerous section that we made a hard fight on and which we feared would destroy the Government support operation of Government bonds has wisely been stricken out by the Senate. This, I believe, proves the point the minority tried to prove here the other day.

This bill will have no more effect on stopping inflation than the placing of a very small pin in the path of a rushing Pennsylvania streamlined train. The bill contains two tiny items, one to restrict installment credit, which restriction continues until July 1 of next year; and the other raises the reserve requirements of member banks in the Federal Reserve by 4 percent.

This tiny bit of effect against inflation is what the Republican mountain has labored and brought forth by its labor.

When people complain to you about dollar or dollar and a half a pound meat, of record-breaking prices for clothing, and of an all-time high cost of living, you can point to this bill and say that this is Congress's feeble answer to your plea for something to stop inflation.

If it stops it, it will certainly surprise every Member of the Democratic side of the Committee on Banking and Currency, because it is absolutely insufficient and ineffective in meeting the dangerous spiral of inflation that is going on today.

The Congress, I feel, in passing this insignificant bill, has completely admitted its failure to deal with inflation. If the people in control of this Congress did not like the President's program, and since they could not deny that inflation was here, they should have submitted a program that they themselves could have supported.

Under the gag-rule provisions which the Republican majority has imposed in this special session, the Democratic minority was denied the right to amend this bill to make it effective, or to even offer a motion to recommit.

Even in the Banking and Currency Committee, the committee by majority action refused to even hear the testimony of the Cabinet members most actively affected by this inflation spiral. Ready and asking to testify were the Secretaries of Agriculture, on food prices; the Secretary of Commerce on priorities and allocations on scarce industrial commodities; and the Secretary of Interior on fuel prices. They, too, were denied a right to appear in person before the Banking and Currency Committee to testify.

Then, when this mouselike bill to halt inflation was brought to the floor, the most severe form of gag rule was imposed, so that no Member of the House could seek to strengthen or make effective the meager provisions of the committee bill.

All told, the House itself, under this gag-rule procedure, permitted only 40 minutes of debate and consideration to the Nation's No. 1 problem of inflation. The product of its deliberations hardly indicate that that much time was spent. Surely, when the people look at new high record prices each month, then they can only logically conclude that this Republican-controlled Congress either was unwilling to recognize the danger, or was incapable of recommending any effective remedy for their plight.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wish the gentleman to explain, if he will, the restrictions that are placed in this bill on installment credit, as we have not had a chance to hear the bill read. What restrictions are placed upon installment credit?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Section 1 of this bill deals with the matter of consumer-installment credit and extends it until June 30, 1949, only on selected items. It will probably not be as inclusive as regulation W was in all its forms. In that measure they covered automobiles, furniture, and 10 household-appliance items. This, of course, will have to be set up by regulations of the Federal Reserve Board so far as to what is actually covered.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They are permissive?

Mr. BUCHANAN. As far as consumer-installment credit is controlled they will be mandatory.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They are mandatory. In other words, we have done nothing whatever to stop the inflationary spiral, but now we put restrictive installment-credit controls on the poor people who have to spend their meager salaries over a long period of time in order to obtain any consumer goods.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is section 1 of the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the Federal Reserve Bank have to indicate the items on which there are installment controls?

Mr. BUCHANAN. They will prescribe the administrative regulations. Of course, I am merely forecasting, but I think those regulations will probably not be as all-inclusive as regulation W.

Mr. Speaker, what is in this bill? Of course, insofar as what we passed the other day, section 1 deals with consumer installment credit and as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], has stated, the very controversial gold reserve section has been stricken out by the other body.

In the section on bank reserves they have raised the percentage points to 4 across the board on demand deposits and 1½ on time deposits. The previous resolution that we sent over was 3 percentage points across the board on time deposits and one on time deposits.

The American economy has since the end of hostilities displayed remarkable strength and elasticity.

Now, the present inflationary pressures continue. Our economy, of course, having gone through a period of war and a period of postwar adjustment, is still in the throes of a continual rising period of an inflationary spiral. The pressures are constantly increasing.

The President in his various messages to the Congress on four respective occasions has asked for control measures and stand-by measures to meet and deal with the present situation providing that if conditions were to become aggravated, he would have authority to deal with it. He asked for an eight-point anti-inflation program to cover price control, wage control, rationing, allocations, inventory control, and tighter rent control. There is nothing in this so-called Republican anti-inflation control bill that meets any of those problems.

I want to say to the Members of the House and I want to say to the people of this country that they should not be under any illusions so far as what this bill will do. While it does contain two of the recommended provisions that on consumer credit and that on bank reserves, there is nothing so far as controls or stand-by authority that will give to the President the over-all authority to check the continuing spiral of inflation.

We are witnessing the spectacle of rapidly soaring prices. On the very eve of an economic collapse, many people are apt to grow more confident that all is well even in the face of new mounting figures. When you appraise the figures on industrial production, gross national product, distribution of income, prices, wages and profits, it gives one the illusion that we are enjoying a great period of prosperity. Nothing can be farther from the truth because the gap is ever getting wider between wages and prices, prices rising and wages falling behind. The gap between the middle and lower income groups is spreading. Savings are being spent. Consumer credit continues to expand. One-fourth of the family units spent more than they earned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, all of the expert opinion and testimony that was offered before the House Banking Committee, of course, was to the effect that we are in an artificial period of prosperity. We should recognize the fact that we were called to action by the President to do something constructive and affirmative now, to put the brakes on, to put the checks on, and to apply these brakes and apply these checks; but the story so far as this legislation is concerned is too little, too late. So, Mr. Speaker, when the story is written on housing in the Eightieth Congress, when the story is written on price control, when the story is written on Federal aid to education, when the story is written on excess profits, you may recall the theme song in 1946 of the Republican Party which was, "Have you had enough?"

I believe that the American people in 1948 are going to offer their version of the theme song by saying that they have had enough of nothing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I voted against this proposal several days ago because I felt that the Federal Reserve requirements being increased was possibly a dangerous move. I shall support this legislation not with the idea that it will accomplish its goal or its purpose, but that something, as small as it is, is better than nothing.

I think it is tragic that we have handled the gravest domestic issue facing the American people today as a partisan political matter. The truth of the matter is—and all of us must admit it if we will be honest with ourselves—that we are living in a war economy. We have a $40,000,000,000 national budget; we have a national debt of something over $250,000,000,000. The inflationary pressures today are every bit as great as they were during World War II. As long as the international situation remains as it is, as long as Russia challenges our freedom and our liberty, the pressures are going to remain upon the economy of America, and we are going home, Democrats and Republicans alike, with this Nation facing its most dangerous economic situation in all of its history and telling the people of this country that we have done something about it.

Now, that is just perfectly ridiculous and incomprehensible. We have done nothing about it. I am not pleading for the President's program. I have no way in the world of knowing whether or not it would have worked, but I say this, that with prices spiraling as they are spiraling now, to have conducted hearings for only a matter of days and hours, to have permitted only four witnesses to come before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, to have failed to go to the finest brains in America and the best economists in America and ask them to come forward with a program that might possibly offer a solution to this problem, is a dereliction of duty that lies squarely upon the leadership of this body. The record is written. The gag rule was used in committee and on the floor. The country will know this too.

Inflation is not a partisan matter. Inflation affects Republicans and Democrats, Wallaceites, and Dixiecrats. It affects all Americans, and if we will reflect for a moment and think about the welfare of our country rather than partisan politics, and face this grave problem honestly and squarely, we would attempt to do something constructive about it. We would not go home and abandon our people and invite depression, disaster, unemployment, and insecurity. Remember that is what Russia is counting on in the cold war.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is no more than a gesture toward curbing inflation. When it was before the House for consideration on Thursday it not only was subject to the criticism that it presents no remedy for inflation. It then contained a section which actually made it a dangerous bill.

As the bill was then written, section 2 would have increased the gold-certificate reserve requirement to 40 percent against its Federal Reserve notes in circulation, and to 35 percent against Federal Reserve bank deposits.

The present reserve requirement is 25 percent. Under the original provisions of this bill the supporting Federal Reserve funds for supporting Government bonds, and maintaining them at par, would have been reduced from the figure of $40,500,000,000 to approximately $10,000,000,000, or a reduction of 450 percent, according to financial experts.

This would have created the possibility of one of the greatest panics this country has ever seen. It created the possibility of large holders of 2½-percent Government bonds cashing them in, with the veiw of buying new issues at a higher interest rate, and breaking the Government bond market.

It is important that the Federal Government maintain Government bonds at par. The people who have bought and paid for these bonds have the right to expect and look to the Government to be able to buy them in at 100 cents on the dollar, plus accrued interest at all times.

Section 2 would reduce the amount of gold reserve available to support the price of Government bonds, and would weaken the cushion that has been available to support the bond market.

This section 2 was a menace to the stability of the Government bond market. As reluctant as I am to vote against any measure offered as a weapon against inflation, I could not vote to subject the people of the United States to such a provision as this section 2, and I voted against it.

The Senate realized the danger of this provision, and has wisely and properly amended the bill to remove section 2.

The bill is now back before us with this provision taken out.

It is a weak and ineffective measure. In my opinion it will have little effect on inflation. Yet, it is the only anti-inflationary bill that is going to be permitted to come before Congress this session. And, under the circumstances, since the threat to the Government bond market is now out of the bill, I shall support it.

I am sorry the bill carries a provision to place Regulation W back into effect. I feel that it is wrong in principle to pass a law that in effect will keep a poor man from buying his wife a washing machine and paying for it on the installment plan, or a refrigerator, or similar articles. I doubt that this feature of the bill will reduce inflation to any noticeable extent. Still, it is a gesture, and under the circumstances, it may be worth trying. At any rate, it will only remain in force under this bill less than 11 months, until June 30, 1949.

We only have the choice of voting for the bill as is, or voting against it as is.

Therefore, with section 2 and its threat to the bond market now out of the bill, I shall vote for it. The Atlanta Journal on July 31, 1948, carried an editorial pointing out some of the difficulties incident to curbing inflation at this late date. I attach this editorial herewith, as a part of my remarks:

THE CONGRESS AND INFLATION

At least one paragraph in President Truman's Mid-Year Economic Report, which was transmitted Friday to the Congress, is understandable by any person who can read, and will be disputed by no one. It is this:

"Thus far we have shown a blind disregard of the dangers that beset our path. Despite my repeated warnings and recommendations, we have not adopted adequate legislation for controlling inflation."

All, too, will join fervently in his expressed hope that "it is not too late for preventive measures." The tragic consequences of economic collapse into depression are a grim reality to those who experienced the bitter 1930's, and we want no more of that.

As to the efficacy of the prescription offered by Mr. Truman to treat the economic fever which now racks our people, there is ample room for doubt. Nonetheless, the duty of Congress to deal with the situation honestly, emphatically, and without political finagling is exigent. If the Congress can devise and enact a better legislative program than that offered by the President it should do so.

It is too bad that the administration and/or Congress not only failed 2 years ago to take reasonable steps against inflation recommended by the Committee for Economic Development, but actually went counter to some of the most important of those recommendations.

This committee, a group of able and experienced executives and economists, stated seven essential requirements. They were:

1. Efforts of management, labor, and Government to increase production.

2. Restraint by individuals, acting singly or collectively, in raising prices, wages, and salaries in recognition of the common interest in avoiding a wage-cost-price spiral.

3. Restraint by individuals and businesses in making deferrable expenditures.

4. Restraint by State and local governments in making expenditures not urgently needed.

5. A monetary policy to help prevent further expansion of expendable funds in the hands of the public.

6. A vigorous campaign to sell, and keep sold, Series E and F bonds of small denominations.

7. A vigorous policy to reduce Federal expenditures and maintain sufficient revenues to yield a large excess of receipts over expenditures.

The vital items were: (1) control of wages and prices, (2) a monetary policy to prevent further expansion of expendable funds, (3) maintenance of taxation to reduce the Federal debt.

President Truman wanted a continuance of OPA but did not want to curb wages or the price of farm products. It is less easy to make flat general statements about monetary policy, but it is significant that Marriner S. Eccles, who favored an anti-inflationary curbing of credit, was dismissed from a position of power over the Federal Reserve system. The President pleaded against tax reduction but Congress overrode him.

In short, nothing was done, and a bad situation has become worse. In September 1946, when President Truman transmitted that report to Congress, it would have been painful to put its recommendations into effect. Now it is many times more unpleasant, if indeed it has not become what is cynically termed politically impossible.

NONE WILL BE FOOLED

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to voice my assent to all that has been said in the little time allotted to them by my distinguished colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, which has been charged with handling this piece of legislation.

I hope that if nothing else comes from this special session it will teach the Eighty-first Congress the necessity of stopping the practice of bringing in and attempting to pass legislation under suspension of the rules.

The two most important problems confronting this Congress will have been disposed of by this special session after 80 minutes of discussion, without an opportunity to offer a single amendment, without an opportunity to hear from anyone as to how we could solve these two very important problems.

I will support this measure, but I want everybody to know that none of us think for one moment that this will stop the inflationary spiral or that it may even tend to cut back prices.

It will do nothing of any real consequence to help stop the rise in the cost of living. It will do nothing to help the man, who cannot buy meat for his family today, to buy it.

It may help restrict some in the commercial field from getting credit. It may stop some people from getting luxury items they have no right to buy.

But it will help no one to buy the necessities of life, whether food or clothing, and it will certainly give no housing to the low-income groups.

None will be fooled by this bill. We have not begun to deal with the problems, the solution of which is the duty of this Congress.

STRENGTHEN THE ANTITRUST LAWS TO FIGHT INFLATION

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the administration has demonstrated its incompetency to deal with the subject of inflation in two important respects. First, it has adopted a policy of favoring high farm prices and even cutting farm production to maintain those high prices. The President has failed to use those measures presently enacted into law to control the excess amount of money on the market. The President has advocated to the special session of Congress various other inflationary measures.

Secondly, the administration has advocated price control in such a way that if it were enacted it would ruin the economy.

The administration has not struck at the causes of inflation. Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn this Congress we can strike one telling blow at a basic cause of inflation by passing H. R. 7024, a bill which I introduced on June 19, 1948, to strengthen the antitrust and antimonopoly laws.

Alice-in-Wonderland economics and Government tinkering will not combat high prices. To go back to Government controlled economy at this time without the powerful motives of war for high production would result in America turning into one huge black market, because Americans will not readily submit to dictatorship controls except in war times. Price fixing, which also means wage fixing, can work only with people subdued under a dictatorship. And even a dictator fixing low prices and wages cannot legislate production. There is no use fixing prices when there is little on the shelves to buy except on the black market. If we want Leningrad type of production, we can enact the Government controls advocated by Socialists masquerading as Democrats and thus put the American economy in a Marxian strait-jacket.

But before we adjourn this special session we can hit at a basic cause of our high prices. The issue is production and competition in a market where freedom is maintained versus scarcity and monopoly in a Government-controlled market. The latter method built the pyramids with the whip of tyranny across the backs of slaves. The former method built the United States.

But I have said, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to production we must have competition. We can produce a mountain of products but if the disposal of these products is in the hands of only a few, then the few can control the price and withhold the products from the market place. Recently we have had examples of huge industrial combinations raising the price of consumer goods because there has been no effective competition to bring the price down. There has been such a merger of economic power within the past decade that many of the large enterprises in our cities have, during that period, been merged so as to be controlled from other metropolitan centers. We must return more competition to the American market place. H. R. 7024 is designed to strengthen our antitrust laws and to increase competition. Clever lawyers have gotten around the purpose of the present laws intended to maintain competition. The present laws prevent the buying of the corporate shares of a corporation by a competing corporation, but they do not

prevent a corporation from buying the assets of a competing corporation. And thus the lawyers have found a loophole and the merging of industries in this country during the past few decades has produced such economic giants as United States Steel, that can dictate the price of steel for the United States. The antitrust laws should be strengthened to prevent the merger of such competing corporations. They should also be strengthened to prevent the directors of competing corporations from sitting together on the board of a third corporation. Vertical monopolies should also be given close scrutiny. No private enterprise should be permitted to monopolize a substantial part of our natural resources from the raw material to the finished product.

Our American system needs a market place where freedom is maintained. But that freedom must be maintained with eternal vigilance. Freedom does not mean the freedom to destroy freedom. Freedom of speech does not give a person the liberty to shout "fire" in a theater. Free enterprise does not give a particular industry the liberty to swallow up all competition so as to monopolize the market. That kind of freedom is mere license and is the law of the jungle.

The price of modern technology has been the concentration of economic power in the hands of few men. The Socialist solution is to turn the concentrated power over to the state so that the majority of the workers will get their wages and prices fixed by the all-knowing employer state. The American solution is to prevent the concentration of economic power either in private or state hands. The American system demands hundreds of thousands of free enterprises operating with due regard for the freedom of one another. Thus, Mr. Speaker, we can strike one American blow at the basic cause of high prices by encouraging competition in the market place. If we do not take this step and economic mergers continue, small business will be a thing of the past.

Even as we debate in this House, we have a very wonderful Olympic team representing the United States in London. That team will win the Olympics. I watched the selection of the American Olympic team in Chicago a month ago. It was selected on the basis of keen but fair competition. Keen and fair competition brought out the very best in American athletic effort. That is the American way. We need more of that some competition in American industry.

I beseech the Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, to take favorable action on H. R. 7024 before this special session adjourns.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it necessarily follows that this is a very short bill and does not cover very many subjects.

The contention has been made, and it is not subject to successful contradiction, that the Administration and the Federal Reserve System today have sufficient powers to stabilize the value of the American dollar and the American economy. It would be foolish of us to reenact the powers which they already have to do that job.

They have asked for an increase in reserve requirements. In this bill we have given them an increase in reserve requirements. We have increased the reserve requirements on demand deposits by four percentage points. We have increased the reserve requirements on time deposits by one and one-half percentage points.

It will be recalled that when the bill passed the House Thursday we had increased the reserve requirements three percentage points on demand deposits. The Senate increased that to four percentage points, and if this resolution is adopted we will accept the Senate version. The same thing applies to the action taken on time deposits, which we increased by one percentage point. The Senate increased them by one and one-half percentage points.

As was said the other day, if these powers are judiciously used, then, with the powers which the Federal Reserve and the administration have at the present time, we can stabilize the value of the American dollar, stabilize our economy, and bring prices down.

In respect to consumer-credit controls, the President asked only for the authority to control installment buying. The bills which were introduced by the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], and the minority floor leader of the other body, Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, provided only for the continuance of the power to control installment buying.

If there is any criticism that we have not extended the controls more broadly in the consumer-credit field, it lies in the fact that the President has not asked for any broader powers than we are giving him in this bill, and those in charge of his legislative program in the Congress have not asked for any broader powers than we are giving him in this bill.

We do not know, of course, how these powers to control consumer installment buying are going to be administered. The field is rather wide open. But the reason given for the control of consumer credit is that we should decrease the volume of velocity of consumer credit because of the influence which consumer credit has upon prices. If that is the case, the only way that these controls can be effectively used is to control all consumer installment buying—not the consumer installment buying which attends the purchase of a refrigerator or the purchase of a rug or the purchase of an automobile, or the purchase of any other 1 or 2 of 12 commodities, such as were under control when we rescinded the authority last year. So long as anyone can go down to a jewelry store and buy a $300 diamond ring for 50 cents down and 50 cents a month for the rest of their lives, then we are not slowing down the velocity of credit, and we are not reducing the volume of credit.

In order that these controls may be effectively used and they can be effectively used, the whole field of consumer credit should be controlled. Unless the whole field of consumer credit is controlled, under this bill, that is, in the installment field, then we may be assured it is not administration policy to use these controls for the purpose of reducing the volume and the velocity of credit, but instead it is to manage that particular segment of our economy which they bring under such controls.

Therein lies the only danger that I see in that particular phase of the bill.

In this bill the other body has taken out—and by the adoption of this resolution we accept their action—the provision with respect to the increase of the gold reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks.

I think it was a mistake on the part of the Senate to do so, but as was said on this floor, the action to increase the gold reserves is more psychological than anything else, because the reserves at the present time are actually 51 percent and we would have reinstated them at 40 percent.

But I presume because of the discussion had on the floor of the House and because of the debate on this joint resolution, it would and should indicate that it is the policy of government to start now—immediately—with the powers which we are legislating here together with the powers which the President and the Federal Reserve already have to reverse the processes by which money has been made cheap—by which the dollar has been depreciated in value and by which prices have been caused to rise and rise and rise. What America needs today is a reversal of these processes which have made money and credit cheap. We should tighten credit. We should revalue the American dollar. We should stabilize. I think we have a right to call upon the President and the Federal Reserve, when this legislation is passed, to do the job that they should have been doing for the last 2 years. We demand of them today, and I think we have the right to demand of them today, that the President and the Federal Reserve stabilize the value of the American dollar, stabilize our economy, and bring prices down.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

(Senate Joint Resolution 157, as amended, is as follows:)

Resolved, etc., That in order to protect the Nation's monetary, banking, and credit structure, and interstate and foreign commerce, against increased inflationary pressures, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are authorized, notwithstanding the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 386, 80th Cong.), to exercise, up to and including June 30, 1949, consumer-credit controls in accordance with and to carry out the purposes of Executive Order No. 8843 (August 9, 1941) insofar as it relates to installment credit.

All the present provisions of section 21 and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (relating to investigations, injunctions, jurisdictions, and other matters), shall be as fully applicable with respect to the exercise by the Board of Governors of consumer installment credit controls as they are now applicable with respect to the exercise by the Securities and Exchange

Commission of its functions under that act, and the Board shall have the same powers in the exercise of such consumer installment credit controls as the Commission now has under the said sections.

SEC. 2. Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the sixth paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion, may by regulation change the requirements as to reserves to be maintained pursuant to this section against demand or time deposits or both (1) by member banks in central reserve cities, or (2) by member banks in reserve cities, or (3) by member banks not in reserve or central reserve cities, or (4) by all member banks; but no such change shall have the effect of requiring any such member bank to maintain a reserve balance against its time deposits in an amount equal to more than 7½ percent thereof, or a reserve balance against its demand deposits in an amount equal to more than 30 percent thereof if such bank is in a central reserve city, 24 percent thereof if in a reserve city, or 18 percent thereof if not in a reserve or central reserve city. No change in reserve requirements made under authority of this paragraph shall continue in effect after June 30, 1949."

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the resolution be passed?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on that.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 337, nays 11, answered "present" 2, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—337

Abbitt	Byrnes, Wis.	Feighan
Abernethy	Camp	Fellows
Albert	Cannon	Fenton
Allen, Calif.	Carroll	Fernandez
Allen, La.	Carson	Fisher
Andersen, H. Carl	Case, N. J.	Flannagan
Anderson, Calif.	Case, S. Dak.	Fletcher
Andresen, August H.	Celler	Fogarty
Andrews, Ala.	Chadwick	Folger
Angell	Chelf	Foote
Arends	Chenoweth	Forand
Arnold	Chiperfield	Fuller
Auchincloss	Church	Fulton
Bakewell	Clason	Gamble
Banta	Clevenger	Garmatz
Barrett	Coffin	Gary
Bates, Mass.	Cole, Kans.	Gathings
Battle	Cole, Mo.	Gavin
Beckworth	Cole, N. Y.	Gearhart
Bell	Colmer	Gillie
Bender	Combs	Goff
Bennett, Mich.	Cooper	Goodwin
Bennett, Mo.	Corbett	Gordon
Bishop	Cotton	Gorski
Blackney	Crawford	Gossett
Bland	Crosser	Graham
Blatnik	Crow	Granger
Bloom	Cunningham	Grant, Ala.
Boggs, Del.	Curtis	Grant, Ind.
Boggs, La.	Dague	Griffiths
Bonner	Davis, Ga.	Gwinn, N. Y.
Boykin	Davis, Wis.	Hale
Bradley	Dawson, Utah	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bramblett	Deane	Hall, Leonard W.
Brehm	Delaney	Halleck
Brooks	Devitt	Hand
Brophy	D'Ewart	Hardy
Brown, Ga.	Dingell	Harness, Ind.
Brown, Ohio	Dondero	Harrison
Bryson	Donohue	Hart
Buchanan	Doughton	Harvey
Buck	Durham	Havenner
Buckley	Eaton	Hays
Bulwinkle	Eberharter	Hedrick
Burke	Ellis	Heffernan
Burleson	Ellsworth	Herter
Busbey	Elston	Heselton
Butler	Engel, Mich.	Hill
Byrne, N. Y.	Engle, Calif.	Hinshaw
Hobbs	Fallon	Hoeven
Hoffman	McMillan, S. C.	Holmes
Hope	McMillen, Ill.	Horan
Huber	Mack	Hull
Jackson, Calif.	MacKinnon	Jackson, Wash.
Jarman	Madden	Javits
Jenison	Mahon	Jenkins, Ohio
Jensen	Maloney	Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.	Manasco	Johnson, Okla.
Jones, Ala.	Mansfield	Jones, N. C.
Jones, Wash.	Martin, Iowa	Jonkman
Judd	Merrow	Karsten, Mo.
Kean	Meyer	Kearney
Kearns	Michener	Keating
Kee	Miller, Calif.	Keefe
Kelley	Miller, Conn.	Kerr
Kersten, Wis.	Miller, Md.	Kilburn
Kilday	Miller, Nebr.	King
Kirwan	Mills	Knutson
Kunkel	Mitchell	Landis
Lane	Monroney	Lanham
Larcade	Morgan	Latham
Lea	Morris	LeCompte
LeFevre	Morrison	Lemke
Lewis, Ky.	Morton	Lewis, Ohio
Lichtenwalter	Muhlenberg	Lodge
Love	Multer	Lusk
Lyle	Mundt	Lynch
McConnell	Murray, Wis.	McCowen
McCulloch	Nicholson	McDonough
McDowell	Nixon	McGarvey
McGregor	Nodar	Kilday
	Norblad	O'Brien
	O'Hara	O'Toole
	Pace	Passman
	Patterson	Peden
	Peterson	Philbin
	Phillips, Calif.	Pickett
	Ploeser	Plumley
	Poage	Potter
	Potts	Poulson
	Preston	Price, Fla.
	Price, Ill.	Rains
	Ramey	Rayburn
	Reed, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
	Rees	Reeves
	Rich	Riehlman
	Rivers	Rizley
	Robertson	Rockwell
	Rogers, Fla.	Rogers, Mass.
	Rohrbough	Rooney
	Ross	Russell
	Sabath	Sadlak
	St. George	Sanborn
	Sarbacher	Sasscer
	Schwabe, Okla.	Scott, Hardie
	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Scrivner
	Seely-Brown	Short
	Sikes	Simpson, Ill.
	Simpson, Pa.	Smathers
	Smith, Maine	Smith, Wis.
	Snyder	Somers
	Stanley	Stefan
	Stevenson	Stratton
	Taber	Talle
	Taylor	Teague
	Thomas, Tex.	Thompson
	Tibbott	Tollefson
	Towe	Twyman
	Van Zandt	Vinson
	Vorys	Vursell
	Wadsworth	Walter
	Weichel	Welch
	West	Wheeler
	Whitten	Whittington
	Wigglesworth	Williams
	Wilson, Ind.	Winstead
	Wolcott	Wolverton
	Woodruff	Youngblood

NAYS—11

Buffett	Patman	Smith, Ohio
Douglas	Rankin	Wilson, Tex.
Hagen	Sadowski	Worley
Holifield	Schwabe, Mo.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Isacson Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—79

Allen, Ill.	Gross	Norrell
Andrews, N. Y.	Gwynne, Iowa	Norton
Barden	Harless, Ariz.	O'Konski
Bates, Ky.	Harris	Pfeifer
Beall	Hartley	Phillips, Tenn.
Bolton	Hébert	Powell
Canfield	Hendricks	Priest
Chapman	Hess	Redden
Clark	Jenkins, Pa.	Regan
Clippinger	Jennings	Richards
Cooley	Johnson, Tex.	Riley
Coudert	Kefauver	Scoblick
Courtney	Kennedy	Shafer
Cox	Keogh	Sheppard
Cravens	Klein	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Smith, Va.
Dawson, Ill.	Lucas	Spence
Dirksen	Ludlow	Stigler
Dolliver	McCormack	Stockman
Domengeaux	McMahon	Sundstrom
Dorn	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	Mason	Trimble
Evins	Mathews	Vail
Gallagher	Meade, Ky.	Whitaker
Gillette	Meade, Md.	Wood
Gore	Murdock	
Gregory	Murray, Tenn.	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Cox.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Redden.
Mr. Canfield with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Jennings with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Vail with Mr. Whitaker.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Cravens.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Priest.
Mr. Mathews with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Beall with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Kline.
Mr. Hess with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. McMahon with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Gregory.
Mr. Shafer with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Sundstrom with Mr. Harless of Arizona.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Murdock.
Mr. Mason with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Stockman with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Smith of Kansas with Mr. Gore.
Mr. Gwynne of Iowa with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Phillips of Tennessee with Mr. Powell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and communications.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will there be an opportunity later on for Members to make extended remarks on the floor of the House?

The SPEAKER. That would not be in order, until after the disposition of the business of the House at the end of the legislative day. It was not the purpose of the leadership to have extended debate after that.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent, then, although I do not want to upset the program of the leadership, to address the House for 15 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

prevent a corporation from buying the assets of a competing corporation. And thus the lawyers have found a loophole and the merging of industries in this country during the past few decades has produced such economic giants as United States Steel, that can dictate the price of steel for the United States. The antitrust laws should be strengthened to prevent the merger of such competing corporations. They should also be strengthened to prevent the directors of competing corporations from sitting together on the board of a third corporation. Vertical monopolies should also be given close scrutiny. No private enterprise should be permitted to monopolize a substantial part of our natural resources from the raw material to the finished product.

Our American system needs a market place where freedom is maintained. But that freedom must be maintained with eternal vigilance. Freedom does not mean the freedom to destroy freedom. Freedom of speech does not give a person the liberty to shout "fire" in a theater. Free enterprise does not give a particular industry the liberty to swallow up all competition so as to monopolize the market. That kind of freedom is mere license and is the law of the jungle.

The price of modern technology has been the concentration of economic power in the hands of few men. The Socialist solution is to turn the concentrated power over to the state so that the majority of the workers will get their wages and prices fixed by the all-knowing employer state. The American solution is to prevent the concentration of economic power either in private or state hands. The American system demands hundreds of thousands of free enterprises operating with due regard for the freedom of one another. Thus, Mr. Speaker, we can strike one American blow at the basic cause of high prices by encouraging competition in the market place. If we do not take this step and economic mergers continue, small business will be a thing of the past.

Even as we debate in this House, we have a very wonderful Olympic team representing the United States in London. That team will win the Olympics. I watched the selection of the American Olympic team in Chicago a month ago. It was selected on the basis of keen but fair competition. Keen and fair competition brought out the very best in American athletic effort. That is the American way. We need more of that some competition in American industry.

I beseech the Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, to take favorable action on H. R. 7024 before this special session adjourns.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it necessarily follows that this is a very short bill and does not cover very many subjects.

The contention has been made, and it is not subject to successful contradiction, that the Administration and the Federal Reserve System today have sufficient powers to stabilize the value of the American dollar and the American economy. It would be foolish of us to reenact the powers which they already have to do that job.

They have asked for an increase in reserve requirements. In this bill we have given them an increase in reserve requirements. We have increased the reserve requirements on demand deposits by four percentage points. We have increased the reserve requirements on time deposits by one and one-half percentage points.

It will be recalled that when the bill passed the House Thursday we had increased the reserve requirements three percentage points on demand deposits. The Senate increased that to four percentage points, and if this resolution is adopted we will accept the Senate version. The same thing applies to the action taken on time deposits, which we increased by one percentage point. The Senate increased them by one and one-half percentage points.

As was said the other day, if these powers are judiciously used, then, with the powers which the Federal Reserve and the administration have at the present time, we can stabilize the value of the American dollar, stabilize our economy, and bring prices down.

In respect to consumer-credit controls, the President asked only for the authority to control installment buying. The bills which were introduced by the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], and the minority floor leader of the other body, Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky, provided only for the continuance of the power to control installment buying.

If there is any criticism that we have not extended the controls more broadly in the consumer-credit field, it lies in the fact that the President has not asked for any broader powers than we are giving him in this bill, and those in charge of his legislative program in the Congress have not asked for any broader powers than we are giving him in this bill.

We do not know, of course, how these powers to control consumer installment buying are going to be administered. The field is rather wide open. But the reason given for the control of consumer credit is that we should decrease the volume of velocity of consumer credit because of the influence which consumer credit has upon prices. If that is the case, the only way that these controls can be effectively used is to control all consumer installment buying—not the consumer installment buying which attends the purchase of a refrigerator or the purchase of a rug or the purchase of an automobile, or the purchase of any other 1 or 2 of 12 commodities, such as were under control when we rescinded the authority last year. So long as anyone can go down to a jewelry store and buy a $300 diamond ring for 50 cents down and 50 cents a month for the rest of their lives, then we are not slowing down the velocity of credit, and we are not reducing the volume of credit.

In order that these controls may be effectively used and they can be effectively used, the whole field of consumer credit should be controlled. Unless the whole field of consumer credit is controlled, under this bill, that is, in the installment field, then we may be assured it is not administration policy to use these controls for the purpose of reducing the volume and the velocity of credit, but instead it is to manage that particular segment of our economy which they bring under such controls.

Therein lies the only danger that I see in that particular phase of the bill.

In this bill the other body has taken out—and by the adoption of this resolution we accept their action—the provision with respect to the increase of the gold reserve requirements of the Federal Reserve banks.

I think it was a mistake on the part of the Senate to do so, but as was said on this floor, the action to increase the gold reserves is more psychological than anything else, because the reserves at the present time are actually 51 percent and we would have reinstated them at 40 percent.

But I presume because of the discussion had on the floor of the House and because of the debate on this joint resolution, it would and should indicate that it is the policy of government to start now—immediately—with the powers which we are legislating here together with the powers which the President and the Federal Reserve already have to reverse the processes by which money has been made cheap—by which the dollar has been depreciated in value and by which prices have been caused to rise and rise and rise. What America needs today is a reversal of these processes which have made money and credit cheap. We should tighten credit. We should revalue the American dollar. We should stabilize. I think we have a right to call upon the President and the Federal Reserve, when this legislation is passed, to do the job that they should have been doing for the last 2 years. We demand of them today, and I think we have the right to demand of them today, that the President and the Federal Reserve stabilize the value of the American dollar, stabilize our economy, and bring prices down.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

(Senate Joint Resolution 157, as amended, is as follows:)

Resolved, etc., That in order to protect the Nation's monetary, banking, and credit structure, and interstate and foreign commerce, against increased inflationary pressures, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are authorized, notwithstanding the act of August 8, 1947 (Public Law 386, 80th Cong.), to exercise, up to and including June 30, 1949, consumer-credit controls in accordance with and to carry out the purposes of Executive Order No. 8843 (August 9, 1941) insofar as it relates to installment credit.

All the present provisions of section 21 and 27 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (relating to investigations, injunctions, jurisdictions, and other matters), shall be as fully applicable with respect to the exercise by the Board of Governors of consumer installment credit controls as they are now applicable with respect to the exercise by the Securities and Exchange

Commission of its functions under that act, and the Board shall have the same powers in the exercise of such consumer installment credit controls as the Commission now has under the said sections.

SEC. 2. Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after the sixth paragraph thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion, may by regulation change the requirements as to reserves to be maintained pursuant to this section against demand or time deposits or both (1) by member banks in central reserve cities, or (2) by member banks in reserve cities, or (3) by member banks not in reserve or central reserve cities, or (4) by all member banks; but no such change shall have the effect of requiring any such member bank to maintain a reserve balance against its time deposits in an amount equal to more than 7½ percent thereof, or a reserve balance against its demand deposits in an amount equal to more than 30 percent thereof if such bank is in a central reserve city, 24 percent thereof if in a reserve city, or 18 percent thereof if not in a reserve or central reserve city. No change in reserve requirements made under authority of this paragraph shall continue in effect after June 30, 1949."

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the resolution be passed?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on that.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 337, nays 11, answered "present" 2, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—337

Abbitt	Byrnes, Wis.	Feighan
Abernethy	Camp	Fellows
Albert	Cannon	Fenton
Allen, Calif.	Carroll	Fernandez
Allen, La.	Carson	Fisher
Andersen, H. Carl	Case, N. J.	Flannagan
	Case, S. Dak.	Fletcher
Anderson, Calif.	Celler	Fogarty
Andresen, August H.	Chadwick	Folger
	Chelf	Foote
Andrews, Ala.	Chenoweth	Forand
Angell	Chiperfield	Fuller
Arends	Church	Fulton
Arnold	Clason	Gamble
Auchincloss	Clevenger	Garmatz
Bakewell	Coffin	Gary
Banta	Cole, Kans.	Gathings
Barrett	Cole, Mo.	Gavin
Bates, Mass.	Cole, N. Y.	Gearhart
Battle	Colmer	Gillie
Beckworth	Combs	Goff
Bell	Cooper	Goodwin
Bender	Corbett	Gordon
Bennett, Mich.	Cotton	Gorski
Bennett, Mo.	Crawford	Gossett
Bishop	Crosser	Graham
Blackney	Crow	Granger
Bland	Cunningham	Grant, Ala.
Blatnik	Curtis	Grant, Ind.
Bloom	Dague	Griffiths
Boggs, Del.	Davis, Ga.	Gwinn, N. Y.
Boggs, La.	Davis, Wis.	Hale
Bonner	Dawson, Utah	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Boykin	Deane	
Bradley	Delaney	Hall, Leonard W.
Bramblett	Devitt	
Brehm	D'Ewart	Halleck
Brooks	Dingell	Hand
Brophy	Dondero	Hardy
Brown, Ga.	Donohue	Harness, Ind.
Brown, Ohio	Doughton	Harrison
Bryson	Durham	Hart
Buchanan	Eaton	Harvey
Buck	Eberharter	Havenner
Buckley	Ellis	Hays
Bulwinkle	Ellsworth	Hedrick
Burke	Elsaesser	Heffernan
Burleson	Elston	Herter
Busbey	Engel, Mich.	Heselton
Butler	Engle, Calif.	Hill
Byrne, N. Y.	Fallon	Hinshaw
Hobbs	McMillan, S. C.	Robertson
Hoeven	McMillen, Ill.	Rockwell
Hoffman	Mack	Rogers, Fla.
Holmes	MacKinnon	Rogers, Mass.
Hope	Madden	Rohrbough
Horan	Mahon	Rooney
Huber	Maloney	Ross
Hull	Manasco	Russell
Jackson, Calif.	Mansfield	Sabath
Jackson, Wash.	Martin, Iowa	Sadlak
Jarman	Merrow	St. George
Javits	Meyer	Sanborn
Jenison	Michener	Sarbacher
Jenkins, Ohio	Miller, Calif.	Sasscer
Jensen	Miller, Conn.	Schwabe, Okla.
Johnson, Calif.	Miller, Md.	Scott, Hardie
Johnson, Ill.	Miller, Nebr.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Johnson, Okla.	Mills	
Jones, Ala.	Mitchell	Scrivner
Jones, N. C.	Monroney	Seely-Brown
Jones, Wash.	Morgan	Short
Jonkman	Morris	Sikes
Judd	Morrison	Simpson, Ill.
Karsten, Mo.	Morton	Simpson, Pa.
Kean	Muhlenberg	Smathers
Kearney	Multer	Smith, Maine
Kearns	Mundt	Smith, Wis.
Keating	Murray, Wis.	Snyder
Kee	Nicholson	Somers
Keefe	Nixon	Stanley
Kelley	Nodar	Stefan
Kerr	Norblad	Stevenson
Kersten, Wis.	O'Brien	Stratton
Kilburn	O'Hara	Taber
Kilday	O'Toole	Talle
King	Pace	Taylor
Kirwan	Passman	Teague
Knutson	Patterson	Thomas, Tex.
Kunkel	Peden	Thompson
Landis	Peterson	Tibbott
Lane	Philbin	Tollefson
Lanham	Phillips, Calif.	Towe
Larcade	Pickett	Twyman
Latham	Ploeser	Van Zandt
Lea	Plumley	Vinson
LeCompte	Poage	Vorys
LeFevre	Potter	Vursell
Lemke	Potts	Wadsworth
Lewis, Ky.	Poulson	Walter
Lewis, Ohio	Preston	Weichel
Lichtenwalter	Price, Fla.	Welch
Lodge	Price, Ill.	West
Love	Rains	Wheeler
Lusk	Ramey	Whitten
Lyle	Rayburn	Whittington
Lynch	Reed, Ill.	Wigglesworth
McConnell	Reed, N. Y.	Williams
McCowen	Rees	Wilson, Ind.
McCulloch	Reeves	Winstead
McDonough	Rich	Wolcott
McDowell	Riehlman	Wolverton
McGarvey	Rivers	Woodruff
McGregor	Rizley	Youngblood

NAYS—11

Buffett	Patman	Smith, Ohio
Douglas	Rankin	Wilson, Tex.
Hagen	Sadowski	Worley
Holifield	Schwabe, Mo.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Isacson Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—79

Allen, Ill.	Gross	Norrell
Andrews, N. Y.	Gwynne, Iowa	Norton
Barden	Harless, Ariz.	O'Konski
Bates, Ky.	Harris	Pfeifer
Beall	Hartley	Phillips, Tenn.
Bolton	Hébert	Powell
Canfield	Hendricks	Priest
Chapman	Hess	Redden
Clark	Jenkins, Pa.	Regan
Clippinger	Jennings	Richards
Cooley	Johnson, Tex.	Riley
Coudert	Kefauver	Scoblick
Courtney	Kennedy	Shafer
Cox	Keogh	Sheppard
Cravens	Klein	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Smith, Va.
Dawson, Ill.	Lucas	Spence
Dirksen	Ludlow	Stigler
Dolliver	McCormack	Stockman
Domengeaux	McMahon	Sundstrom
Dorn	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	Mason	Trimble
Evins	Mathews	Vail
Gallagher	Meade, Ky.	Whitaker
Gillette	Meade, Md.	Wood
Gore	Murdock	
Gregory	Murray, Tenn.	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Cox.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Redden.
Mr. Canfield with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Trimble.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Gillette with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Jennings with Mrs. Norton.
Mr. Vail with Mr. Whitaker.
Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Cravens.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Priest.
Mr. Mathews with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Beall with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Kline.
Mr. Hess with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. McMahon with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Gregory.
Mr. Shafer with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Sundstrom with Mr. Harless of Arizona.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Murdock.
Mr. Mason with Mr. McCormack.
Mr. Stockman with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Smith of Kansas with Mr. Gore.
Mr. Gwynne of Iowa with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Phillips of Tennessee with Mr. Powell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and communications.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will there be an opportunity later on for Members to make extended remarks on the floor of the House?

The SPEAKER. That would not be in order, until after the disposition of the business of the House at the end of the legislative day. It was not the purpose of the leadership to have extended debate after that.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent, then, although I do not want to upset the program of the leadership, to address the House for 15 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper articles.

REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGH PRICES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include some editorial comment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following potent excerpts, all from the editorial page of the Detroit News of Thursday, July 29, with timely and pertinent comments by W. K. Kelsey, have a bearing upon the editorial, "Prices Then and Now."

The editorial of this same issue is factual, not political, and as such cannot be challenged. The comments anent the many unsolved problems, the neglect of which is chargeable directly and solely to the Republicans now in control of both Houses of Congress and to no one else, cannot be denied or laughed off any more.

Indeed, only a few months ago—on February 5, 1948, a ranking Republican Member of the other body proudly told the Middle Atlantic Lumbermen's Association:

> I do not need to remind the membership of this association that it was the Republican leadership in the Senate and the House that was responsible for ending OPA.

Nor can the Republican Party escape this responsibility by senseless shibboleths of Republican leaders that all that is wrong today is due to "a fundamental difference in Government philosophy" between the Congress and the President. On June 6, 1946, when he was actively working to kill OPA, Senator WHERRY said over the radio:

> We are perfectly willing to rest our case with the housewife, the farmer, and the laborer of America. I ask of each of these groups, Can we, who have been raised to expect meat and bread upon our table—who have accepted as our free heritage a living standard second to none—live on statistics and propaganda?

The answer of the American people next November will be, "No, Senator, give us the bread and meat you promised—not statistics and propaganda. We must give President Truman the cooperation of a Democratic Congress."

The victims of inflation and of the superhigh prices suffer want and privation because of the accelerated rise of prices which will continue their devastating upward spiral until stopped by courageous and drastic congressional action. There is no other prospect for relief. The pensioner, the poor, and the fixed-income group will be ground deeper into the dust of desperation unless we act before we adjourn. The Republicans must accept President Truman's recommendations, since they submit none of their own.

There is one thing the people know and remember. It is an undeniable fact that under OPA even during wartime, under conditions not comparable by a great margin with the nearer normal conditions of today, prices were lower—infinitely lower. The price controls held the line and even though goods were scarcer, the rise in price was remarkably small. Even in the black market, which constituted a fraction of the available volume, prices were lower by far than legitimate prices being paid today. Yet the Republicans 2 years ago promised plenitude in 60 days after repeal of OPA and that prices would find their normal lower level in the same length of time. They were elected by this deceitful promise, spiked with their slogan: "Had enough?" Well it seems to me, inasmuch as the price dam has broken and we are now being engulfed by record prices 100 to 200 percent higher than under OPA, which have rationed Mr. Average Citizen not only out of the line in which he stood under OPA but completely out of the market, that now is the time to revive and reverse the slogan the Republicans would like to forget: Have you had enough? Then vote in your own self-defense to bring prices down, build more and cheaper homes, provide relief for social-security beneficiaries, widows, dependent children, old-age pensioners, and others equally deserving—something which can be done without inflation. We can give aid to education, raise the minimum wage level from 40 cents per hour to 75 cents, raise the health standard of the Nation by giving the people a sound and permanent health insurance plan—not "socialized medicine" as the reactionaries and enemies who want to make permanent the pauper system would have you believe.

The clippings, quotations, and the editorial speak in support of my philosophy of government and of its responsibility toward the people more eloquently and without flavor of partisanship or politics than I could, try as hard as I might.

They are worthy of preservation in the RECORD. They are food for thought, and I commend them to you for your perusal:

PRICES THEN AND NOW

Republican leaders in Congress should remember that, faults of OPA's former controls admitted, it did hold prices in check. Compare present Detroit prices of key necessities with those when, in 1946, controls came off.

Steaks: From 55 cents a pound for the best, 45 cents for rounds—up to $1.50 and $1.

Pork: From 34 cents for chops and 42 cents for bacon—up to from 85 to 95 cents for either.

Coal: Average soft, from $11 in 1946 to $17.25 a ton now. (Same cost $8 in 1944.)

Gasoline (regular): From 19 cents in July 1946 to 25.6 cents a gallon now.

Bread: Average loaves through the war and until controls came off, 11 and 12 cents—up to 18 and 21 cents.

The story of manufactured things, automobiles particularly, corresponds.

The intricate argument about who really killed this Cock Robin is simply wearisome evasion. That a chief role in killing OPA was played by the GOP Congress cannot be denied.

For desperate situations, desperate remedies.

THEY LEAVE IT TO THE VOTERS

Assuming the cost of living will be the chief campaign issue, insofar as President Truman can contrive it, the point of main interest in the reply of Republican congressional leaders to his message is their decision in this regard to stand on the record.

They not merely have again rejected Mr. Truman's demand for revived rationing and price control, but have pitched their rejection on the note of political and economic principle. The principle, they announce, they are quite willing to submit to the judgment of voters in the approaching election.

It is a bold course they have chosen. It leaves no convenient avenues of retreat in the event that circumstances, as the campaign progresses, should counsel some less stiff-necked attitude on the price problem.

The Congressmen have left Governor Dewey, whose own attitude on the question remains undisclosed, small room for maneuver should he desire it.

Yet the position taken, whether wisely or unwisely, must evoke admiration for its frank honesty.

Congressional leaders trace the President's quarrel with the Eightieth Congress, on this and other matters, to "a fundamental difference in government philosophy."

"The President," they wrote, "would fix wages, fix prices, expand Government spending, increase Federal taxes, socialize and nationalize medicine and generally regiment the life of every family, as well as agriculture, labor, and industry. * * *

"The Congress believes that progress must be made and all our problems solved within the principles of liberty, equality and justice to all men, which guided this country for 150 years. * * *

"The only way this fundamental difference can be resolved is by vote of the people at the November election."

Further on, the congressional leaders applied their credo specifically to the price problem, with the assertion that Government controls "would only make the situation worse." They would "create black markets and check the increase in production which is the only ultimate solution."

The ultimate truth of that last observation is no more to be challenged than the courage-inspiring insistence that Government's role in the recovery of price stability must be the traditionally passive one. Politically, however, the choice of this proposition, thus stated, as the one to take to the people, may be less widely admired.

It may be questioned, if living costs continue to mount from now to November 2, that ultimate solutions will satisfy an impatient and possibly angry electorate. Governor Dewey, one suspects, would have welcomed being left a little more latitude to adapt his campaign to circumstances as they arise.

MORE TO BE DONE

The cooperation promised by the Lake Carriers Association to reduce the contribution to Detroit's smoke nuisance by vessels passing through the river is very welcome.

The spirit displayed by the vessel owners is no less to be appreciated because cooperation could be forced, if necessary.

Now, if something could be done to dissuade vessel crews from discharging ash and oily wastes into the river and St. Clair Channel, contrary to law, Detroit would be still more grateful. In swimming is the last place where a citizen expects to get a cinder in his eye; but, as matters stand—or float, it can happen here, and frequently does.

THE COMMENTATOR

OVERCONFIDENCE PLAGUES THE GOP

(By W. K. Kelsey)

The Republican leaders are afflicted with an after-convention hang-over. At Philadelphia they assured one another that the November election was in the bag; that President Truman, who would certainly be renominated, was a dead pigeon; that the Dewey-Warren ticket was a 100-to-1 shot to succeed, and that little need be done but raise a huge campaign fund to distribute

among the loyal shirkers, and then wait for the day of the inevitable victory.

This mood persists. It has not been jolted by the President's call of a special session of Congress, nor by the long program of work required to be done which he has outlined. Therefore the Republicans in control plan to do approximately nothing, believing that the great majority of the voters will sanction this decision.

That remains to be seen. In the commentator's opinion, a quick adjournment without even an attempt to answer the President's challenge, is a gamble that is unjustified by present conditions, and is likely to become still less justified before November 2. If the Republican Congress now refuses even to try to enact what it has promised in its platform, the obvious conclusion to which people are entitled to jump is that it has little intention of carrying out its pledges if the party is installed in complete power next year.

The President is accused of playing politics. Certainly he is playing politics. Who, in his position, would not? He is playing the smartest kind of politics. He is putting the Republican Party in the wrong, and the Republican policy is to let him get away with it. If that is smart politics on the Republican side the commentator has spent half a century of political study in vain.

LEAVING THE JOB UNCOMPLETED

President Truman might have pointed out in his message that the job of a Member of Congress has come, in recent years, to be almost full time, and therefore there is no justification for an adjournment when important measures have been enacted by one House and sent to the other for action.

This is especially true when a new Congress must start all over on these bills. They then become new legislation, subject to the regular procedure of committee hearings, reports, getting them to the floor, debating them, passing them, sending them from one House to the other, going through the same process in the second House, sending them to a conference committee in case of disagreement, and final passage. A great deal of this work is time-wasting duplication on bills that have already been studied and passed by one House.

The Seventy-sixth Congress sat 625 days; the Seventy-seventh, 711 days; the Seventy-eighth, 695 days; the preceding Congress, 554 days. The present Congress sat 351 days last year, then quit in June to attend the conventions, leaving a large amount of work nearing completion and a still larger amount ready for action but for the time limit imposed by the adjournment agreement. To shirk this work is to fail to protect the national interests. The President has given Congress an opportunity to make good. Apparently it intends to offer not even a gesture. It will do its best to provide a filibuster, and then adjourn.

The President has asked for various price-control measures. Why not enact all of them, since the Republicans are so sure they won't work? That would throw the responsibility on Mr. Truman. He has asked for a Federal housing measure. Why not enact it, if the Republicans believe it would send building costs sky high? The onus would be on the President. Moreover, to leave the situation as it is does not provide homes for GI men, except those who take over houses abandoned by the more fortunate who can afford new, high-priced dwellings.

Besides, if the Republicans know the answers, they could develop them in the special session, instead of waiting until next year.

WHAT THE PEOPLE CAN INFER

It is no excuse at all to say that the President has heaved at Congress a program so huge that it cannot possibly undertake it in the special session.

What Mr. Truman has done is to demand immediate legislation on several matters, pointing out at the same time other things that need to be done. He has emphasized his previous accusation that this is a do-nothing Congress, that has quit an unfinished job to take a rest and then campaign for reelection. The charge is true. The inference, which the people should be quick to discover, is that this Republican-controlled Congress does not want the job of doing the things needed, and therefore another Republican-controlled Congress will be equally unwilling to do them.

So what fools we shall be if, desiring lower prices, slum clearance, homes for the not-so-well-off, a better break for pensioners, more and cheaper electric power, better schools, and the rest of the multitude of things enumerated by the President, we vote the Republican ticket.

Logically, the least Republicans can do is clear out the riffraff in the House of Representatives, and replace them with persons who really believe in the platform promises of their party.

CONGRESSIONAL ECONOMIC STUDY COMMITTEE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Resolution 714, to create a Congressional Economic Study Committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas problems of economic and social character left unsolved by the break-down of the London Economic Conference in 1933 continue to plague the world; and

Whereas those problems were accentuated by the destruction of property, the dislocation of peoples and the loss of production incident to World War II; and

Whereas there exists in the United States, as in other countries, grave problems of supply and demand in relation to commodities, prices and wages requiring basic adjustments which can be obtained only by a program or programs based upon careful and impartial studies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Congressional Economic Study Committee composed of 10 members with 5 special consultants to be named as follows:

Ten members from the House of Representatives to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Five persons from civilian life eminently qualified to assist in solving problems in the fields of finance, labor, industry, or agriculture and familiar with the problems of the consuming public to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be invited to work with the committee as special consultants and to be compensated as hereinafter provided.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall designate one member of the committee as chairman and another member as vice chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to make a study of (1) economic maladjustments which it believes are contributing to undesirable levels of prices, wages, and supplies of commodities in the United States or places where the United States has a special responsibility for economic conditions; (2) measures which in the committee's judgment might contribute to an improvement or solution of such economic problems; (3) and to consider and evaluate any reports on economic conditions submitted to the Congress by the executive branch of the Government during the life of the committee. The committee may well study, but is not limited to, any economic situations arising out of money supply and monetary relationships in this and other countries.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk thereof if the Congress is not in session) from time to time as it shall deem appropriate, but finally not later than January 3, 1949.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress and until the date of its final report at such times and places as it deems advisable, whether or not the Congress is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel and such special assistants, to hold such hearings, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Reports of its activities may be made public from time to time but its conclusions and recommendations shall be reserved for its reports to Congress as above provided.

Members of the committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the committee. The five special consultants to the committee and whose other relationships to the Federal Government do not prevent shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the committee plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I knew nothing about any such resolution as this coming up. Nobody has even hinted anything about it to me. I do not know what is in this resolution. I do not know whether it overlaps any other investigating committees. I do not know whether it is something that would be helpful to the country or whether it is another around-the-world junket or something like that. I would like to have this resolution laid aside for a little while until I can find out what it is.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am willing to accede to the gentleman's request, if that be helpful. However, I thought that perhaps if the author of the resolution, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is given an opportunity to explain it, in the time which I expect to yield to him, that we might expedite matters.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman might withdraw his motion and have a discussion with the minority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, under a unanimous-consent request, anybody can call up anything that the Speaker will recognize him for. But I think somebody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper articles.

REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGH PRICES

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include some editorial comment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following potent excerpts, all from the editorial page of the Detroit News of Thursday, July 29, with timely and pertinent comments by W. K. Kelsey, have a bearing upon the editorial, "Prices Then and Now."

The editorial of this same issue is factual, not political, and as such cannot be challenged. The comments anent the many unsolved problems, the neglect of which is chargeable directly and solely to the Republicans now in control of both Houses of Congress and to no one else, cannot be denied or laughed off any more.

Indeed, only a few months ago—on February 5, 1948, a ranking Republican Member of the other body proudly told the Middle Atlantic Lumbermen's Association:

> I do not need to remind the membership of this association that it was the Republican leadership in the Senate and the House that was responsible for ending OPA.

Nor can the Republican Party escape this responsibility by senseless shibboleths of Republican leaders that all that is wrong today is due to "a fundamental difference in Government philosophy" between the Congress and the President. On June 6, 1946, when he was actively working to kill OPA, Senator WHERRY said over the radio:

> We are perfectly willing to rest our case with the housewife, the farmer, and the laborer of America. I ask of each of these groups, Can we, who have been raised to expect meat and bread upon our table—who have accepted as our free heritage a living standard second to none—live on statistics and propaganda?

The answer of the American people next November will be, "No, Senator, give us the bread and meat you promised—not statistics and propaganda. We must give President Truman the cooperation of a Democratic Congress."

The victims of inflation and of the superhigh prices suffer want and privation because of the accelerated rise of prices which will continue their devastating upward spiral until stopped by courageous and drastic congressional action. There is no other prospect for relief. The pensioner, the poor, and the fixed-income group will be ground deeper into the dust of desperation unless we act before we adjourn. The Republicans must accept President Truman's recommendations, since they submit none of their own.

There is one thing the people know and remember. It is an undeniable fact that under OPA even during wartime, under conditions not comparable by a great margin with the nearer normal conditions of today, prices were lower—infinitely lower. The price controls held the line and even though goods were scarcer, the rise in price was remarkably small. Even in the black market, which constituted a fraction of the available volume, prices were lower by far than legitimate prices being paid today. Yet the Republicans 2 years ago promised plenitude in 60 days after repeal of OPA and that prices would find their normal lower level in the same length of time. They were elected by this deceitful promise, spiked with their slogan: "Had enough?" Well it seems to me, inasmuch as the price dam has broken and we are now being engulfed by record prices 100 to 200 percent higher than under OPA, which have rationed Mr. Average Citizen not only out of the line in which he stood under OPA but completely out of the market, that now is the time to revive and reverse the slogan the Republicans would like to forget: Have you had enough? Then vote in your own self-defense to bring prices down, build more and cheaper homes, provide relief for social-security beneficiaries, widows, dependent children, old-age pensioners, and others equally deserving—something which can be done without inflation. We can give aid to education, raise the minimum wage level from 40 cents per hour to 75 cents, raise the health standard of the Nation by giving the people a sound and permanent health insurance plan—not "socialized medicine" as the reactionaries and enemies who want to make permanent the pauper system would have you believe.

The clippings, quotations, and the editorial speak in support of my philosophy of government and of its responsibility toward the people more eloquently and without flavor of partisanship or politics than I could, try as hard as I might.

They are worthy of preservation in the RECORD. They are food for thought, and I commend them to you for your perusal:

PRICES THEN AND NOW

Republican leaders in Congress should remember that, faults of OPA's former controls admitted, it did hold prices in check. Compare present Detroit prices of key necessities with those when, in 1946, controls came off.

Steaks: From 55 cents a pound for the best, 45 cents for rounds—up to $1.50 and $1.

Pork: From 34 cents for chops and 42 cents for bacon—up to from 85 to 95 cents for either.

Coal: Average soft, from $11 in 1946 to $17.25 a ton now. (Same cost $8 in 1944.)

Gasoline (regular): From 19 cents in July 1946 to 25.6 cents a gallon now.

Bread: Average loaves through the war and until controls came off, 11 and 12 cents—up to 18 and 21 cents.

The story of manufactured things, automobiles particularly, corresponds.

The intricate argument about who really killed this Cock Robin is simply wearisome evasion. That a chief role in killing OPA was played by the GOP Congress cannot be denied.

For desperate situations, desperate remedies.

THEY LEAVE IT TO THE VOTERS

Assuming the cost of living will be the chief campaign issue, insofar as President Truman can contrive it, the point of main interest in the reply of Republican congressional leaders to his message is their decision in this regard to stand on the record.

They not merely have again rejected Mr. Truman's demand for revived rationing and price control, but have pitched their rejection on the note of political and economic principle. The principle, they announce, they are quite willing to submit to the judgment of voters in the approaching election.

It is a bold course they have chosen. It leaves no convenient avenues of retreat in the event that circumstances, as the campaign progresses, should counsel some less stiff-necked attitude on the price problem.

The Congressmen have left Governor Dewey, whose own attitude on the question remains undisclosed, small room for maneuver should he desire it.

Yet the position taken, whether wisely or unwisely, must evoke admiration for its frank honesty.

Congressional leaders trace the President's quarrel with the Eightieth Congress, on this and other matters, to "a fundamental difference in government philosophy."

"The President," they wrote, "would fix wages, fix prices, expand Government spending, increase Federal taxes, socialize and nationalize medicine and generally regiment the life of every family, as well as agriculture, labor, and industry. * * *

"The Congress believes that progress must be made and all our problems solved within the principles of liberty, equality and justice to all men, which guided this country for 150 years. * * *

"The only way this fundamental difference can be resolved is by vote of the people at the November election."

Further on, the congressional leaders applied their credo specifically to the price problem, with the assertion that Government controls "would only make the situation worse." They would "create black markets and check the increase in production which is the only ultimate solution."

The ultimate truth of that last observation is no more to be challenged than the courage-inspiring insistence that Government's role in the recovery of price stability must be the traditionally passive one. Politically, however, the choice of this proposition, thus stated, as the one to take to the people, may be less widely admired.

It may be questioned, if living costs continue to mount from now to November 2, that ultimate solutions will satisfy an impatient and possibly angry electorate. Governor Dewey, one suspects, would have welcomed being left a little more latitude to adapt his campaign to circumstances as they arise.

MORE TO BE DONE

The cooperation promised by the Lake Carriers Association to reduce the contribution to Detroit's smoke nuisance by vessels passing through the river is very welcome.

The spirit displayed by the vessel owners is no less to be appreciated because cooperation could be forced, if necessary.

Now, if something could be done to dissuade vessel crews from discharging ash and oily wastes into the river and St. Clair Channel, contrary to law, Detroit would be still more grateful. In swimming is the last place where a citizen expects to get a cinder in his eye; but, as matters stand—or float, it can happen here, and frequently does.

THE COMMENTATOR

OVERCONFIDENCE PLAGUES THE GOP

(By W. K. Kelsey)

The Republican leaders are afflicted with an after-convention hang-over. At Philadelphia they assured one another that the November election was in the bag; that President Truman, who would certainly be renominated, was a dead pigeon; that the Dewey-Warren ticket was a 100-to-1 shot to succeed, and that little need be done but raise a huge campaign fund to distribute

among the loyal shirkers, and then wait for the day of the inevitable victory.

This mood persists. It has not been jolted by the President's call of a special session of Congress, nor by the long program of work required to be done which he has outlined. Therefore the Republicans in control plan to do approximately nothing, believing that the great majority of the voters will sanction this decision.

That remains to be seen. In the commentator's opinion, a quick adjournment without even an attempt to answer the President's challenge, is a gamble that is unjustified by present conditions, and is likely to become still less justified before November 2. If the Republican Congress now refuses even to try to enact what it has promised in its platform, the obvious conclusion to which people are entitled to jump is that it has little intention of carrying out its pledges if the party is installed in complete power next year.

The President is accused of playing politics. Certainly he is playing politics. Who, in his position, would not? He is playing the smartest kind of politics. He is putting the Republican Party in the wrong, and the Republican policy is to let him get away with it. If that is smart politics on the Republican side the commentator has spent half a century of political study in vain.

LEAVING THE JOB UNCOMPLETED

President Truman might have pointed out in his message that the job of a Member of Congress has come, in recent years, to be almost full time, and therefore there is no justification for an adjournment when important measures have been enacted by one House and sent to the other for action.

This is especially true when a new Congress must start all over on these bills. They then become new legislation, subject to the regular procedure of committee hearings, reports, getting them to the floor, debating them, passing them, sending them from one House to the other, going through the same process in the second House, sending them to a conference committee in case of disagreement, and final passage. A great deal of this work is time-wasting duplication on bills that have already been studied and passed by one House.

The Seventy-sixth Congress sat 625 days; the Seventy-seventh, 711 days; the Seventy-eighth, 695 days; the preceding Congress, 554 days. The present Congress sat 351 days last year, then quit in June to attend the conventions, leaving a large amount of work nearing completion and a still larger amount ready for action but for the time limit imposed by the adjournment agreement. To shirk this work is to fail to protect the national interests. The President has given Congress an opportunity to make good. Apparently it intends to offer not even a gesture. It will do its best to provide a filibuster, and then adjourn.

The President has asked for various price-control measures. Why not enact all of them, since the Republicans are so sure they won't work? That would throw the responsibility on Mr. Truman. He has asked for a Federal housing measure. Why not enact it, if the Republicans believe it would send building costs sky high? The onus would be on the President. Moreover, to leave the situation as it is does not provide homes for GI men, except those who take over houses abandoned by the more fortunate who can afford new, high-priced dwellings.

Besides, if the Republicans know the answers, they could develop them in the special session, instead of waiting until next year.

WHAT THE PEOPLE CAN INFER

It is no excuse at all to say that the President has heaved at Congress a program so huge that it cannot possibly undertake it in the special session.

What Mr. Truman has done is to demand immediate legislation on several matters, pointing out at the same time other things that need to be done. He has emphasized his previous accusation that this is a do-nothing Congress, that has quit an unfinished job to take a rest and then campaign for reelection. The charge is true. The inference, which the people should be quick to discover, is that this Republican-controlled Congress does not want the job of doing the things needed, and therefore another Republican-controlled Congress will be equally unwilling to do them.

So what fools we shall be if, desiring lower prices, slum clearance, homes for the not-so-well-off, a better break for pensioners, more and cheaper electric power, better schools, and the rest of the multitude of things enumerated by the President, we vote the Republican ticket.

Logically, the least Republicans can do is clear out the riffraff in the House of Representatives, and replace them with persons who really believe in the platform promises of their party.

CONGRESSIONAL ECONOMIC STUDY COMMITTEE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Resolution 714, to create a Congressional Economic Study Committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas problems of economic and social character left unsolved by the break-down of the London Economic Conference in 1933 continue to plague the world; and

Whereas those problems were accentuated by the destruction of property, the dislocation of peoples and the loss of production incident to World War II; and

Whereas there exists in the United States, as in other countries, grave problems of supply and demand in relation to commodities, prices and wages requiring basic adjustments which can be obtained only by a program or programs based upon careful and impartial studies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Congressional Economic Study Committee composed of 10 members with 5 special consultants to be named as follows:

Ten members from the House of Representatives to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Five persons from civilian life eminently qualified to assist in solving problems in the fields of finance, labor, industry, or agriculture and familiar with the problems of the consuming public to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be invited to work with the committee as special consultants and to be compensated as hereinafter provided.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall designate one member of the committee as chairman and another member as vice chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to make a study of (1) economic maladjustments which it believes are contributing to undesirable levels of prices, wages, and supplies of commodities in the United States or places where the United States has a special responsibility for economic conditions; (2) measures which in the committee's judgment might contribute to an improvement or solution of such economic problems; (3) and to consider and evaluate any reports on economic conditions submitted to the Congress by the executive branch of the Government during the life of the committee. The committee may well study, but is not limited to, any economic situations arising out of money supply and monetary relationships in this and other countries.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk thereof if the Congress is not in session) from time to time as it shall deem appropriate, but finally not later than January 3, 1949.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress and until the date of its final report at such times and places as it deems advisable, whether or not the Congress is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel and such special assistants, to hold such hearings, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Reports of its activities may be made public from time to time but its conclusions and recommendations shall be reserved for its reports to Congress as above provided.

Members of the committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the committee. The five special consultants to the committee and whose other relationships to the Federal Government do not prevent shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the committee plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I knew nothing about any such resolution as this coming up. Nobody has even hinted anything about it to me. I do not know what is in this resolution. I do not know whether it overlaps any other investigating committees. I do not know whether it is something that would be helpful to the country or whether it is another around-the-world junket or something like that. I would like to have this resolution laid aside for a little while until I can find out what it is.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am willing to accede to the gentleman's request, if that be helpful. However, I thought that perhaps if the author of the resolution, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is given an opportunity to explain it, in the time which I expect to yield to him, that we might expedite matters.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman might withdraw his motion and have a discussion with the minority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, under a unanimous-consent request, anybody can call up anything that the Speaker will recognize him for. But I think somebody

ought to be told when important matters like this are coming up.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move that further consideration of this resolution be laid aside until 6:30?

The SPEAKER. It may be reserved until 6:30, and at that time the gentleman can renew his request.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution be deferred until such time as a renewal of the motion may be made, in order to permit an opportunity for discussion.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think that is much better than a specific time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Why not allow the Members who desire to make speeches make them now?

The SPEAKER. No. The Chair has ruled during the day that such matters will have to go over until after the legislative business of the day is completed. If the gentleman is going to make any speeches he is going to do it after the calendar business has been disposed of.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the Speaker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 7 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m. by the Speaker.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution making appropriation for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

APPROPRIATION FOR HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY AND THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 445, making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, with amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

"The appropriation of $2,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission in the 'Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948,' (Public Law 785, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) may be apportioned for obligation and expenditure during the first three quarters of the fiscal year 1949."

Page 1, after line 7, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"The amount made available under this head in The Government Corporations Appropriations Act, 1949, for administrative expenses for the Office of the Administrator, is increased from $750,000 to $1,050,000."

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Page 1, strike out line 10 and insert "Federal Housing Administration."

Page 1, line 12, after "expenses" insert "of the Federal Housing Administration."

Page 1, line 15, strike out "($2,400,000)" and insert "$2,100,000."

Page 2, line 4 after "year" insert "; and the sources of funds for such administrative expenses shall include the Housing Investment Insurance Fund created by the Housing Act of 1948."

Page 2 after line 12 insert:

"MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

"Section 6 of Public Law 880 Eightieth Congress second session 'An act to create a Commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers' is hereby amended by striking out the words 'six months' in said section and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'nine months.'

"Section 13 of said act is amended by striking out the words 'six months' period' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'nine months' period.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take for granted it is the purpose of the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, to move that the House concur in full in the Senate amendments.

Mr. TABER. That is it exactly.

Mr. CANNON. I trust the gentleman will explain the Senate amendments, in which we are asked to concur, and their effect upon the resolution as it passed the House.

Mr. TABER. The amendments are these in effect. I will not go into the technical amendments, but just in substance.

The first one, providing $2,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission, having to do with the admission of persons under the so-called Displaced Persons Act, was provided for that purpose by the House. This language provides that instead of being obligated in 12 months, it may be obligated in the first 9 months of the fiscal year.

The second amendment relates to the housing situation.

We provided $2,400,000 for administrative expenses generally.

The Senate, in effect, segregates $300,000 of that for the administrative expenses in the Administrator's office and $2,100,000 in the field, the over-all amount being the same.

The third item—there are more amendments, but the rest are all technical—the third item provides that the bill providing for the presentation of claims for losses by motor carriers whose property was seized during the war may be presented in 9 months from July 3, 1948, instead of 6 months as the act authorized when passed.

These are the three.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is any of this amount appropriated for these motor carriers' claims?

Mr. TABER. No; but they can be filed, and about all that could be done with them anyway would be for them to be filed during the period between now and January 1. Then a commission would be appointed and the consideration of the claims begun and the claims disposed of promptly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I cannot understand and I do not believe the Membership of the House can understand why an appropriation bill should carry a proposition of substantive law which allows these motor carrier claims to be brought before the Congress when the courts have already decided this question. The courts have decided the question, yet now in an appropriation bill you are enacting substantive law to give an advantage to motor carriers whose claims have already been decided by the courts of the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may be under a little misapprehension. The basic law created a commission which could receive these claims. The commission would have to investigate them and make a recommendation to the Congress before any appropriation whatsoever could be made.

There is no appropriation in the bill.

The only occasion for this extension of time for the filing of the claims is that the original act was signed on the 2d of July. That act provided that the claims had to be filed within 6 months after that time. In view of the fact that that bill was passed in the closing hours of the second session no appropriation was made for the operation of the commission. Since no appropriation has been made the commission might not be created and might not be functioning by the 2d of January; and the language in the Senate amendment merely provides that claims may be filed up until the 3d of April, the 9-month anniversary, rather than the 6-month anniversary of July 2. That would give the Congress an opportunity to consider an appropriation for the administrative expenses of the Commission when it meets in January.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether or not responsibility can be placed for this special legislation for motor carriers, classing it as emergency legislation which this Congress has been called into special session to enact. Now, this is special legislation for a particular

class of claims. The leadership has allowed, Mr. Speaker, this special class of claims to be classified under emergency legislation which the Congress is called upon to enact at 15 minutes to 8, daylight saving time, Saturday, August 7, 1948, which is within a few minutes of adjournment. If we are going to legislate, Mr. Speaker, on emergency legislation in this session, I do not think it is proper to bring in this special plea from special pleaders for these motor carriers. The courts have already defined the laws of the United States in this matter. Yet here we are passing special legislation in their behalf. If that is what we are here for in this session, it is all right, but I would like the RECORD to show it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it is apparent from a reading of the Senate amendments and from the explanation made by the gentleman from New York that there is no additional appropriation over the amount provided by the House. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. In other words, these amendments are largely innocuous. Summing up the whole matter there is no advantage and no disadvantage in them. It is largely a matter of allocation.

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in withdrawing my reservation of objection, may I say it is to be regretted that the Senate did not add some amendments which would have provided for additional items which should have been included in this bill. It is especially to be regretted that it does not provide funds to effectuate the War Claims Commission Act and other matters similarly urgent. But under the circumstances, at this late hour, I withdraw my reservation and shall support the bill as inadequate as it is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL MILEAGE OF MEMBERS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Resolution 715.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to pay to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives not to exceed $171,000 out of funds appropriated under the head "Contingent expenses of the House," fiscal year 1949, for additional mileage of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, at the rate authorized by law.

SEC. 2. That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to pay to Walter K. Granger, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of Wilson versus Granger, as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000, to be disbursed out of funds appropriated under the head "Contingent expenses of the House," fiscal year 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this special session of the Congress has produced a few—but very few—useful results. The majority leadership in this body has refused to face up to its full responsibilities in combatting inflation and lack of housing. Too much time has been spent talking; too much time has been spent acting; and not enough time has been spent legislating in behalf of the people.

We have enacted some legislation to control credit; some legislation in behalf of housing; and legislation to lend the United Nations $65,000,000 to build its permanent home in New York City.

We have failed utterly to consider the problem of high food prices. We have thus failed to come to grips with the single most disturbing element in the present situation. We have failed to consider the O'Mahoney-Mansfield bill, H. R. 7076, which would force a cooling-off period for great corporations for 30 days in which to justify price raises before the Federal Trade Commission. Rather than face up to these serious questions we are going to adjourn and go home. The consequences of this lack of action on a full-scale attack against the high cost of living may be tragic for the American people.

This Congress should know that if inflation is not controlled, deflation will follow and a depression will set in. If this happens—and the chances are very much in favor of it—we will face a condition in this country far more serious than the depression of the 1930's. With a domestic depression will come a breakdown in our foreign policy. The U. S. S. R. has been looking forward to an American depression to further the ideology of communism here, to break up the Marshall plan, and to take over western Europe. It is their contention that a depression here will revive isolationism in this country to such an extent that we will refuse help to rehabilitate Europe and will pull up stakes and withdraw entirely from there and Asia as well. If a depression comes, how many Americans will care whether we stay in Berlin, in Germany, in Korea, and in Japan?

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not fear the atomic bomb because it believes a depression here will mark the beginning of the end of our system. It is the duty of this Congress to see to it that a depression does not occur and to do this certain steps are necessary.

We should stay in continuous session to consider and devise means to strengthen the American economy, to lower prices, and to give hope to our people. What we have done so far in this special session is little indeed. We should recognize that a depression here will affect the free peoples of the world and create a situation which will be disastrous for all of us. The people of the world, as well as our own people, are watching us to see what we will do because, in a sense, democracy is on trial. The question they are asking is this: Is a free society capable of the self-control and unselfishness necessary for its own survival? The answer lies in our own hands and will be of the majority's choosing. It is my prayer that even now we will rise above party considerations, get down to business, and stay in session and do the kind of a job we must do to stabilize the American economy and give hope to our people and the people of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I shall demand the yeas and nays to record my opposition to this Congress going home without really tackling the high cost of living and I will oppose the adjournment of this Congress because we have failed in our full duty to the American people.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk House Concurrent Resolution 222 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, August 7, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAYBURN) there were—yeas, 236, noes 56.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 223) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses

ought to be told when important matters like this are coming up.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move that further consideration of this resolution be laid aside until 6:30?

The SPEAKER. It may be reserved until 6:30, and at that time the gentleman can renew his request.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution be deferred until such time as a renewal of the motion may be made, in order to permit an opportunity for discussion.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think that is much better than a specific time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Why not allow the Members who desire to make speeches make them now?

The SPEAKER. No. The Chair has ruled during the day that such matters will have to go over until after the legislative business of the day is completed. If the gentleman is going to make any speeches he is going to do it after the calendar business has been disposed of.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the Speaker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 7 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m. by the Speaker.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution making appropriation for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

APPROPRIATION FOR HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY AND THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 445, making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, with amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

"The appropriation of $2,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission in the 'Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948,' (Public Law 785, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) may be apportioned for obligation and expenditure during the first three quarters of the fiscal year 1949."

Page 1, after line 7, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"The amount made available under this head in The Government Corporations Appropriations Act, 1949, for administrative expenses for the Office of the Administrator, is increased from $750,000 to $1,050,000."

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Page 1, strike out line 10 and insert "Federal Housing Administration."

Page 1, line 12, after "expenses" insert "of the Federal Housing Administration."

Page 1, line 15, strike out "($2,400,000)" and insert "$2,100,000."

Page 2, line 4 after "year" insert "; and the sources of funds for such administrative expenses shall include the Housing Investment Insurance Fund created by the Housing Act of 1948."

Page 2 after line 12 insert:

"MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

"Section 6 of Public Law 880 Eightieth Congress second session 'An act to create a Commission to hear and determine the claims of certain motor carriers' is hereby amended by striking out the words 'six months' in said section and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'nine months.'

"Section 13 of said act is amended by striking out the words 'six months' period' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'nine months' period.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take for granted it is the purpose of the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, to move that the House concur in full in the Senate amendments.

Mr. TABER. That is it exactly.

Mr. CANNON. I trust the gentleman will explain the Senate amendments, in which we are asked to concur, and their effect upon the resolution as it passed the House.

Mr. TABER. The amendments are these in effect. I will not go into the technical amendments, but just in substance.

The first one, providing $2,000,000 for the Displaced Persons Commission, having to do with the admission of persons under the so-called Displaced Persons Act, was provided for that purpose by the House. This language provides that instead of being obligated in 12 months, it may be obligated in the first 9 months of the fiscal year.

The second amendment relates to the housing situation.

We provided $2,400,000 for administrative expenses generally.

The Senate, in effect, segregates $300,000 of that for the administrative expenses in the Administrator's office and $2,100,000 in the field, the over-all amount being the same.

The third item—there are more amendments, but the rest are all technical—the third item provides that the bill providing for the presentation of claims for losses by motor carriers whose property was seized during the war may be presented in 9 months from July 3, 1948, instead of 6 months as the act authorized when passed.

These are the three.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is any of this amount appropriated for these motor carriers' claims?

Mr. TABER. No; but they can be filed, and about all that could be done with them anyway would be for them to be filed during the period between now and January 1. Then a commission would be appointed and the consideration of the claims begun and the claims disposed of promptly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I cannot understand and I do not believe the Membership of the House can understand why an appropriation bill should carry a proposition of substantive law which allows these motor carrier claims to be brought before the Congress when the courts have already decided this question. The courts have decided the question, yet now in an appropriation bill you are enacting substantive law to give an advantage to motor carriers whose claims have already been decided by the courts of the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may be under a little misapprehension. The basic law created a commission which could receive these claims. The commission would have to investigate them and make a recommendation to the Congress before any appropriation whatsoever could be made.

There is no appropriation in the bill.

The only occasion for this extension of time for the filing of the claims is that the original act was signed on the 2d of July. That act provided that the claims had to be filed within 6 months after that time. In view of the fact that that bill was passed in the closing hours of the second session no appropriation was made for the operation of the commission. Since no appropriation has been made the commission might not be created and might not be functioning by the 2d of January; and the language in the Senate amendment merely provides that claims may be filed up until the 3d of April, the 9-month anniversary, rather than the 6-month anniversary of July 2. That would give the Congress an opportunity to consider an appropriation for the administrative expenses of the Commission when it meets in January.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether or not responsibility can be placed for this special legislation for motor carriers, classing it as emergency legislation which this Congress has been called into special session to enact. Now, this is special legislation for a particular

class of claims. The leadership has allowed, Mr. Speaker, this special class of claims to be classified under emergency legislation which the Congress is called upon to enact at 15 minutes to 8, daylight saving time, Saturday, August 7, 1948, which is within a few minutes of adjournment. If we are going to legislate, Mr. Speaker, on emergency legislation in this session, I do not think it is proper to bring in this special plea from special pleaders for these motor carriers. The courts have already defined the laws of the United States in this matter. Yet here we are passing special legislation in their behalf. If that is what we are here for in this session, it is all right, but I would like the RECORD to show it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it is apparent from a reading of the Senate amendments and from the explanation made by the gentleman from New York that there is no additional appropriation over the amount provided by the House. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. In other words, these amendments are largely innocuous. Summing up the whole matter there is no advantage and no disadvantage in them. It is largely a matter of allocation.

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in withdrawing my reservation of objection, may I say it is to be regretted that the Senate did not add some amendments which would have provided for additional items which should have been included in this bill. It is especially to be regretted that it does not provide funds to effectuate the War Claims Commission Act and other matters similarly urgent. But under the circumstances, at this late hour, I withdraw my reservation and shall support the bill as inadequate as it is.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL MILEAGE OF MEMBERS

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Resolution 715.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to pay to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives not to exceed $171,000 out of funds appropriated under the head "Contingent expenses of the House," fiscal year 1949, for additional mileage of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, at the rate authorized by law.

SEC. 2. That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to pay to Walter K. Granger, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of Wilson versus Granger, as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000, to be disbursed out of funds appropriated under the head "Contingent expenses of the House," fiscal year 1949.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this special session of the Congress has produced a few—but very few—useful results. The majority leadership in this body has refused to face up to its full responsibilities in combatting inflation and lack of housing. Too much time has been spent talking; too much time has been spent acting; and not enough time has been spent legislating in behalf of the people.

We have enacted some legislation to control credit; some legislation in behalf of housing; and legislation to lend the United Nations $65,000,000 to build its permanent home in New York City.

We have failed utterly to consider the problem of high food prices. We have thus failed to come to grips with the single most disturbing element in the present situation. We have failed to consider the O'Mahoney-Mansfield bill, H. R. 7076, which would force a cooling-off period for great corporations for 30 days in which to justify price raises before the Federal Trade Commission. Rather than face up to these serious questions we are going to adjourn and go home. The consequences of this lack of action on a full-scale attack against the high cost of living may be tragic for the American people.

This Congress should know that if inflation is not controlled, deflation will follow and a depression will set in. If this happens—and the chances are very much in favor of it—we will face a condition in this country far more serious than the depression of the 1930's. With a domestic depression will come a breakdown in our foreign policy. The U. S. S. R. has been looking forward to an American depression to further the ideology of communism here, to break up the Marshall plan, and to take over western Europe. It is their contention that a depression here will revive isolationism in this country to such an extent that we will refuse help to rehabilitate Europe and will pull up stakes and withdraw entirely from there and Asia as well. If a depression comes, how many Americans will care whether we stay in Berlin, in Germany, in Korea, and in Japan?

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not fear the atomic bomb because it believes a depression here will mark the beginning of the end of our system. It is the duty of this Congress to see to it that a depression does not occur and to do this certain steps are necessary.

We should stay in continuous session to consider and devise means to strengthen the American economy, to lower prices, and to give hope to our people. What we have done so far in this special session is little indeed. We should recognize that a depression here will affect the free peoples of the world and create a situation which will be disastrous for all of us. The people of the world, as well as our own people, are watching us to see what we will do because, in a sense, democracy is on trial. The question they are asking is this: Is a free society capable of the self-control and unselfishness necessary for its own survival? The answer lies in our own hands and will be of the majority's choosing. It is my prayer that even now we will rise above party considerations, get down to business, and stay in session and do the kind of a job we must do to stabilize the American economy and give hope to our people and the people of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I shall demand the yeas and nays to record my opposition to this Congress going home without really tackling the high cost of living and I will oppose the adjournment of this Congress because we have failed in our full duty to the American people.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk House Concurrent Resolution 222 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, August 7, 1948, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Friday, December 31, 1948, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after the respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the acting majority leader of the Senate, and the majority leader of the House of Representatives, all acting jointly, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAYBURN) there were—yeas, 236, noes 56.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 223) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the two Houses

until December 31, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING THE NATION'S ECONOMY AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the language of the House amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures, as amended by the Senate, may be printed in the RECORD immediately preceding the roll call on the adoption of the resolution with reference thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENTS OF COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress until December 31, 1948.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of clarification, may I ask whether or not a Member can today insert a speech in the body of the RECORD, under the terms of the request?

The SPEAKER. Not under the terms of the request, but if the gentleman wishes to make such a request the Chair will be glad to recognize him for that purpose immediately after this request is granted.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HAS GOVERNOR DEWEY SURRENDERED THE LEADERSHIP OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WITHOUT A FIGHT?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the floor of the House I raised the question that remains the enigma of this special session of the Eightieth Congress. I refer, of course, to the inexplicable absence of the influence of Governor Dewey upon the Republican leaders in the Congress. President Truman on July 27 suggested a legislative program of the highest priority to stop the rising cost of living and to build homes for the people who need them. He also suggested a number of other problems—some of them related to the anti-inflation program—and still others upon which he requested consideration to the extent possible without interference with the legislation on housing and high prices.

It is significant that the Republican platform, which Governor Dewey has described as "a magnificent statement of principles, I proudly support it," referred to a number of the subjects upon which President Truman implored the Congress to take action in this special session.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

On this subject of the Republican platform pledges:

> An attack upon the basic causes of inflation, including the following measures: Progressive reduction of the cost of Government through elimination of waste; stimulation of production as the surest way to lower prices; fiscal policies to provide increased incentive for production and thrift; sound currency; reduction of the public debt.

Mr. Speaker, what has been the record of the Republican Eightieth Congress both in the regular and in the special session on such "measures"? According to the most reliable statistics available, the net reductions by the second session of the Eightieth Congress through June 20, 1948, in all specific requests submitted by the President was $1,008,031,936. It has been estimated that the passage of the tax reduction bill over the President's veto will require increased expenditures for tax refunds in fiscal year 1949, in the amount of $687,000,000. For all practical purposes, therefore, despite pledges of hard-headed economy in Government, the Republicans have been unable to cut down more than a trifle the Budget that President Truman and his Cabinet had already slashed to the bone. So, the Republicans, despite their platform, have made no "progressive reduction on the cost of Government."

The majority would also stimulate production "as the surest way to lower prices." Mr. Speaker, this sounds like the advertisements of the National Association of Manufacturers in 1946 in their hate-campaign against OPA. I am sure we will not soon forget the Republican NAM promise "If OPA is discontinued, the production of goods will rise rapidly and, through free competition, prices will quickly adjust themselves to levels that consumers are willing to pay." The other Republican platform promises for "an attack on the basic causes of inflation" include sound fiscal policies, sound currency, and debt reduction—all of which have been made infinitely more difficult, if not impossible, by the Republican tax-reduction bill which has wiped out the surplus for the current fiscal year at a time when our national income is the history in history. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has rejected not only the anti-inflation program of President Truman, but also the vague and innocuous Republican platform pledges which Governor Dewey found so magnificent. If he has supported these magnificent principles during the special session of Congress, his support has been well-nigh invisible.

HOUSING

On this subject the Republican platform is a bit more honest. It suggests that "Government can and should encourage the building of better homes at less cost," but recommends Federal aid "for local slum clearance and low-rental housing programs only where there is a need that cannot be met either by private enterprise or by the States and localities." On the other hand, President Truman has called for the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill as the only direct and adequate solution of the housing shortage. But here Candidate Dewey, the Republican platform, and even the distinguished Republican coauthor of the T-E-W housing bill have bowed to the Old Guard in control of the Eightieth Congress.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

President Truman warned the Congress: "Children in our schools, and the men and women who teach there, have been the victims of inflation," and he called upon the Congress to provide Federal assistance to the States in meeting the present crisis in education. The fate of this proposal at the Republican National Convention was remarkably prophetic of the disposition by the Eightieth Congress of this urgent appeal. The tentative text of the Republican platform, prepared by a drafting subcommittee, did contain the following proposal: "We favor Federal aid to the States on a just basis to increase educational opportunities without Federal control." This tentative plank proved too strong for the full resolutions committee, and was deleted from the platform. This deletion, of course, is strictly in line with the reported attitude of Governor Dewey toward the teachers of the country.

MINIMUM WAGES

The closest the Republican platform came to a discussion of minimum wage legislation was the bold assertion that

"there must be decent legislation and decent wages." President Truman has stressed repeatedly how pitifully inadequate is the present minimum-wage law in the face of today's high prices. Yet we find the very moderate proposal to raise minimum wages to 75 cents an hour too unpalatable for the Republican leaders in Congress. And Governor Dewey has refused to urge action at this special session.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Other victims of inflation for whom the President urged Congress to take action are the 2,000,000 people who depend upon social-security benefits. Even the Republican platform called for "an increase of the benefits to a more realistic level," but the only action of the Republican Eightieth Congress, despite all of its promises and despite all the talk to the contrary, has been to do not one thing about raising the moderate level of benefits set back in 1939, and to deprive of even these benefits nearly a million workers and their families whom the Supreme Court held were given coverage by a Democratic Congress back in 1935.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Displaced Persons Act, passed in the closing days of the regular session, was signed reluctantly by President Truman because of its discrimination against some displaced persons on the ground of religion, land of origin, or occupation. The President reminded the Congress on July 27:

> These provisions are contrary to all American ideals. This act should be promptly amended to wipe out this discrimination.

According to the press of yesterday and today, Governor Dewey shares President Truman's views regarding the Republican Displaced Persons Act. A Republican Member of the other body announced that Governor Dewey had asked revision of the law, but stated that no action would be forthcoming during the present session of Congress.

Now it may be, Mr. Speaker, that Governor Dewey's experience on displaced-persons legislation suggested the wisdom to him of remaining silent on all these other great issues. If he cannot lead his party on the question of displaced-persons legislation, then how could he hope to be an influence on the critical problems of housing and inflation? If Governor Dewey is so impotent in the formulation of Republican policy, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fortunate that this fact has been revealed to the American people before next November, rather than afterward.

PUBLIC POWER

One of the most significant changes made by the Republican platform committee in the draft prepared by its subcommittee at Philadelphia was the deletion of a pledge of "adequate appropriations" for the progressive development of the Nation's water power resources. The people of the great Northwest, and of the entire country, should know that this action at the Republican national convention, which received the blessings of Governor Dewey, is strictly in accord with the failure of the Republican Eightieth Congress to provide adequate appropriations for the implementation of our national electric power policy. Governor Dewey has not asked Congress to do anything to restore the appropriations for the TVA steam plant and for other projects, the lack of which may delay the production of power for more than a year. As in all these other important areas of Federal activity, a page of legislation is worth a million times all the promises that could ever be assembled for a Republican platform.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. Speaker, there is very little difference between the Republican and Democratic platform on this question, but it is crystal clear that the Republican leadership in the Congress abandoned principle to use the anti-poll-tax legislation as a cloak for their inactivity on the pressing problems of prices and housing.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to cover briefly the subjects upon which President Truman called for action at the special session of this Republican Eightieth Congress. I have tried to point out that the Republican platform pledged the party to a position on most of these issues. I have also pointed out that Governor Dewey, as the defeated Republican candidate in 1944 and as the party nominee for President in 1948, has specifically bound himself to the pledges in the Republican platform. Yet, Mr. Speaker, except for the displaced persons discrimination, Governor Dewey has done nothing to try to obtain action at this current session on these Republican promises. It is clear that either Governor Dewey has abdicated his leadership of the Republican Party or he has rejected, by his very inaction, the principles to which he committed himself in his acceptance speech at Philadelphia. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, where is Governor Dewey? Where does he stand? Is he going to try to lead the Republican Party? Why hasn't he spoken out on behalf of his views at this special session? The American people are entitled to know.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF HEROIC SERVICE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in this final hour of the Eightieth Congress, may I be privileged to relate to the House an inspiring chapter of heroism taken from recent history of the Detroit police department. This is not the first example of courage and of devotion to service, nor is it the last. The annals of the department are replete with examples of selflessness and of sacrifice for the people of Detroit.

The story surrounding the heroism of Casimer W. Kaliszewski, Jr., however, is different. A probationary officer, a "rookie" of scarcely 22 years of age, he displayed the stuff of which heroes are made. He has the heart of a lion and the spirit which is natural in his family and which is the motivating impulse of the Detroit police force.

Casimer, Jr., a worthy son of a noble sire, was endowed with forthrightness and courage by his equally brave and honest father who, 23 years ago, set the pattern in exemplary service for his posthumous son when he gave his all for the people of Detroit and for the uniform which he respected.

"Giving your all" is not an outcropping of individual bravery—it is traditional with the entire Detroit police force. It is a priceless heritage passed on as in this instance from a heroic father to an equally brave and worthy son. It permeates to a marked degree the entire body of the men in blue.

Once before, Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to extoll the virtues of a brave lad who perished in the continuous war against the depraved thug and bandit.

Somewhere along the line of demarcation between life and death the young police officer battles bravely for survival bolstered by the love and the devotion of two spartanlike women. One, the young wife who but a few months ago was his smiling happy bride; the other, his mother for whom this vigil is a second journey which it is hoped might terminate short of Golgotha.

The prayers of these faithful women joined in a chorus of the citizens of all Detroit pour forth before the throne of the Almighty God to stay the heavenly call so that Casimer W. Kaliszewski, Jr., might live to serve as an inspiration to the rookies of tomorrow and to put fear into the criminal hearts of all evildoers who by the words of Commissioner Harry S. Toy face retribution for a certainty.

In his orders to the police force, the commissioner stated, "This is a case that must be cleaned up—and fast," and again he added, "This boy's father was killed while he was on duty and we can't let the son down." The entire force is on its toes; the scoundrel will not evade the dragnet; he will be caught and with his henchmen, if there be any, brought to justice.

Thus closes my brief and totally inadequate narrative covering the other side of another story on the police blotter—a story of heroism, service, and devotion, written in the blood of the men in police uniforms—these men of courage, who risk the happiness of their own families and their lives for the sake of the community.

While man for man the Detroit police force is the equal of any in the world, no force is stronger or more effective than the public sentiment by which it is sustained. Public support of the police, both moral and financial, in all the good work of the department is essential to the well-being and morale of the entire force. Such wholehearted support will redound to the credit and the safety of the entire community. These foul and cowardly attacks upon the police will be eliminated or at least curbed by the moral force of an aroused and united citizenry.

Casimer W. Kaliszewski, Jr., like his heroic father who paid the price before him, is a symbol of faithfulness and courage which must be sustained by a grateful people lest such sacrifice be made in vain.

until December 31, 1948, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING THE NATION'S ECONOMY AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the language of the House amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures, as amended by the Senate, may be printed in the RECORD immediately preceding the roll call on the adoption of the resolution with reference thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENTS OF COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress until December 31, 1948.

The SPEAKER: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of clarification, may I ask whether or not a Member can today insert a speech in the body of the RECORD, under the terms of the request?

The SPEAKER. Not under the terms of the request, but if the gentleman wishes to make such a request the Chair will be glad to recognize him for that purpose immediately after this request is granted.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HAS GOVERNOR DEWEY SURRENDERED THE LEADERSHIP OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WITHOUT A FIGHT?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the floor of the House I raised the question that remains the enigma of this special session of the Eightieth Congress. I refer, of course, to the inexplicable absence of the influence of Governor Dewey upon the Republican leaders in the Congress. President Truman on July 27 suggested a legislative program of the highest priority to stop the rising cost of living and to build homes for the people who need them. He also suggested a number of other problems—some of them related to the anti-inflation program—and still others upon which he requested consideration to the extent possible without interference with the legislation on housing and high prices.

It is significant that the Republican platform, which Governor Dewey has described as "a magnificent statement of principles, I proudly support it," referred to a number of the subjects upon which President Truman implored the Congress to take action in this special session.

HIGH COST OF LIVING

On this subject of the Republican platform pledges:

An attack upon the basic causes of inflation, including the following measures: Progressive reduction of the cost of Government through elimination of waste; stimulation of production as the surest way to lower prices; fiscal policies to provide increased incentive for production and thrift; sound currency; reduction of the public debt.

Mr. Speaker, what has been the record of the Republican Eightieth Congress both in the regular and in the special session on such "measures"? According to the most reliable statistics available, the net reductions by the second session of the Eightieth Congress through June 20, 1948, in all specific requests submitted by the President was $1,008,031,936. It has been estimated that the passage of the tax reduction bill over the President's veto will require increased expenditures for tax refunds in fiscal year 1949, in the amount of $687,000,000. For all practical purposes, therefore, despite pledges of hard-headed economy in Government, the Republicans have been unable to cut down more than a trifle the Budget that President Truman and his Cabinet had already slashed to the bone. So, the Republicans, despite their platform, have made no "progressive reduction on the cost of Government."

The majority would also stimulate production "as the surest way to lower prices." Mr. Speaker, this sounds like the advertisements of the National Association of Manufacturers in 1946 in their hate-campaign against OPA. I am sure we will not soon forget the Republican NAM promise "If OPA is discontinued, the production of goods will rise rapidly and, through free competition, prices will quickly adjust themselves to levels that consumers are willing to pay." The other Republican platform promises for "an attack on the basic causes of inflation" include sound fiscal policies, sound currency, and debt reduction—all of which have been made infinitely more difficult, if not impossible, by the Republican tax-reduction bill which has wiped out the surplus for the current fiscal year at a time when our national income is the history in history. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has rejected not only the anti-inflation program of President Truman, but also the vague and innocuous Republican platform pledges which Governor Dewey found so magnificent. If he has supported these magnificent principles during the special session of Congress, his support has been well-nigh invisible.

HOUSING

On this subject the Republican platform is a bit more honest. It suggests that "Government can and should encourage the building of better homes at less cost," but recommends Federal aid "for local slum clearance and low-rental housing programs only where there is a need that cannot be met either by private enterprise or by the States and localities." On the other hand, President Truman has called for the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill as the only direct and adequate solution of the housing shortage. But here Candidate Dewey, the Republican platform, and even the distinguished Republican coauthor of the T-E-W housing bill have bowed to the Old Guard in control of the Eightieth Congress.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

President Truman warned the Congress: "Children in our schools, and the men and women who teach there, have been the victims of inflation," and he called upon the Congress to provide Federal assistance to the States in meeting the present crisis in education. The fate of this proposal at the Republican National Convention was remarkably prophetic of the disposition by the Eightieth Congress of this urgent appeal. The tentative text of the Republican platform, prepared by a drafting subcommittee, did contain the following proposal: "We favor Federal aid to the States on a just basis to increase educational opportunities without Federal control." This tentative plank proved too strong for the full resolutions committee, and was deleted from the platform. This deletion, of course, is strictly in line with the reported attitude of Governor Dewey toward the teachers of the country.

MINIMUM WAGES

The closest the Republican platform came to a discussion of minimum wage legislation was the bold assertion that

"there must be decent legislation and decent wages." President Truman has stressed repeatedly how pitifully inadequate is the present minimum-wage law in the face of today's high prices. Yet we find the very moderate proposal to raise minimum wages to 75 cents an hour too unpalatable for the Republican leaders in Congress. And Governor Dewey has refused to urge action at this special session.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Other victims of inflation for whom the President urged Congress to take action are the 2,000,000 people who depend upon social-security benefits. Even the Republican platform called for "an increase of the benefits to a more realistic level," but the only action of the Republican Eightieth Congress, despite all of its promises and despite all the talk to the contrary, has been to do not one thing about raising the moderate level of benefits set back in 1939, and to deprive of even these benefits nearly a million workers and their families whom the Supreme Court held were given coverage by a Democratic Congress back in 1935.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The Displaced Persons Act, passed in the closing days of the regular session, was signed reluctantly by President Truman because of its discrimination against some displaced persons on the ground of religion, land of origin, or occupation. The President reminded the Congress on July 27:

> These provisions are contrary to all American ideals. This act should be promptly amended to wipe out this discrimination.

According to the press of yesterday and today, Governor Dewey shares President Truman's views regarding the Republican Displaced Persons Act. A Republican Member of the other body announced that Governor Dewey had asked revision of the law, but stated that no action would be forthcoming during the present session of Congress.

Now it may be, Mr. Speaker, that Governor Dewey's experience on displaced-persons legislation suggested the wisdom to him of remaining silent on all these other great issues. If he cannot lead his party on the question of displaced-persons legislation, then how could he hope to be an influence on the critical problems of housing and inflation? If Governor Dewey is so impotent in the formulation of Republican policy, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed fortunate that this fact has been revealed to the American people before next November, rather than afterward.

PUBLIC POWER

One of the most significant changes made by the Republican platform committee in the draft prepared by its subcommittee at Philadelphia was the deletion of a pledge of "adequate appropriations" for the progressive development of the Nation's water power resources. The people of the great Northwest, and of the entire country, should know that this action at the Republican national convention, which received the blessings of Governor Dewey, is strictly in accord with the failure of the Republican Eightieth Congress to provide adequate appropriations for the implementation of our national electric power policy. Governor Dewey has not asked Congress to do anything to restore the appropriations for the TVA steam plant and for other projects, the lack of which may delay the production of power for more than a year. As in all these other important areas of Federal activity, a page of legislation is worth a million times all the promises that could ever be assembled for a Republican platform.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. Speaker, there is very little difference between the Republican and Democratic platform on this question, but it is crystal clear that the Republican leadership in the Congress abandoned principle to use the anti-poll-tax legislation as a cloak for their inactivity on the pressing problems of prices and housing.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to cover briefly the subjects upon which President Truman called for action at the special session of this Republican Eightieth Congress. I have tried to point out that the Republican platform pledged the party to a position on most of these issues. I have also pointed out that Governor Dewey, as the defeated Republican candidate in 1944 and as the party nominee for President in 1948, has specifically bound himself to the pledges in the Republican platform. Yet, Mr. Speaker, except for the displaced persons discrimination, Governor Dewey has done nothing to try to obtain action at this current session on these Republican promises. It is clear that either Governor Dewey has abdicated his leadership of the Republican Party or he has rejected, by his very inaction, the principles to which he committed himself in his acceptance speech at Philadelphia. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, where is Governor Dewey? Where does he stand? Is he going to try to lead the Republican Party? Why hasn't he spoken out on behalf of his views at this special session? The American people are entitled to know.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF HEROIC SERVICE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in this final hour of the Eightieth Congress, may I be privileged to relate to the House an inspiring chapter of heroism taken from recent history of the Detroit police department. This is not the first example of courage and of devotion to service, nor is it the last. The annals of the department are replete with examples of selflessness and of sacrifice for the people of Detroit.

The story surrounding the heroism of Casimer W. Kaliszewski, Jr., however, is different. A probationary officer, a "rookie" of scarcely 22 years of age, he displayed the stuff of which heroes are made. He has the heart of a lion and the spirit which is natural in his family and which is the motivating impulse of the Detroit police force.

Casimer, Jr., a worthy son of a noble sire, was endowed with forthrightness and courage by his equally brave and honest father who, 23 years ago, set the pattern in exemplary service for his posthumous son when he gave his all for the people of Detroit and for the uniform which he respected.

"Giving your all" is not an outcropping of individual bravery—it is traditional with the entire Detroit police force. It is a priceless heritage passed on as in this instance from a heroic father to an equally brave and worthy son. It permeates to a marked degree the entire body of the men in blue.

Once before, Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to extoll the virtues of a brave lad who perished in the continuous war against the depraved thug and bandit.

Somewhere along the line of demarcation between life and death the young police officer battles bravely for survival bolstered by the love and the devotion of two spartanlike women. One, the young wife who but a few months ago was his smiling happy bride; the other, his mother for whom this vigil is a second journey which it is hoped might terminate short of Golgotha.

The prayers of these faithful women joined in a chorus of the citizens of all Detroit pour forth before the throne of the Almighty God to stay the heavenly call so that Casimer W. Kaliszewski, Jr., might live to serve as an inspiration to the rookies of tomorrow and to put fear into the criminal hearts of all evildoers who by the words of Commissioner Harry S. Toy face retribution for a certainty.

In his orders to the police force, the commissioner stated, "This is a case that must be cleaned up—and fast," and again he added, "This boy's father was killed while he was on duty and we can't let the son down." The entire force is on its toes; the scoundrel will not evade the dragnet; he will be caught and with his henchmen, if there be any, brought to justice.

Thus closes my brief and totally inadequate narrative covering the other side of another story on the police blotter—a story of heroism, service, and devotion, written in the blood of the men in police uniforms—these men of courage, who risk the happiness of their own families and their lives for the sake of the community.

While man for man the Detroit police force is the equal of any in the world, no force is stronger or more effective than the public sentiment by which it is sustained. Public support of the police, both moral and financial, in all the good work of the department is essential to the well-being and morale of the entire force. Such wholehearted support will redound to the credit and the safety of the entire community. These foul and cowardly attacks upon the police will be eliminated or at least curbed by the moral force of an aroused and united citizenry.

Casimer W. Kaliszewski, Jr., like his heroic father who paid the price before him, is a symbol of faithfulness and courage which must be sustained by a grateful people lest such sacrifice be made in vain.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on official business when the roll call was ordered on H. R. 6959, the Housing Act of 1948. I am and have been in favor of this legislation and would have voted for it had I been present.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the adjournment of the House until Friday, December 31, 1948, by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations, may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the Eightieth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 716) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to Congress, pursuant to section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945 (56 Stat. 6), and the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597), after the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, shall be printed as House documents of the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

AUGUST 7, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the standing Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Respectfully,

CARL ALBERT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

AUGUST 7, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture to take effect today.

Sincerely yours,

PRESTON E. PEDEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 717) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee on Agriculture.

The resolution was agreed to.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until December 31, 1948; and

H. Con. Res. 223. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signing of enrolled bills following adjournment.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The House stands adjourned pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 222.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 222, the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1718. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $400,000 and an authorization in the amount of $3,450,000 for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $10,000,000 for the Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1949 (H. Doc. No. 740); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1719. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $5,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 741); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1720. A letter from A. Tarchiani, Ambassador of Italy, to the Speaker, transmitting an invitation from the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Genoa, Italy, to the Congress of the United States to be represented in the International Parliamentary Convention in Genoa, September 14 through September 17, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. Report pursuant to House Resolution 93, Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Eighteenth intermediate report on investigation of General Accounting Office audit of wartime freight vouchers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Nineteenth intermediate report on investigation of Bureau of Reclamation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4713. A bill to authorize the Secretary of National Defense to acquire additional recreational facilities at Eglin Field, Fla.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 7149. A bill to provide for cooperation of the Federal and State Governments in the assessment of inheritance taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7150. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7151. A bill to amend the copyright laws so as to make unlawful the pirating of phonograph records; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 7152. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 7153. A bill to provide for a program of aeronautical training for the youth of America to insure a better understanding of the international, social, and political implications of air power and its vital place in the

future of world developments and to provide a trained backlog of pilots and technically qualified young manpower to meet the requirements of a national emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7154. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 7155. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to collective-bargaining contracts which have been in existence for a continuous period of 20 years or more; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 7156. A bill for the relief of the city of Chicopee, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCOWEN:

H. R. 7157. A bill to provide Federal funds to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of plant facilities for public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. J. Res. 446. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Denver, Colo., as "Edward W. Combs Veterans Facility Hospital"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. J. Res. 447. Joint resolution to create a Congressional Economic Study Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 710. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should direct the Export-Import Bank of Washington to lend $150,000,000 to Israel; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. Res. 712. Resolution to authorize the House Judiciary Committee to investigate the Rosa Lee Ingram case; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 713. Resolution to authorize the House Judiciary Committee to investigate the Rosa Lee Ingram case; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. Res. 714. Resolution to create a Congressional Economic Study Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7158. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 7159. A bill for the relief of Irene Maria Schneidmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 7160. A bill for the relief of Nicolae Malaxa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 7161. A bill for the relief of Lazar Gartenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2143. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to stop present inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2144. Also, petition of the city of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Taft-Wagner-Ellender- housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1948

The Senate reassembled this day in its Chamber at the Capitol in the city of Washington, in pursuance of the provisions of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 222) agreed to August 7, 1948.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the Senate, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, may the year that is past teach us and not torment. Help us to be realistic about ourselves. May we not steal credit for success, nor deny blame for failure. Give us the grace to take things as they are, and to resolve, by Thy help, to make them what they ought to be, in the strong name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, August 7, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield to the acting minority leader, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], for a quorum call, for which he has asked.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hoey	Pepper
Ball	Holland	Reed
Brewster	Ives	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Stennis
Cooper	Lucas	Stewart
Cordon	McCarran	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Taylor
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McGrath	Thye
Ferguson	McKellar	Tydings
Flanders	McMahon	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Martin	Watkins
George	Maybank	Wherry
Green	Millikin	White
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hatch	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	
Hickenlooper	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. FEAZEL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair would like to state the order of business which will be pursued this morning.

There are a number of privileged matters to which attention first will be given. At the conclusion of the privileged matters the regular morning hour will offer all Senators ample opportunity for any activities they may have in mind.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on August 7, 1948 the President pro tempore, under the authority of House Concurrent Resolution 223, signed the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on August 7, 1948, the Secretary of the Senate reported that on August 9, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures.

APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on August 7, 1948, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved the following joint resolutions:

On August 10, 1948:

S. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report.

On August 11, 1948:

S. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

On August 16, 1948:

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures.

DEATH OF SENATOR BUSHFIELD, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, at this time it is my sad responsibility to remind the Senate, that since our last meeting in August, one of our number has been called to his final reward.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on official business when the roll call was ordered on H. R. 6959, the Housing Act of 1948. I am and have been in favor of this legislation and would have voted for it had I been present.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the adjournment of the House until Friday, December 31, 1948, by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations, may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the Eightieth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 716) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to Congress, pursuant to section 5 of the act of February 24, 1945 (56 Stat. 6), and the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597), after the adjournment of the House until December 31, 1948, shall be printed as House documents of the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

AUGUST 7, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the standing Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Respectfully,

CARL ALBERT.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

AUGUST 7, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture to take effect today.

Sincerely yours,

PRESTON E. PEDEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 717) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee on Agriculture.

The resolution was agreed to.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the two Houses of Congress until December 31, 1948; and

H. Con. Res. 223. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signing of enrolled bills following adjournment.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The House stands adjourned pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 222.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 222, the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1718. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $400,000 and an authorization in the amount of $3,450,000 for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $10,000,000 for the Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1949 (H. Doc. No. 740); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1719. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $5,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 741); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1720. A letter from A. Tarchiani, Ambassador of Italy, to the Speaker, transmitting an invitation from the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Genoa, Italy, to the Congress of the United States to be represented in the International Parliamentary Convention in Genoa, September 14 through September 17, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. Report pursuant to House Resolution 93, Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Eighteenth intermediate report on investigation of General Accounting Office audit of wartime freight vouchers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Nineteenth intermediate report on investigation of Bureau of Reclamation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4713. A bill to authorize the Secretary of National Defense to acquire additional recreational facilities at Eglin Field, Fla.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 7149. A bill to provide for cooperation of the Federal and State Governments in the assessment of inheritance taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7150. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7151. A bill to amend the copyright laws so as to make unlawful the pirating of phonograph records; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 7152. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 7153. A bill to provide for a program of aeronautical training for the youth of America to insure a better understanding of the international, social, and political implications of air power and its vital place in the

future of world developments and to provide a trained backlog of pilots and technically qualified young manpower to meet the requirements of a national emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 7154. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 7155. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to collective-bargaining contracts which have been in existence for a continuous period of 20 years or more; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 7156. A bill for the relief of the city of Chicopee, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCOWEN:

H. R. 7157. A bill to provide Federal funds to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of plant facilities for public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. J. Res. 446. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Denver, Colo., as "Edward W. Combs Veterans Facility Hospital"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. J. Res. 447. Joint resolution to create a Congressional Economic Study Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 710. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should direct the Export-Import Bank of Washington to lend $150,000,000 to Israel; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ISACSON:

H. Res. 712. Resolution to authorize the House Judiciary Committee to investigate the Rosa Lee Ingram case; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 713. Resolution to authorize the House Judiciary Committee to investigate the Rosa Lee Ingram case; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. Res. 714. Resolution to create a Congressional Economic Study Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 7158. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 7159. A bill for the relief of Irene Maria Schneidmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 7160. A bill for the relief of Nicolae Malaxa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 7161. A bill for the relief of Lazar Gartenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2143. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to stop present inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2144. Also, petition of the city of Chelsea, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of the Taft-Wagner-Ellender- housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1948

The Senate reassembled this day in its Chamber at the Capitol in the city of Washington, in pursuance of the provisions of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 222) agreed to August 7, 1948.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the Senate, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, may the year that is past teach us and not torment. Help us to be realistic about ourselves. May we not steal credit for success, nor deny blame for failure. Give us the grace to take things as they are, and to resolve, by Thy help, to make them what they ought to be, in the strong name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, August 7, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield to the acting minority leader, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], for a quorum call, for which he has asked.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	O'Mahoney
Baldwin	Hoey	Pepper
Ball	Holland	Reed
Brewster	Ives	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Stennis
Cooper	Lucas	Stewart
Cordon	McCarran	Taft
Donnell	McCarthy	Taylor
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	McGrath	Thye
Ferguson	McKellar	Tydings
Flanders	McMahon	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Martin	Watkins
George	Maybank	Wherry
Green	Millikin	White
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hatch	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	
Hickenlooper	O'Conor	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. FEAZEL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair would like to state the order of business which will be pursued this morning.

There are a number of privileged matters to which attention first will be given. At the conclusion of the privileged matters the regular morning hour will offer all Senators ample opportunity for any activities they may have in mind.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on August 7, 1948 the President pro tempore, under the authority of House Concurrent Resolution 223, signed the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 445) making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on August 7, 1948, the Secretary of the Senate reported that on August 9, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 157) to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures.

APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate on August 7, 1948, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved the following joint resolutions:

On August 10, 1948:

S. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of time within which the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall make its final report.

On August 11, 1948:

S. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to authorize the President, following appropriation of the necessary funds by the Congress, to bring into effect on the part of the United States the loan agreement of the United States of America and the United Nations, signed at Lake Success, N. Y., March 23, 1948.

On August 16, 1948:

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures.

DEATH OF SENATOR BUSHFIELD, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, at this time it is my sad responsibility to remind the Senate, that since our last meeting in August, one of our number has been called to his final reward.

I refer to my esteemed colleague HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, who passed away September 27, 1948, at his home in Miller, S. Dak. His passing represents a distinct and irreplaceable loss to his family, to the United States Senate, to the Nation generally, and particularly to the citizens of South Dakota in whose interests he labored unceasingly for many, many years. And, with his passing, I have felt the heavy personal sadness which engulfs one who has lost a friend.

Senator BUSHFIELD was born in Atlantic, Iowa, August 6, 1882, but moved with his parents to Dakota Territory in 1883. He attended the public schools of Miller, S. Dak., and was graduated from the University of Minnesota Law School in 1904. He made his mark in the professional field of law early in his career, and, as the years wore on, he devoted an increasing amount of time and energy to the affairs of his community, State, and Nation.

In 1938 he was elected Governor of South Dakota, and during the two terms he served, he fashioned a State administration which will be a model for his successors for many years to come. Entering the United States Senate in 1943, he quickly won the respect and admiration of the Members of this body by his sincerity and his determination to press those legislative measures which he believed would promote the general welfare of this country.

I knew and admired HARLAN BUSHFIELD for more than a score of years, and from the beginning of our friendship, I knew that his conspicuous ability and tenacity of purpose made it inevitable that the area of his public service and influence would continually expand.

My affection for HARLAN BUSHFIELD was not founded on personal intimacy, nor even on parallel thinking, because on many issues our opinions differed. It was anchored on something more basic and fundamental—a healthy respect for his honesty, sincerity, and dogged determination to uphold those principles in which he believed.

The thought has often crossed my mind that HARLAN BUSHFIELD typified South Dakotans. He was honest, forthright to the point of bluntness, independent in thought, and large and rugged physically. He ascribed those qualities to others, too, and he was impatient with the sly, the devious, and the cunning wherever encountered. That is typical, I think, of South Dakotans.

And now HARLAN BUSHFIELD has answered the final quorum call. I find myself quite lacking in the eloquence necessary to word an appropriate and meaningful tribute. I must merely observe that he served his State and Nation eminently well; that he was a constructive force for good; and that he leaves us all a rich and inspirational legacy of memories of a public servant whose devotion to principle was unswerving.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be immediately considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the tribute paid by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD. I became acquainted with the late Senator BUSHFIELD when we came to the Senate at the same time. We were personal friends, and I know him to have been a man of high standing, many friendships, and great qualities. I join with his colleague in the tribute which has been paid, and the many additional tributes which may be paid to HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to add my testimonial to the remarks which have been made about our late colleague, HARLAN BUSHFIELD, by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

I knew Senator BUSHFIELD first some years ago when we were both Governors of our respective States and learned to like and appreciate him at that time.

Later on, when he came to the Senate, it was my privilege to be associated with him for 6 years while he was a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

HARLAN BUSHFIELD was a man of high principle, courage, and steadfastness of purpose. He had a firm belief in the ideals for which he stood and could not be wavered from those beliefs. I always admired this quality in the man as well as his kindliness and courage.

His primary interest seemed to be in the welfare of the American farmer and we all remember the very potent and powerful speech which he made in support of the tillers of the soil about a year ago. Even when his health began to fail him, he made it a point to attend meetings of the Committee on Agriculture and the Senate whenever matters of agricultural importance were being considered, often at the expense of his own health.

He served the farmers of South Dakota and of the Nation well and in his passing they have lost a real friend and we Members of the Senate have lost a loyal and devoted colleague.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that several other Senators wish to speak respecting our departing colleagues. The Chair suggests that Senators defer their addresses until the Senate can conclude the privileged business of the morning.

Without objection, the resolution just presented will be considered.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 273) was considered by unanimous consent and unanimously agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 224, providing that the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 31, 1948, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The message informed the Senate that a committee of two Members had been appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

SENATOR FROM SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I present the certificate of appointment of Mrs. VERA C. BUSHFIELD to fill the unexpired term of Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of appointment will be received and placed on file.

The certificate of appointment is as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of South Dakota, I, George T. Mickelson, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint VERA C. BUSHFIELD, of Miller, Hand County, S. Dak., a Senator from said State to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Harlan J. Bushfield, until a successor is elected and qualified as provided by law.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, George T. Mickelson, and our seal hereto affixed at Pierre, this 6th day of October A. D. 1948.

By the Governor:

GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor.

Attest:

[SEAL] ANNAMAE RIIFF,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resignation of Mrs. VERA C. BUSHFIELD as Senator from South Dakota.

The resignation was read, as follows:

UPPER MONTCLAIR, N. J.,
December 22, 1948.

The Honorable GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor of South Dakota,
Pierre, S. Dak.

DEAR GOVERNOR MICKELSON: Herewith I tender my resignation from the office of United States Senator from South Dakota, to become effective at 12:01 a. m., December 27, 1948.

Your appointment of me to this high office was a personal honor. It was even more an honor to the memory of my late husband, Harlan J. Bushfield, and for this I am more grateful than I can tell you.

Faithfully yours,

VERA C. BUSHFIELD,
United States Senator.

Signed in the presence of Mary Janith Bushfield Work, John L. Work.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I present the certificate of appointment of

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT to fill the unexpired term of Senator from South Dakota due to the resignation of Mrs. Bushfield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of appointment will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of South Dakota, I, George T. Mickelson, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint KARL E. MUNDT, of Madison, Lake County, S. Dak., a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States, effective as of 12:01 a. m. December 27, 1948, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Vera C. Bushfield, until said KARL E. MUNDT shall have qualified for the term to which he was elected.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, George T. Mickelson, and our seal hereto affixed at Pierre, this 24th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] ANNAMAE RIIFF,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of appointment will be placed on file.

SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the certificate of election of Hon. J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON to fill the term of Senator expiring on January 3, 1949.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of election will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

To J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, *Greeting:*

We do by these presents commission you a Member of the United States Senate, Congress of the United States of America from the State of North Carolina for the short term ending January 3, 1949, your election thereto at the general election of November 2, 1948, having been duly certified to us; and do hereby confer upon you all the rights, privileges, and powers useful and necessary to the just discharge of the duties of said office.

In witness whereof, His Excellency, R. Gregg Cherry, our governor, and commander in chief, hath signed with his hand these presents and caused our great seal to be affixed thereto.

Done at our city of Raleigh, on the 24th day of November A. D. 1948, and in the one hundred and seventy-third year of our American independence.

By the Governor:
R. GREGG CHERRY.
[SEAL] THAD EURE,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of election will be placed on file.

SENATOR FROM LOUISIANA

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennesssee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. I send to the desk the credentials of the Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG, the Senator-elect from the State of Louisiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be read by the clerk.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, RUSSELL B. LONG was duly chosen, by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term ending at noon on January 3, 1951.

Witness His Excellency our Gov. Earl K. Long, and our seal hereto affixed, at Baton Rouge, this 26th day of November A. D. 1948.

[SEAL] EARL K. LONG,
Governor.

By the Governor:
WADE O. MARTIN, JR.,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be placed on file.

If the three Senators whose credentials have just been presented will proceed to the desk the oath of office will be administered to them.

Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BROUGHTON, and Mr. LONG, escorted by Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. MCKELLAR, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

CREDENTIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the credentials of the 32 Senators elected for the 6-year terms beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

These credentials, with four exceptions, in which State forms are probably followed, are in the form suggested by the Senate in its resolution of January 4, 1934, and, if there be no objection, they will be printed in the RECORD without reading and ordered to be placed on file.

There being no objection, the credentials of the respective Senators-elect were received, ordered to be placed on file, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, CLINTON P. ANDERSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Thomas J. Mabry, and our seal hereto affixed at Santa Fe, this 18th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1948.

THOMAS J. MABRY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] ALICIA ROMERO,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 STYLES BRIDGES was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Hampshire a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Charles M. Dale, and our seal hereto affixed this 22d day of November 1948.

CHARLES M. DALE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ENOCH D. FULLER,
Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

To J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, *Greeting:*

We do by these presents commission you a Member of the United States Senate, Congress of the United States of America, from the State of North Carolina for the regular term beginning January 3, 1949, your election thereto at the general election of November 2, 1948, having been duly certified to us; and do hereby confer upon you all the rights, privileges, and powers useful and necessary to the just discharge of the duties of said office.

In witness whereof, His Excellency R. Gregg Cherry, our Governor and commander in chief, hath signed with his hand these presents and caused our great seal to be affixed thereto.

Done at our city of Raleigh, on the 24th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948, and in the one hundred and seventy-third year of our American Independence.

R. GREGG CHERRY.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] THAD EURE,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
STATE BOARD OF ELECTION COMMISSIONERS,
Frankfort, Ky., November 22, 1948:

The undersigned, a board for examining the returns of an election held on Tuesday, the 2d day of November 1948, for United States Senator of the State of Kentucky, do certify that Hon. VIRGIL CHAPMAN, of Paris, Ky., received the highest number of votes given for that office, as certified to the secretary of state, and is, therefore, duly and regularly elected for the term prescribed by the Constitution.

CHARLES K. O'CONNELL, *Chairman,*
T. C. MCMURRAY, *Member,*
DANIEL W. DAVIES, *Member,*
State Board of Election Commissioners for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Attest:
CATTIE LOU MILLER,
Secretary, State Board of Election Commissioners.

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

Know ye, that it appearing from the official canvass of the votes cast at the regular general election held within and for the State of Oregon on Tuesday, the 2d day of November A. D. 1948, that GUY CORDON, of Douglas County, State of Oregon, received the highest number of votes cast for the office of United States Senator in Congress at said election:

Now, therefore, I, John H. Hall, Governor of the State of Oregon, by virtue and in pursuance of the authority vested in me under the laws of the State of Oregon, do hereby grant this certificate of election and declare said GUY CORDON, of Douglas County, State of Oregon, to be duly elected to the office of United States Senator in Congress for the State of Oregon for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Oregon to be hereto affixed. Done at the

I refer to my esteemed colleague HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, who passed away September 27, 1948, at his home in Miller, S. Dak. His passing represents a distinct and irreplaceable loss to his family, to the United States Senate, to the Nation generally, and particularly to the citizens of South Dakota in whose interests he labored unceasingly for many, many years. And, with his passing, I have felt the heavy personal sadness which engulfs one who has lost a friend.

Senator BUSHFIELD was born in Atlantic, Iowa, August 6, 1882, but moved with his parents to Dakota Territory in 1883. He attended the public schools of Miller, S. Dak., and was graduated from the University of Minnesota Law School in 1904. He made his mark in the professional field of law early in his career, and, as the years wore on, he devoted an increasing amount of time and energy to the affairs of his community, State, and Nation.

In 1938 he was elected Governor of South Dakota, and during the two terms he served, he fashioned a State administration which will be a model for his successors for many years to come. Entering the United States Senate in 1943, he quickly won the respect and admiration of the Members of this body by his sincerity and his determination to press those legislative measures which he believed would promote the general welfare of this country.

I knew and admired HARLAN BUSHFIELD for more than a score of years, and from the beginning of our friendship, I knew that his conspicuous ability and tenacity of purpose made it inevitable that the area of his public service and influence would continually expand.

My affection for HARLAN BUSHFIELD was not founded on personal intimacy, nor even on parallel thinking, because on many issues our opinions differed. It was anchored on something more basic and fundamental—a healthy respect for his honesty, sincerity, and dogged determination to uphold those principles in which he believed.

The thought has often crossed my mind that HARLAN BUSHFIELD typified South Dakotans. He was honest, forthright to the point of bluntness, independent in thought, and large and rugged physically. He ascribed those qualities to others, too, and he was impatient with the sly, the devious, and the cunning wherever encountered. That is typical, I think, of South Dakotans.

And now HARLAN BUSHFIELD has answered the final quorum call. I find myself quite lacking in the eloquence necessary to word an appropriate and meaningful tribute. I must merely observe that he served his State and Nation eminently well; that he was a constructive force for good; and that he leaves us all a rich and inspirational legacy of memories of a public servant whose devotion to principle was unswerving.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be immediately considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the tribute paid by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD. I became acquainted with the late Senator BUSHFIELD when we came to the Senate at the same time. We were personal friends, and I know him to have been a man of high standing, many friendships, and great qualities. I join with his colleague in the tribute which has been paid, and the many additional tributes which may be paid to HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to add my testimonial to the remarks which have been made about our late colleague, HARLAN BUSHFIELD, by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

I knew Senator BUSHFIELD first some years ago when we were both Governors of our respective States and learned to like and appreciate him at that time.

Later on, when he came to the Senate, it was my privilege to be associated with him for 6 years while he was a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

HARLAN BUSHFIELD was a man of high principle, courage, and steadfastness of purpose. He had a firm belief in the ideals for which he stood and could not be wavered from those beliefs. I always admired this quality in the man as well as his kindliness and courage.

His primary interest seemed to be in the welfare of the American farmer and we all remember the very potent and powerful speech which he made in support of the tillers of the soil about a year ago. Even when his health began to fail him, he made it a point to attend meetings of the Committee on Agriculture and the Senate whenever matters of agricultural importance were being considered, often at the expense of his own health.

He served the farmers of South Dakota and of the Nation well and in his passing they have lost a real friend and we Members of the Senate have lost a loyal and devoted colleague.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that several other Senators wish to speak respecting our departing colleagues. The Chair suggests that Senators defer their addresses until the Senate can conclude the privileged business of the morning.

Without objection, the resolution just presented will be considered.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 273) was considered by unanimous consent and unanimously agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 224, providing that the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 31, 1948, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The message informed the Senate that a committee of two Members had been appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

SENATOR FROM SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I present the certificate of appointment of Mrs. VERA C. BUSHFIELD to fill the unexpired term of Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of appointment will be received and placed on file.

The certificate of appointment is as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of South Dakota, I, George T. Mickelson, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint VERA C. BUSHFIELD, of Miller, Hand County, S. Dak., a Senator from said State to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Harlan J. Bushfield, until a successor is elected and qualified as provided by law.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, George T. Mickelson, and our seal hereto affixed at Pierre, this 6th day of October A. D. 1948.

By the Governor:

GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor.

Attest:

[SEAL] ANNAMAE RIIFF,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resignation of Mrs. VERA C. BUSHFIELD as Senator from South Dakota.

The resignation was read, as follows:

UPPER MONTCLAIR, N. J.,
December 22, 1948.

The Honorable GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor of South Dakota,
Pierre, S. Dak.

DEAR GOVERNOR MICKELSON: Herewith I tender my resignation from the office of United States Senator from South Dakota, to become effective at 12:01 a. m., December 27, 1948.

Your appointment of me to this high office was a personal honor. It was even more an honor to the memory of my late husband, Harlan J. Bushfield, and for this I am more grateful than I can tell you.

Faithfully yours,

VERA C. BUSHFIELD,
United States Senator.

Signed in the presence of Mary Janith Bushfield Work, John L. Work.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I present the certificate of appointment of

Hon. KARL E. MUNDT to fill the unexpired term of Senator from South Dakota due to the resignation of Mrs. Bushfield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of appointment will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of South Dakota, I, George T. Mickelson, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint KARL E. MUNDT, of Madison, Lake County, S. Dak., a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States, effective as of 12:01 a. m. December 27, 1948, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Vera C. Bushfield, until said KARL E. MUNDT shall have qualified for the term to which he was elected.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, George T. Mickelson, and our seal hereto affixed at Pierre, this 24th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] ANNAMAE RIIFF,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of appointment will be placed on file.

SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the certificate of election of Hon. J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON to fill the term of Senator expiring on January 3, 1949.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of election will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

To J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, *Greeting:*

We do by these presents commission you a Member of the United States Senate, Congress of the United States of America from the State of North Carolina for the short term ending January 3, 1949, your election thereto at the general election of November 2, 1948, having been duly certified to us; and do hereby confer upon you all the rights, privileges, and powers useful and necessary to the just discharge of the duties of said office.

In witness whereof, His Excellency, R. Gregg Cherry, our governor, and commander in chief, hath signed with his hand these presents and caused our great seal to be affixed thereto.

Done at our city of Raleigh, on the 24th day of November A. D. 1948, and in the one hundred and seventy-third year of our American independence.

By the Governor:
R. GREGG CHERRY.
[SEAL] THAD EURE,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The certificate of election will be placed on file.

SENATOR FROM LOUISIANA

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennesssee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. I send to the desk the credentials of the Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG, the Senator-elect from the State of Louisiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be read by the clerk.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, RUSSELL B. LONG was duly chosen, by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term ending at noon on January 3, 1951.

Witness His Excellency our Gov. Earl K. Long, and our seal hereto affixed, at Baton Rouge, this 26th day of November A. D. 1948.

[SEAL] EARL K. LONG,
Governor.

By the Governor:
WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be placed on file.

If the three Senators whose credentials have just been presented will proceed to the desk the oath of office will be administered to them.

Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BROUGHTON, and Mr. LONG, escorted by Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. McKELLAR, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

CREDENTIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the credentials of the 32 Senators elected for the 6-year terms beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

These credentials, with four exceptions, in which State forms are probably followed, are in the form suggested by the Senate in its resolution of January 4, 1934, and, if there be no objection, they will be printed in the RECORD without reading and ordered to be placed on file.

There being no objection, the credentials of the respective Senators-elect were received, ordered to be placed on file, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, CLINTON P. ANDERSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Thomas J. Mabry, and our seal hereto affixed at Santa Fe, this 18th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1948.

THOMAS J. MABRY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] ALICIA ROMERO,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 STYLES BRIDGES was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Hampshire a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Charles M. Dale, and our seal hereto affixed this 22d day of November 1948.

CHARLES M. DALE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ENOCH D. FULLER,
Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

To J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, *Greeting:*

We do by these presents commission you a Member of the United States Senate, Congress of the United States of America, from the State of North Carolina for the regular term beginning January 3, 1949, your election thereto at the general election of November 2, 1948, having been duly certified to us; and do hereby confer upon you all the rights, privileges, and powers useful and necessary to the just discharge of the duties of said office.

In witness whereof, His Excellency R. Gregg Cherry, our Governor and commander in chief, hath signed with his hand these presents and caused our great seal to be affixed thereto.

Done at our city of Raleigh, on the 24th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948, and in the one hundred and seventy-third year of our American Independence.

R. GREGG CHERRY.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] THAD EURE,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
STATE BOARD OF ELECTION COMMISSIONERS,
Frankfort, Ky., November 22, 1948:

The undersigned, a board for examining the returns of an election held on Tuesday, the 2d day of November 1948, for United States Senator of the State of Kentucky, do certify that Hon. VIRGIL CHAPMAN, of Paris, Ky., received the highest number of votes given for that office, as certified to the secretary of state, and is, therefore, duly and regularly elected for the term prescribed by the Constitution.

CHARLES K. O'CONNELL, *Chairman,*
T. C. McMURRAY, *Member,*
DANIEL W. DAVIES, *Member,*
State Board of Election Commissioners for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Attest:
CATTIE LOU MILLER,
Secretary, State Board of Election Commissioners.

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

Know ye, that it appearing from the official canvass of the votes cast at the regular general election held within and for the State of Oregon on Tuesday, the 2d day of November A. D. 1948, that GUY CORDON, of Douglas County, State of Oregon, received the highest number of votes cast for the office of United States Senator in Congress at said election:

Now, therefore, I, John H. Hall, Governor of the State of Oregon, by virtue and in pursuance of the authority vested in me under the laws of the State of Oregon, do hereby grant this certificate of election and declare said GUY CORDON, of Douglas County, State of Oregon, to be duly elected to the office of United States Senator in Congress for the State of Oregon for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Oregon to be hereto affixed. Done at the

capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 2d day of December A. D. 1948.

JOHN H. HALL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] EARL T. NEWBRY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ILLINOIS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 PAUL H. DOUGLAS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Illinois a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Acting, Hugh W. Cross, and our seal hereto affixed at Springfield this 22d day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

HUGH W. CROSS,
Lieutenant Governor and Acting Governor.

By the Governor and Acting Governor:
[SEAL] EDWARD J. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning at noon on January 3, 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Earl K. Long, and our seal hereto affixed, at Baton Rouge this 26th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

EARL K. LONG,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WADE O. MARTIN, JR.,
Secretary of State.

JACKSON, MISS.,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 JAMES O. EASTLAND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Fielding L. Wright, and our seal hereto affixed at Jackson this the 13th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

F. L. WRIGHT,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HEBER LADNER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF DELAWARE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Delaware a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Walter W. Bacon, and our seal hereto affixed at Dover, this 22d day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

WALTER W. BACON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WILLIAM J. STOREY,
Secretary of State.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, December 6, 1948.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 HOMER FERGUSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Michigan, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the third day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Kim Sigler, and our seal hereto affixed at Lansing, Mich., this 6th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

KIM SIGLER,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] F. W. ALGER,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF IOWA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To GUY M. GILLETTE, *Greeting:*

It is hereby certified, that an election holden on the 2d day of November A. D. 1948 you were elected to the office of United States Senator of said State, for the term of 6 years, beginning at noon on the 3d day of January A. D. 1949.

Given at the seat of government Des Moines, Iowa, this 22d day of November A. D. 1948.

ROBERT D. BLUE,
Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL] ROLLO H. BERGESON,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND
PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, PROVIDENCE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November A. D. 1948, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Rhode Island a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January A. D. 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, John O. Pastore, and our seal hereto affixed at Providence, R. I., this 8th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948

JOHN O. PASTORE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ARMAND H. COTE,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify, that on November 2, 1948, ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Jersey, a Senator from the said State, to represent the said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 2d day of January 1949.

In testimony whereof the great seal of the State is hereunto affixed.

Witness the hand of His Excellency our Governor, Alfred E. Driscoll, at Trenton, this 30th day of November A. D. 1948.

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] LLOYD B. MARSH,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Minnesota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Minnesota to be affixed at the State capitol in St. Paul this 29th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948 and of the State, the ninety-first.

LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
Governor.

[SEAL] MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, LESTER C. HUNT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wyoming a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, LESTER C. HUNT, and our seal hereto affixed at Cheyenne, Wyo., this 27th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

LESTER C. HUNT,
Governor of Wyoming.

Attest:
[SEAL] A. G. CRANE,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, EDWIN C. JOHNSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Colorado a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Lee Knous, and our seal hereto affixed at Denver, this 23d day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

LEE KNOUS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WALTER F. MORRISON,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, LYNDON B. JOHNSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Texas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin, this 29th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

BEAUFORD H. JESTER,
Governor of Texas.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] PAUL H. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, ESTES KEFAUVER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Jim McCord, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville, Tenn., this 20th day of November 1948.

JIM MCCORD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JOE C. CARR,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Oklahoma City, November 15, 1948.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, ROBERT S. KERR was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor of the State of Oklahoma, and our seal hereto affixed at Oklahoma City, Okla., this 16th day of November A. D. 1948.

ROY J. TURNER,
Governor of Oklahoma.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, BURNET R. MAYBANK was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Carolina, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, J. Strom Thurmond, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, this 29th day of November A. D. 1948.

J. STROM THURMOND,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] W. P. BLACKWELL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Little Rock.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Ben Laney, and our seal hereto affixed at Little Rock, this the 17th day of November A. D. 1948.

BEN LANEY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
C. G. HALL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

CERTIFICATE

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, BERT H. MILLER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Idaho a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, C. A. Robins, and our seal hereto affixed at Boise, this 24th day of November A. D. 1948.

C. A. ROBINS.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] J. D. CY PRICE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d of November 1948, KARL E. MUNDT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Dakota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, George T. Mickelson and our seal hereto affixed at Pierre, the capital, this 2d day of December A. D. 1948.

GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ANNAMAE RIIFF,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MONTANA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS.

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 JAMES E. MURRAY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Montana a Senator from this State to represent the State of Montana in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governnor, Sam C. Ford, and our seal hereto affixed at Helena, this 6th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

SAM C. FORD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] SAM W. MITCHELL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Charleston, December 7, 1948.

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 MATTHEW M. NEELY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Clarence W. Meadows, and our seal hereto affixed at Charleston, this 7th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

CLARENCE W. MEADOWS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] D. PITT O'BRIEN,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 A. WILLIS ROBERTSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Virginia a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent Virginia in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

In testimony whereof the Governor of Virginia hath hereunto signed his name and affixed the lesser seal of the Commonwealth at Richmond this 23d day of November in the year of our Lord 1948 and in the one hundred and seventy-third year of the Commonwealth.

WM. M. TUCK,
Governor.

[SEAL] THELMA Y. GORDON,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

STATE OF GEORGIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Atlanta.

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Georgia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Herman E. Talmadge, and our seal hereto affixed at Atlanta, Ga., this 16th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] BEN W. FORTSON, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 13th day of September 1948 MARGARET CHASE SMITH was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maine a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Horace Hildreth, and our seal hereto affixed at Augusta, this 16th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

HORACE HILDRETH,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HAROLD I. GOSS,
Secretary of State.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 LEVERETT SALTONSTALL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Gov. Robert F. Bradford, and our seal hereto affixed at Boston this 24th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1948.

ROBERT F. BRADFORD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] P. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF KANSAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Kansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Gov. Frank Carlson, and our seal hereto affixed at Topeka, Kans., this 2d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1948.

FRANK CARLSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] FRANK J. RYAN,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 JOHN SPARKMAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alabama a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the third day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, and our seal hereto affixed at Montgomery this 15th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1948.

JAMES E. FOLSOM,
Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL] SIBYL POOL,
Secretary of State.

capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 2d day of December A. D. 1948.

JOHN H. HALL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] EARL T. NEWBRY,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ILLINOIS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 PAUL H. DOUGLAS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Illinois a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Acting, Hugh W. Cross, and our seal hereto affixed at Springfield this 22d day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

HUGH W. CROSS,
Lieutenant Governor and Acting Governor.

By the Governor and Acting Governor:
[SEAL] EDWARD J. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning at noon on January 3, 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Earl K. Long, and our seal hereto affixed, at Baton Rouge this 26th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

EARL K. LONG,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WADE O. MARTIN, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

JACKSON, MISS.,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 JAMES O. EASTLAND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Fielding L. Wright, and our seal hereto affixed at Jackson this the 13th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

F. L. WRIGHT,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HEBER LADNER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF DELAWARE,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Delaware a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Walter W. Bacon, and our seal hereto affixed at Dover, this 22d day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

WALTER W. BACON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WILLIAM J. STOREY,
Secretary of State.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, December 6, 1948.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 HOMER FERGUSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Michigan, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the third day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Kim Sigler, and our seal hereto affixed at Lansing, Mich., this 6th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

KIM SIGLER,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] F. W. ALGER,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF IOWA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To GUY M. GILLETTE, *Greeting:*

It is hereby certified, that an election holden on the 2d day of November A. D. 1948 you were elected to the office of United States Senator of said State, for the term of 6 years, beginning at noon on the 3d day of January A. D. 1949.

Given at the seat of government Des Moines, Iowa, this 22d day of November A. D. 1948.

ROBERT D. BLUE,
Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL] ROLLO H. BERGESON,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND
PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, PROVIDENCE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November A. D. 1948, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Rhode Island a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January A. D. 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, John O. Pastore, and our seal hereto affixed at Providence, R. I., this 8th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948

JOHN O. PASTORE.
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ARMAND H. COTE,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify, that on November 2, 1948, ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Jersey, a Senator from the said State, to represent the said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 2d day of January 1949.

In testimony whereof the great seal of the State is hereunto affixed.

Witness the hand of His Excellency our Governor, Alfred E. Driscoll, at Trenton, this 30th day of November A. D. 1948.

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] LLOYD B. MARSH,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Minnesota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Minnesota to be affixed at the State capitol in St. Paul this 29th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948 and of the State, the ninety-first.

LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL,
Governor.

[SEAL] MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, LESTER C. HUNT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wyoming a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, LESTER C. HUNT, and our seal hereto affixed at Cheyenne, Wyo., this 27th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

LESTER C. HUNT,
Governor of Wyoming.

Attest:
[SEAL] A. G. CRANE,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, EDWIN C. JOHNSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Colorado a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Lee Knous, and our seal hereto affixed at Denver, this 23d day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

LEE KNOUS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WALTER F. MORRISON,
Secretary of State.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, LYNDON B. JOHNSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Texas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin, this 29th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

BEAUFORD H. JESTER,
Governor of Texas.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] PAUL H. BROWN,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, ESTES KEFAUVER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Jim McCord, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville, Tenn., this 20th day of November 1948.

JIM MCCORD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] JOE C. CARR,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Oklahoma City, November 15, 1948.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, ROBERT S. KERR was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor of the State of Oklahoma, and our seal hereto affixed at Oklahoma City, Okla., this 16th day of November A. D. 1948.

ROY J. TURNER,
Governor of Oklahoma.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] WILBURN CARTWRIGHT,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, BURNET R. MAYBANK was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Carolina, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, J. Strom Thurmond, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, this 29th day of November A. D. 1948.

J. STROM THURMOND,
Governor.

By the Governor:
Attest:
[SEAL] W. P. BLACKWELL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Little Rock.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Ben Laney, and our seal hereto affixed at Little Rock, this the 17th day of November A. D. 1948.

BEN LANEY,
Governor.

By the Governor:
C. G. HALL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

CERTIFICATE

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948, BERT H. MILLER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Idaho a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, C. A. Robins, and our seal hereto affixed at Boise, this 24th day of November A. D. 1948.

C. A. ROBINS.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] J. D. CY PRICE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d of November 1948, KARL E. MUNDT was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Dakota a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, George T. Mickelson and our seal hereto affixed at Pierre, the capital, this 2d day of December A. D. 1948.

GEORGE T. MICKELSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] ANNAMAE RIFF,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF MONTANA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS.

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 JAMES E. MURRAY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Montana a Senator from this State to represent the State of Montana in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governnor, Sam C. Ford, and our seal hereto affixed at Helena, this 6th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

SAM C. FORD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] SAM W. MITCHELL,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Charleston, December 7, 1948.

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 MATTHEW M. NEELY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia, a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Clarence W. Meadows, and our seal hereto affixed at Charleston, this 7th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

CLARENCE W. MEADOWS,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] D. PITT O'BRIEN,
Secretary of State.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 A. WILLIS ROBERTSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Virginia a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent Virginia in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

In testimony whereof the Governor of Virginia hath hereunto signed his name and affixed the lesser seal of the Commonwealth at Richmond this 23d day of November in the year of our Lord 1948 and in the one hundred and seventy-third year of the Commonwealth.

WM. M. TUCK,
Governor.

[SEAL] THELMA Y. GORDON,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

STATE OF GEORGIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Atlanta.

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Georgia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Herman E. Talmadge, and our seal hereto affixed at Atlanta, Ga., this 16th day of December in the year of our Lord 1948.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] BEN W. FORTSON, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

To THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 13th day of September 1948 MARGARET CHASE SMITH was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maine a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness His Excellency our Governor, Horace Hildreth, and our seal hereto affixed at Augusta, this 16th day of November in the year of our Lord 1948.

HORACE HILDRETH,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] HAROLD I. GOSS,
Secretary of State.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 LEVERETT SALTONSTALL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Gov. Robert F. Bradford, and our seal hereto affixed at Boston this 24th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1948.

ROBERT F. BRADFORD,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] P. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

STATE OF KANSAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Kansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Gov. Frank Carlson, and our seal hereto affixed at Topeka, Kans., this 2d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1948.

FRANK CARLSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] FRANK J. RYAN,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 JOHN SPARKMAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alabama a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the third day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, and our seal hereto affixed at Montgomery this 15th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1948.

JAMES E. FOLSOM,
Governor.

Attest:
[SEAL] SIBYL POOL,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 KENNETH S. WHERRY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nebraska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Gov. Val Peterson, and our seal hereto affixed at Lincoln, Nebr., this 22d day of November, in the year of our Lord 1948.

VAL PETERSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL]
FRANK MARSH,
Secretary of State.

ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certified copies of the final ascertainment of the electors for President and Vice President of the United States from the States of Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts (photostat), Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska (amended), Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BALL, chairman of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of labor-management relations, which was ordered to be printed as part 3 of Report No. 986.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BALL, chairman of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of Labor-Management Relations—Welfare Funds, which was ordered to be printed as part 4 of Report No. 986.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BALL, chairman of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of Labor-Management Relations—West Coast Maritime Industry, which was ordered to be printed as part 5 of Report No. 986.

Mr. MURRAY subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that there has been submitted a majority report of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations. I merely wish to reserve the right to file minority views after having opportunity to study the majority report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's reservation will be noted.

REPORT ON CONTROL OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE (S. DOC. NO. 211)

Mr. WHERRY, from the Special Subcommittee on the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease of the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a report on the study of pernicious effect of foot-and-mouth disease as it exists in Mexico and elsewhere, progress of program to prevent entry of the disease into the United States, the most effective methods of combating and controlling the disease, and the proper location for the authorized research facilities, which was ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

REPORT ON POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE (REPT. NO. 1777)

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 81, Eightieth Congress, first session, a report relating to postmaster appointments under civil service, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON PARKING LOTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 209)

Mr. CAIN presented a report of the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitted to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, pursuant to Public Law 826, Eightieth Congress, relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

PAY OF SENATE PAGES

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 274), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms hereby is authorized to employ 21 pages for duty in the Senate Chamber to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from December 28 to December 31, 1948, at the basic rate of $1,800 per annum.

LEORA STANLEY

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution to pay a gratuity to Mrs. Leora Stanley, and ask for its immediate consideration. I have consulted with the ranking majority and minority members of the Rules Committee, and they have no objection. I am informed the funds are available in the contingent fund.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 275) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mrs. Leora Stanley, widow of Sherwood B. Stanley, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

Mr. GURNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 276), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Harlan J. Bushfield, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FRED J. CRENSHAW

Mr. MAYBANK. I submit a resolution in the case of Fred J. Crenshaw, who was badly shot and was unable to return to work. He was a member of the Capitol Police force. The man who shot him is serving a prison term of from 5 to 15 years.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 278) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Fred J. Crenshaw an amount equal to 2 years' compensation at the rate last received by him as a private of Capitol Police, the said sum to be considered as reimbursement in full for all expenses and allowances on account of injuries suffered by him in the discharge of his official duties.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. LUCAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 279), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner with which he has presided over its deliberations during the present Congress.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

CONTINUATION OF SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 280) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947 (creating a Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises), and continued by Senate Resolution 153, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, and Senate Resolution 191, Eightieth Congress, agreed to March 15, 1948, is hereby continued until January 31, 1949.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the unanimous-consent request, may I inquire from the able Senator from Nebraska just what is expected to be done between now and the 31st of January next?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to answer the inquiry.

The resolution providing for the extension for 30 days is primarily for the purpose of enabling the committee to complete its work. About all that remains to be done is to write the reports and wind up the affairs of the committee as it is now constituted.

I do not know what Members on the other side may say about the work of the committee. However, so far as we are concerned, all the investigations have been concluded. The purpose of the resolution is merely to afford time for winding up the affairs of the committee. Ninety percent of such work consists of writing reports and findings of investigations.

I may say further for the benefit of the distinguished acting minority leader that I am not sure that there is sufficient money on hand to complete the work; but I felt that if it should prove that there were not sufficient funds to take care of terminal-leave pay, and so forth, the proper way to handle the situation would be to come before the Senate with a resolution which would be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration and reported back to the Senate. Otherwise I would not submit the resolution today.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that I shall not object to the resolution which has been submitted for continuation of the committee for a period of 30 days, in order that the committee may make its report during that time. However, Members of the Senate well know the position of the great majority of Democratic Members with respect to special committees under the Reorganization Act. No Senator is more interested in the continued success of small business than is the Senator from Illinois. However, a vital principle dealing with special committees is involved under the Reorganization Act, and it seems to me that at the proper time either the Banking and Currency Committee or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should take over the duties of the Small Business Committee. One of the regular standing committees should continue to operate in behalf of the small business of this Nation. As everyone knows, I feel very keenly about the matter, as was apparent from the spirited debates we had on this subject 2 years ago when the matter was before us at that time. I shall reserve further remarks upon the question until some more appropriate time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as a member of the minority of the committee, I wish to say that I am fully in accord with the expression of opinion by the acting leader of the majority. I think the committee has served a very valuable purpose during the years it has been in operation, and I am very anxious that it be given this additional time in which to write reports.

Of course, I am in favor of an extension of the committee. It should be extended because of the great service it has rendered the businessmen of the United States. I think they would be bitterly disappointed if there were a failure on the part of the Senate to continue the work of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes, which was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of July 7, 1947, entitled "An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," is amended as follows:

(1) Section 10 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Report: Not later than 70 days after the Eighty-first Congress is convened and organized, the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress."

(2) Section 3 is amended, as of December 31, 1948, by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(d) Continuation of membership upon change of status: Despite the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a Member of Congress or in the status of a person in the executive branch of the Government, who thereafter ceases to have such status, shall nevertheless continue as a member of the Commission, and from and after his change of status shall, if he has returned to private life (except for his membership on the Commission), receive the same compensation as a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a person from private life."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this resolution extends for 60 days the length of time during which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make its report to the Senate. A tremendous amount of work has been involved in this matter. That work is not quite finished, although it is nearly completed. We hope to have it ready by the 13th of January, but it will not be so good a report as it would be if a little more time were given.

The other provision of the resolution would permit Representative MANASCO to remain as a member of the Commission until the report is made and the work is completed. Under the present law, Representative MANASCO will cease to be a member of the Commission as soon as his successor in the House of Representatives takes office on January 3. This resolution would permit the continuation of the Commission as it now is. It would simply be out of question for a new Member of the House of Representatives to take over that work at this stage of the proceeding, when the report is almost, but not quite, ready to be submitted.

So I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution from the House of Representatives acted upon and approved at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NOTIFICATION OF THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution (H. Res. 718), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore to join a similar committee appointed by the House, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This resolution corresponds to the one received from the House of Representatives.

Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 277) is considered and agreed to; and the Chair appoints the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] as the committee on the part of the Senate.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 224), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 31, 1948, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

CARL A. LOEFFLER

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to compliment the Senate by calling its attention to an event which is of far more than casual or passing interest and importance.

Mr. Carl A. Loeffler, Secretary of the United States Senate, will be relieved of his official duties and retired from his official relationship with the Senate on Monday, January 3. In this brief announcement of fact there lies a career and record as distinguished and noteworthy as one can find in the entire annals of American political history.

Mr. Loeffler was born here in Washington on January 12, 1873, in the shadow of the White House and during U. S. Grant's first term in Washington.

Mr. Loeffler was born on a Sunday on Church Street during church hours. He was conceived, lived, and will die, as a Christian.

Carl Loeffler has served the Senate of the United States in almost every capacity for 59 years. His first association

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1948 KENNETH S. WHERRY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nebraska a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 3d day of January 1949.

Witness: His Excellency our Gov. Val Peterson, and our seal hereto affixed at Lincoln, Nebr., this 22d day of November, in the year of our Lord 1948.

VAL PETERSON,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL]
FRANK MARSH,
Secretary of State.

ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certified copies of the final ascertainment of the electors for President and Vice President of the United States from the States of Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts (photostat), Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska (amended), Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BALL, chairman of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of labor-management relations, which was ordered to be printed as part 3 of Report No. 986.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BALL, chairman of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of Labor-Management Relations—Welfare Funds, which was ordered to be printed as part 4 of Report No. 986.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BALL, chairman of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of Labor-Management Relations—West Coast Maritime Industry, which was ordered to be printed as part 5 of Report No. 986.

Mr. MURRAY subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that there has been submitted a majority report of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations. I merely wish to reserve the right to file minority views after having opportunity to study the majority report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's reservation will be noted.

REPORT ON CONTROL OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE (S. DOC. NO. 211)

Mr. WHERRY, from the Special Subcommittee on the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease of the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a report on the study of pernicious effect of foot-and-mouth disease as it exists in Mexico and elsewhere, progress of program to prevent entry of the disease into the United States, the most effective methods of combating and controlling the disease, and the proper location for the authorized research facilities, which was ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

REPORT ON POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE (REPT. NO. 1777)

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 81, Eightieth Congress, first session, a report relating to postmaster appointments under civil service, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON PARKING LOTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 209)

Mr. CAIN presented a report of the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitted to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, pursuant to Public Law 826, Eightieth Congress, relating to parking lots in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

PAY OF SENATE PAGES

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 274), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms hereby is authorized to employ 21 pages for duty in the Senate Chamber to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from December 23 to December 31, 1948, at the basic rate of $1,800 per annum.

LEORA STANLEY

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution to pay a gratuity to Mrs. Leora Stanley, and ask for its immediate consideration. I have consulted with the ranking majority and minority members of the Rules Committee, and they have no objection. I am informed the funds are available in the contingent fund.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 275) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mrs. Leora Stanley, widow of Sherwood B. Stanley, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

Mr. GURNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 276), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the President pro tempore in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. Harlan J. Bushfield, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota, on vouchers to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

FRED J. CRENSHAW

Mr. MAYBANK. I submit a resolution in the case of Fred J. Crenshaw, who was badly shot and was unable to return to work. He was a member of the Capitol Police force. The man who shot him is serving a prison term of from 5 to 15 years.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 278) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Fred J. Crenshaw an amount equal to 2 years' compensation at the rate last received by him as a private of Capitol Police, the said sum to be considered as reimbursement in full for all expenses and allowances on account of injuries suffered by him in the discharge of his official duties.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. LUCAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 279), which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner with which he has presided over its deliberations during the present Congress.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

CONTINUATION OF SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 280) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947 (creating a Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises), and continued by Senate Resolution 153, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, and Senate Resolution 191, Eightieth Congress, agreed to March 15, 1948, is hereby continued until January 31, 1949.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the unanimous-consent request, may I inquire from the able Senator from Nebraska just what is expected to be done between now and the 31st of January next?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to answer the inquiry.

The resolution providing for the extension for 30 days is primarily for the purpose of enabling the committee to complete its work. About all that remains to be done is to write the reports and wind up the affairs of the committee as it is now constituted.

I do not know what Members on the other side may say about the work of the committee. However, so far as we are concerned, all the investigations have been concluded. The purpose of the resolution is merely to afford time for winding up the affairs of the committee. Ninety percent of such work consists of writing reports and findings of investigations.

I may say further for the benefit of the distinguished acting minority leader that I am not sure that there is sufficient money on hand to complete the work; but I felt that if it should prove that there were not sufficient funds to take care of terminal-leave pay, and so forth, the proper way to handle the situation would be to come before the Senate with a resolution which would be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration and reported back to the Senate. Otherwise I would not submit the resolution today.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that I shall not object to the resolution which has been submitted for continuation of the committee for a period of 30 days, in order that the committee may make its report during that time. However, Members of the Senate well know the position of the great majority of Democratic Members with respect to special committees under the Reorganization Act. No Senator is more interested in the continued success of small business than is the Senator from Illinois. However, a vital principle dealing with special committees is involved under the Reorganization Act, and it seems to me that at the proper time either the Banking and Currency Committee or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should take over the duties of the Small Business Committee. One of the regular standing committees should continue to operate in behalf of the small business of this Nation. As everyone knows, I feel very keenly about the matter, as was apparent from the spirited debates we had on this subject 2 years ago when the matter was before us at that time. I shall reserve further remarks upon the question until some more appropriate time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as a member of the minority of the committee, I wish to say that I am fully in accord with the expression of opinion by the acting leader of the majority. I think the committee has served a very valuable purpose during the years it has been in operation, and I am very anxious that it be given this additional time in which to write reports.

Of course, I am in favor of an extension of the committee. It should be extended because of the great service it has rendered the businessmen of the United States. I think they would be bitterly disappointed if there were a failure on the part of the Senate to continue the work of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes, which was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of July 7, 1947, entitled "An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," is amended as follows:

(f) Section 10 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Report: Not later than 70 days after the Eighty-first Congress is convened and organized, the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress."

(2) Section 3 is amended, as of December 31, 1948, by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(d) Continuation of membership upon change of status: Despite the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a Member of Congress or in the status of a person in the executive branch of the Government, who thereafter ceases to have such status, shall nevertheless continue as a member of the Commission, and from and after his change of status shall, if he has returned to private life (except for his membership on the Commission), receive the same compensation as a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a person from private life."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this resolution extends for 60 days the length of time during which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make its report to the Senate. A tremendous amount of work has been involved in this matter. That work is not quite finished, although it is nearly completed. We hope to have it ready by the 13th of January, but it will not be so good a report as it would be if a little more time were given.

The other provision of the resolution would permit Representative MANASCO to remain as a member of the Commission until the report is made and the work is completed. Under the present law, Representative MANASCO will cease to be a member of the Commission as soon as his successor in the House of Representatives takes office on January 3. This resolution would permit the continuation of the Commission as it now is. It would simply be out of question for a new Member of the House of Representatives to take over that work at this stage of the proceeding, when the report is almost, but not quite, ready to be submitted.

So I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution from the House of Representatives acted upon and approved at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NOTIFICATION OF THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution (H. Res. 718), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President pro tempore to join a similar committee appointed by the House, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This resolution corresponds to the one received from the House of Representatives.

Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 277) is considered and agreed to; and the Chair appoints the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] as the committee on the part of the Senate.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 224), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 31, 1948, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

CARL A. LOEFFLER

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to compliment the Senate by calling its attention to an event which is of far more than casual or passing interest and importance.

Mr. Carl A. Loeffler, Secretary of the United States Senate, will be relieved of his official duties and retired from his official relationship with the Senate on Monday, January 3. In this brief announcement of fact there lies a career and record as distinguished and noteworthy as one can find in the entire annals of American political history.

Mr. Loeffler was born here in Washington on January 12, 1873, in the shadow of the White House and during U. S. Grant's first term in Washington.

Mr. Loeffler was born on a Sunday on Church Street during church hours. He was conceived, lived, and will die, as a Christian.

Carl Loeffler has served the Senate of the United States in almost every capacity for 59 years. His first association

with the Senate came when he was selected to be a page boy by Matthew Stanley Quay, of Pennsylvania, in December of 1889. He was 16 years of age when he first took his place in the service of the Senate.

Carl Loeffler's father was the late Maj. Charles D. A. Loeffler, United States Army, who, as usher to the President, was the friend and confidant of eight Presidents, beginning with U. S. Grant and continuing through the terms of Teddy Roosevelt. Major Loeffler in his own right was as unusual as his son has become. When General Grant first entered the White House, he called Major Loeffler to serve as his personal aide and secretary. During Grant's second term, Major Loeffler resigned his commission, and continued to serve in a civilian capacity. During President McKinley's occupancy of the White House, the President established the post of military storekeeper in the Army, in order that Major Loeffler might return to a post of importance in the military service of his country. When the post was sanctioned by the Senate, and Major Loeffler was confirmed by the Senate to fill the position, he remained for the rest of his life in the Army, while continuing to serve in the White House for many years.

From such a background did Carl Loeffler enter this world. The young man's formal education came from the public schools of the District of Columbia and from Columbian University. His much broader education and background came from his parents and from what he lived among and saw during his early childhood, which was spent in and about the White House.

This Senator knows of his utter inability to describe adequately what has taken place within the Senate and Nation since Carl Loeffler began his duties in 1889. Carl Loeffler is one of the few men alive who could do justice to that task. I am but one of many who deeply trust that the future will provide both time and energy through which Carl Loeffler may leave for students everywhere a written record of what has taken place before his very eyes. This would be a tremendous contribution. It would constitute a textbook to satisfy the curiosity of youngsters who will dream of some day serving in the United States Senate.

A word of recapitulation is all I can or should attempt.

During Carl Loeffler's early service in the Senate, he witnessed the bitter debate on the Force bill of 1890 relating to more stringent enforcement of Federal election laws; the stormy period of the Spanish-American War, culminating in Cuban independence, and the dissolution of the last vestige of European control in the Western Hemisphere.

Carl Loeffler was here when Hawaii was annexed and the Philippines became a possession of the United States.

Carl Loeffler was here when William McKinley was assassinated and Theodore Roosevelt became President.

Those were times of great movements which marked the end of our pioneer era and the beginning of our period of great industrial growth.

All that and a great deal more took place while Carl Loeffler was growing up with his country and serving one of the great institutions which exist on the face of the earth.

In 1913, Carl Loeffler was elected acting assistant doorkeeper of the Senate, and in 1919 he became the assistant doorkeeper.

That was the period of the First World War; and the vastly increased legislative activity in the Senate was carefully surveyed, briefed, and indexed in the agile and painstaking mind of the one who retires to private life on Monday next.

In his 59 years of service, Carl Loeffler has seen and known intimately more than one-half of all the Senators who have ever served in the United States Senate. No American has ever enjoyed and been permitted to appreciate an experience comparable to his.

In the career of Carl Loeffler there have been legislative high spots which ought to be mentioned. Every one of them would mark an epoch in the life of any individual who was permitted to be a participant in the forming of the legislation. How many of us had any part to play in any considerable number of this abbreviated list:

First. Uniform Bankruptcy Act.

Second. Elkins Interstate Commerce Act.

Third. Aldrich-Vreeland Currency Association Act.

Fourth. Postal Savings Bank Act.

Fifth. Department of Commerce establishment.

Sixth. Interstate Commerce Act.

Seventh. Food and Drug Act.

Eighth. Panama Canal Act.

Ninth. Bureau of Mines establishment.

Tenth. Federal Reserve Bank Act.

Eleventh. Sixteenth through twenty-first amendments to the Constitution.

Twelfth. Federal Corrupt Practices Acts.

Thirteenth. Railroad Arbitration Act.

Fourteenth. Eight Hour Acts.

Fifteenth. Department of Labor establishment.

Sixteenth. General Accounting Office establishment.

Seventeenth. Budget created.

Eighteenth. Debates on (a) Colombian treaty, including Panama Canal rights; (b) Canadian reciprocity bill; (c) ship-purchase bill, World War I; (d) arming of merchant vessels, World War I; (e) League of Nations; (f) limitation of naval armament; (g) World Court protocol; (h) extension of NRA; (i) neutrality acts of World War II.

Nobody can ever challenge Carl Loeffler's official association with the past and the present. Any student or curious citizen will always be able to determine the long period of time during which Carl Loeffler was a distinguished public servant. Official records probably will be far too dry and terse to give credit to Carl Loeffler as a very human man. As those of us who know him well chuckle over the fun we know he enjoyed as a youngster, history ought to permit others to derive the same joy and satisfaction.

We see Carl Loeffler sitting before us today as a courtly and dignified elder statesmen. May I suggest that it was not, as it should not have been, always thus. Carl Loeffler was once a page, and a good one, too. He was as high-spirited and bubbling over with youthful enthusiasm as are any of those who sit this morning at his feet. Once upon a time, Carl and other pages brought bows and arrows to this very Chamber. They affixed gum to one end of the arrows and long paper streamers to the other. They took for their target, with Carl as their leader, the glass panels in the ceiling above us. There the arrows remained fixed and the paper streamers hanging until tall ladders could be brought by workmen and the offending decorations removed.

On another occasion, while playing and running in the Chamber before the day's session, as succeeding corps of pages have done through the years, Carl Loeffler was so eager to catch and tag one of the other pages that he crashed through one of the glass doors in the cloakroom and shattered beyond repair the etched glass panel. Undaunted and honest, as always, he immediately went to the head page and admitted the accident. I have not yet discovered why he was not fired, and neither has he.

Carl Loeffler in years is not a young man, but he remains in energetic health and stamina. There is a most excellent reason for his present excellent condition. Carl was a bicyclist of note in the days of the long ago when that sport overshadowed all the many games we play today. He was a winner of medals in competition, and he once set a record for cycling between Washington and Lock Haven, Pa., a distance of 225 miles, in 2 days' time. Do you know of any among us who could have gone so far so fast?

Carl Loeffler is a man of many parts. At Columbian University he prepared himself to become an engineer. The fact is that he almost became one, and the Senate almost lost his services before his career was more than just begun. He once went to New York City to seek an engineering opening. When told that his services upon graduation from his engineering school would command the sum of $4 a week, he decided to remain in politics, which was a wise decision for him and for us.

Carl Loeffler has the virtue of stubbornness and on occasion it has kept him from doing what he most enjoyed. Some years ago Mr. Loeffler was a member of the Columbia Country Club. Like all of us who play golf, he became one day so disgusted with his golf game that he publicly declared that unless there was some immediate improvement he would resign his membership and sell his clubs for any figure which anybody might offer. Unlike most of us, he meant what he said. His game got worse, he resigned and sold his clubs, and did not play golf again for more than 10 years.

Carl Loeffler may give to many the impression that he is stern of mien, and leaves to others the laughing over the fun of living. Nothing could be further from the truth. Just about a year ago a friend of Carl Loeffler's was entertaining friends of his from England. After dinner it was decided to visit the amusement park at Glen Echo. Carl Loeffler did there what he wanted to do. His conduct amazed, delighted, and amused

the party, for he rode on everything, including the high slides. When the visitors returned to England, they wrote Mr. Loeffler's friend of their tremendous enjoyment of that particular evening, and they added that they felt it to be a wonderful thing that a man so highly placed in the United States Senate could so thoroughly enjoy himself and still maintain his dignity.

Mr. Loeffler has followed many worthwhile interests other than that of politics. He is a talented portrait artist in pen and ink, and has drawn portraits of many of the prominent men with whom he has been associated. Carl Loeffler has more than a reasonable ability as a poet, having written hundreds of poems extremely varied in subject, many of them written for his own children. He is likewise a skillful creator of miniature furniture. His grandchildren can testify to his ability in this field and to his originality of furniture design and treatment.

Carl Loeffler has been a life-long Republican, but two of his greatest friends and advisers have been strong members of the Democratic Party. Not only was he a friend of Col. Jacob Ruppert, but at one time while performing his duties in the Senate, he helped Colonel Ruppert operate his office, while Ruppert was a Member of the House of Representatives. Another of his great friends among the Democrats was the late Senator Hill, of New York, with whom Mr. Loeffler toured Europe in 1908.

Carl Loeffler was married in April 1901, to Minnie Schneider of Washington, D. C. To this union were born two charming and talented daughters. This family of four is as happy today as it has always been. Mrs. Loeffler and the daughters are proud of the head of their household. He has never failed to count them as being his most priceless assets.

The junior Senator from Washington would have preferred to listen to a far more able presentation of the worthwhileness of a distinguished American. It is his privileged opportunity, however, to speak good and happy thoughts about a fine friend. When this Senator first came to Washington, Carl Loeffler went out of his way to open the mysterious doors which surround the uninitiated. What Carl did for me, he had been doing for others through decades gone by. I shall be sorry to see Carl Loeffler leave the Senate; but I shall be glad that when he has gone he will have a long period, of which no man is more deserving, during which he can justifiably think of himself rather than of others, which he has done so completely during his lifetime up to this minute. [Applause on the floor.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad to join in the deserved tribute paid by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to our friend, Carl Loeffler.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to say a word, joining with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], relative to the retirement of Carl Loeffler.

It is with sincere regret that I note the retirement of Mr. Loeffler from the official family of the United States Senate, for he has been more than a member of the official family; he has been a real friend of Senators, and no employee of this legislative body has ever served more faithfully. No employee has been more devoted to the best interests of the Senate and to the fulfillment of its high place in the Government and life of our people. We shall miss Carl very much, and yet we are aware of how completely he has earned the retirement which we hope will be most pleasant for him and his family.

He entered the service of the United States Senate a hundred years and some months after the first convening of this body under the Constitution. That was in December 1889, the first session of the Fifty-first Congress. In December of this year he passed his fifty-ninth year of faithful service to the Senate. He entered this Chamber as a page, and leaves it as Secretary of the United States Senate. That fact alone is a high tribute to Carl Loeffler's industry, ability, and loyalty.

In closing I want to extend to him and to Mrs. Loeffler my best wishes that in retirement they may find those pleasures which a very busy life to date may have prevented them from enjoying, and that complete fulfillment may be theirs in the years ahead.

I am sure all the Members of this body entertain the same feelings as those I have attempted briefly to express toward this loyal, faithful, and intelligent public servant on his retirement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to join in the sentiments expressed not only by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], but also by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in their tributes to the Secretary of the Senate, Carl Loeffler, who will retire next Monday. I know I represent all Senators when I say we join in the observations made about this man who has served 59 years in connection with the work of the Senate of the United States.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPORTS FROM A SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as presently constituted, may file reports until January 17, 1949. In making this request I have no desire that it include any work to be done other than the making up of such reports and their filing. The work of the committee will be under the leadership of the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. There is sufficient money to carry on the program. There would be included, however, a joint report on "The Voice of America," and the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations having to do with that subject will be headed by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I join in the request just made by the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none; and the order is made.

ELECTION FRAUDS IN KENTUCKY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement prepared by the Citizens' Committee of Bourbon County, Ky., concerning the attempted vote frauds in that county at the recent November election. The committee of which I speak is made up of outstanding citizens of Bourbon County, of both parties. It is headed by Cassius M. Clay, as chairman. It was formed on November 10 for the purpose of assisting in the investigation of the attempted frauds, and, as stated by the Committee, "the bringing to justice of the guilty persons, regardless of person or party."

There can be no question that a very flagrant fraud was attempted in the general elections at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, a United States Senator, and a Member of the House of Representatives were to be elected. It is at present being investigated by the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is being rumored in Kentucky, as reported to me by substantial citizens, that an effort has been made, or will be made, to minimize to Federal law enforcement officials the magnitude of the crime. I have no knowledge that this is true. I hope it is not true, or that if it be true that such an attempt has or will be made, it will be resented and denied by Federal officials. I call upon my colleague in the Senate, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator who will succeed me, and upon the newly elected Member of the House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky, vigorously to present the importance of this matter to the Department of Justice. I speak of the matter because of the pride in my State and in the citizens of Bourbon County itself, who are representatives of the very best of our people.

There are a few counties in Kentucky in which such frauds have been practiced in the past. In 1942 a Federal grand jury in the eastern district of Kentucky indicted 99 defendants and convicted 71 persons. That action has deterred this illegal practice in Kentucky. As a circuit judge I presided at trials in 1946 which resulted in sending several defendants to the State penitentiary for vote frauds.

I know from my experience as a judge that it is not difficult to receive the evidence and convict in these cases if there is a genuine desire to stop the practice. If the case is not vigorously prosecuted, new offenders will find courage to continue such frauds. I can think of no more reprehensible practice and nothing that represents a more cynical attitude toward free government than does vote stealing.

I hope that the Department of Justice will vigorously investigate this matter and will prosecute the offenders.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the November 2, 1948, general election, 11 of the 31 ballot boxes in Bourbon County, Ky., were stuffed with forged and fraudulent ballots before the polls were open

with the Senate came when he was selected to be a page boy by Matthew Stanley Quay, of Pennsylvania, in December of 1889. He was 16 years of age when he first took his place in the service of the Senate.

Carl Loeffler's father was the late Maj. Charles D. A. Loeffler, United States Army, who, as usher to the President, was the friend and confidant of eight Presidents, beginning with U. S. Grant and continuing through the terms of Teddy Roosevelt. Major Loeffler in his own right was as unusual as his son has become. When General Grant first entered the White House, he called Major Loeffler to serve as his personal aide and secretary. During Grant's second term, Major Loeffler resigned his commission, and continued to serve in a civilian capacity. During President McKinley's occupancy of the White House, the President established the post of military storekeeper in the Army, in order that Major Loeffler might return to a post of importance in the military service of his country. When the post was sanctioned by the Senate, and Major Loeffler was confirmed by the Senate to fill the position, he remained for the rest of his life in the Army, while continuing to serve in the White House for many years.

From such a background did Carl Loeffler enter this world. The young man's formal education came from the public schools of the District of Columbia and from Columbian University. His much broader education and background came from his parents and from what he lived among and saw during his early childhood, which was spent in and about the White House.

This Senator knows of his utter inability to describe adequately what has taken place within the Senate and Nation since Carl Loeffler began his duties in 1889. Carl Loeffler is one of the few men alive who could do justice to that task. I am but one of many who deeply trust that the future will provide both time and energy through which Carl Loeffler may leave for students everywhere a written record of what has taken place before his very eyes. This would be a tremendous contribution. It would constitute a textbook to satisfy the curiosity of youngsters who will dream of some day serving in the United States Senate.

A word of recapitulation is all I can or should attempt.

During Carl Loeffler's early service in the Senate, he witnessed the bitter debate on the Force bill of 1890 relating to more stringent enforcement of Federal election laws; the stormy period of the Spanish-American War, culminating in Cuban independence, and the dissolution of the last vestige of European control in the Western Hemisphere.

Carl Loeffler was here when Hawaii was annexed and the Philippines became a possession of the United States.

Carl Loeffler was here when William McKinley was assassinated and Theodore Roosevelt became President.

Those were times of great movements which marked the end of our pioneer era and the beginning of our period of great industrial growth.

All that and a great deal more took place while Carl Loeffler was growing up with his country and serving one of the great institutions which exist on the face of the earth.

In 1913, Carl Loeffler was elected acting assistant doorkeeper of the Senate, and in 1919 he became the assistant doorkeeper.

That was the period of the First World War; and the vastly increased legislative activity in the Senate was carefully surveyed, briefed, and indexed in the agile and painstaking mind of the one who retires to private life on Monday next.

In his 59 years of service, Carl Loeffler has seen and known intimately more than one-half of all the Senators who have ever served in the United States Senate. No American has ever enjoyed and been permitted to appreciate an experience comparable to his.

In the career of Carl Loeffler there have been legislative high spots which ought to be mentioned. Every one of them would mark an epoch in the life of any individual who was permitted to be a participant in the forming of the legislation. How many of us had any part to play in any considerable number of this abbreviated list:

First. Uniform Bankruptcy Act.

Second. Elkins Interstate Commerce Act.

Third. Aldrich-Vreeland Currency Association Act.

Fourth. Postal Savings Bank Act.

Fifth. Department of Commerce establishment.

Sixth. Interstate Commerce Act.

Seventh. Food and Drug Act.

Eighth. Panama Canal Act.

Ninth. Bureau of Mines establishment.

Tenth. Federal Reserve Bank Act.

Eleventh. Sixteenth through twenty-first amendments to the Constitution.

Twelfth. Federal Corrupt Practices Acts.

Thirteenth. Railroad Arbitration Act.

Fourteenth. Eight Hour Acts.

Fifteenth. Department of Labor establishment.

Sixteenth. General Accounting Office establishment.

Seventeenth. Budget created.

Eighteenth. Debates on (a) Colombian treaty, including Panama Canal rights; (b) Canadian reciprocity bill; (c) ship-purchase bill, World War I; (d) arming of merchant vessels, World War I; (e) League of Nations; (f) limitation of naval armament; (g) World Court protocol; (h) extension of NRA; (i) neutrality acts of World War II.

Nobody can ever challenge Carl Loeffler's official association with the past and the present. Any student or curious citizen will always be able to determine the long period of time during which Carl Loeffler was a distinguished public servant. Official records probably will be far too dry and terse to give credit to Carl Loeffler as a very human man. As those of us who know him well chuckle over the fun we know he enjoyed as a youngster, history ought to permit others to derive the same joy and satisfaction.

We see Carl Loeffler sitting before us today as a courtly and dignified elder statesmen. May I suggest that it was not, as it should not have been, always thus. Carl Loeffler was once a page, and a good one, too. He was as high-spirited and bubbling over with youthful enthusiasm as are any of those who sit this morning at his feet. Once upon a time, Carl and other pages brought bows and arrows to this very Chamber. They affixed gum to one end of the arrows and long paper streamers to the other. They took for their target, with Carl as their leader, the glass panels in the ceiling above us. There the arrows remained fixed and the paper streamers hanging until tall ladders could be brought by workmen and the offending decorations removed.

On another occasion, while playing and running in the Chamber before the day's session, as succeeding corps of pages have done through the years, Carl Loeffler was so eager to catch and tag one of the other pages that he crashed through one of the glass doors in the cloakroom and shattered beyond repair the etched glass panel. Undaunted and honest, as always, he immediately went to the head page and admitted the accident. I have not yet discovered why he was not fired, and neither has he.

Carl Loeffler in years is not a young man, but he remains in energetic health and stamina. There is a most excellent reason for his present excellent condition. Carl was a bicyclist of note in the days of the long ago when that sport overshadowed all the many games we play today. He was a winner of medals in competition, and he once set a record for cycling between Washington and Lock Haven, Pa., a distance of 225 miles, in 2 days' time. Do you know of any among us who could have gone so far so fast?

Carl Loeffler is a man of many parts. At Columbian University he prepared himself to become an engineer. The fact is that he almost became one, and the Senate almost lost his services before his career was more than just begun. He once went to New York City to seek an engineering opening. When told that his services upon graduation from his engineering school would command the sum of $4 a week, he decided to remain in politics, which was a wise decision for him and for us.

Carl Loeffler has the virtue of stubbornness and on occasion it has kept him from doing what he most enjoyed. Some years ago Mr. Loeffler was a member of the Columbia Country Club. Like all of us who play golf, he became one day so disgusted with his golf game that he publicly declared that unless there was some immediate improvement he would resign his membership and sell his clubs for any figure which anybody might offer. Unlike most of us, he meant what he said. His game got worse, he resigned and sold his clubs, and did not play golf again for more than 10 years.

Carl Loeffler may give to many the impression that he is stern of mien, and leaves to others the laughing over the fun of living. Nothing could be further from the truth. Just about a year ago a friend of Carl Loeffler's was entertaining friends of his from England. After dinner it was decided to visit the amusement park at Glen Echo. Carl Loeffler did there what he wanted to do. His conduct amazed, delighted, and amused

the party, for he rode on everything, including the high slides. When the visitors returned to England, they wrote Mr. Loeffler's friend of their tremendous enjoyment of that particular evening, and they added that they felt it to be a wonderful thing that a man so highly placed in the United States Senate could so thoroughly enjoy himself and still maintain his dignity.

Mr. Loeffler has followed many worthwhile interests other than that of politics. He is a talented portrait artist in pen and ink, and has drawn portraits of many of the prominent men with whom he has been associated. Carl Loeffler has more than a reasonable ability as a poet, having written hundreds of poems extremely varied in subject, many of them written for his own children. He is likewise a skillful creator of miniature furniture. His grandchildren can testify to his ability in this field and to his originality of furniture design and treatment.

Carl Loeffler has been a life-long Republican, but two of his greatest friends and advisers have been strong members of the Democratic Party. Not only was he a friend of Col. Jacob Ruppert, but at one time while performing his duties in the Senate, he helped Colonel Ruppert operate his office, while Ruppert was a Member of the House of Representatives. Another of his great friends among the Democrats was the late Senator Hill, of New York, with whom Mr. Loeffler toured Europe in 1908.

Carl Loeffler was married in April 1901, to Minnie Schneider of Washington, D. C. To this union were born two charming and talented daughters. This family of four is as happy today as it has always been. Mrs. Loeffler and the daughters are proud of the head of their household. He has never failed to count them as being his most priceless assets.

The junior Senator from Washington would have preferred to listen to a far more able presentation of the worthwhileness of a distinguished American. It is his privileged opportunity, however, to speak good and happy thoughts about a fine friend. When this Senator first came to Washington, Carl Loeffler went out of his way to open the mysterious doors which surround the uninitiated. What Carl did for me, he had been doing for others through decades gone by. I shall be sorry to see Carl Loeffler leave the Senate; but I shall be glad that when he has gone he will have a long period, of which no man is more deserving, during which he can justifiably think of himself rather than of others, which he has done so completely during his lifetime up to this minute. [Applause on the floor.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad to join in the deserved tribute paid by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to our friend, Carl Loeffler.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to say a word, joining with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], relative to the retirement of Carl Loeffler.

It is with sincere regret that I note the retirement of Mr. Loeffler from the official family of the United States Senate, for he has been more than a member of the official family; he has been a real friend of Senators, and no employee of this legislative body has ever served more faithfully. No employee has been more devoted to the best interests of the Senate and to the fulfillment of its high place in the Government and life of our people. We shall miss Carl very much, and yet we are aware of how completely he has earned the retirement which we hope will be most pleasant for him and his family.

He entered the service of the United States Senate a hundred years and some months after the first convening of this body under the Constitution. That was in December 1889, the first session of the Fifty-first Congress. In December of this year he passed his fifty-ninth year of faithful service to the Senate. He entered this Chamber as a page, and leaves it as Secretary of the United States Senate. That fact alone is a high tribute to Carl Loeffler's industry, ability, and loyalty.

In closing I want to extend to him and to Mrs. Loeffler my best wishes that in retirement they may find those pleasures which a very busy life to date may have prevented them from enjoying, and that complete fulfillment may be theirs in the years ahead.

I am sure all the Members of this body entertain the same feelings as those I have attempted briefly to express toward this loyal, faithful, and intelligent public servant on his retirement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to join in the sentiments expressed not only by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], but also by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in their tributes to the Secretary of the Senate, Carl Loeffler, who will retire next Monday. I know I represent all Senators when I say we join in the observations made about this man who has served 59 years in connection with the work of the Senate of the United States.

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPORTS FROM A SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as presently constituted, may file reports until January 17, 1949. In making this request I have no desire that it include any work to be done other than the making up of such reports and their filing. The work of the committee will be under the leadership of the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. There is sufficient money to carry on the program. There would be included, however, a joint report on "The Voice of America," and the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations having to do with that subject will be headed by the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I join in the request just made by the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none; and the order is made.

ELECTION FRAUDS IN KENTUCKY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement prepared by the Citizens' Committee of Bourbon County, Ky., concerning the attempted vote frauds in that county at the recent November election. The committee of which I speak is made up of outstanding citizens of Bourbon County, of both parties. It is headed by Cassius M. Clay, as chairman. It was formed on November 10 for the purpose of assisting in the investigation of the attempted frauds, and, as stated by the Committee, "the bringing to justice of the guilty persons, regardless of person or party."

There can be no question that a very flagrant fraud was attempted in the general elections at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, a United States Senator, and a Member of the House of Representatives were to be elected. It is at present being investigated by the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is being rumored in Kentucky, as reported to me by substantial citizens, that an effort has been made, or will be made, to minimize to Federal law enforcement officials the magnitude of the crime. I have no knowledge that this is true. I hope it is not true, or that if it be true that such an attempt has or will be made, it will be resented and denied by Federal officials. I call upon my colleague in the Senate, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator who will succeed me, and upon the newly elected Member of the House of Representatives from the Sixth Congressional District of Kentucky, vigorously to present the importance of this matter to the Department of Justice. I speak of the matter because of the pride in my State and in the citizens of Bourbon County itself, who are representatives of the very best of our people.

There are a few counties in Kentucky in which such frauds have been practiced in the past. In 1942 a Federal grand jury in the eastern district of Kentucky indicted 99 defendants and convicted 71 persons. That action has deterred this illegal practice in Kentucky. As a circuit judge I presided at trials in 1946 which resulted in sending several defendants to the State penitentiary for vote frauds.

I know from my experience as a judge that it is not difficult to receive the evidence and convict in these cases if there is a genuine desire to stop the practice. If the case is not vigorously prosecuted, new offenders will find courage to continue such frauds. I can think of no more reprehensible practice and nothing that represents a more cynical attitude toward free government than does vote stealing.

I hope that the Department of Justice will vigorously investigate this matter and will prosecute the offenders.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the November 2, 1948, general election, 11 of the 31 ballot boxes in Bourbon County, Ky., were stuffed with forged and fraudulent ballots before the polls were open

for voting. Since all but 1 of the 254 ballots, which during the tally were identified as forged, were straight Democratic votes, the ostensible purpose (as stated in the Federal district attorney's petition to the Federal court) was to increase the Democratic vote in the county and to diminish the number of Republican ballots in relation to the total vote.

Soon after forgery and fraud were discovered, County Judge George Batterton and various other officers, civic organizations, and individuals appealed to the Honorable Tom Clark, Attorney General of the United States, to have the FBI assist in the investigation and determination of those guilty of the fraud. Circuit Judge William B. Ardery, of the State court, also specially charged the grand jury to "investigate to the limit of the ability of each of you jurors and to the limit of the resources of all of you." The grand jury investigation was halted when the Federal attorney for the district, Hon. Claude Stephens, obtained an order from the Federal court impounding the evidence in the case. In a report to the circuit court, the grand jury found that, "The evidence proved conclusively that in 11 precincts fraud and forgery had been committed," constituting "a crime against the United States and the Commonwealth of Kentucky." The grand jury advised the court that its investigation had been "temporarily halted by the action of the Federal court," and requested that the court "instruct the next grand jury to pursue the investigation."

The FBI field representatives arrived on the scene while the matter was still before the grand jury. The FBI has not yet completed its work on the case; and it is understood that there will be no release from the Department of Justice on the matter until after the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress.

Our citizens committee, which was formed in response to a mass meeting of citizens held in the county courthouse on November 10, 1948, is composed of the following representative citizens of the county: Hume Payne, Dodge L. Whipple, Cassius M. Clay, Stanley S. Dickson, Thomas M. Mitchell, Frazier R. Insko, and Samuel Clay, Jr.

It includes both Democrats and Republicans. At the mass meeting, it was charged with the responsibility of furthering the investigation and the bringing to justice of the guilty persons, "regardless of person or party."

In a report, copies of which have been placed in the hands of the Attorney General of the United States and of the Federal district attorney, the committee has stated:

"The committee is strongly of the opinion that no one thing will be more conducive to honest elections in the county in the future than the bringing to justice of the individual or individuals responsible for the stuffing of the ballot boxes with fraudulent ballots in the November general election. The unanimity of opinion among right-thinking citizens on this point was evidenced in the mass meeting, in response to which the citizens' committee was formed, and in the action taken by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, Rotary Club, Lions Club, and other civic organizations, as well as by the telegrams sent to the Attorney General of the United States by Judge George Batterton and other individuals, concerning the fraud and urging action by the responsible authorities. It was shown by general public approval of Circuit Judge William B. Ardery's charge to the grand jury. Attention also should be called to the interim report of the grand jury to the court after the evidence had been impounded by order of the Federal court.

"The contemptuous disregard of the Federal and State election laws in the stuffing of the ballot boxes and the forging of the signatures of election officers was crudely conceived and executed. It should not be difficult for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with its experience in much more difficult cases and with the expert facilities at its command, to discover those guilty of the fraud, as so far as we are advised, it may have done already. We urge the Department of Justice to assign to the case one of its special attorneys to assist the Federal district attorney, as was done when similar election frauds were uncovered and prosecuted in Harlan County, Ky., some years ago. We are informed that the Department frequently assigns a special attorney in cases where the public interest is less clear than in the instant case.

"While regrettable from the standpoint of the guilty person or persons in this case that they must be made to suffer the penalty whereas in the past others have violated the law without punishment, failure to bring to trial the person or persons guilty of this gross fraud will be unfair to the many innocent officials of the county and others in the party organizations who have now been brought under suspicion by the act of said person or persons.

"The view that, because persons with political influence in Washington may be able to exert pressure on the Department of Justice, the matter will not be prosecuted with vigor, we reject because it is subversive of our faith in the fundamental soundness of our American institutions of government."

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
(S. DOC. NO. 210)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent in his State today. He has asked me to request of the Senate unanimous consent for the printing as a Senate document of an important document on the United States Constitution. The material had been prepared primarily for the use of the Senate Judiciary Committee as a vital reference to its work in connection with the Constitution. But it was felt preferable that it be prepared as a Senate document.

The material includes a chronology of important dates in the history of the Constitution and of leading quotations with reference to it.

I am happy to comply with the request of my colleague to ask at this time unanimous consent for its printing as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly today of a former Member of the Congress who died in February of this year. I speak of John Marshall Robsion, who represented the Ninth Congressional District of Kentucky, in which I reside, formerly the Eleventh Congressional District, continuously during the 30 years from 1918 to 1948, with the exception of 1931 and 1932, when he was in voluntary retirement, and the year 1930, when he was a Member of the United States Senate.

Even before his election to Congress he had demonstrated the qualities of leadership which were to mark his service here, and had attained outstanding success as an educator in the public schools and colleges of Kentucky, as a banker, and as one of the great lawyers of our State.

It is unnecessary for me to retell in detail the story of his work and accomplishments as a Member of the Congress. He never stopped working, and as a ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary he had practically completed, at the time of his death, the task of revising and codifying the United States Code, and helping to enact it into positive law.

Others collaborated, but I am sure that all would agree that it was solely the industry and the broad legal knowledge of Mr. Robsion that made possible this monumental achievement.

His career in the Congress was marked by conscientious work in committee, by vigorous debate on the floor, and by a broad interest and knowledge of all fields of legislation.

Perhaps, however, his people will remember him for his work in those fields which touched their daily needs, his labors in behalf of roads and schools, and for his sympathetic interest in those who labor on the farm, in the mines, and in the factories. Himself the son of a wounded Union soldier, and the father of a soldier, his namesake, he was the friend of the soldier. Thousands of veterans and their dependents will attest to his affection for those who had known the heat of battle, their widows and orphans.

The regard in which he was held by his people, and by his colleagues in Congress did not arise from superficial qualities. It arose from his strong and independent mind and from the enduring qualities of his character, his unquestioned integrity, his tolerance and sympathy, and his great humility.

Above all other characteristics, perhaps, which we knew he possessed, was that fierce and patriotic love of country and its institutions which is the proud mark of the people he represented.

In appearance, in action, and in thought, he was a leader, and bore well the title given to him by his people, "The Tall Sycamore of the Mountains."

It has been difficult for me to speak of him because of the respect and affection I held for him, but in this inadequate way I have wanted to remember a firm friend and a great leader.

I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks an editorial by the distinguished editor of the Louisville Times, Mr. Tom Wallace, regarding Mr. Robsion, and an article by Mr. Harry Snyder of the Owensboro (Ky.) Messenger paying tribute to him.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Times of February 21, 1948]

ROBSION'S FRANKNESS UNFAILING—CANDOR IN COMMITTING HIMSELF IN WRITING REFRESHING CONTRAST TO EVASIONS OF MANY

(By Tom Wallace)

One characteristic of the late Representative John Robsion, who knew a great deal about personal politics; about how to earn friendships by performing services for his constituents, be it getting for them garden seed or pensions or something else, was his willingness to commit himself on issues when queried.

His congressional district was not anywhere near Mammoth Cave National Park, and Kentucky's sectionalism is well known. But, when I wrote to him in opposition to the proposed Mining City Dam in Green River which would affect the underground

streams in Mammoth Cave and in other ways injure the park, he promptly replied that he would oppose it.

"I am very much opposed to any action which will lessen the value of our wonderful Mammoth Cave," he said, "not only as a great asset to Kentucky but to the Nation as a whole, and I am sure this is the view of an overwhelming majority of Kentuckians and the people of the Nation."

He was among the earliest Kentuckians in public office who opposed the projected power dam in Cumberland River which would have destroyed Cumberland Falls. The dam was advocated by Flem D. Sampson, a Republican Governor from Mr. Robsion's section.

It falls to the lot of persons interested in legislation affecting natural resources to write occasionally to Members of their State's delegation in Washington, asking them to oppose or to support this or that pending bill.

ARTFUL DODGERS

Anyone who writes to his State's delegation a few times learns what to expect in the way of replies. He soon learns that there are Members of Congress who will never so reply that they are committed to anything, no matter how well they know the effect of proposed legislation; no matter how determined they are to vote for it or against it. Their letters are models of courtesy and calculated evasiveness. They reply promptly and the man who has written to them knows nothing about their intentions beyond knowing that they do not intend being frank.

A poll of members of a State delegation gets candid responses from some of them and the usual dodge-the-issue responses from others. Mr. Robsion was among the candid repliers. I always knew what to expect from him. I did not know what his position would be, but I knew he would say forthrightly what it was.

No matter how one may differ with a lawmaker, the lawmaker earns his respect if he is willing to be frank when it would be wholly unreasonable to believe the measure under discussion one as to which he could be without opinion because of lack of information.

I always attributed Mr. Robsion's straightforward replies to superior intelligence as well as to courage. In my opinion, a politician who thinks it wise, or smart, to be habitually evasive is a good deal less smart than he thinks he is, because anyone who deals with him and learns that he is always bent upon being sleek or slippery loses respect for his character no matter how he bellows and bawls on the stump about his righteousness.

SENSE OF HUMOR

Mr. Robsion had a sense of humor, about others and about himself, and a keen sense of humor is a reflection of keen mentality. The pompous man is the dull and undiscerning man. As a figure in politics he is no novelty.

Not being among those who instinctively dislike, distrust, and disparage a politician because he is of one political party and instinctively think well of a man who belongs to another political party, I was never much moved by the party label under which Mr. Robsion won his honors and kept them to the end of his long life.

I liked him, enjoyed his company when—rarely—we were thrown together. But I especially liked dealing with him as to measures pending in Congress. When a lawmaker writes, in response to a legitimate question, an answer which suggests the possibility that it is a form letter which he does not actually dictate; a letter which his secretary knows how to write and does write, for his signature, knowing that he will sign it and a sheaf of like letters without reading them, the recipient of the form letter develops an opinion as to the character of the signer. That opinion is so uncomplimentary that any man of high intelligence would wish to avoid incurring it.

Mr. Robsion was highly intelligent. He was in manner and in speech almost as rural as the late Joe Cannon, who after 30 years in Congress was, perhaps painstakingly, a man from Vermilion County, Ill. The quaintness of Long John Robsion, along with his faculty for humor, made him a most agreeable companion. His formula for political success was based on recognition of the high value of personal contacts, and he was singularly successful.

[From the Owensboro (Ky.) Messenger of February 22, 1948]

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT SAYS MONUMENTS TO REPRESENTATIVE ROBSION NOT NECESSARY—HE HAS THEM

(By Harry Snyder)

WASHINGTON.—The last roll call has been answered by Representative Robsion, Republican, of Kentucky, but it will be a long time before he passes from the memories of his associates on Capitol Hill.

"Did you know him well?" ask his colleagues. "He was a real character."

His friends say they won't have to build any monuments to him. He has them already. They are real, live people.

Here is what they mean:

Back in 1919, after the one-time rough-and-tumble school teacher turned lawyer and was elected to Congress, he decided to help young fellows improve themselves.

So he began the practice of hiring young men to work in his office or elsewhere in the Federal Government. But they had to agree to go to school while they worked.

There was Charlie Parrigin, of Clinton County. The Congressman brought him to the Capital, watched him go through National University, get his law degree. Today he is chief of a division in the Department of Internal Revenue.

Then there was Sam Bass, from the home district. Sam became an accountant. Now he's with the Federal Reserve Board.

After Sam came Walter Ray Smith, of Williamsburg. That was in 1922.

Ray came to the Capital in response to a telegram from the Congressman. "I've got a job for you, Ray," said Robsion; "you start today. But I want you to start to school right away—tonight. I'll be watching you."

Smith did. He studied shorthand and typing, and one day he was directed to take over the Congressman's secretarial duties.

For 26 years he has served in that capacity, picking up a law degree and a master's degree on the side. Now it is his job to wind up his mentor's affairs.

Ben Sharp, of Jamestown, was another young man to whom Robsion lent a helping hand. Ben, too, got a law degree and now is practicing in his home town.

Next came John Cannon, a Washington youth, who responded to an advertisement which offered "office work at poor pay but with an opportunity to get an education." Cannon now is chief attorney of the Chicago district of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

From London came Rufe Bird, who was guided through a business-college course as he worked in the Kentuckian's office. He now is a successful businessman in his home town.

It was then time for the Representative's son, John M., Jr., to take his turn at the office routine. Young John did, getting his law degree at Georgetown University at the same time. He now practices law in Louisville.

Then there was Joe Muncey, of Leslie County, who worked his way through a business college and departed to make his home in Ohio.

Since the war "J. M." had brought on Roy Woolum, of Knox County, an Army veteran, and Harvey Cromer, of Whitney County, a Navy veteran.

Close associates of the Congressman credit him with helping Herbert Hoover gain acceptance by many Republican Members of the House.

"Robsion began inviting Hoover to dinner with his colleagues," it is told. "He had Hoover meet his friends in small groups from time to time. Finally, Hoover made friends with a majority of them, and his nomination followed."

Robsion turned down the Secretary of the Interior post under Hoover.

"I want to do something for you," the former President is quoted as having told Robsion. "How about that boy of yours?"

The Congressman's son was then working in the Pension Bureau.

"I'll make him Chief of the Law Division in the Pension Bureau," said Hoover.

Young Robsion was one of the youngest division chiefs in the Department. He was 24.

A colleague recalls another incident to demonstrate Robsion's independence. He was then a Senator, having been appointed to fill a vacancy.

Hoover had nominated Judge John Parker, of North Carolina, for the Supreme Court. Parker had earned the opposition of organized labor, and Robsion shared the feeling.

He is reported to have gone to the President and urged him to withdraw the appointment. Hoover was adamant. Robsion is reported to have told him:

"Mr. President, I am sorry you are taking this stand. The vote in the Senate will be close. I will vote against confirmation."

Parker was rejected by the Senate by one vote. It was Robsion's.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. WHERRY advanced in the center aisle and Mr. LUCAS said: Mr. President, the committee appointed to inquire of the President of the United States whether he had any further communications to make to the Congress before adjournment has performed its duty, and reports back that the President has no further communication to make.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives subsequent to the final adjournment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that subsequent to the sine die adjournment today the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the enrolled joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 448.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

for voting. Since all but 1 of the 254 ballots, which during the tally were identified as forged, were straight Democratic votes, the ostensible purpose (as stated in the Federal district attorney's petition to the Federal court) was to increase the Democratic vote in the county and to diminish the number of Republican ballots in relation to the total vote.

Soon after forgery and fraud were discovered, County Judge George Batterton and various other officers, civic organizations, and individuals appealed to the Honorable Tom Clark, Attorney General of the United States, to have the FBI assist in the investigation and determination of those guilty of the fraud. Circuit Judge William B. Ardery, of the State court, also specially charged the grand jury to "investigate to the limit of the ability of each of you jurors and to the limit of the resources of all of you." The grand jury investigation was halted when the Federal attorney for the district, Hon. Claude Stephens, obtained an order from the Federal court impounding the evidence in the case. In a report to the circuit court, the grand jury found that, "The evidence proved conclusively that in 11 precincts fraud and forgery had been committed," constituting "a crime against the United States and the Commonwealth of Kentucky." The grand jury advised the court that its investigation had been "temporarily halted by the action of the Federal court," and requested that the court "instruct the next grand jury to pursue the investigation."

The FBI field representatives arrived on the scene while the matter was still before the grand jury. The FBI has not yet completed its work on the case; and it is understood that there will be no release from the Department of Justice on the matter until after the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress.

Our citizens committee, which was formed in response to a mass meeting of citizens held in the county courthouse on November 10, 1948, is composed of the following representative citizens of the county: Hume Payne, Dodge L. Whipple, Cassius M. Clay, Stanley S. Dickson, Thomas M. Mitchell, Frazier R. Insko, and Samuel Clay, Jr.

It includes both Democrats and Republicans. At the mass meeting, it was charged with the responsibility of furthering the investigation and the bringing to justice of the guilty persons, "regardless of person or party."

In a report, copies of which have been placed in the hands of the Attorney General of the United States and of the Federal district attorney, the committee has stated:

"The committee is strongly of the opinion that no one thing will be more conducive to honest elections in the county in the future than the bringing to justice of the individual or individuals responsible for the stuffing of the ballot boxes with fraudulent ballots in the November general election. The unanimity of opinion among right-thinking citizens on this point was evidenced in the mass meeting, in response to which the citizens' committee was formed, and in the action taken by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, Rotary Club, Lions Club, and other civic organizations, as well as by the telegrams sent to the Attorney General of the United States by Judge George Batterton and other individuals, concerning the fraud and urging action by the responsible authorities. It was shown by general public approval of Circuit Judge William B. Ardery's charge to the grand jury. Attention also should be called to the interim report of the grand jury to the court after the evidence had been impounded by order of the Federal court.

"The contemptuous disregard of the Federal and State election laws in the stuffing of the ballot boxes and the forging of the signatures of election officers was crudely conceived and executed. It should not be difficult for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with its experience in much more difficult cases and with the expert facilities at its command, to discover those guilty of the fraud, as so far as we are advised, it may have done already. We urge the Department of Justice to assign to the case one of its special attorneys to assist the Federal district attorney, as was done when similar election frauds were uncovered and prosecuted in Harlan County, Ky., some years ago. We are informed that the Department frequently assigns a special attorney in cases where the public interest is less clear than in the instant case.

"While regrettable from the standpoint of the guilty person or persons in this case that they must be made to suffer the penalty whereas in the past others have violated the law without punishment, failure to bring to trial the person or persons guilty of this gross fraud will be unfair to the many innocent officials of the county and others in the party organizations who have now been brought under suspicion by the act of said person or persons.

"The view that, because persons with political influence in Washington may be able to exert pressure on the Department of Justice, the matter will not be prosecuted with vigor, we reject because it is subversive of our faith in the fundamental soundness of our American institutions of government."

THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
(S. DOC. NO. 210)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent in his State today. He has asked me to request of the Senate unanimous consent for the printing as a Senate document of an important document on the United States Constitution. The material had been prepared primarily for the use of the Senate Judiciary Committee as a vital reference to its work in connection with the Constitution. But it was felt preferable that it be prepared as a Senate document.

The material includes a chronology of important dates in the history of the Constitution and of leading quotations with reference to it.

I am happy to comply with the request of my colleague to ask at this time unanimous consent for its printing as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly today of a former Member of the Congress who died in February of this year. I speak of John Marshall Robsion, who represented the Ninth Congressional District of Kentucky, in which I reside, formerly the Eleventh Congressional District, continuously during the 30 years from 1918 to 1948, with the exception of 1931 and 1932, when he was in voluntary retirement, and the year 1930, when he was a Member of the United States Senate.

Even before his election to Congress he had demonstrated the qualities of leadership which were to mark his service here, and had attained outstanding success as an educator in the public schools and colleges of Kentucky, as a banker, and as one of the great lawyers of our State.

It is unnecessary for me to retell in detail the story of his work and accomplishments as a Member of the Congress. He never stopped working, and as a ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary he had practically completed, at the time of his death, the task of revising and codifying the United States Code, and helping to enact it into positive law.

Others collaborated, but I am sure that all would agree that it was solely the industry and the broad legal knowledge of Mr. Robsion that made possible this monumental achievement.

His career in the Congress was marked by conscientious work in committee, by vigorous debate on the floor, and by a broad interest and knowledge of all fields of legislation.

Perhaps, however, his people will remember him for his work in those fields which touched their daily needs, his labors in behalf of roads and schools, and for his sympathetic interest in those who labor on the farm, in the mines, and in the factories. Himself the son of a wounded Union soldier, and the father of a soldier, his namesake, he was the friend of the soldier. Thousands of veterans and their dependents will attest to his affection for those who had known the heat of battle, their widows and orphans.

The regard in which he was held by his people, and by his colleagues in Congress did not arise from superficial qualities. It arose from his strong and independent mind and from the enduring qualities of his character, his unquestioned integrity, his tolerance and sympathy, and his great humility.

Above all other characteristics, perhaps, which we knew he possessed, was that fierce and patriotic love of country and its institutions which is the proud mark of the people he represented.

In appearance, in action, and in thought, he was a leader, and bore well the title given to him by his people, "The Tall Sycamore of the Mountains."

It has been difficult for me to speak of him because of the respect and affection I held for him, but in this inadequate way I have wanted to remember a firm friend and a great leader.

I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks an editorial by the distinguished editor of the Louisville Times, Mr. Tom Wallace, regarding Mr. Robsion, and an article by Mr. Harry Snyder of the Owensboro (Ky.) Messenger paying tribute to him.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Times of February 21, 1948]

ROBSION'S FRANKNESS UNFAILING—CANDOR IN COMMITTING HIMSELF IN WRITING REFRESHING CONTRAST TO EVASIONS OF MANY

(By Tom Wallace)

One characteristic of the late Representative John Robsion, who knew a great deal about personal politics; about how to earn friendships by performing services for his constituents, be it getting for them garden seed or pensions or something else, was his willingness to commit himself on issues when queried.

His congressional district was not anywhere near Mammoth Cave National Park, and Kentucky's sectionalism is well known. But, when I wrote to him in opposition to the proposed Mining City Dam in Green River which would affect the underground

streams in Mammoth Cave and in other ways injure the park, he promptly replied that he would oppose it.

"I am very much opposed to any action which will lessen the value of our wonderful Mammoth Cave," he said, "not only as a great asset to Kentucky but to the Nation as a whole, and I am sure this is the view of an overwhelming majority of Kentuckians and the people of the Nation."

He was among the earliest Kentuckians in public office who opposed the projected power dam in Cumberland River which would have destroyed Cumberland Falls. The dam was advocated by Flem D. Sampson, a Republican Governor from Mr. Robsion's section.

It falls to the lot of persons interested in legislation affecting natural resources to write occasionally to Members of their State's delegation in Washington, asking them to oppose or to support this or that pending bill.

ARTFUL DODGERS

Anyone who writes to his State's delegation a few times learns what to expect in the way of replies. He soon learns that there are Members of Congress who will never so reply that they are committed to anything, no matter how well they know the effect of proposed legislation; no matter how determined they are to vote for it or against it. Their letters are models of courtesy and calculated evasiveness. They reply promptly and the man who has written to them knows nothing about their intentions beyond knowing that they do not intend being frank.

A poll of members of a State delegation gets candid responses from some of them and the usual dodge-the-issue responses from others. Mr. Robsion was among the candid repliers. I always knew what to expect from him. I did not know what his position would be, but I knew he would say forthrightly what it was.

No matter how one may differ with a lawmaker, the lawmaker earns his respect if he is willing to be frank when it would be wholly unreasonable to believe the measure under discussion one as to which he could be without opinion because of lack of information.

I always attributed Mr. Robsion's straightforward replies to superior intelligence as well as to courage. In my opinion, a politician who thinks it wise, or smart, to be habitually evasive is a good deal less smart than he thinks he is, because anyone who deals with him and learns that he is always bent upon being sleek or slippery loses respect for his character no matter how he bellows and bawls on the stump about his righteousness.

SENSE OF HUMOR

Mr. Robsion had a sense of humor, about others and about himself, and a keen sense of humor is a reflection of keen mentality. The pompous man is the dull and undiscerning man. As a figure in politics he is no novelty.

Not being among those who instinctively dislike, distrust, and disparage a politician because he is of one political party and instinctively think well of a man who belongs to another political party, I was never much moved by the party label under which Mr. Robsion won his honors and kept them to the end of his long life.

I liked him, enjoyed his company when—rarely—we were thrown together. But I especially liked dealing with him as to measures pending in Congress. When a lawmaker writes, in response to a legitimate question, an answer which suggests the possibility that it is a form letter which he does not actually dictate; a letter which his secretary knows how to write and does write, for his signature, knowing that he will sign it and a sheaf of like letters without reading them, the recipient of the form letter develops an opinion as to the character of the signer. That opinion is so uncomplimentary that any man of high intelligence would wish to avoid incurring it.

Mr. Robsion was highly intelligent. He was in manner and in speech almost as rural as the late Joe Cannon, who after 30 years in Congress was, perhaps painstakingly, a man from Vermilion County, Ill. The quaintness of Long John Robsion, along with his faculty for humor, made him a most agreeable companion. His formula for political success was based on recognition of the high value of personal contacts, and he was singularly successful.

[From the Owensboro (Ky.) Messenger of February 22, 1948]

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT SAYS MONUMENTS TO REPRESENTATIVE ROBSION NOT NECESSARY—HE HAS THEM

(By Harry Snyder)

WASHINGTON.—The last roll call has been answered by Representative Robsion, Republican, of Kentucky, but it will be a long time before he passes from the memories of his asspciates on Capitol Hill.

"Did you know him well?" ask his colleagues. "He was a real character."

His friends say they won't have to build any monuments to him. He has them already. They are real, live people.

Here is what they mean:

Back in 1919, after the one-time rough-and-tumble school teacher turned lawyer and was elected to Congress, he decided to help young fellows improve themselves.

So he began the practice of hiring young men to work in his office or elsewhere in the Federal Government. But they had to agree to go to school while they worked.

There was Charlie Parrigin, of Clinton County. The Congressman brought him to the Capital, watched him go through National University, get his law degree. Today he is chief of a division in the Department of Internal Revenue.

Then there was Sam Bass, from the home district. Sam became an accountant. Now he's with the Federal Reserve Board.

After Sam came Walter Ray Smith, of Williamsburg. That was in 1922.

Ray came to the Capital in response to a telegram from the Congressman. "I've got a job for you, Ray," said Robsion; "you start today. But I want you to start to school right away—tonight. I'll be watching you."

Smith did. He studied shorthand and typing, and one day he was directed to take over the Congressman's secretarial duties.

For 26 years he has served in that capacity, picking up a law degree and a master's degree on the side. Now it is his job to wind up his mentor's affairs.

Ben Sharp, of Jamestown, was another young man to whom Robsion lent a helping hand. Ben, too, got a law degree and now is practicing in his home town.

Next came John Cannon, a Washington youth, who responded to an advertisement which offered "office work at poor pay but with an opportunity to get an education." Cannon now is chief attorney of the Chicago district of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

From London came Rufe Bird, who was guided through a business-college course as he worked in the Kentuckian's office. He now is a successful businessman in his home town.

It was then time for the Representative's son, John M., Jr., to take his turn at the office routine. Young John did, getting his law degree at Georgetown University at the same time. He now practices law in Louisville.

Then there was Joe Muncey, of Leslie County, who worked his way through a business college and departed to make his home in Ohio.

Since the war "J. M." had brought on Roy Woolum, of Knox County, an Army veteran, and Harvey Cromer, of Whitney County, a Navy veteran.

Close associates of the Congressman credit him with helping Herbert Hoover gain acceptance by many Republican Members of the House.

"Robsion began inviting Hoover to dinner with his colleagues," it is told. "He had Hoover meet his friends in small groups from time to time. Finally, Hoover made friends with a majority of them, and his nomination followed."

Robsion turned down the Secretary of the Interior post under Hoover.

"I want to do something for you," the former President is quoted as having told Robsion. "How about that boy of yours?"

The Congressman's son was then working in the Pension Bureau.

"I'll make him Chief of the Law Division in the Pension Bureau," said Hoover.

Young Robsion was one of the youngest division chiefs in the Department. He was 24.

A colleague recalls another incident to demonstrate Robsion's independence. He was then a Senator, having been appointed to fill a vacancy.

Hoover had nominated Judge John Parker, of North Carolina, for the Supreme Court. Parker had earned the opposition of organized labor, and Robsion shared the feeling.

He is reported to have gone to the President and urged him to withdraw the appointment. Hoover was adamant. Robsion is reported to have told him:

"Mr. President, I am sorry you are taking this stand. The vote in the Senate will be close. I will vote against confirmation."

Parker was rejected by the Senate by one vote. It was Robsion's.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. WHERRY advanced in the center aisle and Mr. LUCAS said: Mr. President, the committee appointed to inquire of the President of the United States whether he had any further communications to make to the Congress before adjournment has performed its duty, and reports back that the President has no further communication to make.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives subsequent to the final adjournment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that subsequent to the sine die adjournment today the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the enrolled joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 448.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, late a Representative from the State of Texas, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes, and it was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE WEST

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I present a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 281) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE DELANEY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I send to the desk a resolution, and ask that it be read and immediately considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 282) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

TRIBUTES TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, apparently the Senate has about concluded its work for the day, and, incidentally, this day marks the end of the Eightieth Congress. I had been informed that possibly the minority leader would have some remarks to make about some of the members of the Senate who are leaving today to return to active private life. Unfortunately, the minority leader is not with us.

Today when we part with some of our associates in the Senate I should like to say, especially to the new Members of the Senate, that during my 6 years one thing that has impressed me is that, regardless of the party with which one might be affiliated, or whatever its ideology, we develop friendships and fellowships here that mean much to us as the years come and go.

The end of the Eightieth Congress witnesses a turn-over in the United States Senate. and while I am not absolutely positive of the correctness of this statement, I think we will possibly lose more Members from the Senate who have served here for a long period than has happened at the conclusion of any other Congress.

It would be impossible for me to mention the names of all those who leave us today, but I wish to say to each and every one that, as the acting majority leader, whether they are on this side of the aisle or the other, I deeply feel their passing, and extend to them my very sincere wish for every good thing in their new careers in private life.

Now I wish to speak of three of these men who have rendered long periods of service. As I have already intimated, regardless of our party affiliations, we all believe in the two-party system in this country, because it is the foundation upon which our form of government actually rests. But there develops over the years the fellowship and friendship and comradeship to which I have referred.

Naturally we all have affection for the minority leader, the distinguished senior Senato· from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and we all desire to pay him our tribute today, and assure him of our respect, as he takes over in a short time the office of Vice President of the United States, and leaves his post where he has so fully and actively participated in the proceedings of the United States Senate, where we have come to know him so intimately. I do not know how long the Senator from Kentucky has served in the Congress of the United States, both the House of Representatives and the Senate, but I remember that one day a very interesting colloquy took place in which the Senator from Kentucky engaged the Senator from Tennessee in a debate as to who had rendered the longest service in this body and in the House of Representatives. Possibly all Senators now present remember the colloquy which ensued, and one of the statements made, namely, that one had been here longer than the other, and that one was still in short pants when the other one came to the House of Representatives. I am not sure which Senator won that debate, but I am sure that both of them have worn long pants as they have done their work in this great body.

Another Member of the Senate who concludes his term today is the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. One of the most fitting tributes ever accorded a Senator was paid Senator CAPPER by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who honored him with the inspiring observations he made at the conclusion of the special session last August. For me or anyone else to attempt to expand his remarks it seems to me would be an anticlimax to the very impressive and inspiring experience we all enjoyed at that time.

There are just a few facts I should like t. present for the RECORD today about Senator CAPPER, who leaves the Senate after long experience here. He has been a Member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during his entire tenure of office in the Senate. To me, that seems unusual. For the past 2 years he has been the chairman of that committee. During the Coolidge and Hoover administrations he was chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and on that committee he is today the ranking Republican member. He has served on it for 30 years, and so well that in Washington circles he has been regarded as a Senator for the District of Columbia, as well as a Senator from the State of Kansas. He also is ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Before coming to the Senate, in 1919, Senator CAPPER had served 4 years as Governor of his native State of Kansas, from 1915 to 1919.

Four major pieces of legislation bear his name: The Capper-Volstead Act, legal basis for every farmer cooperative in the Nation today; the Capper-Tincher Act, regulating trading in futures on the grain exchanges, since amended by the Capper-Jones Act so as to take in commodity exchanges; and the Capper-Ketcham Act, authorizing permanent appropriations for 4–H Club work. There also was a Capper Act which placed a representative of the Secretary of Agriculture c□ the Federal Reserve Board. The original act reducing interest rates on Federal land-bank mortgages was sponsored by him.

Mr. President, I shall not go further into his record in the Senate. It is well known to all of us. I wish to say, however, that the thing about him which to my mind stands out above everything else is that during all the time I have had the privilege of associating with him and being a friend of his I have never known him to utter nor ever heard of him saying an unkind word respecting any person, or of doing an unkind deed. I think that when such a tribute can truthfully be paid to a man it is really a remarkable tribute, and it is something from which we should all profit.

Another of our colleagues who will leave the Senate today is the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I suppose that during the past 2 years I have been more closely associated with him than any other Member of the Senate. During that time there has been developed between us not only a friendship but a comradeship of which I am justly proud. Having had such a close relationship with the Senator from Maine I am inspired by it to pay a tribute to this public servant who has performed such a masterful job as a Senator, as chairman of the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and as the majority floor leader of the Republican Party.

Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., was born in Lewiston, Maine, August 6, 1877. His first service in Washington was as secretary to his grandfather, Senator William P. Frye.

Elected to the House of Representatives in 1916, he took his seat April 6, 1917, at the special session of Congress called by President Wilson to declare war. He served in the House until 1930 when he was elected to the Senate, in which body he has served ever since.

From 1928 to 1930 he was chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House. He served as

minority leader of the Senate from 1944 to 1946, when he was elected majority leader. During the past 2 years he has also served as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Senator WHITE's service is in the great tradition of our Nation. With the exception of a 6-year period from 1911 to 1917—please bear this in mind, for I think it establishes a record—with the exception of a 6-year period from 1911 to 1917, Senator WHITE and his grandfather, Senator William P. Frye, have served the people of Maine and of America in Congress continuously since 1871, a period of more than three-quarters of a century.

Those of us who have been honored with WALLACE WHITE's friendship, know that among his outstanding characteristics are his integrity, which is above reproach; his loyalty, which is unquestioned; and his faith, which is abiding. He is beloved by each and every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and it is with deep regret that we see such a distinguished American pass from the ranks of Senate membership into private life.

Mr. President, I can think of no more fitting tribute that can be paid the honorable Senator from Maine than that of having him make the final motion to adjourn. This is the last motion he will make as a Senator, as floor leader, and it will conclude the work of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as colleague of the senior Senator from Maine, I ask the indulgence of the Senate to express what I know to be the unanimous sentiment of the Members of this body, the deep regard and affection with which my colleague has come to be held through the period of his rather extraordinary service. I shall not undertake to amplify what the acting majority leader has said regarding his public service except to point out that from that record it will be found the American merchant marine perhaps owes as much to him as to any other single American to the end that the American flag still flies upon the high seas.

On the subject of communications Senator WHITE has been recognized as the authority, for, regardless of party ties, President Roosevelt selected him as the chairman of the American delegation to repeated international communication conferences in spite of the fact that he was a member of the minority at the time. That was a distinct recognition of knowledge, ability, and patriotic devotion.

As a colleague in recent years of the senior Senator from Maine I can only add my deep personal regard and esteem, and to express profound satisfaction that in spite of his decision now to leave the active public service we shall still have available his rich experience and his wise counsel to assist us in the many problems with which America will continue to be faced.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not want this session to end without adding my tribute to the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who are voluntarily retiring, in addition to those who retire as political casualties by reason of what happened in November.

Senator CAPPER has served Kansas longer than any other citizen has served it in its existence. His 30 years in the Senate, following 4 years as governor, is a record which will stand for the next hundred years. No man in Kansas has enjoyed greater respect and admiration and confidence on the part of the people of Kansas than has Senator CAPPER as governor and as Senator.

Mr. President, when I came to the Senate 10 years ago I became a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, and was associated on that committee with the Senator from Maine, WALLACE WHITE. For the last 2 years he has been chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I have been called to serve under his chairmanship.

There are no two men in the Senate who have won to a greater extent the respect and confidence of the Senate than have the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Maine.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would be remiss to the emotions of my being did I not say one word. The Senate of the United States, the Nation, can ill afford to lose the intellectual honesty, the courage, the conviction that WALLACE WHITE brought to the public service, and which has marked his every thought and act through a long and useful career. By instinct and inheritance he has been a Senator in the great tradition. I have known many men in the years that I have been privileged to serve in public capacity, but I have never known one who had more courage and who was farther from ever stooping to do the purely expedient thing. I know of no man for whom I have a more profound affection or more respect than I do for the distinguished Senator from Maine, and I shall miss his presence in this body. His life and character have been a constant source of inspiration to me, and I am blessed to be able to call him friend.

I repeat the words that I uttered once before on this floor, paraphrasing the Bard of Avon:

His life is gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world "This was a man!"

Hail and farewell to a great American citizen. I pray that he may be vouchsafed many years of peace and happiness.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is most unfortunate that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the minority leader of the Senate, is unable, because of a temporary indisposition, to be present today. In view of his long and distinguished service in the United States Senate he is much more capable of paying just tribute to those to whom tribute is due than is the Senator from Illinois.

In my brief service in the United States Senate it has been my privilege to be associated rather closely with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], who by retiring as a United States Senator severs his connection with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which he served so long. During all the time he was chairman of that committee, I want to bear witness to the Senate and the country that he was fair, just, and courteous. At all times he had the welfare of the basic industry of America, which is agriculture, at heart. No more lovable character has served in the Senate during my period of service than the Senator from Kansas.

My experience with the majority leader, Mr. WHITE, has been a most unusual one. He is a man to whom a younger Senator could go for advice and counsel. In him one could place trust and confidence, because when WALLACE WHITE said anything he was speaking from a heart of truth. His long experience in the United States Senate has been of great assistance to me at various times during my short career in this great legislative body. He is a mild-mannered man, courteous, and easy to get along with. Yet from the lips of WALLACE WHITE I have heard some of the most profound statements upon controversial issues that I have heard from any man who has served in this body during my period of service.

Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senators who have spoken so highly of the retiring Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Carl Loeffler. What is true of WALLACE WHITE with respect to courtesy, fairness, and decency, counsel, and advice, is also true of Carl Loeffler. He is a gentleman of the old school, who understands good fellowship, who has intuitive judgment about human beings and problems. He is a great and good citizen who passes out of the political arena today along with other distinguished men. I am glad to rise and pay this brief but sincere tribute to honorable and good men.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it has been said that peace has its victories no less renowned than those of war, and that the forum has its gallant leaders as well as do the more famous battlefields. In the past few moments in this chamber encomiums have been paid to such distinguished leaders.

It was my great privilege to serve for many years on the Commerce Committee with the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and for the past 2 years on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. In those committee relationships, as well as in the Senate and in the happiest personal associations, I came to treasure their friendships and to admire and revere their ability, their sterling characters, and their innate capacities.

There are many whose going saddens all of us. As has been so well said by the acting majority leader [Mr. WHERRY] our personal relations have always clung more tenaciously in our memories than have the differences we may have had upon matters of public policy. I know of nobody in which personal relationships reach deeper into sentiment and into the wells of tender affection than in the Senate of the United States.

When these gentlemen go forth from these walls, may they have the satisfaction of knowing that, in the opinion of their colleagues, to as great an extent as any men who live they have reached the Biblical standard, so that one is able to say that they have constantly grown in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and man. May the blessings

The message further communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, late a Representative from the State of Texas, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes, and it was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE WEST

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I present a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 281) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE DELANEY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in behalf of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I send to the desk a resolution, and ask that it be read and immediately considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 282) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

TRIBUTES TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, apparently the Senate has about concluded its work for the day, and, incidentally, this day marks the end of the Eightieth Congress. I had been informed that possibly the minority leader would have some remarks to make about some of the members of the Senate who are leaving today to return to active private life. Unfortunately, the minority leader is not with us.

Today when we part with some of our associates in the Senate I should like to say, especially to the new Members of the Senate, that during my 6 years one thing that has impressed me is that, regardless of the party with which one might be affiliated, or whatever its ideology, we develop friendships and fellowships here that mean much to us as the years come and go.

The end of the Eightieth Congress witnesses a turn-over in the United States Senate. and while I am not absolutely positive of the correctness of this statement, I think we will possibly lose more Members from the Senate who have served here for a long period than has happened at the conclusion of any other Congress.

It would be impossible for me to mention the names of all those who leave us today, but I wish to say to each and every one that, as the acting majority leader, whether they are on this side of the aisle or the other, I deeply feel their passing, and extend to them my very sincere wish for every good thing in their new careers in private life.

Now I wish to speak of three of these men who have rendered long periods of service. As I have already intimated, regardless of our party affiliations, we all believe in the two-party system in this country, because it is the foundation upon which our form of government actually rests. But there develops over the years the fellowship and friendship and comradeship to which I have referred.

Naturally we all have affection for the minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and we all desire to pay him our tribute today, and assure him of our respect, as he takes over in a short time the office of Vice President of the United States, and leaves his post where he has so fully and actively participated in the proceedings of the United States Senate, where we have come to know him so intimately. I do not know how long the Senator from Kentucky has served in the Congress of the United States, both the House of Representatives and the Senate, but I remember that one day a very interesting colloquy took place in which the Senator from Kentucky engaged the Senator from Tennessee in a debate as to who had rendered the longest service in this body and in the House of Representatives. Possibly all Senators now present remember the colloquy which ensued, and one of the statements made, namely, that one had been here longer than the other, and that one was still in short pants when the other one came to the House of Representatives. I am not sure which Senator won that debate, but I am sure that both of them have worn long pants as they have done their work in this great body.

Another Member of the Senate who concludes his term today is the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. One of the most fitting tributes ever accorded a Senator was paid Senator CAPPER by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who honored him with the inspiring observations he made at the conclusion of the special session last August. For me or anyone else to attempt to expand his remarks it seems to me would be an anticlimax to the very impressive and inspiring experience we all enjoyed at that time.

There are just a few facts I should like to present for the RECORD today about Senator CAPPER, who leaves the Senate after long experience here. He has been a Member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during his entire tenure of office in the Senate. To me, that seems unusual. For the past 2 years he has been the chairman of that committee. During the Coolidge and Hoover administrations he was chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and on that committee he is today the ranking Republican member. He has served on it for 30 years, and so well that in Washington circles he has been regarded as a Senator for the District of Columbia, as well as a Senator from the State of Kansas. He also is ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Before coming to the Senate, in 1919, Senator CAPPER had served 4 years as Governor of his native State of Kansas, from 1915 to 1919.

Four major pieces of legislation bear his name: The Capper-Volstead Act, legal basis for every farmer cooperative in the Nation today; the Capper-Tincher Act, regulating trading in futures on the grain exchanges, since amended by the Capper-Jones Act so as to take in commodity exchanges; and the Capper-Ketcham Act, authorizing permanent appropriations for 4-H Club work. There also was a Capper Act which placed a representative of the Secretary of Agriculture on the Federal Reserve Board. The original act reducing interest rates on Federal land-bank mortgages was sponsored by him.

Mr. President, I shall not go further into his record in the Senate. It is well known to all of us. I wish to say, however, that the thing about him which to my mind stands out above everything else is that during all the time I have had the privilege of associating with him and being a friend of his I have never known him to utter nor ever heard of him saying an unkind word respecting any person, or of doing an unkind deed. I think that when such a tribute can truthfully be paid to a man it is really a remarkable tribute, and it is something from which we should all profit.

Another of our colleagues who will leave the Senate today is the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I suppose that during the past 2 years I have been more closely associated with him than any other Member of the Senate. During that time there has been developed between us not only a friendship but a comradeship of which I am justly proud. Having had such a close relationship with the Senator from Maine I am inspired by it to pay a tribute to this public servant who has performed such a masterful job as a Senator, as chairman of the important Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and as the majority floor leader of the Republican Party.

Senator WALLACE H. WHITE, JR., was born in Lewiston, Maine, August 6, 1877. His first service in Washington was as secretary to his grandfather, Senator William P. Frye.

Elected to the House of Representatives in 1916, he took his seat April 6, 1917, at the special session of Congress called by President Wilson to declare war. He served in the House until 1930 when he was elected to the Senate, in which body he has served ever since.

From 1928 to 1930 he was chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House. He served as

minority leader of the Senate from 1944 to 1946, when he was elected majority leader. During the past 2 years he has also served as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Senator WHITE'S service is in the great tradition of our Nation. With the exception of a 6-year period from 1911 to 1917—please bear this in mind, for I think it establishes a record—with the exception of a 6-year period from 1911 to 1917, Senator WHITE and his grandfather, Senator William P. Frye, have served the people of Maine and of America in Congress continuously since 1871, a period of more than three-quarters of a century.

Those of us who have been honored with WALLACE WHITE'S friendship, know that among his outstanding characteristics are his integrity, which is above reproach; his loyalty, which is unquestioned; and his faith, which is abiding. He is beloved by each and every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and it is with deep regret that we see such a distinguished American pass from the ranks of Senate membership into private life.

Mr. President, I can think of no more fitting tribute that can be paid the honorable Senator from Maine than that of having him make the final motion to adjourn. This is the last motion he will make as a Senator, as floor leader, and it will conclude the work of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as colleague of the senior Senator from Maine, I ask the indulgence of the Senate to express what I know to be the unanimous sentiment of the Members of this body, the deep regard and affection with which my colleague has come to be held through the period of his rather extraordinary service. I shall not undertake to amplify what the acting majority leader has said regarding his public service except to point out that from that record it will be found the American merchant marine perhaps owes as much to him as to any other single American to the end that the American flag still flies upon the high seas.

On the subject of communications Senator WHITE has been recognized as the authority, for, regardless of party ties, President Roosevelt selected him as the chairman of the American delegation to repeated international communication conferences in spite of the fact that he was a member of the minority at the time. That was a distinct recognition of knowledge, ability, and patriotic devotion.

As a colleague in recent years of the senior Senator from Maine I can only add my deep personal regard and esteem, and to express profound satisfaction that in spite of his decision now to leave the active public service we shall still have available his rich experience and his wise counsel to assist us in the many problems with which America will continue to be faced.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not want this session to end without adding my tribute to the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who are voluntarily retiring, in addition to those who retire as political casualties by reason of what happened in November.

Senator CAPPER has served Kansas longer than any other citizen has served it in its existence. His 30 years in the Senate, following 4 years as governor, is a record which will stand for the next hundred years. No man in Kansas has enjoyed greater respect and admiration and confidence on the part of the people of Kansas than has Senator CAPPER as governor and as Senator.

Mr. President, when I came to the Senate 10 years ago I became a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, and was associated on that committee with the Senator from Maine, WALLACE WHITE. For the last 2 years he has been chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I have been called to serve under his chairmanship.

There are no two men in the Senate who have won to a greater extent the respect and confidence of the Senate than have the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Maine.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would be remiss to the emotions of my being did I not say one word. The Senate of the United States, the Nation, can ill afford to lose the intellectual honesty, the courage, the conviction that WALLACE WHITE brought to the public service, and which has marked his every thought and act through a long and useful career. By instinct and inheritance he has been a Senator in the great tradition. I have known many men in the years that I have been privileged to serve in public capacity, but I have never known one who had more courage and who was farther from ever stooping to do the purely expedient thing. I know of no man for whom I have a more profound affection or more respect than I do for the distinguished Senator from Maine, and I shall miss his presence in this body. His life and character have been a constant source of inspiration to me, and I am blessed to be able to call him friend.

I repeat the words that I uttered once before on this floor, paraphrasing the Bard of Avon:

His life is gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world "This was a man!"

Hail and farewell to a great American citizen. I pray that he may be vouchsafed many years of peace and happiness.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is most unfortunate that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the minority leader of the Senate, is unable, because of a temporary indisposition, to be present today. In view of his long and distinguished service in the United States Senate he is much more capable of paying just tribute to those to whom tribute is due than is the Senator from Illinois.

In my brief service in the United States Senate it has been my privilege to be associated rather closely with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], who by retiring as a United States Senator severs his connection with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which he served so long. During all the time he was chairman of that committee, I want to bear witness to the Senate and the country that he was fair, just, and courteous. At all times he had the welfare of the basic industry of America, which is agriculture, at heart. No more lovable character has served in the Senate during my period of service than the Senator from Kansas.

My experience with the majority leader, Mr. WHITE, has been a most unusual one. He is a man to whom a younger Senator could go for advice and counsel. In him one could place trust and confidence, because when WALLACE WHITE said anything he was speaking from a heart of truth. His long experience in the United States Senate has been of great assistance to me at various times during my short career in this great legislative body. He is a mild-mannered man, courteous, and easy to get along with. Yet from the lips of WALLACE WHITE I have heard some of the most profound statements upon controversial issues that I have heard from any man who has served in this body during my period of service.

Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senators who have spoken so highly of the retiring Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Carl Loeffler. What is true of WALLACE WHITE with respect to courtesy, fairness, and decency, counsel, and advice, is also true of Carl Loeffler. He is a gentleman of the old school, who understands good fellowship, who has intuitive judgment about human beings and problems. He is a great and good citizen who passes out of the political arena today along with other distinguished men. I am glad to rise and pay this brief but sincere tribute to honorable and good men.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, it has been said that peace has its victories no less renowned than those of war, and that the forum has its gallant leaders as well as do the more famous battlefields. In the past few moments in this chamber encomiums have been paid to such distinguished leaders.

It was my great privilege to serve for many years on the Commerce Committee with the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and for the past 2 years on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with the able Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. In those committee relationships, as well as in the Senate and in the happiest personal associations, I came to treasure their friendships and to admire and revere their ability, their sterling characters, and their innate capacities.

There are many whose going saddens all of us. As has been so well said by the acting majority leader [Mr. WHERRY] our personal relations have always clung more tenaciously in our memories than have the differences we may have had upon matters of public policy. I know of nobody in which personal relationships reach deeper into sentiment and into the wells of tender affection than in the Senate of the United States.

When these gentlemen go forth from these walls, may they have the satisfaction of knowing that, in the opinion of their colleagues, to as great an extent as any men who live they have reached the Biblical standard, so that one is able to say that they have constantly grown in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and man. May the blessings

of Providence, like the affection of their colleagues, follow them through many very happy and useful years.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now yield to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] with the request that he formally make the motion to adjourn.

RESPONSE OF SENATOR WHITE—ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I cannot resist saying a brief word in appreciation of all the kindly expressions which have come to me during this day from Members on both sides of the Chamber, as well as the many kindnesses which have been shown me throughout my long service in this body. I am deeply grateful, but I am robbed of the words adequately to express how I feel. I am eternally grateful.

Now, Mr. President, it is my understanding that the business appropriate to today has been concluded. Because of that fact, in pursuance of action taken concurrently by House and Senate, I now move that the Senate adjourn sine die, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator and Representatives.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1948

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 222, the House met and was called to order at 12 o'clock noon by the Speaker, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Father of mankind, we would be still and know that Thou art God, holy and blessed forevermore. In the afterglow of this holy season, O let the Star of Bethlehem radiate until it lightens the darkened corners of the earth, bringing peace to men of good will.

As we stand at the threshold of a new year, lay Thy hand upon the homes of our land; O pour the blended spirit of city, village, and country into the chalice of our national life that it may ever bear the fruitage of unselfish devotion to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. We ask in the name of Jesus our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, August 7, 1948, was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT MADE AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 18, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of August 7, 1948, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did, on August 14, 1948, appoint as a member of the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] to fill the existing vacancy thereon caused by the resignation of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 223, Eightieth Congress, he did, on August 7, 1948, sign a joint resolution of the Senate, as follows:

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures.

And on August 8, 1948, a joint resolution of the House as follows:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on August 9, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION AFTER ADJOURNMENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States received by the Clerk of the House reported that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 10, 1948:

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

On August 13, 1948:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report on fuel investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

HON. PAUL C. JONES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the secretary of state of the State of Missouri, I have received, as of November 26, the certificate of election of the Honorable PAUL C. JONES as Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Tenth Congressional District of that State, to fill the unexpired term of the Honorable Orville Zimmerman, now deceased.

This special election was held on November 2, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

HON. CLARENCE G. BURTON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the secretary of the State Board of Elections of the Commonwealth of Virginia, I have received, as of December 8, the certificate of election of the Honorable CLARENCE G. BURTON as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of that Commonwealth, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond.

This special election was held on November 2, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the secretary of state of the State of Texas, I have received, as of December 30, the certificate of election of the Honorable LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR., as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Fifteenth Congressional District of that State, to fill the vacancy for the unexpired term of the Honorable Milton H. West, deceased.

This special election was held on December 4, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. BURTON, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. PAUL C. JONES appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 30, 1948.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I take this means of informing you that I have transmitted to the Governor of South Dakota my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the First District of South Dakota with the stipulation that this resignation become effective as of 12:01 a. m. of December 31, 1948.

With best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
Member of Congress.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO MAKE REPORT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of July 7, 1947, entitled "An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," is amended as follows:

(1) Section 10 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Report: Not later than 70 days after the Eighty-first Congress is convened and organized, the Commission shall make a re-

port of its findings and recommendations to the Congress."

(2) Section 3 is amended, as of December 31, 1948, by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(d) Continuation of membership upon change of status: Despite the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a Member of Congress or in the status of a person in the executive branch of the Government, who thereafter ceases to have such status, shall nevertheless continue as a member of the Commission, and from and after his change of status shall, if he has returned to private life (except for his membership on the Commission), receive the same compensation as a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a person from private life."

The resolution was engrossed, read the third time, and passed.

CERTAIN STUDIES OF CAPITOL POWER PLANT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 719) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the House Office Building Commission, is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with competent engineers to conduct an investigation and study of the steam distribution systems and the refrigeration supply and distribution systems of the Capitol power plant, with particular view to future load increases, at a cost not to exceed $8,000, which shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such Commission, signed by the chairman of such Commission, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROVISION FOR SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 224) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 31, 1948, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 718) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 718, the Chair appoints as the House members of the committee to notify the President of the United States the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS OR JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I transmit herewith the third report to Congress on the United States foreign-aid program made pursuant to Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress. This report was received in the office of the Clerk from the President of the United States on November 8, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THIRD QUARTERLY REPORT OF EXPENDITURES AND ACTIVITIES UNDER THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the third quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-aid program authorized by Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress, approved December 17, 1947.

This report covers the period from April 1 through June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 8, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The attached sealed envelope indicating on its face that it contains a message from the President of the United States, and addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, was received in the office of the Clerk on December 6, 1948.

Respectfully,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the fifth quarterly report (covering the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949) on United States military assistance to Greece and Turkey. Military aid to Greece and Turkey was inaugurated under the authority of Public Law 75, Eightieth Congress, and was continued under the authority of title III of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, known as the Greek-Turkish Assistance Act of 1948. Responsibility for United States assistance in the economic rehabilitation of Greece begun under Public Law 75 was, pursuant to Public Law 472, title I, transferred effective July 1, 1948, to the Economic Cooperation Administration, and results are reported to the Congress under that title.

The encouraging prospect for substantial elimination of the Greek guerrilla forces which existed at the time of the victory of the Greek National Army in the Grammos Mountains and which was referred to in the report for the period ending June 30, 1948, has unfortunately not materialized. A military stalemate has ensued which has prolonged the struggle. The United States is, of course, through the American Mission for Aid to Greece, continuing to deliver to the Greeks necessary military supplies and equipment and to advise and assist the Greek armed forces, in accordance with the Assistance Act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The accompanying fourth report to Congress on assistance to Greece and Turkey

of Providence, like the affection of their colleagues, follow them through many very happy and useful years.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now yield to the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] with the request that he formally make the motion to adjourn.

RESPONSE OF SENATOR WHITE—ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I cannot resist saying a brief word in appreciation of all the kindly expressions which have come to me during this day from Members on both sides of the Chamber, as well as the many kindnesses which have been shown me throughout my long service in this body. I am deeply grateful, but I am robbed of the words adequately to express how I feel. I am eternally grateful.

Now, Mr. President, it is my understanding that the business appropriate to today has been concluded. Because of that fact, in pursuance of action taken concurrently by House and Senate, I now move that the Senate adjourn sine die, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator and Representatives.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1948

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 222, the House met and was called to order at 12 o'clock noon by the Speaker, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Father of mankind, we would be still and know that Thou art God, holy and blessed forevermore. In the afterglow of this holy season, O let the Star of Bethlehem radiate until it lightens the darkened corners of the earth, bringing peace to men of good will.

As we stand at the threshold of a new year, lay Thy hand upon the homes of our land; O pour the blended spirit of city, village, and country into the chalice of our national life that it may ever bear the fruitage of unselfish devotion to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. We ask in the name of Jesus our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, August 7, 1948, was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT MADE AFTER ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 18, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of August 7, 1948, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did, on August 14, 1948, appoint as a member of the Select Committee to Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] to fill the existing vacancy thereon caused by the resignation of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 223, Eightieth Congress, he did, on August 7, 1948, sign a joint resolution of the Senate, as follows:

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to aid in protecting the Nation's economy against inflationary pressures.

And on August 8, 1948, a joint resolution of the House as follows:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on August 9, 1948, present to the President, for his approval, joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION AFTER ADJOURNMENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States received by the Clerk of the House reported that on the following dates the President approved and signed a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 10, 1948:

H. R. 6959. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

On August 13, 1948:

H. J. Res. 445. Joint resolution making appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report on fuel investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

HON. PAUL C. JONES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the secretary of state of the State of Missouri, I have received, as of November 26, the certificate of election of the Honorable PAUL C. JONES as Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Tenth Congressional District of that State, to fill the unexpired term of the Honorable Orville Zimmerman, now deceased.

This special election was held on November 2, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

HON. CLARENCE G. BURTON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the secretary of the State Board of Elections of the Commonwealth of Virginia, I have received, as of December 8, the certificate of election of the Honorable CLARENCE G. BURTON as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Sixth Congressional District of that Commonwealth, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond.

This special election was held on November 2, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the secretary of state of the State of Texas, I have received, as of December 30, the certificate of election of the Honorable LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR., as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Fifteenth Congressional District of that State, to fill the vacancy for the unexpired term of the Honorable Milton H. West, deceased.

This special election was held on December 4, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. BURTON, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. PAUL C. JONES appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 30, 1948.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I take this means of informing you that I have transmitted to the Governor of South Dakota my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the First District of South Dakota with the stipulation that this resignation become effective as of 12:01 a. m. of December 31, 1948.

With best wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
Member of Congress.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO MAKE REPORT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following joint resolution (H. J. Res. 448) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act of July 7, 1947, entitled "An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," is amended as follows:

(1) Section 10 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Report: Not later than 70 days after the Eighty-first Congress is convened and organized, the Commission shall make a re-

port of its findings and recommendations to the Congress."

(2) Section 3 is amended, as of December 31, 1948, by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(d) Continuation of membership upon change of status: Despite the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a Member of Congress or in the status of a person in the executive branch of the Government, who thereafter ceases to have such status, shall nevertheless continue as a member of the Commission, and from and after his change of status shall, if he has returned to private life (except for his membership on the Commission), receive the same compensation as a person appointed to the Commission in the status of a person from private life."

The resolution was engrossed, read the third time, and passed.

CERTAIN STUDIES OF CAPITOL POWER PLANT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 719) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the House Office Building Commission, is authorized and directed to enter into a contract with competent engineers to conduct an investigation and study of the steam distribution systems and the refrigeration supply and distribution systems of the Capitol power plant, with particular view to future load increases, at a cost not to exceed $8,000, which shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such Commission, signed by the chairman of such Commission, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROVISION FOR SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 224) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Friday, December 31, 1948, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 718) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 718, the Chair appoints as the House members of the committee to notify the President of the United States the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS OR JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I transmit herewith the third report to Congress on the United States foreign-aid program made pursuant to Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress. This report was received in the office of the Clerk from the President of the United States on November 8, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THIRD QUARTERLY REPORT OF EXPENDITURES AND ACTIVITIES UNDER THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the third quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-aid program authorized by Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress, approved December 17, 1947.

This report covers the period from April 1 through June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 8, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The attached sealed envelope indicating on its face that it contains a message from the President of the United States, and addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, was received in the office of the Clerk on December 6, 1948.

Respectfully,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the fifth quarterly report (covering the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949) on United States military assistance to Greece and Turkey. Military aid to Greece and Turkey was inaugurated under the authority of Public Law 75, Eightieth Congress, and was continued under the authority of title III of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, known as the Greek-Turkish Assistance Act of 1948. Responsibility for United States assistance in the economic rehabilitation of Greece begun under Public Law 75 was, pursuant to Public Law 472, title I, transferred effective July 1, 1948, to the Economic Cooperation Administration, and results are reported to the Congress under that title.

The encouraging prospect for substantial elimination of the Greek guerrilla forces which existed at the time of the victory of the Greek National Army in the Grammos Mountains and which was referred to in the report for the period ending June 30, 1948, has unfortunately not materialized. A military stalemate has ensued which has prolonged the struggle. The United States is, of course, through the American Mission for Aid to Greece, continuing to deliver to the Greeks necessary military supplies and equipment and to advise and assist the Greek armed forces, in accordance with the Assistance Act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The accompanying fourth report to Congress on assistance to Greece and Turkey

was received from the President of the United States in the office of the Clerk on October 5, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 75 (80th Cong., 1st sess., 61 Stat. 103) is the fourth quarterly report of expenditures and activities in conjunction with the program for aid to Greece and Turkey.

This legislation was enacted at a critical juncture in the history of the struggle for peace, involving the right of small nations to self-determination of their future. The conspicuous success of this program in enabling the people of Greece to meet the military and economic crisis which confronted them, and in supporting the Turkish determination to remain independent in the face of external pressure, has contributed significantly toward stabilizing this strategic area of the world in the interest of world peace.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: On September 15, 1948, the Clerk received the accompanying twenty-sixth report to Congress on lend-lease operations from the President of the United States.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the twenty-sixth report of operations under the Lend-Lease Act.

The attached report on lend-lease fiscal operations was prepared by the Treasury Department and submitted to the Secretary of State in accordance with Executive Order No. 9726. The period covered is from March 11, 1941, through September 30, 1947.

Activities to complete fulfillment of the various pipe-line agreements have continued since the issuance of the twenty-fifth report.

A final settlement agreement was signed with Norway on February 24, 1948. In March, Haiti paid the balance due on its account. An arrangement was concluded with Brazil on April 15, 1948, fixing the terms of payment of the amount due under the original master agreement with Brazil.

As stated in chapter 4 of the twenty-third lend-lease report, one of the important remaining lend-lease functions is the collection of payments due under various international agreements. Some of these agreements involve matters other than lend-lease, such as surplus property and claims. Recent payments arising out of agreements covering lend-lease, and in some cases other matters as well, are shown in the following list:

Brazil: $5,000,000 principal paid on July 15, 1948; installment on its remaining lend-lease obligations.

France: $13,000,000 interest paid in francs on July 1, 1948, under settlement agreement dated May 28, 1946.

Iran: $711,753.40 paid on April 29 and $711,753.40 on July 15, 1948, principal under settlement agreement dated December 21, 1945.

Netherlands: $960,000 interest paid in dollars on June 30, 1948, under settlement agreement dated May 28, 1947.

United Kingdom: $76,617.50 paid on March 31, $262,112.50 on April 30, $403,250 on May 28, and $403,250 on June 15, 1948 (paid in pounds), principal under settlement agreement dated December 6, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 15, 1948.*

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth quarterly reports of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution received in the Clerk's office from the President of the United States on August 13, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the thirteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from July 1, 1947, through September 30, 1947.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of UNRRA's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited primarily to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of September 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the fourteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from October 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of December 31, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the fifteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1948.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of March 31, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The accompanying third quarterly report to Congress on the United States' foreign-relief program was received in the office of the Clerk from the President of the United States on September 1, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THIRD QUARTERLY REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELIEF PROGRAM — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the third quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-relief program authorized by Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 31, 1947, to provide "relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war." This report covers the quarter ending March 31, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 1, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The attached sealed envelope indicating on its face that it contains a message from the President of the United States, and addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, was received in the office of the Clerk on November 4, 1948.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

FOURTH REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELIEF PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the fourth quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-relief program, authorized by Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 31, 1947.

This report covers the period from April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 4, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the President of the United States the Clerk received on October 4, 1948, the accompanying first report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration made pursuant to Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

FIRST REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the first report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

This report is for the period April 3 to June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The attached sealed envelope indicating on its face that it contains a message from the President of the United States, and addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, was received in the office of the Clerk on October 21, 1948.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE FIRST REPORT TO CONGRESS OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the supplement to the first report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 21, 1948.*

CONGRESSIONAL INAUGURATION COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

NOVEMBER 29, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Congressional Inauguration Committee, such resignation to take effect as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

L. C. ARENDS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of August 7, 1948, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did on November 29, 1948, appoint as a member of the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that in view of the long-standing custom of the House of Representatives there will be no speeches made today except in eulogy of our deceased members.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three articles.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report of the Subcommittee on Questionable Trade Practices, although it may exceed the allowance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio talk made by him.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of nearly nine happy and informative years for me in the House of Representatives—for today the Eightieth Congress ends. This means that it is my last day in the House, for as you know, I am relinquishing my seat in the House to move over to the Senate.

I shall miss my friends in the House, friends who have generously given of their time and talents to "teach me the ropes" in Congress to make a better legislator of me. I shall never forget my friends in the House who have taught me patience, forbearance, parliamentary procedure, clean progressive politics—who have given me constructive lessons in statesmanship. Without these friends I would never have been able to equip

was received from the President of the United States in the office of the Clerk on October 5, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 75 (80th Cong., 1st sess., 61 Stat. 103) is the fourth quarterly report of expenditures and activities in conjunction with the program for aid to Greece and Turkey.

This legislation was enacted at a critical juncture in the history of the struggle for peace, involving the right of small nations to self-determination of their future. The conspicuous success of this program in enabling the people of Greece to meet the military and economic crisis which confronted them, and in supporting the Turkish determination to remain independent in the face of external pressure, has contributed significantly toward stabilizing this strategic area of the world in the interest of world peace.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: On September 15, 1948, the Clerk received the accompanying twenty-sixth report to Congress on lend-lease operations from the President of the United States.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the twenty-sixth report of operations under the Lend-Lease Act.

The attached report on lend-lease fiscal operations was prepared by the Treasury Department and submitted to the Secretary of State in accordance with Executive Order No. 9726. The period covered is from March 11, 1941, through September 30, 1947.

Activities to complete fulfillment of the various pipe-line agreements have continued since the issuance of the twenty-fifth report.

A final settlement agreement was signed with Norway on February 24, 1948. In March, Haiti paid the balance due on its account. An arrangement was concluded with Brazil on April 15, 1948, fixing the terms of payment of the amount due under the original master agreement with Brazil.

As stated in chapter 4 of the twenty-third lend-lease report, one of the important remaining lend-lease functions is the collection of payments due under various international agreements. Some of these agreements involve matters other than lend-lease, such as surplus property and claims. Recent payments arising out of agreements covering lend-lease, and in some cases other matters as well, are shown in the following list:

Brazil: $5,000,000 principal paid on July 15, 1948; installment on its remaining lend-lease obligations.

France: $13,000,000 interest paid in francs on July 1, 1948, under settlement agreement dated May 28, 1946.

Iran: $711,753.40 paid on April 29 and $711,753.40 on July 15, 1948, principal under settlement agreement dated December 21, 1945.

Netherlands: $960,000 interest paid in dollars on June 30, 1948, under settlement agreement dated May 28, 1947.

United Kingdom: $76,617.50 paid on March 31, $262,112.50 on April 30, $403,250 on May 28, and $403,250 on June 15, 1948 (paid in pounds), principal under settlement agreement dated December 6, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 15, 1948.*

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth quarterly reports of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution received in the Clerk's office from the President of the United States on August 13, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the thirteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from July 1, 1947, through September 30, 1947.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of UNRRA's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited primarily to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of September 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the fourteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from October 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of December 31, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the fifteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration joint resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1948.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of March 31, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The accompanying third quarterly report to Congress on the United States' foreign-relief program was received in the office of the Clerk from the President of the United States on September 1, 1948.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

THIRD QUARTERLY REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELIEF PROGRAM — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the third quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-relief program authorized by Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 31, 1947, to provide "relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war." This report covers the quarter ending March 31, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 1, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The attached sealed envelope indicating on its face that it contains a message from the President of the United States, and addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, was received in the office of the Clerk on November 4, 1948.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

FOURTH REPORT TO CONGRESS ON THE UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELIEF PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the fourth quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-relief program, authorized by Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 31, 1947.

This report covers the period from April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 4, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the President of the United States the Clerk received on October 4, 1948, the accompanying first report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration made pursuant to Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

FIRST REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the first report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

This report is for the period April 3 to June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1948.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The attached sealed envelope indicating on its face that it contains a message from the President of the United States, and addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, was received in the office of the Clerk on October 21, 1948.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE FIRST REPORT TO CONGRESS OF THE ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the supplement to the first report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 21, 1948.*

CONGRESSIONAL INAUGURATION COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

NOVEMBER 29, 1948.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Congressional Inauguration Committee, such resignation to take effect as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

L. C. ARENDS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, Eightieth Congress, and the order of the House of August 7, 1948, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, he did on November 29, 1948, appoint as a member of the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that in view of the long-standing custom of the House of Representatives there will be no speeches made today except in eulogy of our deceased members.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three articles.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report of the Subcommittee on Questionable Trade Practices, although it may exceed the allowance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio talk made by him.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of nearly nine happy and informative years for me in the House of Representatives—for today the Eightieth Congress ends. This means that it is my last day in the House, for as you know, I am relinquishing my seat in the House to move over to the Senate.

I shall miss my friends in the House, friends who have generously given of their time and talents to "teach me the ropes" in Congress to make a better legislator of me. I shall never forget my friends in the House who have taught me patience, forbearance, parliamentary procedure, clean progressive politics—who have given me constructive lessons in statesmanship. Without these friends I would never have been able to equip

myself with the necessary qualifications for the United States Senate in the degree as approved by the people of Maine in granting me that office on September 13. Yes, much of my good fortune will be directly attributable to my friends in the House.

I shall be homesick for the House. One of the good things about being elected to the Senate is that I will be in Washington with my good friends in Congress—to be able to walk over from the other side of the Capitol and to return to the floor of the House and renew and continue friendships which have meant and mean so much to me. I say to the membership of the House, and to its truly great leader, the Speaker, thank you from the bottom of my heart.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three statements by Paul O. Peters of the Select Committee on Small Business.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Champaign News-Gazette about the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by George J. Burger, a member of the board of directors of the National Federation of Small Business, made before the Committee on Monopolistic Practices of the Small Business Committee on November 17, 1948.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Public Printer that the estimated cost of printing is $177.50. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copy of a bill which he introduced today.

Mr. HOBBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities together with some documents released to the press.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: First, in connection with the death of George F. Rogers; and, secondly, in connection with the death of Edgar A. Sharp, and also to include an editorial.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert a speech made by Gen. Omar N. Bradley.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. I believe it to be the unanimous sentiment of this House that we go on record to express our hearty appreciation of the excellent service rendered by the retiring Speaker, the Honorable JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

Although he was reelected as a Member of Congress by the flattering majority of 33,000, his party—Nation-wide—did not do as well. And so, due to circumstances beyond the claims of his own meritorious record, JOE MARTIN is stepping down from the Speakership to his old and able role as minority floor leader.

Even we, of the Democratic Party, regret this transition, for there is no more democratic Member of this body—and I use the word in its nonpartisan meaning—than the genial and fair-minded Representative from the Fourteenth Massachusetts District.

His own party is indebted to him for his steadfast devotion to those principles which he believes in. Under his Speakership, we of the opposition have learned to respect him highly. In an office whose power and responsibility is second only to that of the Presidency, he has worked hard, honestly, and well.

It is such character that nourishes our national unity in spite of partisan divisions, and to this, we of the opposite party wish to pay tribute.

We tender to you our thanks for your distinguished and invaluable leadership. But, what is more, we want you to know that we think you are a swell guy.

This comes from your legion of friends on both sides of the aisle who hope that you will be with the Congress for many, many years to come.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include therewith excerpts.

Mr. LYLE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Mr. Dale Miller.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] to kindly take the chair.

Mr. MCCORMACK assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I come to perform a pleasurable duty in one sense, and one that is not so, in another. I come to speak of the man who will in all probability on next Monday vacate the Speaker's chair.

Before I offer a resolution of thanks to him for his uniform kindness and fairness, I desire to say that as minority leader when I was Speaker, and as Speaker when I was minority leader, our relationships personally, and in the conduct of the business of the House, have been uniformly pleasant. He has worked with me as I have sought to work with him.

I say this without fear of contradiction, that he will go down in the history of the House of Representatives as one of the fairest, one of the ablest men who ever graced the chair of Speaker. I look forward in the days to come to a continuation of that fine association, because I will need his counsel, I will need his help, and I will need and desire the benefit of his great parliamentary skill.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I offer a highly privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 720) offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over the deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair during the present term of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the vote on the resolution may be had by a rising vote of the House.

The question was taken; and on a rising vote the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to express his sincere thanks to the distinguished gentleman from Texas for his generous and laudatory remarks and also the splendid comradeship to every Member of the House. It has been a pleasure for me to have served 2 years as your Speaker. I have endeavored to the best of my ability to be fair to all. At all times I have been conscious of the great prestige the House enjoys among the people of this country, a prestige that makes the heart of every Member of this body swell with pride. This great House of Representatives is a symbol, a symbol of democracy; it is a symbol of a people's government. I have tried to maintain that high tradition. Let me say any success I may have enjoyed would not have been possible without the generous support of the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the always fair and uniform cooperation of the distinguished minority leader,

the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Each of us have our own opinions, sometimes they are in conflict; but I have always been proud to say that few people ever came to the Congress who were not trying each in his own way to build a better and finer country. I have been proud of membership in this Congress not only in these last two critical years, but in the 24 years I have served in this body.

Next Monday, in another role, I hope to have a greater opportunity to express my personal tribute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], when I present him to the House as your Speaker. I know we will all be in safe hands when he is Speaker. I thank the Members of the House for their generous resolution which I shall always cherish.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes.

THE LATE FRANK W. COLLIER

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 721).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Frank W. Collier, Postmaster of the House of Representatives from the Sixty-sixth Congress to the Seventy-second Congress, and for the Eightieth Congress.

Resolved, That the Clerk transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

FLORENCE M. COLLIER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 722) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Florence M. Collier, widow of Frank W. Collier, late Postmaster of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 1 year's salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Frank W. Collier.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE MILTON H. WEST

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, since last we convened here the State of Texas, the Congress, and the Nation have sustained a great loss in the passing of our former colleague from Texas, a Member of the Eightieth Congress, Hon. MILTON WEST, who passed away in the city of Washington on the 28th day of October 1948.

This year I have served as chairman of the Texas congressional delegation, and on behalf of the members of the delegation I speak at this time. We, of course, were shocked and grieved over the passing of our colleague. He was our friend.

Earlier in the year when Mr. WEST announced that he would not seek reelection to Congress I had occasion in the House of Representatives to speak of this stalwart friend and his distinguished service in the Congress.

He came to the House of Representatives during the Seventy-third Congress when the Honorable John Nance Garner from southwest Texas was made Vice President. At the time this seat became vacated MILTON WEST took over and served here for many years with great distinction.

MILTON WEST was much beloved by his colleagues from Texas and he was much beloved by the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. He performed a great service to his own district and State, to the Congress, and the Nation. We all mourn his passing and we extend our sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve with MILTON WEST in the Texas Legislature nearly 20 years ago. We knew him there as here, as a man who would speak his mind without hesitation and without reservation. We knew him as one on whom we could rely and one whose word was always good. We came to have a real affection for MILTON WEST as did the Members of this House.

MILTON WEST has served his State and his Nation over a long period of time with credit to himself and with great benefit to his own community. His passing was a great loss to the Nation, and although he had voluntarily retired from the Congress and was not a candidate for reelection, his passing will be felt in Texas and throughout the United States. All of us will find ourselves the poorer by losing this great friend of ours.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, this is our first meeting since the untimely death of our late lamented friend and former colleague, the Honorable MILTON WEST, of Brownsville, Tex. I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to him. He served his district, the State of Texas, and the Nation here in the Congress for many years with rare distinction. He was a rugged individualist of whom we have too few. He commanded the respect of all who knew him. There was never any doubt of his position on any issue. He always fought for what he thought to be right with honesty, courage, and ability. Our country is a better place because of his life and service, and suffered a great loss in his passing.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to pay my tribute to MILTON WEST. He was one of the finest men I have ever associated with in all my life. He was a man who had his own individual ideas and at heart he was one of the finest characters I have ever known. Always sincere in the things he wanted to do, he did those things which he believed would be in the best interest of his country.

The people of Texas have lost a great representative, the people of the United States have lost a man who was always interested in doing those things that would make our country a better place in which to live. Personally, I have lost one of the finest friends I have ever had.

Mr. Speaker, MILTON WEST's name will go down in history as one of the greatest Congressmen. He was a friend at all times, a man for whom we had great respect and confidence. His loss is mourned by all.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for giving me this opportunity to say a word of tribute to our late colleague and my very dear friend, MILTON WEST. While I had the honor to be chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. WEST served for a number of years as a member of that committee. Up to the time his health failed he was always attentive and diligent in his work, and his outstanding ability was equaled only by his courage. He always acted in a way that he conceived to be his duty, not only for the best interest of his own district, but in advancement of the welfare of the entire country. He enjoyed the respect and confidence and, I might say, the love of each member of our committee.

MILTON WEST succeeded a great man in this House. He represented the district formerly represented by the great John Nance Garner, who was for many years, as we all know, one of the most able and outstanding Members of this House. Mr. Garner served two terms as Vice President of the United States.

MILTON WEST succeeded a great man; he represented a great district; and he discharged his duties in a most commendable manner. I am proud and glad to have the privilege of saying a word of tribute to the splendid work he did in this Congress.

In closing I express my deepest and most profound sympathy for each member of his family in their great sorrow and bereavement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this Nation lost a wise legislator, an able, fearless, public servant in the passing of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, of Texas. Those who have served with Representative WEST know that he was firm in his convictions and moreover that he had the courage to stand by them at all times and under all circumstances. Here was the type of Representative who never deviated from what he considered the fundamental principles of sound government.

Although a quiet man, when he did express himself either in committee or on the floor of the House his words carried weight with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

During the Seventy-third Congress to the Eightieth Congress, inclusive, the service of Representative WEST in the

myself with the necessary qualifications for the United States Senate in the degree as approved by the people of Maine in granting me that office on September 13. Yes, much of my good fortune will be directly attributable to my friends in the House.

I shall be homesick for the House. One of the good things about being elected to the Senate is that I will be in Washington with my good friends in Congress—to be able to walk over from the other side of the Capitol and to return to the floor of the House and renew and continue friendships which have meant and mean so much to me. I say to the membership of the House, and to its truly great leader, the Speaker, thank you from the bottom of my heart.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three statements by Paul O. Peters of the Select Committee on Small Business.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Champaign News-Gazette about the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by George J. Burger, a member of the board of directors of the National Federation of Small Business, made before the Committee on Monopolistic Practices of the Small Business Committee on November 17, 1948.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Public Printer that the estimated cost of printing is $177.50. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copy of a bill which he introduced today.

Mr. HOBBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities together with some documents released to the press.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: First, in connection with the death of George F. Rogers; and, secondly, in connection with the death of Edgar A. Sharp, and also to include an editorial.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert a speech made by Gen. Omar N. Bradley.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. I believe it to be the unanimous sentiment of this House that we go on record to express our hearty appreciation of the excellent service rendered by the retiring Speaker, the Honorable JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

Although he was reelected as a Member of Congress by the flattering majority of 33,000, his party—Nation-wide—did not do as well. And so, due to circumstances beyond the claims of his own meritorious record, JOE MARTIN is stepping down from the Speakership to his old and able role as minority floor leader.

Even we, of the Democratic Party, regret this transition, for there is no more democratic Member of this body—and I use the word in its nonpartisan meaning—than the genial and fair-minded Representative from the Fourteenth Massachusetts District.

His own party is indebted to him for his steadfast devotion to those principles which he believes in. Under his Speakership, we of the opposition have learned to respect him highly. In an office whose power and responsibility is second only to that of the Presidency, he has worked hard, honestly, and well.

It is such character that nourishes our national unity in spite of partisan divisions, and to this, we of the opposite party wish to pay tribute.

We tender to you our thanks for your distinguished and invaluable leadership. But, what is more, we want you to know that we think you are a swell guy.

This comes from your legion of friends on both sides of the aisle who hope that you will be with the Congress for many, many years to come.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include therewith excerpts.

Mr. LYLE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Mr. Dale Miller.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] to kindly take the chair.

Mr. MCCORMACK assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I come to perform a pleasurable duty in one sense, and one that is not so, in another. I come to speak of the man who will in all probability on next Monday vacate the Speaker's chair.

Before I offer a resolution of thanks to him for his uniform kindness and fairness, I desire to say that as minority leader when I was Speaker, and as Speaker when I was minority leader, our relationships personally, and in the conduct of the business of the House, have been uniformly pleasant. He has worked with me as I have sought to work with him.

I say this without fear of contradiction, that he will go down in the history of the House of Representatives as one of the fairest, one of the ablest men who ever graced the chair of Speaker. I look forward in the days to come to a continuation of that fine association, because I will need his counsel, I will need his help, and I will need and desire the benefit of his great parliamentary skill.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I offer a highly privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 720) offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over the deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair during the present term of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the vote on the resolution may be had by a rising vote of the House.

The question was taken; and on a rising vote the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to express his sincere thanks to the distinguished gentleman from Texas for his generous and laudatory remarks and also the splendid comradeship to every Member of the House. It has been a pleasure for me to have served 2 years as your Speaker. I have endeavored to the best of my ability to be fair to all. At all times I have been conscious of the great prestige the House enjoys among the people of this country, a prestige that makes the heart of every Member of this body swell with pride. This great House of Representatives is a symbol, a symbol of democracy; it is a symbol of a people's government. I have tried to maintain that high tradition. Let me say any success I may have enjoyed would not have been possible without the generous support of the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the always fair and uniform cooperation of the distinguished minority leader,

the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Each of us have our own opinions, sometimes they are in conflict; but I have always been proud to say that few people ever came to the Congress who were not trying each in his own way to build a better and finer country. I have been proud of membership in this Congress not only in these last two critical years, but in the 24 years I have served in this body.

Next Monday, in another role, I hope to have a greater opportunity to express my personal tribute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], when I present him to the House as your Speaker. I know we will all be in safe hands when he is Speaker. I thank the Members of the House for their generous resolution which I shall always cherish.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes.

THE LATE FRANK W. COLLIER

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 721).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. Frank W. Collier, Postmaster of the House of Representatives from the Sixty-sixth Congress to the Seventy-second Congress, and for the Eightieth Congress.

Resolved, That the Clerk transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

FLORENCE M. COLLIER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 722) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Florence M. Collier, widow of Frank W. Collier, late Postmaster of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 1 year's salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said Frank W. Collier.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE MILTON H. WEST

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, since last we convened here the State of Texas, the Congress, and the Nation have sustained a great loss in the passing of our former colleague from Texas, a Member of the Eightieth Congress, Hon. MILTON WEST, who passed away in the city of Washington on the 28th day of October 1948.

This year I have served as chairman of the Texas congressional delegation, and on behalf of the members of the delegation I speak at this time. We, of course, were shocked and grieved over the passing of our colleague. He was our friend.

Earlier in the year when Mr. WEST announced that he would not seek reelection to Congress I had occasion in the House of Representatives to speak of this stalwart friend and his distinguished service in the Congress.

He came to the House of Representatives during the Seventy-third Congress when the Honorable John Nance Garner from southwest Texas was made Vice President. At the time this seat became vacated MILTON WEST took over and served here for many years with great distinction.

MILTON WEST was much beloved by his colleagues from Texas and he was much beloved by the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. He performed a great service to his own district and State, to the Congress, and the Nation. We all mourn his passing and we extend our sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve with MILTON WEST in the Texas Legislature nearly 20 years ago. We knew him there as here, as a man who would speak his mind without hesitation and without reservation. We knew him as one on whom we could rely and one whose word was always good. We came to have a real affection for MILTON WEST as did the Members of this House.

MILTON WEST has served his State and his Nation over a long period of time with credit to himself and with great benefit to his own community. His passing was a great loss to the Nation, and although he had voluntarily retired from the Congress and was not a candidate for reelection, his passing will be felt in Texas and throughout the United States. All of us will find ourselves the poorer by losing this great friend of ours.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, this is our first meeting since the untimely death of our late lamented friend and former colleague, the Honorable MILTON WEST, of Brownsville, Tex. I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to him. He served his district, the State of Texas, and the Nation here in the Congress for many years with rare distinction. He was a rugged individualist of whom we have too few. He commanded the respect of all who knew him. There was never any doubt of his position on any issue. He always fought for what he thought to be right with honesty, courage, and ability. Our country is a better place because of his life and service, and suffered a great loss in his passing.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to pay my tribute to MILTON WEST. He was one of the finest men I have ever associated with in all my life. He was a man who had his own individual ideas and at heart he was one of the finest characters I have ever known. Always sincere in the things he wanted to do, he did those things which he believed would be in the best interest of his country.

The people of Texas have lost a great representative, the people of the United States have lost a man who was always interested in doing those things that would make our country a better place in which to live. Personally, I have lost one of the finest friends I have ever had.

Mr. Speaker, MILTON WEST's name will go down in history as one of the greatest Congressmen. He was a friend at all times, a man for whom we had great respect and confidence. His loss is mourned by all.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for giving me this opportunity to say a word of tribute to our late colleague and my very dear friend, MILTON WEST. While I had the honor to be chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. WEST served for a number of years as a member of that committee. Up to the time his health failed he was always attentive and diligent in his work, and his outstanding ability was equaled only by his courage. He always acted in a way that he conceived to be his duty, not only for the best interest of his own district, but in advancement of the welfare of the entire country. He enjoyed the respect and confidence and, I might say, the love of each member of our committee.

MILTON WEST succeeded a great man in this House. He represented the district formerly represented by the great John Nance Garner, who was for many years, as we all know, one of the most able and outstanding Members of this House. Mr. Garner served two terms as Vice President of the United States.

MILTON WEST succeeded a great man; he represented a great district; and he discharged his duties in a most commendable manner. I am proud and glad to have the privilege of saying a word of tribute to the splendid work he did in this Congress.

In closing I express my deepest and most profound sympathy for each member of his family in their great sorrow and bereavement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this Nation lost a wise legislator, an able, fearless, public servant in the passing of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, of Texas. Those who have served with Representative WEST know that he was firm in his convictions and moreover that he had the courage to stand by them at all times and under all circumstances. Here was the type of Representative who never deviated from what he considered the fundamental principles of sound government.

Although a quiet man, when he did express himself either in committee or on the floor of the House his words carried weight with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

During the Seventy-third Congress to the Eightieth Congress, inclusive, the service of Representative WEST in the

House of Representatives was of the highest order in the field of statesmanship. I knew him well. I not only had a profound respect for him but a deep affection as well. We were personal friends to the very last.

I consider that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has lost one of its ablest and most valuable members in the passing of our distinguished colleague from Texas.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. West and to the relatives and friends of Representative WEST.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to add my word of tribute to this distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST]. He was a a man of noble impulse; a man of the highest character; a rugged man of the soil. It was a pleasure to serve with him on the Ways and Means Committee when we were considering matters of great importance, which we did frequently on that important committee; it was a test of one's intelligence, and more important yet, it was a test of one's courage and fortitude. With the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] it apparently was easy for him to make his decision and it was easy for us to know his position and to know that when he once took a position he could be depended upon. I shall miss MILTON WEST, for I had great confidence in him and great respect for his opinion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it was with very deep regret that I heard of the unfortunate passing of our distinguished colleague, MILTON WEST, of Texas. It was my privilege to serve with him throughout his service here and to be rather closely associated with him as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He was a man who possessed the highest attributes of character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood; a man of recognized ability and demonstrative devotion to public service.

I am sure we all extend our deepest sympathies to the members of his bereaved family.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay a modest tribute to my good friend, MILTON WEST, who has been to me a paragon of rugged honesty and helpful in all the things that are good and decent. May God rest his soul.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, strong, stalwart, statesmanlike, fearless, without ever asking any quarter from anybody anywhere, MILTON WEST, from the State of Texas, which is not a State but an empire, stood on the floor of this House and voiced his opinion and spoke his convictions often at times against his own colleagues.

There is not much remuneration that we get from being in this body except the camaraderie and the good friendship, but always until my dying day shall I cherish the memory of MILTON WEST.

He was no softie or cream puff. He was not a sissy. No one ever accused him of being such. He was a Texas Ranger. He had red blood in his veins, he had clear thinking in his mind, and he had brotherly love in his heart.

I loved MILTON WEST more than I ever dared tell him. CLARENCE LEA, you who have served for a third of a century in this House, knew him well. We are sorry to see you leave, but having lived and associated with him all these years, I know that you like myself will cherish his blessed memory.

Words are weak and impotent, they are so hollow, and we cannot really give expression to the feeling that is deep down in our hearts, but you who lived with him and knew him much better than most any of us know that we can say "Here is a man." God bless him and his loved ones through all the years to come.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it was with real sorrow and regret that I learned of the death of our colleague and member of our committee, Hon. MILTON WEST, of Texas.

During my terms of service in the House of Representatives, and more particularly since I became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I learned to know him and to admire him for his outstanding ability, for his courage, and his loyalty. I know that we are all sorry to hear of his death.

I extend to his family and relatives my sincerest condolences.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, during my entire service on the Committee on Ways and Means I enjoyed very much the friendship and comradeship of MILTON WEST. He served on that committee with distinction to himself, to his district, and to the Congress of the United States and to the United States as a nation.

It was with great regret and sorrow that I learned of his death. I knew that he had been ill for several months. I join with the other Members who have expressed their sorrow at his passing.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, an honor for me to speak of my distinguished and honored predecessor, MILTON H. WEST.

God in his wisdom has seen fit to take from our midst one of the House of Representatives' most courageous and capable men. I knew MILTON WEST and members of his family intimately, although I did not have the privilege, as you men had, of serving with him. But I did have the honor of being one of his constituents.

He was of the pioneer stock that took Texas as a frontier country and made it the progressive State it is today. His life story is almost a legendary one of service to the people of this Nation as a Texas Ranger, district attorney, State legislator, and United States Representative.

The things that MILTON stood for were pronounced by his every deed and his every action. He was known throughout his district as a man of courage and ability, a man who voted his convictions in serving both his district and his country.

Now that MILTON WEST has gone west, we of his district want the Members of the House to know that the thoughts and love of the people of his district go with him. He was a sincere, honest, and generous citizen of our State—a man we like to think of as a real Texan.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the words of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], or at least some of them, in describing the man, MILTON WEST, were accurate and deeply touching. Always when I thought of MILTON WEST, I thought of two things. I thought of the Rock of Ages and I thought of the giant oak. He was sturdy; he was strong. He was a Texas Ranger in the days when it was dangerous to be an officer of the law in some sections of the far West. He was a sheriff. He was a lawyer. He was a prosecuting attorney. He was a Congressman. He was true to the ancient faith every day of his good life.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in Texas, MILTON WEST needs no eulogy, for it is written in the hearts and minds of the people who knew and admired him. He typified the spirit of the West, of those who believed in good, old-fashioned Americanism. He had but little patience with those who want something for nothing, who sneer at the fundamentals of our democratic institutions.

MILTON WEST was reared in southwest Texas, along the silvery waters of the Rio Grande, where he developed a code of honor and justice which followed him throughout his useful life. In Congress he devoted himself to the welfare of his own constituents with a frequency unequaled. Among men of honor he commanded the highest respect, and with his logic and soundness of judgment he wielded a tremendous influence.

Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our friend, the State of Texas and his district have lost an eminent representative and an outstanding citizen, the Nation has lost an exponent of those principles of sound government which must be preserved if our democracy is to survive, and I have lost a treasured friend.

By the memory of MILTON WEST, let us resolve to cultivate, preserve, and emulate those fine qualities which characterized his career; let us determine to meet the call of duty with that firmness of character and devotion to principle which typified his life.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House who desire to do so may have unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point in regard to the passing of our late beloved colleague, MILTON WEST.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our beloved colleague, MILTON WEST, the membership of the House and the people of his great dis-

trict have lost an able and patriotic public servant. No man has ever served in the House who was more highly regarded by his colleagues than he. His common honesty, good level head and straightforward manner in dealing with men and problems endeared him to all of us. We will miss his wise counsel and his personal friendship.

I enjoin with you in expressing to his lovely family our deep and sincere sympathy. We share with them their great sorrow and irreparable loss.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 723) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN J. DELANEY

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, since the House recessed at the special session, we in New York have lost a very distinguished Member of our congressional delegation in the death of the Honorable JOHN J. DELANEY.

Mr. DELANEY represented his district in Brooklyn in this House for many years. He first came to Washington in the Sixty-fifth Congress, and later in the Seventy-second Congress, and remained here until his death, shortly after he had been elected to the Eighty-first Congress which will shortly convene.

JOHN DELANEY was one of the most beloved citizens of Brooklyn. For years he had been active in the fraternal and civic affairs of his native borough and had served the city of New York as one of its deputy commissioners in one of its very important departments.

He came here as a young man and devoted himself to the service of his country and to the legislation in this House. He was made a member of the Rules Committee of the House, where he served with distinction for many years.

I am sure we are all regretful of his passing, which came shortly after he had been reelected. Although during the last campaign he had been unable to go out and speak for himself, because of his illness, nevertheless his friends were legion, and they returned him to this House.

To his wife and son and daughter I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member who may desire to do so may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of our late colleague and dear friend, JOHN DELANEY, is a personal loss to me, and a great loss to the House of Representatives. During our years of service, while I have become very close to many Members, and I think enjoy the friendship of most Members with whom I have served, there is none who occupied a closer or more friendly relationship than the late beloved JOHN DELANEY. He had a long and honorable service, not only in this body but in other public offices in the great State of New York.

JOHN DELANEY was not only a lovable personality, but a man of understanding nature; a man with whom anyone could live, without regard to differences of opinion or race or color or creed, because he was possessed of that one spirit, which I think is more important to enable people to live together than anything else—the spirit of understanding, of respect of one for the other, with an understanding state of mind.

JOHN DELANEY was a man of intense faith, a man of equally intense loyalties; and when in the journey of life you and I find a person of intense faith and intense loyalty we find one of God's noblemen.

My career in this body has been a rather interesting and checkered one. I served for 10 years on the Committee on Ways and Means and for 6½ years as majority leader. In the last 2 years I was a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That was the first time in my 20 years' service in this body with JOHN DELANEY that he and I were on the same committee. He was a tireless worker, not one who spoke excessively, but one who wielded a powerful influence in this body and in its committees, because of the respect we all had for him, and the last 2 years in committee work with JOHN DELANEY were most pleasant to me.

The House has lost one of its most humble Members, a man of great simplicity, but one of its most influential Members because of the persuasion he wielded in his quiet way, because of the noble things of which he was symbolic, and because of our response to his great endowments.

To his widow I extend my deepest sympathy, and I know that all of my colleagues join me in expressing to her their deepest sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when JOHN DELANEY was a member of the Rules Committee I leaned on him with confidence for many years. He was able, conscientious, loyal, patriotic, well schooled in the principles of sound government and their application. He endeavored at all times to beneficially serve not only his great State and district but all the people of the United States. He was in no sense or degree provincial. He showed extraordinary interest in the cause of labor and legislation in the interest of the masses. Frequently, he was the only man on whom I could consistently rely to help me in my endeavors in the Rules Committee to effect the mandates of the people and our party program. He could always be found on the side of the common people and trying to reflect in legislation the wishes of those who elected him.

I knew this lovable dead for many years. I saw him grow in stature as a statesman from the time he served first as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. He patiently and assiduously served an adequate novitiate before he became an influential member of the great Committee on Rules. I admired his unflinching courage to stand, after thorough and thoughtful consideration, for what he believed was right and for the best interest of the whole country.

I know his splendid family, consisting of wife, daughter, and son, to whom he has left an enviable record as good citizen, wise legislator, and humanitarian. May they in this sore and dark hour be comforted by the Giver of all good. His passing has left a void that will be hard to fill, because few men have the opportunity that was his, and which he embraced with enthusiasm, to acquire so much useful and practical information to help make this a better world for men and women of good will.

Although a lawyer by profession, our friend concentrated all efforts on his congressional duties. He was seldom absent when a roll call came on important measures and never unnecessarily absent. Indeed he represented his district with honor and distinction many years; and he has left a real imprint upon the major activities of National Government in the difficult era in which he served with perfect fidelity and selflessness.

His services will be gratefully remembered by many who are his beneficiaries; and I hope members of his family will extract from this useful life a sustaining love and remembrance that may soften this severe blow that must at this time seem irreparable. The gratitude of myriads will live long in connection with our deceased colleague. His earthly work is finished; but his influence for good is imperishable.

In thinking of our departed friend let us remember our obligation to make safe and secure the government of the people which has been committed to our keeping. Let us remember that it can thrive and grow only in a spirit of popular attachment and unselfish devotion; and, above all, let us remember the lessons and admonitions that flow from the useful life which we today memorialize.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, when I listen to these eulogies year after year, I like to think in what respect a certain individual was particularly outstanding. I knew JACK DELANEY well, although he came from a great metropolitan district and I come from a rural district, and although he was a Democrat and I a Republican we were very warm friends.

We lived at the same hotel and I knew him well. His character was above reproach. But he was distinctive in that he was preeminent in his unfailing courtesy. He was always a gentleman. He was warm and cordial and always courteous. I shall miss him and I extend to his widow my most profound sympathy.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

House of Representatives was of the highest order in the field of statesmanship. I knew him well. I not only had a profound respect for him but a deep affection as well. We were personal friends to the very last.

I consider that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has lost one of its ablest and most valuable members in the passing of our distinguished colleague from Texas.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. West and to the relatives and friends of Representative WEST.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to add my word of tribute to this distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST]. He was a a man of noble impulse; a man of the highest character; a rugged man of the soil. It was a pleasure to serve with him on the Ways and Means Committee when we were considering matters of great importance, which we did frequently on that important committee; it was a test of one's intelligence, and more important yet, it was a test of one's courage and fortitude. With the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST] it apparently was easy for him to make his decision and it was easy for us to know his position and to know that when he once took a position he could be depended upon. I shall miss MILTON WEST, for I had great confidence in him and great respect for his opinion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it was with very deep regret that I heard of the unfortunate passing of our distinguished colleague, MILTON WEST, of Texas. It was my privilege to serve with him throughout his service here and to be rather closely associated with him as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He was a man who possessed the highest attributes of character and all of the sterling qualities of manhood; a man of recognized ability and demonstrative devotion to public service.

I am sure we all extend our deepest sympathies to the members of his bereaved family.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay a modest tribute to my good friend, MILTON WEST, who has been to me a paragon of rugged honesty and helpful in all the things that are good and decent. May God rest his soul.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, strong, stalwart, statesmanlike, fearless, without ever asking any quarter from anybody anywhere, MILTON WEST, from the State of Texas, which is not a State but an empire, stood on the floor of this House and voiced his opinion and spoke his convictions often at times against his own colleagues.

There is not much remuneration that we get from being in this body except the camaraderie and the good friendship, but always until my dying day shall I cherish the memory of MILTON WEST.

He was no softie or cream puff. He was not a sissy. No one ever accused him of being such. He was a Texas Ranger. He had red blood in his veins, he had clear thinking in his mind, and he had brotherly love in his heart.

I loved MILTON WEST more than I ever dared tell him. CLARENCE LEA, you who have served for a third of a century in this House, knew him well. We are sorry to see you leave, but having lived and associated with him all these years, I know that you like myself will cherish his blessed memory.

Words are weak and impotent, they are so hollow, and we cannot really give expression to the feeling that is deep down in our hearts, but you who lived with him and knew him much better than most any of us know that we can say "Here is a man." God bless him and his loved ones through all the years to come.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it was with real sorrow and regret that I learned of the death of our colleague and member of our committee, Hon. MILTON WEST, of Texas.

During my terms of service in the House of Representatives, and more particularly since I became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I learned to know him and to admire him for his outstanding ability, for his courage, and his loyalty. I know that we are all sorry to hear of his death.

I extend to his family and relatives my sincerest condolences.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, during my entire service on the Committee on Ways and Means I enjoyed very much the friendship and comradeship of MILTON WEST. He served on that committee with distinction to himself, to his district, and to the Congress of the United States and to the United States as a nation.

It was with great regret and sorrow that I learned of his death. I knew that he had been ill for several months. I join with the other Members who have expressed their sorrow at his passing.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, an honor for me to speak of my distinguished and honored predecessor, MILTON H. WEST.

God in his wisdom has seen fit to take from our midst one of the House of Representatives' most courageous and capable men. I knew MILTON WEST and members of his family intimately, although I did not have the privilege, as you men had, of serving with him. But I did have the honor of being one of his constituents.

He was of the pioneer stock that took Texas as a frontier country and made it the progressive State it is today. His life story is almost a legendary one of service to the people of this Nation as a Texas Ranger, district attorney, State legislator, and United States Representative.

The things that MILTON stood for were pronounced by his every deed and his every action. He was known throughout his district as a man of courage and ability, a man who voted his convictions in serving both his district and his country.

Now that MILTON WEST has gone west, we of his district want the Members of the House to know that the thoughts and love of the people of his district go with him. He was a sincere, honest, and generous citizen of our State—a man we like to think of as a real Texan.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the words of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], or at least some of them, in describing the man, MILTON WEST, were accurate and deeply touching. Always when I thought of MILTON WEST, I thought of two things. I thought of the Rock of Ages and I thought of the giant oak. He was sturdy; he was strong. He was a Texas Ranger in the days when it was dangerous to be an officer of the law in some sections of the far West. He was a sheriff. He was a lawyer. He was a prosecuting attorney. He was a Congressman. He was true to the ancient faith every day of his good life.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in Texas, MILTON WEST needs no eulogy, for it is written in the hearts and minds of the people who knew and admired him. He typified the spirit of the West, of those who believed in good, old-fashioned Americanism. He had but little patience with those who want something for nothing, who sneer at the fundamentals of our democratic institutions.

MILTON WEST was reared in southwest Texas, along the silvery waters of the Rio Grande, where he developed a code of honor and justice which followed him throughout his useful life. In Congress he devoted himself to the welfare of his own constituents with a frequency unequaled. Among men of honor he commanded the highest respect, and with his logic and soundness of judgment he wielded a tremendous influence.

Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our friend, the State of Texas and his district have lost an eminent representative and an outstanding citizen, the Nation has lost an exponent of those principles of sound government which must be preserved if our democracy is to survive, and I have lost a treasured friend.

By the memory of MILTON WEST, let us resolve to cultivate, preserve, and emulate those fine qualities which characterized his career; let us determine to meet the call of duty with that firmness of character and devotion to principle which typified his life.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House who desire to do so may have unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point in regard to the passing of our late beloved colleague, MILTON WEST.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our beloved colleague, MILTON WEST, the membership of the House and the people of his great dis-

trict have lost an able and patriotic public servant. No man has ever served in the House who was more highly regarded by his colleagues than he. His common honesty, good level head and straightforward manner in dealing with men and problems endeared him to all of us. We will miss his wise counsel and his personal friendship.

I enjoin with you in expressing to his lovely family our deep and sincere sympathy. We share with them their great sorrow and irreparable loss.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 723) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN J. DELANEY

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, since the House recessed at the special session, we in New York have lost a very distinguished Member of our congressional delegation in the death of the Honorable JOHN J. DELANEY.

Mr. DELANEY represented his district in Brooklyn in this House for many years. He first came to Washington in the Sixty-fifth Congress, and later in the Seventy-second Congress, and remained here until his death, shortly after he had been elected to the Eighty-first Congress which will shortly convene.

JOHN DELANEY was one of the most beloved citizens of Brooklyn. For years he had been active in the fraternal and civic affairs of his native borough and had served the city of New York as one of its deputy commissioners in one of its very important departments.

He came here as a young man and devoted himself to the service of his country and to the legislation in this House. He was made a member of the Rules Committee of the House, where he served with distinction for many years.

I am sure we are all regretful of his passing, which came shortly after he had been reelected. Although during the last campaign he had been unable to go out and speak for himself, because of his illness, nevertheless his friends were legion, and they returned him to this House.

To his wife and son and daughter I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member who may desire to do so may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of our late colleague and dear friend, JOHN DELANEY, is a personal loss to me, and a great loss to the House of Representatives. During our years of service, while I have become very close to many Members, and I think enjoy the friendship of most Members with whom I have served, there is none who occupied a closer or more friendly relationship than the late beloved JOHN DELANEY. He had a long and honorable service, not only in this body but in other public offices in the great State of New York.

JOHN DELANEY was not only a lovable personality, but a man of understanding nature; a man with whom anyone could live, without regard to differences of opinion or race or color or creed, because he was possessed of that one spirit, which I think is more important to enable people to live together than anything else—the spirit of understanding, of respect of one for the other, with an understanding state of mind.

JOHN DELANEY was a man of intense faith, a man of equally intense loyalties; and when in the journey of life you and I find a person of intense faith and intense loyalty we find one of God's noblemen.

My career in this body has been a rather interesting and checkered one. I served for 10 years on the Committee on Ways and Means and for 6½ years as majority leader. In the last 2 years I was a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That was the first time in my 20 years' service in this body with JOHN DELANEY that he and I were on the same committee. He was a tireless worker, not one who spoke excessively, but one who wielded a powerful influence in this body and in its committees, because of the respect we all had for him, and the last 2 years in committee work with JOHN DELANEY were most pleasant to me.

The House has lost one of its most humble Members, a man of great simplicity, but one of its most influential Members because of the persuasion he wielded in his quiet way, because of the noble things of which he was symbolic, and because of our response to his great endowments.

To his widow I extend my deepest sympathy, and I know that all of my colleagues join me in expressing to her their deepest sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when JOHN DELANEY was a member of the Rules Committee I leaned on him with confidence for many years. He was able, conscientious, loyal, patriotic, well schooled in the principles of sound government and their application. He endeavored at all times to beneficially serve not only his great State and district but all the people of the United States. He was in no sense or degree provincial. He showed extraordinary interest in the cause of labor and legislation in the interest of the masses. Frequently, he was the only man on whom I could consistently rely to help me in my endeavors in the Rules Committee to effect the mandates of the people and our party program. He could always be found on the side of the common people and trying to reflect in legislation the wishes of those who elected him.

I knew this lovable dead for many years. I saw him grow in stature as a statesman from the time he served first as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. He patiently and assiduously served an adequate novitiate before he became an influential member of the great Committee on Rules. I admired his unflinching courage to stand, after thorough and thoughtful consideration, for what he believed was right and for the best interest of the whole country.

I know his splendid family, consisting of wife, daughter, and son, to whom he has left an enviable record as good citizen, wise legislator, and humanitarian. May they in this sore and dark hour be comforted by the Giver of all good. His passing has left a void that will be hard to fill, because few men have the opportunity that was his, and which he embraced with enthusiasm, to acquire so much useful and practical information to help make this a better world for men and women of good will.

Although a lawyer by profession, our friend concentrated all efforts on his congressional duties. He was seldom absent when a roll call came on important measures and never unnecessarily absent. Indeed he represented his district with honor and distinction many years; and he has left a real imprint upon the major activities of National Government in the difficult era in which he served with perfect fidelity and selflessness.

His services will be gratefully remembered by many who are his beneficiaries; and I hope members of his family will extract from this useful life a sustaining love and remembrance that may soften this severe blow that must at this time seem irreparable. The gratitude of myriads will live long in connection with our deceased colleague. His earthly work is finished; but his influence for good is imperishable.

In thinking of our departed friend let us remember our obligation to make safe and secure the government of the people which has been committed to our keeping. Let us remember that it can thrive and grow only in a spirit of popular attachment and unselfish devotion; and, above all, let us remember the lessons and admonitions that flow from the useful life which we today memorialize.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, when I listen to these eulogies year after year, I like to think in what respect a certain individual was particularly outstanding. I knew JACK DELANEY well, although he came from a great metropolitan district and I come from a rural district, and although he was a Democrat and I a Republican we were very warm friends.

We lived at the same hotel and I knew him well. His character was above reproach. But he was distinctive in that he was preeminent in his unfailing courtesy. He was always a gentleman. He was warm and cordial and always courteous. I shall miss him and I extend to his widow my most profound sympathy.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress I met JOHN DELANEY and I found him to be most interesting, affable, and very helpful, even though he was a Member on the other side of the House. We were very good friends. We often dined together and talked things over. He was particularly interested in legislation that would take care of Members of Congress in their old age or on their retirement.

I looked upon Mr. DELANEY as a great citizen, a man who rendered a splendid public service to his Nation, to his city, and to his State. I regret his passing. I consider it a personal loss, and I extend to Mrs. Delaney and his family my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, JOHN DELANEY was a fine, Christian gentleman. He was a member of the opposite party, but as a neighbor in the House Office Building and having served on the same committee with me, and living in the same hotel, I knew Mr. DELANEY as a fine Christian gentleman and mourn his loss.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to pay my respects to JOHN DELANEY. He was progressive, far-sighted, and generous. Mr. DELANEY was one of the first Members to welcome me to this great body, because we both came from Brooklyn.

It was with regret that I noted his passing, which is a great loss, not only to this body but to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I could not fail to embrace this opportunity to raise my voice in very brief but sincere tribute to the life, character, and public service of our friend and colleague, JOHN J. DELANEY, of New York. It was my privilege to cherish a very warm and close friendship with him throughout the period of our services.

He was a man of unusual ability and great devotion to the public service. His heart beat in tune with the interest and welfare of the masses of our people. He was always extremely courteous and considerate of all of those with whom he came in contact. I am sure that we all feel a great loss now that he has passed away. We realize that his district, his city, and the Nation have lost an outstanding public servant.

We extend our deepest sympathies to his bereaved family.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of JOHN DELANEY I have lost one of my best personal friends. Since first I came to Congress, Mr. DELANEY was very kind and very generous to me. We spent many happy hours together. Our association was very close, and I join with the other Members in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family. His passing is not only a very definite loss to his own district but to the country. He was a humanitarian, a man of great understanding, and I sincerely sympathize with his family at this time.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my heartfelt tribute to my good friend, JOHN J. DELANEY, of New York, and to say, in his memory, that he has rendered a great service, not only to his people but to the entire Nation. I can ask but one thing of the Lord, and that is that He rest his worthy soul.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, JOHN DELANEY was one of the most kindly men it has been my privilege to know. He was honest, courageous, and able. He had in him those fine qualities out of which good and true men are made. God bless his family.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 724).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of the Eightieth Congress the State of South Dakota also lost a member of its congressional delegation, a Member of the other body, our very distinguished Senator HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD. Senator BUSHFIELD had been twice elected Governor of our State and was completing the sixth year of his term as Senator from South Dakota. He was one of the sturdiest and stanchest sons of the Northwest and it was a great loss to the State and the Nation when he passed away.

Senator BUSHFIELD had been in poor health for some months prior to his death. Last spring, that condition led to a decision to withdraw from a primary contest for nomination for reelection. Although he and his friends were confident of winning that contest, he calmly and deliberately decided that he did not have the physical strength to carry on a campaign in person at home and be faithful to his duties here in the Senate at the same time.

I shall never, never forget when he called me over to his office to tell me of his decision some days before he made a public announcement.

He was a man of great stature, a man accustomed to carrying out his convictions and his decisions with an iron will. He had led South Dakota out of the depression when he had to win support for a policy of economy and thrift and taxes in the days when drought had made our people poor. He led us with courage and confidence and the people responded to the inspiration of his call for sacrifice and hard work, though some called him cold and unfeeling.

That day, Mr. Speaker, I saw that his so-called coolness was but the calm courage of a true leader to follow the right as God gave him to see the right, cost what it might. When the time came for him to apply a difficult decision to himself, he was as true as steel to his sense of duty.

He had gone through whatever Gethsemane there is when a proud man peers into the shadows and sees the end of his hopes. The marks of the struggle were on his face that morning, but he did not flinch from carrying out the mandate of his conscience.

Some days later, when he announced his decision, I made some remarks in this Chamber on the outstanding service of Senator BUSHFIELD to South Dakota and the Nation and I shall not review them here. In passing I shall only say that in the days ahead, yes, in these very days, the world sorely needs men of the Bushfield courage, men of the Bushfield conviction, men of the Bushfield will, men who place public responsibility above personal ambition.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution for the consideration of the House and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 725).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, a Senator of the United States from the State of South Dakota.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 224. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the Congress on December 31, 1948.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution No. 273

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

Senate Resolution No. 281

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution No. 282

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as a further remark of respect to the deceased Members, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution No. 224 the Chair declares the second session of the Eightieth Congress adjourned sine die.

Whereupon (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned sine die.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes.

APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

A message from the President of the United States, received by the Clerk of the House, reported that on this day the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members elected to fill unexpired terms in the Eightieth Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the Eightieth Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

PAUL C. JONES, Tenth District of Missouri.

LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR., Fifteenth District of Texas.

CLARENCE G. BURTON, Sixth District of Virginia.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

[*Submitted September 24, 1948*]

1721. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of Defense Homes Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (pursuant to House Resolution 716, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 746); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1722. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on audit of the Inter-American Affairs Corporations for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and including in this report the audit of the Inter-American Navigation Corporation for the period July 1, 1946, to February 25, 1947 (pursuant to H. Res. 716, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 747); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

[*Submitted October 28, 1948*]

1723. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1946 and 1947 (pursuant to H. Res. 716, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 748); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1724. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 22, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, East Chester Creek (Hutchinson River), N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 27, 1945, and also authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 749); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1725. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 21, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Kenosha Harbor, Wis., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 750); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1726. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 11, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Grand Marais Harbor, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 19, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 751); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1727. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 6, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on San Joaquin River and Stockton Channel, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 6, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 752); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

[*Submitted December 16, 1948*]

1728. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (volume 6—deals exclusively with the activities of the subsidiary, Metals Reserve Company) (pursuant to H. R. 716, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

[*Submitted December 22, 1948*]

1836. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 9, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study of Anna Maria and Longboat Keys, Fla. Made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 760); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with seven illustrations.

1837. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 5, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative study for beach erosion control at Santa Barbara, Calif., made under authority of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 761); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 13 illustrations.

1838. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 4, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Fire Island Inlet, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 762); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1839. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 5, 1947, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study of certain portions of the shore line of North Carolina, made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 763); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 13 illustrations.

1840. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 10, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations,

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress I met JOHN DELANEY and I found him to be most interesting, affable, and very helpful, even though he was a Member on the other side of the House. We were very good friends. We often dined together and talked things over. He was particularly interested in legislation that would take care of Members of Congress in their old age or on their retirement.

I looked upon Mr. DELANEY as a great citizen, a man who rendered a splendid public service to his Nation, to his city, and to his State. I regret his passing. I consider it a personal loss, and I extend to Mrs. Delaney and his family my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, JOHN DELANEY was a fine, Christian gentleman. He was a member of the opposite party, but as a neighbor in the House Office Building and having served on the same committee with me, and living in the same hotel, I knew Mr. DELANEY as a fine Christian gentleman and mourn his loss.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to pay my respects to JOHN DELANEY. He was progressive, far-sighted, and generous. Mr. DELANEY was one of the first Members to welcome me to this great body, because we both came from Brooklyn.

It was with regret that I noted his passing, which is a great loss, not only to this body but to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I could not fail to embrace this opportunity to raise my voice in very brief but sincere tribute to the life, character, and public service of our friend and colleague, JOHN J. DELANEY, of New York. It was my privilege to cherish a very warm and close friendship with him throughout the period of our services.

He was a man of unusual ability and great devotion to the public service. His heart beat in tune with the interest and welfare of the masses of our people. He was always extremely courteous and considerate of all of those with whom he came in contact. I am sure that we all feel a great loss now that he has passed away. We realize that his district, his city, and the Nation have lost an outstanding public servant.

We extend our deepest sympathies to his bereaved family.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of JOHN DELANEY I have lost one of my best personal friends. Since first I came to Congress, Mr. DELANEY was very kind and very generous to me. We spent many happy hours together. Our association was very close, and I join with the other Members in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family. His passing is not only a very definite loss to his own district but to the country. He was a humanitarian, a man of great understanding, and I sincerely sympathize with his family at this time.

Mr. LYNCH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my heartfelt tribute to my good friend, JOHN J. DELANEY, of New York, and to say, in his memory, that he has rendered a great service, not only to his people but to the entire Nation. I can ask but one thing of the Lord, and that is that He rest his worthy soul.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, JOHN DELANEY was one of the most kindly men it has been my privilege to know. He was honest, courageous, and able. He had in him those fine qualities out of which good and true men are made. God bless his family.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 724).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HONORABLE HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of the Eightieth Congress the State of South Dakota also lost a member of its congressional delegation, a Member of the other body, our very distinguished Senator HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD. Senator BUSHFIELD had been twice elected Governor of our State and was completing the sixth year of his term as Senator from South Dakota. He was one of the sturdiest and stanchest sons of the Northwest and it was a great loss to the State and the Nation when he passed away.

Senator BUSHFIELD had been in poor health for some months prior to his death. Last spring, that condition led to a decision to withdraw from a primary contest for nomination for reelection. Although he and his friends were confident of winning that contest, he calmly and deliberately decided that he did not have the physical strength to carry on a campaign in person at home and be faithful to his duties here in the Senate at the same time.

I shall never, never forget when he called me over to his office to tell me of his decision some days before he made a public announcement.

He was a man of great stature, a man accustomed to carrying out his convictions and his decisions with an iron will. He had led South Dakota out of the depression when he had to win support for a policy of economy and thrift and taxes in the days when drought had made our people poor. He led us with courage and confidence and the people responded to the inspiration of his call for sacrifice and hard work, though some called him cold and unfeeling.

That day, Mr. Speaker, I saw that his so-called coolness was but the calm courage of a true leader to follow the right as God gave him to see the right, cost what it might. When the time came for him to apply a difficult decision to himself, he was as true as steel to his sense of duty.

He had gone through whatever Gethsemane there is when a proud man peers into the shadows and sees the end of his hopes. The marks of the struggle were on his face that morning, but he did not flinch from carrying out the mandate of his conscience.

Some days later, when he announced his decision, I made some remarks in this Chamber on the outstanding service of Senator BUSHFIELD to South Dakota and the Nation and I shall not review them here. In passing I shall only say that in the days ahead, yes, in these very days, the world sorely needs men of the Bushfield courage, men of the Bushfield conviction, men of the Bushfield will, men who place public responsibility above personal ambition.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution for the consideration of the House and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution (H. Res. 725).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, a Senator of the United States from the State of South Dakota.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 224. Concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the Congress on December 31, 1948.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution No. 273

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

Senate Resolution No. 281

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. MILTON H. WEST, late a Representative from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

Senate Resolution No. 282

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as a further remark of respect to the deceased Members, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution No. 224 the Chair declares the second session of the Eightieth Congress adjourned sine die.

Whereupon (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned sine die.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes.

APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

A message from the President of the United States, received by the Clerk of the House, reported that on this day the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 448. Joint resolution to extend for 60 days the time within which the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government may make a report of its findings and recommendations, and for other purposes.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members elected to fill unexpired terms in the Eightieth Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the Eightieth Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

PAUL C. JONES, Tenth District of Missouri.

LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR., Fifteenth District of Texas.

CLARENCE G. BURTON, Sixth District of Virginia.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

[*Submitted September 24, 1948*]

1721. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of Defense Homes Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (pursuant to House Resolution 716, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 746); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1722. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on audit of the Inter-American Affairs Corporations for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and including in this report the audit of the Inter-American Navigation Corporation for the period July 1, 1946, to February 25, 1947 (pursuant to H. Res. 716, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 747); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

[*Submitted October 28, 1948*]

1723. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of Tennessee Valley Authority for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1946 and 1947 (pursuant to H. Res. 716, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 748); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1724. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 22, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, East Chester Creek (Hutchinson River), N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 27, 1945, and also authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 749); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1725. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 21, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Kenosha Harbor, Wis., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 750); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1726. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 11, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Grand Marais Harbor, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 19, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 751); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1727. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 6, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on San Joaquin River and Stockton Channel, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 6, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 752); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

[*Submitted December 16, 1948*]

1728. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated corporations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (volume 6—deals exclusively with the activities of the subsidiary, Metals Reserve Company) (pursuant to H. R. 716, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

[*Submitted December 22, 1948*]

1836. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 9, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study of Anna Maria and Longboat Keys, Fla. Made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 760); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with seven illustrations.

1837. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 5, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative study for beach erosion control at Santa Barbara, Calif., made under authority of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 761); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 13 illustrations.

1838. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 4, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Fire Island Inlet, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 762); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1839. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 5, 1947, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study of certain portions of the shore line of North Carolina, made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 763); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 13 illustrations.

1840. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 10, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations,

on a cooperative study for beach erosion control of Winthrop Beach., Mass., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 764); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with eight illustrations.

1841. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 20, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study of Jupiter Island, Fla., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 765); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with six illustrations.

[*Submitted December 29, 1948*]

1842. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 23, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Chocolate and Bastrop Bayous, Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 28, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 768); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

1843. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 16, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the shore in the vicinity of Punta Las Marias, San Juan, P. R., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 769); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 10 illustrations.

1844. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 12, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Far Creek, N. C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 27, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 770); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1845. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 21, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Christiansted Harbor, St. Croix, V. I., with a view to improvement for navigation, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 772); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1846. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 7, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study of Palm Beach, Fla., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and Public Law 166, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 31, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 772); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 12 illustrations.

1847. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 15, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Alabama-Coosa Branch of the Mobile River System, with a view to locating as nearly as can be determined the salinity line in the Mobile River and its tributaries, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 16, 1944 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 773); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with seven illustrations.

[*Submitted December 31, 1948*]

1729. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration, covering its operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1730. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of June 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1731. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of July 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1732. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of September 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1733. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of settlements of debts due Farmers Home Administration in excess of $1,000; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1734. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of August 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1735. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of that law for the month of October 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1736. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a request by the Junior Midshipman of America, Inc., for the transfer of a steel pontoon barge to be used at New London, Conn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1737. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, showing the amount of moneys credited to the helium-production fund and the amount of disbursements made therefrom during the preceding fiscal year, and the unexpended and unobligated balances on hand in such fund as of the end of such fiscal year (pursuant to sec. 3 (c) of the amendatory Helium Act approved September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 885; 50 U. S. C., sec. 164)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1738. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting an interim report covering the contracts negotiated by the NACA pursuant to the authority of sections 2 (c) (11) and (16) of that act during the period May 19 through June 30, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 413, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1739. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending June 30, 1948, of real and personal property leased by the Department of the Navy under the authority of Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1740. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the sixth annual report, under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 560, Eightieth Congress, for the period July 1, 1947, through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1741. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report to Congress on transportation to and from places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by naval establishments and Navy contractors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1742. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting proceedings of the Forty-ninth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in St. Louis, Mo., August 29 to September 3, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1743. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the Fiftieth National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Washington, D. C., August 22 to 26, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Cong.), approved September 18, 1941); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1744. A letter from the adjutant and quartermaster general, Grand Army of the Republic, transmitting journal of proceedings of the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, held at Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1745. A letter from the Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the sixth semiannual report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, covering the period from January 1 through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1746. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the eighty-fifth annual report, covering the activities of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1747. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of petroleum products (pursuant to Public Law 395, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1748. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for factory-made steel houses, and copies of the requests for compliance therewith which the Secretary of Commerce has issued to various steel producers and steel consumers (pursuant to Public Law 395, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1749. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for the construction, conversion, and repair of domestic freight-carrying barges and towing vessels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1750. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for requirements of the armed forces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1751. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products to the anthracite industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1752. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for tank and oil-field production equipment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1753. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary

plan for the allocation of steel products for oil tankers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1754. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for requirements of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1755. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for construction, reconversion, and repair of merchant vessels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1756. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, covering the housing activities of the Federal Government for the calendar year 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1757. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting its annual report, dated September 28, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 592, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1758. A letter from the President, Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, transmitting its report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1759. A letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, for the year ended December 31, 1947, covering the regulation and operation, also financial and statistical data of the public utilities in the District of Columbia coming under the jurisdiction of said Commission (pursuant to pars. 14 and 20 of sec. 8 of an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1760. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the quarterly progress report by the War Assets Administration for the period July to September 1948 (pursuant to sec. 24 of the Surplus Property Act); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1761. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the eleventh report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1762. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report listing the contracts for research and development and industrial mobilization awarded by the Departments of the National Military Establishment from May 19 through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1763. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1764. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Production and Marketing Administration report of losses on the disposition of price-support commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the provisions of section 11 (e) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the limitations established in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1765. A letter from the Chairman, Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting the Third Semiannual Report of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission, for the period ending December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1766. A letter from Vassili Dendramis, Ambassador of Greece, transmitting a message voted and drafted by the Greek Parliament protesting barbarism, and an appeal to the United Nations Organization to come to the aid of the Greek people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1767. A letter from V. K. Wellington Koo, Ambassador of China, transmitting a message from the President and Vice President of the Legislative Yuan of China, dealing with the critical status of affairs in China and asking and appealing for increased and speedy aid, military and economic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1768. A letter from Dr. Francis Gordon, ex-Hungarian Minister in Switzerland, transmitting notes and copies of letters addressed to the Secretary of State and Members of the Senate of the United States and a report on the real events in Hungary from the beginning of 1945 to the end of 1947; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1769. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Power Commission to the Eighty-first Congress, first session, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (D) of the Federal Power Act, furnishing required information on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1770. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the seventeenth quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period July 1 through September 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1771. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Department of Commerce during the fiscal year 1948 under part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (title 4 of Public Law 601, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1772. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 35 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1773. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Panama Railroad Company in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) for the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1774. A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report to the Congress of tort claims paid by the Veterans' Administration pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (title IV, Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1775. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the fourth quarterly report required under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, entitled "Export Control and Allocation Powers"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1776. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the fifth quarterly report required under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1777. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a report of all tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1778. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting new and additional evidence in the case of Costos Kolitses which warrant the reopening of the entire proceedings and requesting that the case be withdrawn from those now before Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1779. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting quarterly report of claimant to whom relief has been granted under Public Law 657, together with the amount of such relief and a brief statement of the facts and the administration decision; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1780. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1781. A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from July 1 through September 30, 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1782. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the fourth quarterly report outlining the activities of the Maritime Commission relating to ocean transportation to, from, and within Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1783. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly, the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1784. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1785. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of the budget for the municipality of St. Croix, V. I., for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1786. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certified copies of acts of the seventh special session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, July 12 to 25, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1787. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of the budget for the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., for the fiscal year July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1788. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the fourth quarterly (final) report covering conditions in underground bituminous coal and lignite mines inspected by the Federal coal-mine inspectors during the year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1789. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting his report and findings of a plan for the development of the Chino Valley project, Arizona, together with related data and letters of comment on the report; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1790. A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1791. A letter from the director, American Legion National Legislative Commission, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including October 31, 1948; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1792. A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to make clear the authority of the Administrator to negotiate rates of compensation for training in certain

on a cooperative study for beach erosion control of Winthrop Beach., Mass., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 764); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with eight illustrations.

1841. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 20, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study of Jupiter Island, Fla., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 765); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with six illustrations.

[*Submitted December 29, 1948*]

1842. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 23, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Chocolate and Bastrop Bayous, Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 28, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 768); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

1843. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 16, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study of the shore in the vicinity of Punta Las Marias, San Juan, P. R., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved on July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 769); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 10 illustrations.

1844. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 12, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Far Creek, N. C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 27, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 770); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1845. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 21, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Christiansted Harbor, St. Croix, V. I., with a view to improvement for navigation, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 772); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1846. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 7, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion study of Palm Beach, Fla., made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and Public Law 166, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 31, 1945 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 772); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 12 illustrations.

1847. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 15, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Alabama-Coosa Branch of the Mobile River System, with a view to locating as nearly as can be determined the salinity line in the Mobile River and its tributaries, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 16, 1944 (pursuant to Public Law 296, 80th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 773); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with seven illustrations.

[*Submitted December 31, 1948*]

1729. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Farm Credit Administration, covering its operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1730. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of June 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1731. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of July 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1732. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of September 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1733. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of settlements of debts due Farmers Home Administration in excess of $1,000; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1734. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of August 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1735. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of that law for the month of October 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1736. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a request by the Junior Midshipman of America, Inc., for the transfer of a steel pontoon barge to be used at New London, Conn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1737. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, showing the amount of moneys credited to the helium-production fund and the amount of disbursements made therefrom during the preceding fiscal year, and the unexpended and unobligated balances on hand in such fund as of the end of such fiscal year (pursuant to sec. 3 (c) of the amendatory Helium Act approved September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 885; 50 U. S. C., sec. 164)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1738. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting an interim report covering the contracts negotiated by the NACA pursuant to the authority of sections 2 (c) (11) and (16) of that act during the period May 19 through June 30, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 413, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1739. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of the semiannual report for the period ending June 30, 1948, of real and personal property leased by the Department of the Navy under the authority of Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1740. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the sixth annual report, under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 560, Eightieth Congress, for the period July 1, 1947, through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1741. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report to Congress on transportation to and from places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by naval establishments and Navy contractors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1742. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting proceedings of the Forty-ninth National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in St. Louis, Mo., August 29 to September 3, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1743. A letter from the adjutant general, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the Fiftieth National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Washington, D. C., August 22 to 26, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Cong.), approved September 18, 1941); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1744. A letter from the adjutant and quartermaster general, Grand Army of the Republic, transmitting journal of proceedings of the Eighty-second National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, held at Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1745. A letter from the Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the sixth semiannual report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, covering the period from January 1 through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1746. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the eighty-fifth annual report, covering the activities of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1747. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of petroleum products (pursuant to Public Law 395, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1748. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for factory-made steel houses, and copies of the requests for compliance therewith which the Secretary of Commerce has issued to various steel producers and steel consumers (pursuant to Public Law 395, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1749. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for the construction, conversion, and repair of domestic freight-carrying barges and towing vessels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1750. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for requirements of the armed forces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1751. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products to the anthracite industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1752. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for tank and oil-field production equipment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1753. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary

plan for the allocation of steel products for oil tankers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1754. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for requirements of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1755. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for construction, reconversion, and repair of merchant vessels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1756. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, covering the housing activities of the Federal Government for the calendar year 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1757. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, transmitting its annual report, dated September 28, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 592, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1758. A letter from the President, Commission on Licensure, Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, transmitting its report showing the activities of the Commission for the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1759. A letter from the Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, for the year ended December 31, 1947, covering the regulation and operation, also financial and statistical data of the public utilities in the District of Columbia coming under the jurisdiction of said Commission (pursuant to pars. 14 and 20 of sec. 8 of an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1760. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the quarterly progress report by the War Assets Administration for the period July to September 1948 (pursuant to sec. 24 of the Surplus Property Act); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1761. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the eleventh report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1762. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report listing the contracts for research and development and industrial mobilization awarded by the Departments of the National Military Establishment from May 19 through June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1763. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1764. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Production and Marketing Administration report of losses on the disposition of price-support commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the provisions of section 11 (e) of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 and the limitations established in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1765. A letter from the Chairman, Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting the Third Semiannual Report of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission, for the period ending December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1766. A letter from Vassili Dendramis, Ambassador of Greece, transmitting a message voted and drafted by the Greek Parliament protesting barbarism, and an appeal to the United Nations Organization to come to the aid of the Greek people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1767. A letter from V. K. Wellington Koo, Ambassador of China, transmitting a message from the President and Vice President of the Legislative Yuan of China, dealing with the critical status of affairs in China and asking and appealing for increased and speedy aid, military and economic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1768. A letter from Dr. Francis Gordon, ex-Hungarian Minister in Switzerland, transmitting notes and copies of letters addressed to the Secretary of State and Members of the Senate of the United States and a report on the real events in Hungary from the beginning of 1945 to the end of 1947; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1769. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Power Commission to the Eighty-first Congress, first session, pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (D) of the Federal Power Act, furnishing required information on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1770. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the seventeenth quarterly report on contract settlement, covering the period July 1 through September 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1771. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Department of Commerce during the fiscal year 1948 under part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (title 4 of Public Law 601, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1772. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 35 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1773. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Panama Railroad Company in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) for the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1774. A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report to the Congress of tort claims paid by the Veterans' Administration pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (title IV, Public Law 601, 79th Cong.) during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1775. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the fourth quarterly report required under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947, entitled "Export Control and Allocation Powers"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1776. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the fifth quarterly report required under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1777. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a report of all tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1778. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting new and additional evidence in the case of Costos Kolitses which warrant the reopening of the entire proceedings and requesting that the case be withdrawn from those now before Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1779. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting quarterly report of claimant to whom relief has been granted under Public Law 657, together with the amount of such relief and a brief statement of the facts and the administration decision; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1780. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1781. A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from July 1 through September 30, 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1782. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the fourth quarterly report outlining the activities of the Maritime Commission relating to ocean transportation to, from, and within Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1783. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly, the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1784. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1785. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of the budget for the municipality of St. Croix, V. I., for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1786. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certified copies of acts of the seventh special session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, July 12 to 25, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1787. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy of the budget for the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., for the fiscal year July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1788. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the fourth quarterly (final) report covering conditions in underground bituminous coal and lignite mines inspected by the Federal coal-mine inspectors during the year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1789. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting his report and findings of a plan for the development of the Chino Valley project, Arizona, together with related data and letters of comment on the report; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1790. A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1791. A letter from the director, American Legion National Legislative Commission, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including October 31, 1948; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1792. A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to make clear the authority of the Administrator to negotiate rates of compensation for training in certain

institutions"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1793. A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, with the request that it be introduced and considered for enactment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1794. A letter from the director, the American Legion National Legislative Commission, transmitting proceedings of the thirtieth national convention of the American Legion, held at Miami, Fla., October 18 to 21, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1795. A letter from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to section 607 of the act for the quarter ending September 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1796. A letter from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to section 607 of the act as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.) for the quarter ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1797. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 (Public Law 106), a consolidated report and supporting data covering additional within-grade salary advancements as rewards for superior accomplishment made by the several Government departments and agencies during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1798. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting reports of funds received during the fiscal year 1948 for the rental of buildings and lands acquired as sites for the future construction of public buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

1799. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report from the Chief of Army Engineers on the compilation of preliminary examination, survey, and review reports on rivers and harbors, flood control, and beach erosion control prepared pursuant to House Resolution 716, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Public Works.

1800 A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 6, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Taskmers Creek, Northumberland County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1801. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of harbor at public landing, Worcester County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1802. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Hudson River Channel, N. Y., and Hudson River, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 8, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1803. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Deep Creek and Fresh Water Pond, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1804. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 23, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of waterway, approximately 8 feet deep and 50 feet bottom width, from Crescent Lake, Fla., by way of Haw Creek to Bunnell, thence by way of a land cut to the sea at Flagler Beach, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

1805. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 10, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Pine River (Saginaw Bay), Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1806. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 25, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Bayamon and Hondo Rivers and their tributaries, municipality of Bayamon, P. R., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1807. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Peconic River, Long Island, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1808. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 9, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on waterway from Deleon Spring to St. Johns River, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 13, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

1809. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 5, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Wolf River (Memphis Harbor), Loosahatchie River, Tenn., from its mouth to the O. K. Robertson Road and including the area west of the Illinois Central Railroad and north of Wolf River, with a view to extending the navigation facilities of Memphis Harbor, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 18, 1945, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1810. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 4, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Sandy Hook Bay, N. J., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1811. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 7, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Hutchinson River and tributaries, New York, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1812. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 9, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of the Hague (Smith Creek), Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1813. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 6, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Tofte Harbor, Minn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1814. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 3, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Eau Gallie Inlet, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 17, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1815. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on St. Croix River, Minn. and Wis., with a view to providing a small-boat harbor at Stillwater, Minn., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 18, 1945, and Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on October 18, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1816. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 13, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, White and Bad Rivers, S. Dak. and Nebr., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on August 18, 1937, and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

1817. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of San Rafael Creek and its tributaries, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1818. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 3, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Hocking River in Hocking County, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1819. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Chester River Channel, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1820. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 28, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Nelscott, Oreg., with a view to the protection of the beach, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1821. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated Sep-

tember 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of St. Croix River Basin, Minn. and Wis., including consideration of the construction of dam below the mouth of Kettle River, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1822. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of channel from Charlestown, Northeast River, Md., to Havre de Grace, and from Havre de Grace, Md., to Red Point via Stump Point and Carpenter Point, authorized by River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1823. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 11, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Port Jefferson Harbor, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, adopted on October 19, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1824. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Centerport Harbor, Long Island, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1825. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 17, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Marumsco Creek, lower Somerset County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1826. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 4, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Camden Harbor, Maine, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 15, 1943; to the Committee on Public Works.

1827. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 9, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Tanners Creek, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1828. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 7, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Farnham Creek, Richmond County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1829. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 31, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Cimarron River, Okla. and Kans., including Kenton Reservoir, Cimarron River, Okla., and Dry Cimarron River, Union County, N. Mex., authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved on June 22, 1936, and August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

1830. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 5, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Estero River and tributaries, Puerto Rico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1831. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 6, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Hoskins Creek, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 5, 1943; to the Committee on Public Works.

1832. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 30, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Clinton River, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1833. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Ross Cove (Magothy River), Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1834. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 17, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Jackson Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1835. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Mamaroneck and Sheldrake Rivers and their tributaries, New York, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1848. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list showing the number of officers in the Navy and Marine Corps above the rank of major in the Army or lieutenant commander in the Navy with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, filed on or before January 1, annually (pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1849. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to adjust salaries of officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1850. A letter from V. K. Wellington Koo, Chinese Ambassador to the United States, transmitting a message signed by the members of the National Assembly of the Republic of China asking for assistance from the United States to help combat communism in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1851. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting the reports of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1947, and June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1852. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter referring to a letter dated April 15, 1948, showing 107 cases involving suspension of deportation, and requesting as of December 21, 1948, that the case of Victor Gama-Bermudez be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1853. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a message from the Congress of Guam, signed by B. J. Bordallo, President of House of Council, and A. Won Pat, Speaker, House of Assembly, Ninth Guam Congress, extending from the people of Guam the season's greetings and best wishes for a successful and prosperous New Year; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1854. A letter from the Governor of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1855. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on a plan for the development of the Snowflake project, Arizona, together with related data and letters of comment on the report; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1856. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting certificates of the final ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States chosen in the respective States on November 2, 1948; to the Committee on House Administration.

1857. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty-inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1947, the number of pieces procured, the estimated mailings, and the estimated cost by departments and agencies for the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1858. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the Fifteenth Annual Report of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

1859. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting 10 copies of the Annual Report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1860. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report to the Congress of the United States on the audit of the Virgin Islands Company for the year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 774); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1861. A letter from the secretary-treasurer, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1862. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the Bureau of Mines, Anthracite Research Laboratory being constructed at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1863. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting copies of petitions from the county chief and county council of Mauputasi County, American Samoa, and from the district governor and district council of Manua District, American Samoa; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and a resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 7162. A bill to authorize the United States during an emergency period to assist

institutions"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1793. A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, with the request that it be introduced and considered for enactment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1794. A letter from the director, the American Legion National Legislative Commission, transmitting proceedings of the thirtieth national convention of the American Legion, held at Miami, Fla., October 18 to 21, 1948 (pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1795. A letter from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to section 607 of the act for the quarter ending September 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1796. A letter from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to section 607 of the act as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.) for the quarter ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1797. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 (Public Law 106), a consolidated report and supporting data covering additional within-grade salary advancements as rewards for superior accomplishment made by the several Government departments and agencies during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1798. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting reports of funds received during the fiscal year 1948 for the rental of buildings and lands acquired as sites for the future construction of public buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

1799. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report from the Chief of Army Engineers on the compilation of preliminary examination, survey, and review reports on rivers and harbors, flood control, and beach erosion control prepared pursuant to House Resolution 716, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Public Works.

1800 A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 6, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Taskmers Creek, Northumberland County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1801. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of harbor at public landing, Worcester County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1802. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Hudson River Channel, N. Y., and Hudson River, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 8, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1803. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Deep Creek and Fresh Water Pond, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1804. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 23, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of waterway, approximately 8 feet deep and 50 feet bottom width, from Crescent Lake, Fla., by way of Haw Creek to Bunnell, thence by way of a land cut to the sea at Flagler Beach, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

1805. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 10, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Pine River (Saginaw Bay), Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1806. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 25, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Bayamon and Hondo Rivers and their tributaries, municipality of Bayamon, P. R., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1807. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Peconic River, Long Island, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1808. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 9, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on waterway from Deleon Spring to St. Johns River, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 13, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

1809. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 5, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Wolf River (Memphis Harbor), Loosahatchie River, Tenn., from its mouth to the O. K. Robertson Road and including the area west of the Illinois Central Railroad and north of Wolf River, with a view to extending the navigation facilities of Memphis Harbor, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 18, 1945, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1810. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 4, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Sandy Hook Bay, N. J., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 21, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1811. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 7, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Hutchinson River and tributaries, New York, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1812. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 9, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of the Hague (Smith Creek), Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1813. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 6, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Tofte Harbor, Minn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1814. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 3, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Eau Gallie Inlet, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 17, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1815. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on St. Croix River, Minn. and Wis., with a view to providing a small-boat harbor at Stillwater, Minn., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 18, 1945, and Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on October 18, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1816. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 13, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, White and Bad Rivers, S. Dak. and Nebr., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on August 18, 1937, and also authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

1817. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 20, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of San Rafael Creek and its tributaries, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1818. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 3, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Hocking River in Hocking County, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

1819. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Chester River Channel, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1820. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 28, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Nelscott, Oreg., with a view to the protection of the beach, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1821. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated Sep-

tember 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of St. Croix River Basin, Minn. and Wis., including consideration of the construction of dam below the mouth of Kettle River, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1822. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of channel from Charlestown, Northeast River, Md., to Havre de Grace, and from Havre de Grace, Md., to Red Point via Stump Point and Carpenter Point, authorized by River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1823. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 11, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Port Jefferson Harbor, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, adopted on October 19, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1824. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Centerport Harbor, Long Island, N. Y., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1825. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 17, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Marumsco Creek, lower Somerset County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1826. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 4, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Camden Harbor, Maine, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 15, 1943; to the Committee on Public Works.

1827. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 9, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Tanners Creek, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1828. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 7, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Farnham Creek, Richmond County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1829. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 31, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Cimarron River, Okla. and Kans., including Kenton Reservoir, Cimarron River, Okla., and Dry Cimarron River, Union County, N. Mex., authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved on June 22, 1936, and August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

1830. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 5, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Estero River and tributaries, Puerto Rico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1831. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 6, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Hoskins Creek, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 5, 1943; to the Committee on Public Works.

1832. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 30, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Clinton River, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1833. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Ross Cove (Magothy River), Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1834. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 17, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Jackson Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1835. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Mamaroneck and Sheldrake Rivers and their tributaries, New York, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

1848. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list showing the number of officers in the Navy and Marine Corps above the rank of major in the Army or lieutenant commander in the Navy with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of the report, filed on or before January 1, annually (pursuant to Public Law 301, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1849. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to adjust salaries of officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1850. A letter from V. K. Wellington Koo, Chinese Ambassador to the United States, transmitting a message signed by the members of the National Assembly of the Republic of China asking for assistance from the United States to help combat communism in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1851. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting the reports of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1947, and June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1852. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter referring to a letter dated April 15, 1948, showing 107 cases involving suspension of deportation, and requesting as of December 21, 1948, that the case of Victor Gama-Bermudez be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1853. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a message from the Congress of Guam, signed by B. J. Bordallo, President of House of Council, and A. Won Pat, Speaker, House of Assembly, Ninth Guam Congress, extending from the people of Guam the season's greetings and best wishes for a successful and prosperous New Year; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1854. A letter from the Governor of Hawaii, transmitting a copy of the journal of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1855. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on a plan for the development of the Snowflake project, Arizona, together with related data and letters of comment on the report; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1856. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting certificates of the final ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States chosen in the respective States on November 2, 1948; to the Committee on House Administration.

1857. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty-inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1947, the number of pieces procured, the estimated mailings, and the estimated cost by departments and agencies for the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1858. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting the Fifteenth Annual Report of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

1859. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting 10 copies of the Annual Report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1860. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the audit report to the Congress of the United States on the audit of the Virgin Islands Company for the year ended June 30, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 774); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1861. A letter from the secretary-treasurer, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting the Seventh Annual Report of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1862. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the Bureau of Mines, Anthracite Research Laboratory being constructed at Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1863. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting copies of petitions from the county chief and county council of Mauputasi County, American Samoa, and from the district governor and district council of Manua District, American Samoa; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and a resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 7162. A bill to authorize the United States during an emergency period to assist

in rehabilitating and stabilizing Italy's economy by permitting the admission into the United States for permanent residence of an increased number of Italian nationals who are relatives of United States citizens, and agricultural, skilled, professional and other workers needed in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7163. A bill to provide veterans of World War II the opportunity to obtain rental housing by providing temporary financial aid to such veterans in meeting the high rentals of newly constructed rental housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. Con. Res. 225. Concurrent resolution to refer the cases of Bishop Lajos Ordass and Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[*Submitted December 20, 1948*]

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report on investigation on Army Talks; without amendment (Rept. No. 2463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report on investigation of strikes in the meat-packing industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted December 29, 1948*]

Mr. PLOESER: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on problems of small business resulting from monopolistic and unfair trade practices; without amendment (Rept. No. 2465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PLOESER: Select Committee on Small Business. Annual report of the Select Committee on Small Business; without amendment (Rept. No. 2466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report on national transportation inquiry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report on fuel investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted December 31, 1948*]

Mr. RIZLEY, Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures. A report of the Campaign Expenditures Committee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and foreign Commerce. Report on fuel investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supply. Final report; without amendment (Rept. No. 2471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Select Committee to Investigate Commodity Transactions. Final report; without amendment (Rept. No. 2472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report of Subcommittee on Procurement and Buildings; without amendment (Rept. No. 2473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Final report of Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda; without amendment (Rept. No. 2474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARTLEY: Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations. Report on labor-management relations, west coast maritime industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARTLEY: Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations. Report on labor-management relations, welfare funds; without amendment (Rept. No. 2476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARTLEY: Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations. Report on labor-management relations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2145. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Bayerischer Handwerkstag, Munchen, Germany, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to Bavarian handicraft, freedom of trade, and an order of the military government dated December 2, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2146. Also, petition of F. A. MacDonald, clerk, city of Cincinnati Council, Cincinnati, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resoluton with reference to urging the United States Housing Administrator to withold evictions from public housing projects until additional housing can be provided to meet the existing critical shortage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2147. Also, petition of clerk, City of Rome, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the tax-exempt property in the city of Rome, N. Y., and in reference to adequate physical plants for carrying on the educational work in that city; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2148. Also, petition of president, United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the admission of the state of Israel to the United Nations and to render it financial assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2149. Also, petition of secretary, Greek-American Progressive Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Greece's claim to the territory of North Epirus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2150. Also, petition of the Student Council, Julliard School of Music, New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the rededication of Members of Congress to the struggle for peace and security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2151. Also, petition of president, St. Elizabeths Holy Name Society of St. Elizabeths Roman Catholic Church, Wilmington, Del., petitioning consideration of their resolution against communism and for the preservation of God-given rights and the guaranty of blessings of liberty and freedom to peace-loving people throughout the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2152. Also, petition of Jessie W. Jenkins, executive secretary, the National Patrick Henry Organization, Inc., Columbus, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the impeachment of President Harry S. Truman, the voiding of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and for the apprehension and incarceration of the warmongers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2153. Also, petition of Capt. Ejner Henrichsen, Valparaiso, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to asking for payment for damages caused to his ship the *Viking*, and further consideration of their plight with the Immigration Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2154. Also, petition of John Sabol, secretary, the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States of America petitioning consideration of their resolution that the Congress of the United States of America be heartily commended in its action in enacting legislation to provide an asylum for displaced persons, that again may be reborn the freedoms with which God's blessing bestowed upon the peoples of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2155. Also, petition of H. Maandi, secretary general, the Estonian National Council, Stockholm, petitioning consideration of their resolution that in the interests of equity and justice, the Displaced Persons Act be amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2156. Also, petition of John Jacob Janzen, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his second amendment to his claim of April 6, 1946, for compensation for a lost claim against Russia and the Russian people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2157. Also, petition of Nicholas J. Curtis, Trenton, N. J., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his case against Philip Forman, United States Department of Justice, district of New Jersey, and Guy L. Fake, United States Department of Justice, district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2158. Also, petition of secretary and treasurer, International Association for Identification, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to enable Hawaii to be admitted into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2159. Also petition of the Rotary Club of Tacloban, Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to establishment of an international shrine in the immediate vicinity of a national park at Red Beach, Palo, on Leyte; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2160. Also, petition of Adriano V. Nogar, municipal secretary, Municipal Council of Palo, Leyte, Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the construction of four veterans' hospitals in the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2161. Also, petition of Pedro Ambatali, Nueva Vizcaya, Philippine Islands, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to Resolution No. 1, of the Philippine Constabulary Veterans, asking that veterans who serve from 1901 to 1914, be included in legislation now pending in the Eightieth Congress (H. R. 451), and scheduled to be introduced in the Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2162. Also, petition of President Francisco Colon Gordiany, Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to Resolution No. 8, asking for an appropriation for the construction of a hospital at San Juan, P. R.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2163. Also petition of Hon. William M. Tuck, chairman, Governor's Office, Richmond, Va., petitioning consideration of his resolu-

tion with reference to transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted by the Southern Governors' Conference at Savannah, Ga., December 14, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the third calendar quarter of 1948.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act, three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____
Business address _____

INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM PERSONS REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:
(1) _____
(2) In whose interest he appears or works:
(2) _____
(3) The duration of such employment:
(3) _____
(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:
(4) _____
(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:
(5) _____
(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:
(6) _____
(7) What expenses are to be included:
(7) _____

See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name _____
Business address _____
Employed by _____
Address _____

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:
(1) _____
(2) To whom paid:
(2) _____
(3) For what purposes:
(3) _____
(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:
(4) _____
(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:
(5) _____

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the third calendar quarter 1948, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Association of American Ship Owners, The, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The registrant is composed of 14 owners of vessels documented under the laws of the United States. (2) See attached.[1] (3) The duration of the registrant is not limited. (4) The amount which registrant is paid and is to receive is indefinite but is fixed from time to time at rates based upon the gross registered tonnage of vessels owned and operated by registrant's members as the members determine to be necessary to provide funds to defray expenditures in accordance with the articles of association authorized in registrant's budget. (5) The registrant is paid or is to be paid by registrant's members. (6) Registrant is to be paid nothing for expenses other than expenses authorized by the members in the registrant's budgets. (7) The expenses provided in the budgets of the registrant are as follows: Salaries, withholding tax, general expense of officers, rent and electricity, furniture and fixtures, office supplies, telephone, teletype, and telegraph, postage and express, subscriptions and publications, transcripts, printing, publicity, employers pay-roll taxes, other and miscellaneous expenses, legal and other fees.

Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Sixty-eight member companies (see attached list of member companies).[1] (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (5) Sixty-eight member companies. (6) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (7) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1]

Berger, Robert I., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite. (4) $650. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) None. (7) None.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Brown, Russell B., 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. Amended form. Since filing Registration Form B under the Lobbying Act, my annual salary has been increased as of October 1, 1948, in the amount of $3,000.

Carson, T. J., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Special session beginning July 26, 1948. (4) $25 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Personal expenses, transportation.

Case, Ralph H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Tribal Council, Cheyenne River Reservation, Cheyenne Agency, S. Dak. (2) The Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. Dak. (3) Five years. (4) $2,000 per annum. (5) By the tribal council, with the approval of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. (6) Travel and subsistence while on tribal business, telegrams, stenographic services, printing, etc., with the approval of tribal council and Commissioner of Indian Affairs. (7) Same as included in (6) above.

Coulter, John Lee, 611 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Renderers Association, 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of American agriculture and American consumers. (3) Irregular. (4) $50 per diem when actually employed. (5) National Renderers Association. (6) None. (7) None.

Drake, John, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite, no fixed term. (4) $5,000 per annum to cover all services for the federation including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Federline, Andrew Paul, 723 Fifteenth Street NW. Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen, Bona Allen Building, Atlanta, Ga. (2) For the commission salesmen who sell women's and children's apparel (members of the association named above). (3) Continuing, indefinite (registrant is Washington counsel for the association named). (4) $10 per hour for the time actually spent on legislative matters (same as for services on legal and administrative matters). (5) National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen. (6) None other than reimbursement for cash outlay. (7) Telephone, telegraph, meals, and travel.

Fifer, Russell, executive secretary, American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. Amend Form B on file, item 4, to read as follows: "$14,000 per annum—such payments are received for services as executive secretary of the American Butter Institute."

Gall, John C. (firm of Gall & Lane), Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Electric Companies, Washington, D. C. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) No fixed amount; fees for work done from time to time. (5) Same as (1). (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (7) Telephone, telegraph, taxi, miscellaneous office.

Gardner, Fraser S.,[2] national legislative chairman. ANU., 5410 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Appointed (to serve without pay) by National Commander James

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

in rehabilitating and stabilizing Italy's economy by permitting the admission into the United States for permanent residence of an increased number of Italian nationals who are relatives of United States citizens, and agricultural, skilled, professional and other workers needed in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7163. A bill to provide veterans of World War II the opportunity to obtain rental housing by providing temporary financial aid to such veterans in meeting the high rentals of newly constructed rental housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. Con. Res. 225. Concurrent resolution to refer the cases of Bishop Lajos Ordass and Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[*Submitted December 20, 1948*]

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report on investigation on Army Talks; without amendment (Rept. No. 2463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report on investigation of strikes in the meat-packing industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted December 29, 1948*]

Mr. PLOESER: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on problems of small business resulting from monopolistic and unfair trade practices; without amendment (Rept. No. 2465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PLOESER: Select Committee on Small Business. Annual report of the Select Committee on Small Business; without amendment (Rept. No. 2466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report on national transportation inquiry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Progress report on fuel investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted December 31, 1948*]

Mr. RIZLEY, Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures. A report of the Campaign Expenditures Committee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and foreign Commerce. Report on fuel investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Select Committee on Newsprint and Paper Supply. Final report; without amendment (Rept. No. 2471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: Select Committee to Investigate Commodity Transactions. Final report; without amendment (Rept. No. 2472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report of Subcommittee on Procurement and Buildings; without amendment (Rept. No. 2473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Final report of Subcommittee on Publicity and Propaganda; without amendment (Rept. No. 2474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARTLEY: Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations. Report on labor-management relations, west coast maritime industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARTLEY: Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations. Report on labor-management relations, welfare funds; without amendment (Rept. No. 2476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARTLEY: Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations. Report on labor-management relations; without amendment (Rept. No. 2477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2145. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Bayerischer Handwerkstag, Munchen, Germany, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to Bavarian handicraft, freedom of trade, and an order of the military government dated December 2, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2146. Also, petition of F. A. MacDonald, clerk, city of Cincinnati Council, Cincinnati, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resoluton with reference to urging the United States Housing Administrator to withold evictions from public housing projects until additional housing can be provided to meet the existing critical shortage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2147. Also, petition of clerk, City of Rome, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the tax-exempt property in the city of Rome, N. Y., and in reference to adequate physical plants for carrying on the educational work in that city; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2148. Also, petition of president, United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the admission of the state of Israel to the United Nations and to render it financial assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2149. Also, petition of secretary, Greek-American Progressive Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Greece's claim to the territory of North Epirus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2150. Also, petition of the Student Council, Julliard School of Music, New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the rededication of Members of Congress to the struggle for peace and security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2151. Also, petition of president, St. Elizabeths Holy Name Society of St. Elizabeths Roman Catholic Church, Wilmington, Del., petitioning consideration of their resolution against communism and for the preservation of God-given rights and the guaranty of blessings of liberty and freedom to peace-loving people throughout the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2152. Also, petition of Jessie W. Jenkins, executive secretary, the National Patrick Henry Organization, Inc., Columbus, Ga., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the impeachment of President Harry S. Truman, the voiding of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and for the apprehension and incarceration of the warmongers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2153. Also, petition of Capt. Ejner Henrichsen, Valparaiso, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to asking for payment for damages caused to his ship the *Viking*, and further consideration of their plight with the Immigration Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2154. Also, petition of John Sabol, secretary, the First Catholic Slovak Union of the United States of America petitioning consideration of their resolution that the Congress of the United States of America be heartily commended in its action in enacting legislation to provide an asylum for displaced persons, that again may be reborn the freedoms with which God's blessing bestowed upon the peoples of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2155. Also, petition of H. Maandi, secretary general, the Estonian National Council, Stockholm, petitioning consideration of their resolution that in the interests of equity and justice, the Displaced Persons Act be amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2156. Also, petition of John Jacob Janzen, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his second amendment to his claim of April 6, 1946, for compensation for a lost claim against Russia and the Russian people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2157. Also, petition of Nicholas J. Curtis, Trenton, N. J., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his case against Philip Forman, United States Department of Justice, district of New Jersey, and Guy L. Fake, United States Department of Justice, district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2158. Also, petition of secretary and treasurer, International Association for Identification, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to enable Hawaii to be admitted into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2159. Also petition of the Rotary Club of Tacloban, Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to establishment of an international shrine in the immediate vicinity of a national park at Red Beach, Palo, on Leyte; to the Committee on Public Lands.

2160. Also, petition of Adriano V. Ncgar, municipal secretary, Municipal Council of Palo, Leyte, Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the construction of four veterans' hospitals in the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2161. Also, petition of Pedro Ambatali, Nueva Vizcaya, Philippine Islands, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to Resolution No. 1, of the Philippine Constabulary Veterans, asking that veterans who serve from 1901 to 1914, be included in legislation now pending in the Eightieth Congress (H. R. 451), and scheduled to be introduced in the Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2162. Also, petition of President Francisco Colon Gordiany, Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to Resolution No. 8, asking for an appropriation for the construction of a hospital at San Juan, P. R.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2163. Also petition of Hon. William M. Tuck, chairman, Governor's Office, Richmond, Va., petitioning consideration of his resolu-

tion with reference to transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted by the Southern Governors' Conference at Savannah, Ga., December 14, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the third calendar quarter of 1948.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act, three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name ----------
Business address ----------

INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM PERSONS REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:
(1) ----------
(2) In whose interest he appears or works:
(2) ----------
(3) The duration of such employment:
(3) ----------
(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:
(4) ----------
(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:
(5) ----------
(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:
(6) ----------
(7) What expenses are to be included:
(7) ----------

See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name ----------
Business address ----------
Employed by ----------
Address ----------

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:
(1) ----------
(2) To whom paid:
(2) ----------
(3) For what purposes:
(3) ----------
(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:
(4) ----------
(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:
(5) ----------

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the third calendar quarter 1948, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Association of American Ship Owners, The, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) The registrant is composed of 14 owners of vessels documented under the laws of the United States. (2) See attached.[1] (3) The duration of the registrant is not limited. (4) The amount which registrant is paid and is to receive is indefinite but is fixed from time to time at rates based upon the gross registered tonnage of vessels owned and operated by registrant's members as the members determine to be necessary to provide funds to defray expenditures in accordance with the articles of association authorized in registrant's budget. (5) The registrant is paid or is to be paid by registrant's members. (6) Registrant is to be paid nothing for expenses other than expenses authorized by the members in the registrant's budgets. (7) The expenses provided in the budgets of the registrant are as follows: Salaries, withholding tax, general expense of officers, rent and electricity, furniture and fixtures, office supplies, telephone, teletype, and telegraph, postage and express, subscriptions and publications, transcripts, printing, publicity, employers pay-roll taxes, other and miscellaneous expenses, legal and other fees.

Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Sixty-eight member companies (see attached list of member companies).[1] (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite. (4) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (5) Sixty-eight member companies. (6) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (7) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1]

Berger, Robert I., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite. (4) $650. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) None. (7) None.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Brown, Russell B., 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. Amended form. Since filing Registration Form B under the Lobbying Act, my annual salary has been increased as of October 1, 1948, in the amount of $3,000.

Carson, T. J., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Special session beginning July 26, 1948. (4) $25 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Personal expenses, transportation.

Case, Ralph H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Tribal Council, Cheyenne River Reservation, Cheyenne Agency, S. Dak. (2) The Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation, S. Dak. (3) Five years. (4) $2,000 per annum. (5) By the tribal council, with the approval of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. (6) Travel and subsistence while on tribal business, telegrams, stenographic services, printing, etc., with the approval of tribal council and Commissioner of Indian Affairs. (7) Same as included in (6) above.

Coulter, John Lee, 611 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Renderers Association, 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of American agriculture and American consumers. (3) Irregular. (4) $50 per diem when actually employed. (5) National Renderers Association. (6) None. (7) None.

Drake, John, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite, no fixed term. (4) $5,000 per annum to cover all services for the federation including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Federline, Andrew Paul, 723 Fifteenth Street NW. Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen, Bona Allen Building, Atlanta, Ga. (2) For the commission salesmen who sell women's and children's apparel (members of the association named above). (3) Continuing, indefinite (registrant is Washington counsel for the association named). (4) $10 per hour for the time actually spent on legislative matters (same as for services on legal and administrative matters). (5) National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen. (6) None other than reimbursement for cash outlay. (7) Telephone, telegraph, meals, and travel.

Fifer, Russell, executive secretary, American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. Amend Form B on file, item 4, to read as follows: "$14,000 per annum—such payments are received for services as executive secretary of the American Butter Institute."

Gall, John C. (firm of Gall & Lane), Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Electric Companies, Washington, D. C. (2) Same. (3) Indefinite. (4) No fixed amount; fees for work done from time to time. (5) Same as (1). (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (7) Telephone, telegraph, taxi, miscellaneous office.

Gardner, Fraser S.,[2] national legislative chairman. ANU., 5410 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Appointed (to serve without pay) by National Commander James

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

M. Callahan, Army and Navy Union, U. S. A. Victor, Iowa (national headquarters, Atlantic City, N. J.), on August 19, 1948. Representing Army and Navy Union, U. S. A. (2) The Army and Navy Union, U. S. A., in the welfare of veterans and members of the armed forces via legislative activities. (3) Usually for a period of 1 year, the duration of the national commander's term of office (August 1948 to August 1949). (4) No wages or salary is given for the work. (5) No wages or salary is given for the work. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses are reimbursed, such as lunch, cab fare, phone calls, wires, postage, etc., by the National Adjutant Henry W. Gerber, of Atlantic City, N. J., on approval of the national commander. (7) Normal every day business activity expenses as recited in (6) above. (This, the oldest active veterans' organization, has very limited funds.)

Gilbert, Ray, Hotel English, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Same. (3) Approximately special session. (4) Approximately $20 per day (salary). (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation.

Goodman, Leo, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Membership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 per annum. (5) Congress of Industrial Organizations. (6) Indeterminate; will be submitted at later date. (7) Travel and actual personal expenses.

Haynes, Kit H. (1) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (3) October 1, 1948, until terminated. (4) Salary of $6,000 per year, which includes services of all kinds rendered by me to my employer; my complete legislative activities, much of which consists of appearing before committees of Congress, will consume less than 10 percent of my time. (5) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (6) Limited to actual expenses. (7) Travel expenses only.

Henderson, Elmer W. (1) American Council on Human Rights, 1130 Sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Edna Over Gray, president. (2) American Council on Human Rights. (3) Permanent. (4) $4,800 per year. (5) American Council on Human Rights. (6) $500 per year (estimate). (7) Local travel and miscellaneous above normal office expenses.

Hickman, R. L., Bayou Rapides Road, Alexandria, La. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Possible special session. (4) $20. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80. (7) Room, meals, telegram, telephone, taxi fare.

Jones, L. Dan, Esq., 1110 king Building, Washington, D. C. Amended form. This is to advise you that since filing Registration Form B under the Lobbying Act and my letter to you dated July 10, 1947, my annual salary has been increased as of October 1, 1948, in the amount of $1,600.

King, Thomas H., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Reserve Officers Association of the United States. (3) Indefinite, elected national judge advocate of the Reserve Officers Association for 1 year in June 1948. (4) Nothing. (5) No one. (6) Nothing. (7) Nothing.

Lipman,[1] Leonard H., Tunison Lane, New Brunswick, N. J. (1) New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc. (2) New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (5) New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc. (6) Whatever they actually amount to, except that automobile travel expense is to be reimbursed at the rate of 6 cents per mile. (7) Travel, meals, lodging, postage, stationery, printing, telephone calls, telegrams, etc.

Lunn, Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Townsend Plan, Inc. (2) Townsend national insurance plan. (3) Temporary. (4) No salary, no specified amount. A small commission on dues of club members locally, not enough to cover stationery and mailing. A humanitarian movement; I donate time and money. (5) Townsend Plan, Inc., and self-donation. (6) No set amount, not enough to cover local expenses, such as postage, etc. (7) Mimeograph occasional bulletins, post-card notices of local club meetings, etc.

Lusk, Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW.; National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue. (2) In the interest of the public and of the members of the respective associations. (3) The Washington Taxpayers Association has been in existence for 15 years. Registrant no longer represents either of the other associations. (4) The amount from Washington Taxpayers Association is not fixed. It varies with the needs of the association and is shown on the required quarterly reports. Registrant no longer represents: (*a*) the Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, nor does he now receive any compensation from that association for legislative activities. The compensation he does receive from the association since February 1, 1948, is in the nature of severance pay and for that reason is not shown in the quarterly reports subsequent to that date; (*b*) the National Association of Home Builders employed registrant to make a public housing survey and paid him a flat fee for his work and expenses in connection therewith. Registrant has set forth all amounts received subsequent to the passage of Public Law 601 in the proper quarterly reports. (5) By the respective associations at the times and in the amounts shown in the quarterly reports. (6) Nothing in addition to the amount described in paragraph 4 above. (7) Salaries, office supplies, and maintenance; travel and miscellaneous expenses.

McBreen, Thomas J. (1) The National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors' Washington Committee, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors' Washington Committee. (3) Indefinitely. (4) At present, part-time employee at $4,000 per year. Salary will be increased later with full-time employment. Sixty percent of salary is paid by National Association of Real Estate Boards and 40 percent by Realtors' Washington Committee. Sixty percent of time is spent on legislation. (5) The National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors' Washington Committee. (6) No specified amount; to be reimbursed for legitimate out-of-pocket expense. (7) Travel, telephone, meals, and similar expenses in connection with my duties.

[1] Registration with the Clerk only.

McCloskey,[2] Bryson deHaas. (1) Youth of America (a nonprofit association), 316 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Youth of America (a nonprofit association). (3) Since 1939 as founder and president—from the date of this registration as lobbyist (for youth). (4) No compensation has been made to date since the establishment of the association in 1939. All salaries are fixed at a maximum of $12,000 yearly. (5) Youth of America (a nonprofit association). (6) No specific compensation as lobbyist; not over $12,000 yearly salary if and when any compensation is paid. (7) Travel and all other expenses incident to the work of the youth organizations; no budget has as yet been drawn for any expenses but it is likely that it will cover office, telephone, printing, etc.

McIsaac,[2] John R., 96 Brooks Street, Brighton, Mass. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Special session commencing July 26, 1948. (4) $25 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Personal expenses, transportation.

Marchbanks, Modane, 901 Lincoln Tower, 75 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. (1) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (3) September 1, 1941. (4) $6,500 per year. (5) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (6) Unspecified expense account, of which none, so far, has been expended regarding Federal legislation. (7) All expenses incident to Federal margarine legislation.

Mathews, P. H., Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Association of American Railroads. (3) Regular employment. (4) As registrant's duties are of a various nature, it is not possible at this time to apportion any percentage of time to Federal legislation, but such time spent on legislation will be reported on quarterly reports. Registant's annual salary is $16,000. (5) Association of American Railroads. (6) Actual expenses for travel and business expenses incurred at headquarters. (7) As shown in item (6).

Morrow, Giles, room 225, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. Amended form. Effective as of September 1, 1948, my rate of compensation was increased from $10,000 per year to $12,000 per year. There is no other change in the information as reported by me on January 24, 1947.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., (chiropractor), 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Chiropractic Association, Inc., Webster City, Iowa. (2) Chiropractors. (3) Have worked for the chiropractors for 10 years; was employed by the National Chiropractic Insurance Co. for approximately 2 years; have been employed by the National Chiropractic Association since July 1, 1948. (4) Salary covers public-relations work; no salary is paid for lobbying, which is incidental to public-relations work. (5) National Chiropractic Association, Inc. (6) Expenses cover public-relations work; no expenses allowed for lobbying. (7) [Blank.]

Pierce, James L., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Special session, beginning July 26, 1948. (4) $25 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Personal expenses, transportation.

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

Schaeffer, Alexander L., Lasher House, Ancram, N. Y. (1) Alexander L. Schaeffer, (self-employed). (2) Own account. (3) Indefinite and optional with the person registering. (4) Not exceeding $7,500 annually, and may be nothing. (5) From contributions and loans. (6) Such expenses as are necessary for the successful accomplishments of the purposes and objectives, depending upon the scope of the endeavor. (7) Maintenance of office or offices, assistances, employees, printing, advertising in all mediums, publications, releases, postage, traveling and subsistence expenditures, legal and/or other necessary expenses.

Stewart,[2] John H., (1) Air Freight Forwarder Association, care of Air Dispatch, Inc., 1015 Union Central Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) As above. (3) Indefinite, for such term as may be decided by the officers of the association from time to time. (4) No compensation. (5) [Blank.] (6) See (7) below. (7) Actual expenses subject to approval in each case by officers of the association.

Sullivan, Charles H., 75 State Street, Albany, N. Y. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Special. (4) Approximately $20 per day (salary). (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation.

Sullivan,[2] Gael, (1) Theatre Owners of America, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Theatre Owners of America. (3) July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949. (4) No compensation in addition to salary as executive director. (5) Theatre Owners of America, Inc. (6) Reimbursement of traveling and hotel (or its equivalent) expenses. (7) See (6) above.

Teel, Donald, (1) Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (2) Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Nothing. I am secretary-treasurer of the Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., serving without pay. (5) Expenses paid by Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc. (6) To be reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) Transportation costs, telephone calls, and other incidental expenses necessary in the performance of duties.

Todd,[2] John H., 1037 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Partner in the law firm of Callaway & Reed, of Dallas, Tex. (Mercantile Bank Building), and Washington, D. C. (Woodward Building). (2) National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association. (3) Indefinite; year-to-year basis. (4) Law firm, as general counsel, receives an annual retainer, less than $1,500 (if any) of which could be considered compensation for activities, the purpose of which is to influence the passage or defeat of Federal legislation. (5) The law firm is paid an annual retainer by the (treasurer of) National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association. My compensation consists of a division of the annual profits of the law firm. (6) Actual expenses are reimbursed. (7) All actual expenses incurred on behalf of the National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association.

Vine, Ronald H., room 701, Realty Building, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) PER, Inc., 3405 Milton Street, Dallas, Tex. (2) In the interest of clients of PER who are manufacturers in the six States of Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas. (3) By yearly contract. Present contract for the period May 17, 1948, to May 16, 1949. (4) $5,000 per year. Note: This salary, plus expense account, is for the primary purpose of representing PER in Washington relative to obtaining business from the Government, foreign purchasing agencies, and commercial people for the clients of PER. It is not expected that lobbying, as such, will require more than 10 percent of the applicant's time. (5) PER, Inc. (6) As required; i. e., office rent, automobile allowance, office supplies, etc.; averages about $130 per month. (7) As above. It is not expected that the applicant will be required to expend moneys for entertainment, literature, etc.

Walker, Jimmie, Post Office Box 1329, 305-06 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc. (2) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc. (3) An elected secretary-treasurer for 1 year from March 1948 and work on a voluntary basis. (4) Retained by Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., and reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in behalf of the association. (5) Voluntary and reimbursement on expense basis. (6) Actual, as incurred and approved. (7) Travel, telephone, postage, meals, and lodging; and when considerable time is devoted to work of association, it is expected in the future that some salary will be paid.

Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) This is a nonprofit organization made up largely of Washington property owners. 1830 Jefferson Place NW. Payment of taxes to the District government qualifies for membership. (2) In the interest of the public and of the members of the association. (3) This organization has been in existence for 15 years. (4) The amount is not fixed; it varies with the needs of the organization and its members. The amount actually received appears on the required quarterly reports. (5) By contributions of members. (6) Nothing in addition to the amount described in (4) above. (7) Salaries, office supplies, printing, and maintenance of office.

Wenchel, Tannenbaum & Nunan, Esqs., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) David Rosenthal, Scarsdale, N. Y., and Henry Kalman, New Rochelle, N. Y., through their counsel, Brozan & Holman, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Same as above. (3) Employment has no specified period of duration but will probably continue during the current and succeeding sessions of Congress. (4) A fee of $1,000 has been paid and additional undetermined fees may be paid at the termination of the employment commensurate with the services rendered and results obtained. (5) The $1,000 fee already paid was received from Messrs. Brozan and Holman, counsel to David Rosenthal and Henry Kalman. Any additional fees will also be paid by Brozan & Holman out of fees paid to them by David Rosenthal and Henry Kalman. (6) It is not contemplated that any expenses are to be paid or incurred in connection with this employment. (7) See above.

Whitney, Byrl A. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 1528 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) For the special session of Congress beginning July 26, 1948. (4) $25 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day, plus transportation costs, telephone, postage, stationery, and such secretarial incidentals. (7) Personal living expenses, transportation, telephone and telegraph, postage, and secretarial incidentals.

Wilken, Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Self. (2) In behalf of national economy, especially agriculture. (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary. (5) Self or some client if occasion should arise. (6) Unknown and indefinite. (7) Those occurred incidental to service.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, Fort Duchesne, Utah; Ignacio, Colo.; Towaoc, Colo. (2) Same as (1). Deponent does not believe that he is required to register or report, because his legislative activities are not only incidental to his employment to prosecute claims against the United States but files this registration so that no question may be raised with respect to his activities. (3) Employed under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior to prosecute claims of Ute Indians against United States in the Court of Claims. (4) Receives no fees unless or until a judgment is entered by the United States Court of Claims, and it is then set by the court. (5) In the event of a judgment, would be paid by United States Treasury from funds recovered for the Confederated Bands of Utes. (6) Necessary expenses for prosecution of claims, approved by Secretary of the Interior. (7) See (6).

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (2) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (3) Permanent. (4) $11,000 per annum, although not more than one-half is paid for the "principal purpose" of influencing legislation as defined in section 307. (5) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (6) No definite amount. (7) Ordinary taxi and telephone expenses.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the third calendar quarter, 1948, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 10279) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Adkerson, J. Carson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; self. (1) Disbursements, $5.58. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Alifas, Nels Peter, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,999.98; reimbursed to the extent of $10 for legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying; i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 20 percent of time spent on this work. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly periodical, of which he is editor. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Allman, Roy G., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; self. (1) No money received, however expended approximately $100

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.
[3] Registration with the Clerk only.

M. Callahan, Army and Navy Union, U. S. A. Victor, Iowa (national headquarters, Atlantic City, N. J.), on August 19, 1948. Representing Army and Navy Union, U. S. A. (2) The Army and Navy Union, U. S. A., in the welfare of veterans and members of the armed forces via legislative activities. (3) Usually for a period of 1 year, the duration of the national commander's term of office (August 1948 to August 1949). (4) No wages or salary is given for the work. (5) No wages or salary is given for the work. (6) Out-of-pocket expenses are reimbursed, such as lunch, cab fare, phone calls, wires, postage, etc., by the National Adjutant Henry W. Gerber, of Atlantic City, N. J., on approval of the national commander. (7) Normal every day business activity expenses as recited in (6) above. (This, the oldest active veterans' organization, has very limited funds.)

Gilbert, Ray, Hotel English, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Same. (3) Approximately special session. (4) Approximately $20 per day (salary). (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation.

Goodman, Leo, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Membership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,000 per annum. (5) Congress of Industrial Organizations. (6) Indeterminate; will be submitted at later date. (7) Travel and actual personal expenses.

Haynes, Kit H. (1) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (3) October 1, 1948, until terminated. (4) Salary of $6,000 per year, which includes services of all kinds rendered by me to my employer; my complete legislative activities, much of which consists of appearing before committees of Congress, will consume less than 10 percent of my time. (5) National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (6) Limited to actual expenses. (7) Travel expenses only.

Henderson, Elmer W. (1) American Council on Human Rights, 1130 Sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Edna Over Gray, president. (2) American Council on Human Rights. (3) Permanent. (4) $4,300 per year. (5) American Council on Human Rights. (6) $500 per year (estimate). (7) Local travel and miscellaneous above normal office expenses.

Hickman, R. L., Bayou Rapides Road, Alexandria, La. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Possible special session. (4) $20. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80. (7) Room, meals, telegram, telephone, taxi fare.

Jones, L. Dan, Esq., 1110 king Building, Washington, D. C. Amended form. This is to advise you that since filing Registration Form B under the Lobbying Act and my letter to you dated July 10, 1947, my annual salary has been increased as of October 1, 1948, in the amount of $1,600.

King, Thomas H., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Reserve Officers Association of the United States. (3) Indefinite, elected national judge advocate of the Reserve Officers Association for 1 year in June 1948. (4) Nothing. (5) No one. (6) Nothing. (7) Nothing.

Lipman,[2] Leonard H., Tunison Lane, New Brunswick, N. J. (1) New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc. (2) New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (5) New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc. (6) Whatever they actually amount to, except that automobile travel expense is to be reimbursed at the rate of 6 cents per mile. (7) Travel, meals, lodging, postage, stationery, printing, telephone calls, telegrams, etc.

Lunn, Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Townsend Plan, Inc. (2) Townsend national insurance plan. (3) Temporary. (4) No salary, no specified amount. A small commission on dues of club members locally, not enough to cover stationery and mailing. A humanitarian movement; I donate time and money. (5) Townsend Plan, Inc., and self-donation. (6) No set amount, not enough to cover local expenses, such as postage, etc. (7) Mimeograph occasional bulletins, post-card notices of local club meetings, etc.

Lusk, Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW.; National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue. (2) In the interest of the public and of the members of the respective associations. (3) The Washington Taxpayers Association has been in existence for 15 years. Registrant no longer represents either of the other associations. (4) The amount from Washington Taxpayers Association is not fixed. It varies with the needs of the association and is shown on the required quarterly reports. Registrant no longer represents: (*a*) the Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, nor does he now receive any compensation from that association for legislative activities. The compensation he does receive from the association since February 1, 1948, is in the nature of severance pay and for that reason is not shown in the quarterly reports subsequent to that date; (*b*) the National Association of Home Builders employed registrant to make a public housing survey and paid him a flat fee for his work and expenses in connection therewith. Registrant has set forth all amounts received subsequent to the passage of Public Law 601 in the proper quarterly reports. (5) By the respective associations at the times and in the amounts shown in the quarterly reports. (6) Nothing in addition to the amount described in paragraph 4 above. (7) Salaries, office supplies, and maintenance; travel and miscellaneous expenses.

McBreen, Thomas J. (1) The National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors' Washington Committee, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors' Washington Committee. (3) Indefinitely. (4) At present, part-time employee at $4,000 per year. Salary will be increased later with full-time employment. Sixty percent of salary is paid by National Association of Real Estate Boards and 40 percent by Realtors' Washington Committee. Sixty percent of time is spent on legislation. (5) The National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors' Washington Committee. (6) No specified amount; to be reimbursed for legitimate out-of-pocket expense. (7) Travel, telephone, meals, and similar expenses in connection with my duties.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

McCloskey,[2] Bryson deHaas. (1) Youth of America (a nonprofit association), 316 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Youth of America (a nonprofit association). (3) Since 1939 as founder and president—from the date of this registration as lobbyist (for youth). (4) No compensation has been made to date since the establishment of the association in 1939. All salaries are fixed at a maximum of $12,000 yearly. (5) Youth of America (a nonprofit association). (6) No specific compensation as lobbyist; not over $12,000 yearly salary if and when any compensation is paid. (7) Travel and all other expenses incident to the work of the youth organizations; no budget has as yet been drawn for any expenses but it is likely that it will cover office, telephone, printing, etc.

McIsaac,[2] John R., 96 Brooks Street, Brighton, Mass. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Special session commencing July 26, 1948. (4) $25 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Personal expenses, transportation.

Marchbanks, Modane, 901 Lincoln Tower, 75 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. (1) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (3) September 1, 1941. (4) $6,500 per year. (5) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (6) Unspecified expense account, of which none, so far, has been expended regarding Federal legislation. (7) All expenses incident to Federal margarine legislation.

Mathews, P. H., Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Association of American Railroads. (3) Regular employment. (4) As registrant's duties are of a various nature, it is not possible at this time to apportion any percentage of time to Federal legislation, but such time spent on legislation will be reported on quarterly reports. Registant's annual salary is $16,000. (5) Association of American Railroads. (6) Actual expenses for travel and business expenses incurred at headquarters. (7) As shown in item (6).

Morrow, Giles, room 225, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. Amended form. Effective as of September 1, 1948, my rate of compensation was increased from $10,000 per year to $12,000 per year. There is no other change in the information as reported by me on January 24, 1947.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., (chiropractor), 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Chiropractic Association, Inc., Webster City, Iowa. (2) Chiropractors. (3) Have worked for the chiropractors for 10 years; was employed by the National Chiropractic Insurance Co. for approximately 2 years; have been employed by the National Chiropractic Association since July 1, 1948. (4) Salary covers public-relations work; no salary is paid for lobbying, which is incidental to public-relations work. (5) National Chiropractic Association, Inc. (6) Expenses cover public-relations work; no expenses allowed for lobbying. (7) [Blank.]

Pierce, James L., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Special session, beginning July 26, 1948. (4) $25 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Personal expenses, transportation.

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.

Schaeffer, Alexander L., Lasher House, Ancram, N. Y. (1) Alexander L. Schaeffer, (self-employed). (2) Own account. (3) Indefinite and optional with the person registering. (4) Not exceeding $7,500 annually, and may be nothing. (5) From contributions and loans. (6) Such expenses as are necessary for the successful accomplishments of the purposes and objectives, depending upon the scope of the endeavor. (7) Maintenance of office or offices, assistances, employees, printing, advertising in all mediums, publications, releases, postage, traveling and subsistence expenditures, legal and/or other necessary expenses.

Stewart,[2] John H., (1) Air Freight Forwarder Association, care of Air Dispatch, Inc., 1015 Union Central Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) As above. (3) Indefinite, for such term as may be decided by the officers of the association from time to time. (4) No compensation. (5) [Blank.] (6) See (7) below. (7) Actual expenses subject to approval in each case by officers of the association.

Sullivan, Charles H., 75 State Street, Albany, N. Y. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) Special. (4) Approximately $20 per day (salary). (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day. (7) Hotel, meals, transportation.

Sullivan,[2] Gael, (1) Theatre Owners of America, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Theatre Owners of America. (3) July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1949. (4) No compensation in addition to salary as executive director. (5) Theatre Owners of America, Inc. (6) Reimbursement of traveling and hotel (or its equivalent) expenses. (7) See (6) above.

Teel, Donald, (1) Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (2) Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Nothing. I am secretary-treasurer of the Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., serving without pay. (5) Expenses paid by Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc. (6) To be reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) Transportation costs, telephone calls, and other incidental expenses necessary in the performance of duties.

Todd,[2] John H., 1037 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Partner in the law firm of Callaway & Reed, of Dallas, Tex. (Mercantile Bank Building), and Washington, D. C. (Woodward Building). (2) National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association. (3) Indefinite; year-to-year basis. (4) Law firm, as general counsel, receives an annual retainer, less than $1,500 (if any) of which could be considered compensation for activities, the purpose of which is to influence the passage or defeat of Federal legislation. (5) The law firm is paid an annual retainer by the (treasurer of) National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association. My compensation consists of a division of the annual profits of the law firm. (6) Actual expenses are reimbursed. (7) All actual expenses incurred on behalf of the National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association.

Vine, Ronald H., room 701, Realty Building, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) PER, Inc., 3405 Milton Street, Dallas, Tex. (2) In the interest of clients of PER who are manufacturers in the six States of Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas. (3) By yearly contract. Present contract for the period May 17, 1948, to May 16, 1949. (4) $5,000 per year. Note: This salary, plus expense account, is for the primary purpose of representing PER in Washington relative to obtaining business from the Government, foreign purchasing agencies, and commercial people for the clients of PER. It is not expected that lobbying, as such, will require more than 10 percent of the applicant's time. (5) PER, Inc. (6) As required; i. e., office rent, automobile allowance, office supplies, etc.; averages about $130 per month. (7) As above. It is not expected that the applicant will be required to expend moneys for entertainment, literature, etc.

Walker, Jimmie, Post Office Box 1329, 305-06 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc. (2) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc. (3) An elected secretary-treasurer for 1 year from March 1948 and work on a voluntary basis. (4) Retained by Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., and reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in behalf of the association. (5) Voluntary and reimbursement on expense basis. (6) Actual, as incurred and approved. (7) Travel, telephone, postage, meals, and lodging; and when considerable time is devoted to work of association, it is expected in the future that some salary will be paid.

Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) This is a nonprofit organization made up largely of Washington property owners. 1830 Jefferson Place NW. Payment of taxes to the District government qualifies for membership. (2) In the interest of the public and of the members of the association. (3) This organization has been in existence for 15 years. (4) The amount is not fixed; it varies with the needs of the organization and its members. The amount actually received appears on the required quarterly reports. (5) By contributions of members. (6) Nothing in addition to the amount described in (4) above. (7) Salaries, office supplies, printing, and maintenance of office.

Wenchel, Tannenbaum & Nunan, Esqs., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) David Rosenthal, Scarsdale, N. Y., and Henry Kalman, New Rochelle, N. Y., through their counsel, Brozan & Holman, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) Same as above. (3) Employment has no specified period of duration but will probably continue during the current and succeeding sessions of Congress. (4) A fee of $1,000 has been paid and additional undetermined fees may be paid at the termination of the employment commensurate with the services rendered and results obtained. (5) The $1,000 fee already paid was received from Messrs. Brozan and Holman, counsel to David Rosenthal and Henry Kalman. Any additional fees will also be paid by Brozan & Holman out of fees paid to them by David Rosenthal and Henry Kalman. (6) It is not contemplated that any expenses are to be paid or incurred in connection with this employment. (7) See above.

Whitney, Byrl A. (1) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 1528 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (3) For the special session of Congress beginning July 26, 1948. (4) $25 per day. (5) Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (6) $11.80 per day, plus transportation costs, telephone, postage, stationery, and such secretarial incidentals. (7) Personal living expenses, transportation, telephone and telegraph, postage, and secretarial incidentals.

Wilken, Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Self. (2) In behalf of national economy, especially agriculture. (3) Indefinite. (4) No salary. (5) Self or some client if occasion should arise. (6) Unknown and indefinite. (7) Those occurred incidental to service.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, Fort Duchesne, Utah; Ignacio, Colo.; Towaoc, Colo. (2) Same as (1). Deponent does not believe that he is required to register or report, because his legislative activities are not only incidental to his employment to prosecute claims against the United States but files this registration so that no question may be raised with respect to his activities. (3) Employed under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior to prosecute claims of Ute Indians against United States in the Court of Claims. (4) Receives no fees unless or until a judgment is entered by the United States Court of Claims, and it is then set by the court. (5) In the event of a judgment, would be paid by United States Treasury from funds recovered for the Confederated Bands of Utes. (6) Necessary expenses for prosecution of claims, approved by Secretary of the Interior. (7) See (6).

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (2) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (3) Permanent. (4) $11,000 per annum, although not more than one-half is paid for the "principal purpose" of influencing legislation as defined in section 307. (5) Chamber of Commerce of the United States. (6) No definite amount. (7) Ordinary taxi and telephone expenses.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the third calendar quarter, 1948, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 10279) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Adkerson, J. Carson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; self. (1) Disbursements, $5.58. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Alifas, Nels Peter, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,999.98; reimbursed to the extent of $10 for legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying; i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 20 percent of time spent on this work. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly periodical, of which he is editor. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allen, William, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Allman, Roy G., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; self. (1) No money received, however expended approximately $100

[2] Registration with the Secretary only.
[3] Registration with the Clerk only.

per month. (2) Transportation, taxis, telephone, cables, postage, entertainment. (3) To promote bills to pay Americans for damages received as result of war in the Far East. (4) None. (5) To pay Americans for war damages.

American Association of University Women,[4] 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None except salary of registered associate, $1,000. (2) To legislative program associate, who is registered under the act. (3) As part of yearly salary of $4,000. (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women (quarterly); General Director's letter (for branch officers and chairmen) (three times a year). (5) See attached sheet[5] (legislative notes from summer, 1948, Journal).

American Booksellers Association, Inc., Gilbert E. Goodkind, executive secretary, American Booksellers Association, Inc., 31 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $115.12 expended in June and paid after filing of last quarterly report. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Telegrams to members of this association and to Senators and Congressmen on June 15, 16, 17, 1948. (4) None. (5) Legislation to increase the book parcel-post rate.

The American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Contributed by 312 member lines during third quarter 1948, $21,656.48, only a small portion of which is for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) J. M. Hood, $74.07; A. C. Mellichampe, $14.85; Wilson Epes, $126; proportion of president's time and supporting secretary and clerks, telegraph, telephone, postage, rent, office supplies, taxes, etc., estimated at $302.10. (3) For salaries, office expenses, printing, and reimbursement of personal expenses in furtherance of the legislative program of the 312 member lines of the association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting short-line railroads. (See first-quarter report for complete text of legislative program.)

Aring, Hector M., 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See original registration form for complete explanation. No other contributions received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposed to appropriation for cotton subsidy under section 32 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act, 1947—Tax legislation.

Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Income, $2,659.33; expenses, $2,784.71. (2) Lobbying activities, none; nonlobbying activities, Edward M. Kriz, John H. Smith, Jr., Patricia Mortell, Jeanette Carey, Sylvia Karr, Kathleen Anderson, Mary Malone, Mrs. John Schaffer, plus miscellaneous operating expenses. (3) The general purpose of the association is to foster more efficient use of third-class mail by those enterprises employing the use of it. (4) None. (5) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations.

Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. The registrant is composed of 14 owners of vessels documented under the laws of the United States. (1) No money has been received by the registrant for activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601. The registrant did, however, in the regular course of business receive payments of dues from certain of its members. No expenditure has been made by or on behalf of the registrant to any person for any amount or value in furtherance of any such object, except that registrant has paid salaries to and expenses of George W. Morgan, its president, and Lynn E. Mote, manager of its Washington office. For the extent, if any, to which such expenditures have been applied to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration, reference is hereby made to the reports being concurrently filed by such officer and employee of the registrant and such reports are hereby made a part hereof. (2) See item (1). (3) See item (1). (4) See item (1). (5) The registrant is not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. Reference is hereby made to paragraph 2 of the registrant's registration statement on Form B, which paragraph is hereby made a part hereof.

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies,[6] 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (2) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (3) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (4) The association publishes the Casualty and Surety Journal, as stated in exhibit A attached to Form A. Also issues releases to insurance trade press and to papers and periodicals of general circulation, such releases being mainly concerned with accident-prevention problems. (5) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies,[7] 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (2) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (3) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (4) The association publishes the Casualty and Surety Journal. Also issues releases to insurance trade press and to papers and periodicals of general circulation, such releases being mainly concerned with accident-prevention problems. (5) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

Austern, H. Thomas, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. (1) No money received or expended during third quarter of 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Canadian fisheries.

Ayer, N. W., & Son, Inc., a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.; National Association of Electric Companies. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer) received from National Association of Electric Companies $14,488.49, of which $11,327.44 represented compensation to Ayer and $3,161.05 was for out-of-pocket expenses. (See item (2) below.) The only money received or spent by registrants, J. Vance Babb, and Raymond C. Baker, was for out-of-pocket expenses noted in item (2) below. (2) J. Vance Babb, R. C. Baker, B. J. Kelly, and O. Leiding, employees of Ayer, for traveling and miscellaneous expenses, $2,303.94; materials, postage, messengers, clippings, telephone and telegrams, mimeographing, prints, etc., $857.11. (3) The amounts described in items (1) and (2) above were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electric industry as described in registration dated April 15, 1948. Neither the services nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) None, except that Ayer services included publicity regarding the proposed appropriation to the Tennessee Valley Authority for construction of a steam power plant. This quarterly report is filed subject to the reservations contained in the amended registration dated April 15, 1948.

Babcock, Charles E., Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va.; National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Have an expense account of $50 per month for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Various; see below. (3) Services at gasoline stations, postage, telegrams, meals, and hotel rooms, transportation to and from Washington, all for myself. (4) The Junior American, the official organ of the Junior Order (as above). (5) Immigration, deportation, and naturalization; free public schools; occasionally other legislation the order believes for the general good of the country, and in which its members are interested.

Bailey, C. Lloyd, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Friends Committee on National Legislation. (1) Gross salary, July, August, September, $1,000; travel expense, $211.71. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send out a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Bailey, Frazer A., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant believes that $750 represents the amount of his salary received from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the third quarter of 1948, which is allocable to legislative activities; $42 paid to Carlton Hotel for expenses of luncheon meeting with industry and labor representatives in connection with overtime-on-overtime legislation. (2) No expenditures other than as indicated in item (1) except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See items (1) and (2). (4) Lykes Fleet Flashes. (5) As president of the federation, am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. However, during past quarter supported overtime-on-overtime legislation and certain amendments to Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Baker, Gibbs L., 1011 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Charles Niedner's Sons Co., Inc., Malden, Mass.; the United States Rubber Co., New York City; the Firehose Manufacturing Co., Inc., New York City; the Approved Equipment Manufacturing Co., Inc., New Milford, N. J.; and the Federal Firehose Manufacturing Co., Inglewood, Calif. (1) $750. (2) Self. (3) On account for services rendered and out-of-pocket disbursements. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5608.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenses, July 1 through September 1, 1948, $55.89; salary, same dates, $165.58. (2) Expenditures made for transportation, office work and supplies, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting civil liberties.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

Baldrige, H. M., United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 per month or $6,000 for the quarter; no money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) During the year I opposed H. R. 5051, H. R. 6502, and House Resolution 425.

Baldwin & Mermey, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (1) Retainer from Hershey Corp., $2,250; reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, $7.22. (2) New York Telephone Co., Baldwin & Mermey, post office. (3) Telephone, postage, and public-relations counsel. (4) [Blank.] (5) Sugar legislation.

Barber, Hartman, room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, seventh floor, Brotherhood Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. Total salary for quarter, $1,320; total expenses for quarter, $338.18. (2) See explanatory statement.[1] (3) See explanatory statement.[1] (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; The Haloid Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barlow, Joel, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (1) Received, $1,149.48; expended, $127.28. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $21.38; Western Union, $78.80; cab fares, miscellaneous expense, $27.10. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, teletype messages, transportation within the District of Columbia, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer for the purpose of rendering general legal advice and assistance. Considerable time is being currently spent and may continue to be spent in the preparation of materials for presentation to Congress in support of proposed legislation to improve marketing conditions in the fruit industry during the postwar interruption in normal export marketing.

Barnard, Robert C., Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Disbursements by Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox during last quarter $4.94. Receipts from Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., $333.63. In accordance with arrangements between registrant and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, this money paid to Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox. (2) Disbursements, $4.74 tolls; 20 cents postage. Receipts to Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox. See answer (1) above. (3) Disbursements, see answer (2) above; receipts, $300 fee for professional services, $33.63 reimbursement for previous expenditures. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6253 and S. 2539, both bills entitled "For the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co."

[1] Not-printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Bauer, Charles J., Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) BOMA Letter (bimonthly newsletter). (5) I was not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. I was employed as permanent secretary of Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington with duties including appearance at public hearings on legislative and regulatory matters of direct concern to the association.

Benson, Ernest H., national legislative representative, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary at rate of $8,600 per annum; no expense account. (2) Ernest H. Benson. (3) Activities in connection with legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes.

Beirne,[4] [6] Joseph A., 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $1,065.34; salary, $3,300; total, $4,365.34. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Berckes, Herbert C., secretary, Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans, La. (1) For services as secretary: April $250, May $250, June $250, total $750. Expended for travel expense: April $454.78, May $589.08, June $563.94, total $1,607.80. (2) Includes transportation and per diem. (3) Legislation. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine lumber industry.

Berger, Robert I., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation the sum of $650 as compensation for all services. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Bergin, Preston B., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $400 salary; $17.97 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Bernard,[4] William S., 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6369, Emergency Displaced Persons Act.

Berns, Karl H., Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,840, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service $368; expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Berry,[5] Raymond H., 1000 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.; Automobile Club of Michigan, 139 Bagley Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Reimbursement on account of transportation, hotel expense, meals, taxis, tips, telephone calls, and telegrams from February 2 to March 15, 1948, $207; also allocated portion of fee for various legal services rendered the Automobile Club of Michigan covering period January 17, 1944, to March 1, 1948, the amount believed apportionable for this report, $290, covering period from February 1 to April 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) No specific legislation; conferences merely had to do with possibility that Internal Revenue Code may be amended to include specifically such clients as the above.

Berry,[6] Raymond H., 1000 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich. (Automobile Club of Michigan). (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) No specific legislation; conferences merely had to do with possibility that Internal Revenue Code may be amended to include specifically such clients as the Automobile Club of Michigan.

Biorn, Norman E., Minnesota Associated Businessmen, 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn. (1) Salary from Minnesota Associated Businessmen, none; received for actual expenses, $180.28; spent for legislative activities, none. (2) Mary Lou Kustelski, $150; United States Government, $12; Northwest Bell Telephone Co., $18.28. (3) Stenographic services, postage, phone, and telegrams. (4) None. (5) Elimination of inequalities in tax legislation.

Bison, Henry, Jr., Tyre Taylor, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,581.27, expenditures for living purposes only. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of the free-enterprise system.

Blair, Newell, 421 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Cardin Mining & Milling Corp., Picher, Okla. (1) Have received from Cardin Mining & Milling Corp. between April 1 and June 30, 1948, $713.98; expended between April 1 and June 30, 1948, $793.46; difference reimbursed in July, $84.48. (2) Blair & Blair, of which firm registrant is a member, 421 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (3) Reimburse advances for travel, $424.72; telephone, $146.56; telegraph, $2.66; printing, $44.42; taxis, $9.35; entertainment, $170.75; total, $798.46. (4) None. (5) Subsidy on nonferrous metal mining.

Bledsoe,[6] Samuel B., 1730 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Selvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $85.75. (2) Carfares, taxicabs, $52.50; meals, etc., $18; phone calls, $15.25. (3) Transportation; luncheons; phone calls, local and long distance. (4) I worked to assure the publication and dissemination of news and radio comment favorable to margarine legislation desired by our client but I cannot say categorically that I caused any articles to be published or any radio comment. (5) Margarine legislation.

Bledsoe,[7] Samuel B., 1730 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Selvage & Lee 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $8.90. (2) Carfares, taxicabs, $2.90; luncheon, $6. (3) Transportation, luncheon. (4) I worked to assure the dissemination

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

per month. (2) Transportation, taxis, telephone, cables, postage, entertainment. (3) To promote bills to pay Americans for damages received as result of war in the Far East. (4) None. (5) To pay Americans for war damages.

American Association of University Women,[4] 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None except salary of registered associate, $1,000. (2) To legislative program associate, who is registered under the act. (3) As part of yearly salary of $4,000. (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women (quarterly); General Director's letter (for branch officers and chairmen) (three times a year). (5) See attached sheet[5] (legislative notes from summer, 1948, Journal).

American Booksellers Association, Inc., Gilbert E. Goodkind, executive secretary, American Booksellers Association, Inc., 31 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $115.12 expended in June and paid after filing of last quarterly report. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Telegrams to members of this association and to Senators and Congressmen on June 15, 16, 17, 1948. (4) None. (5) Legislation to increase the book parcel-post rate.

The American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Contributed by 312 member lines during third quarter 1948, $21,656.48, only a small portion of which is for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) J. M. Hood, $74.07; A. C. Mellichampe, $14.85; Wilson Epes, $126; proportion of president's time and supporting secretary and clerks, telegraph, telephone, postage, rent, office supplies, taxes, etc., estimated at $302.10. (3) For salaries, office expenses, printing, and reimbursement of personal expenses in furtherance of the legislative program of the 312 member lines of the association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting short-line railroads. (See first-quarter report for complete text of legislative program.)

Aring, Hector M., 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See original registration form for complete explanation. No other contributions received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposed to appropriation for cotton subsidy under section 32 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act, 1947—Tax legislation.

Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Income, $2,659.33; expenses, $2,784.71. (2) Lobbying activities, none; nonlobbying activities, Edward M. Kriz, John H. Smith, Jr., Patricia Mortell, Jeanette Carey, Sylvia Karr, Kathleen Anderson, Mary Malone, Mrs. John Schaffer, plus miscellaneous operating expenses. (3) The general purpose of the association is to foster more efficient use of third-class mail by those enterprises employing the use of it. (4) None. (5) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations.

Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. The registrant is composed of 14 owners of vessels documented under the laws of the United States. (1) No money has been received by the registrant for activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601. The registrant did, however, in the regular course of business receive payments of dues from certain of its members. No expenditure has been made by or on behalf of the registrant to any person for any amount or value in furtherance of any such object, except that registrant has paid salaries to and expenses of George W. Morgan, its president, and Lynn E. Mote, manager of its Washington office. For the extent, if any, to which such expenditures have been applied to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration, reference is hereby made to the reports being concurrently filed by such officer and employee of the registrant and such reports are hereby made a part hereof. (2) See item (1). (3) See item (1). (4) See item (1). (5) The registrant is not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. Reference is hereby made to paragraph 2 of the registrant's registration statement on Form B, which paragraph is hereby made a part hereof.

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies,[6] 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (2) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (3) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (4) The association publishes the Casualty and Surety Journal, as stated in exhibit A attached to Form A. Also issues releases to insurance trade press and to papers and periodicals of general circulation, such releases being mainly concerned with accident-prevention problems. (5) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies,[7] 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (2) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (3) See exhibit A attached to Form A.[1] (4) The association publishes the Casualty and Surety Journal. Also issues releases to insurance trade press and to papers and periodicals of general circulation, such releases being mainly concerned with accident-prevention problems. (5) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

Austern, H. Thomas, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. (1) No money received or expended during third quarter of 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Canadian fisheries.

Ayer, N. W., & Son, Inc., a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.; National Association of Electric Companies. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer) received from National Association of Electric Companies $14,488.49, of which $11,327.44 represented compensation to Ayer and $3,161.05 was for out-of-pocket expenses. (See item (2) below.) The only money received or spent by registrants, J. Vance Babb, and Raymond C. Baker, was for out-of-pocket expenses noted in item (2) below. (2) J. Vance Babb, R. C. Baker, B. J. Kelly, and O. Leiding, employees of Ayer, for traveling and miscellaneous expenses, $2,303.94; materials, postage, messengers, clippings, telephone and telegrams, mimeographing, prints, etc., $857.11. (3) The amounts described in items (1) and (2) above were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electric industry as described in registration dated April 15, 1948. Neither the services nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) None, except that Ayer services included publicity regarding the proposed appropriation to the Tennessee Valley Authority for construction of a steam power plant. This quarterly report is filed subject to the reservations contained in the amended registration dated April 15, 1948.

Babcock, Charles E., Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va.; National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Have an expense account of $50 per month for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Various; see below. (3) Services at gasoline stations, postage, telegrams, meals, and hotel rooms, transportation to and from Washington, all for myself. (4) The Junior American, the official organ of the Junior Order (as above). (5) Immigration, deportation, and naturalization; free public schools; occasionally other legislation the order believes for the general good of the country, and in which its members are interested.

Bailey, C. Lloyd, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Friends Committee on National Legislation. (1) Gross salary, July, August, September, $1,000; travel expense, $211.71. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send out a news letter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Bailey, Frazer A., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant believes that $750 represents the amount of his salary received from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the third quarter of 1948, which is allocable to legislative activities; $42 paid to Carlton Hotel for expenses of luncheon meeting with industry and labor representatives in connection with overtime-on-overtime legislation. (2) No expenditures other than as indicated in item (1) except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See items (1) and (2). (4) Lykes Fleet Flashes. (5) As president of the federation, am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. However, during past quarter supported overtime-on-overtime legislation and certain amendments to Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Baker, Gibbs L., 1011 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Charles Niedner's Sons Co., Inc., Malden, Mass.; the United States Rubber Co., New York City; the Firehose Manufacturing Co., Inc., New York City; the Approved Equipment Manufacturing Co., Inc., New Milford, N. J.; and the Federal Firehose Manufacturing Co., Inglewood, Calif. (1) $750. (2) Self. (3) On account for services rendered and out-of-pocket disbursements. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5608.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenses, July 1 through September 1, 1948, $55.89; salary, same dates, $165.58. (2) Expenditures made for transportation, office work and supplies, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting civil liberties.

---

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

Baldrige, H. M., United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 per month or $6,000 for the quarter; no money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) During the year I opposed H. R. 5051, H. R. 6502, and House Resolution 425.

Baldwin & Mermey, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.; Hershey Corp., Hershey, Pa. (1) Retainer from Hershey Corp., $2,250; reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses, $7.22. (2) New York Telephone Co., Baldwin & Mermey, post office. (3) Telephone, postage, and public-relations counsel. (4) [Blank.] (5) Sugar legislation.

Barber, Hartman, room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, seventh floor, Brotherhood Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. Total salary for quarter, $1,320; total expenses for quarter, $338.18. (2) See explanatory statement.[1] (3) See explanatory statement.[1] (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; The Haloid Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barlow, Joel, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (1) Received, $1,149.48; expended, $127.28. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $21.38; Western Union, $78.80; cab fares, miscellaneous expense, $27.10. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, teletype messages, transportation within the District of Columbia, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer for the purpose of rendering general legal advice and assistance. Considerable time is being currently spent and may continue to be spent in the preparation of materials for presentation to Congress in support of proposed legislation to improve marketing conditions in the fruit industry during the postwar interruption in normal export marketing.

Barnard, Robert C., Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Disbursements by Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox during last quarter $4.94. Receipts from Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., $333.63. In accordance with arrangements between registrant and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, this money paid to Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox. (2) Disbursements, $4.74 tolls; 20 cents postage. Receipts to Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox. See answer (1) above. (3) Disbursements, see answer (2) above; receipts, $300 fee for professional services, $33.63 reimbursement for previous expenditures. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6253 and S. 2539, both bills entitled "For the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co."

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Bauer, Charles J., Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) BOMA Letter (bimonthly newsletter). (5) I was not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. I was employed as permanent secretary of Building Owners and Managers Association of Metropolitan Washington with duties including appearance at public hearings on legislative and regulatory matters of direct concern to the association.

Benson, Ernest H., national legislative representative, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary at rate of $8,600 per annum; no expense account. (2) Ernest H. Benson. (3) Activities in connection with legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes.

Beirne,[4] [6] Joseph A., 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $1,065.34; salary, $3,300; total, $4,365.34. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Berckes, Herbert C., secretary, Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans, La. (1) For services as secretary: April $250, May $250, June $250, total $750. Expended for travel expense: April $454.78, May $589.08, June $563.94, total $1,607.80. (2) Includes transportation and per diem. (3) Legislation. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine lumber industry.

Berger, Robert I., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation the sum of $650 as compensation for all services. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Bergin, Preston B., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $400 salary; $17.97 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Bernard,[4] William S., 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6369, Emergency Displaced Persons Act.

Berns, Karl H., Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,840, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service $368; expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Berry,[8] Raymond H., 1000 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.; Automobile Club of Michigan, 139 Bagley Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Reimbursement on account of transportation, hotel expense, meals, taxis, tips, telephone calls, and telegrams from February 2 to March 15, 1948, $207; also allocated portion of fee for various legal services rendered the Automobile Club of Michigan covering period January 17, 1944, to March 1, 1948, the amount believed apportionable for this report, $290, covering period from February 1 to April 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) No specific legislation; conferences merely had to do with possibility that Internal Revenue Code may be amended to include specifically such clients as the above.

Berry,[6] Raymond H., 1000 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich. (Automobile Club of Michigan). (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) No specific legislation; conferences merely had to do with possibility that Internal Revenue Code may be amended to include specifically such clients as the Automobile Club of Michigan.

Biorn, Norman E., Minnesota Associated Businessmen, 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn. (1) Salary from Minnesota Associated Businessmen, none; received for actual expenses, $180.28; spent for legislative activities, none. (2) Mary Lou Kustelski, $150; United States Government, $12; Northwest Bell Telephone Co., $18.28. (3) Stenographic services, postage, phone, and telegrams. (4) None. (5) Elimination of inequalities in tax legislation.

Bison, Henry, Jr., Tyre Taylor, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,581.27, expenditures for living purposes only. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of the free-enterprise system.

Blair, Newell, 421 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Cardin Mining & Milling Corp., Picher, Okla. (1) Have received from Cardin Mining & Milling Corp. between April 1 and June 30, 1948, $713.98; expended between April 1 and June 30, 1948, $793.46; difference reimbursed in July, $84.48. (2) Blair & Blair, of which firm registrant is a member, 421 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C. (3) Reimburse advances for travel, $424.72; telephone, $146.56; telegraph, $2.66; printing, $44.42; taxis, $9.35; entertainment, $170.75; total, $798.46. (4) None. (5) Subsidy on nonferrous metal mining.

Bledsoe,[6] Samuel B., 1730 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Selvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $85.75. (2) Carfares, taxicabs, $52.50; meals, etc., $18; phone calls, $15.25. (3) Transportation; luncheons; phone calls, local and long distance. (4) I worked to assure the publication and dissemination of news and radio comment favorable to margarine legislation desired by our client but I cannot say categorically that I caused any articles to be published or any radio comment. (5) Margarine legislation.

Bledsoe,[7] Samuel B., 1730 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Selvage & Lee 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $8.90. (2) Carfares, taxicabs, $2.90; luncheon, $6. (3) Transportation, luncheon. (4) I worked to assure the dissemination

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

and publication of news favorable to margarine legislation desired by our client but I cannot say that I caused any articles to be published. (5) Margarine legislation.

Bloch, Charles J., Macon, Ga.; Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. (1) Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, under which I have registered, requires that reports shall be filed by registrant so long as his activity continues. Inasmuch as my activity did not continue during the preceding quarter, I am filing no formal report. The only money which I have received from the Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. during the past quarter is as stated in paragraph 1 of my report for the quarter ending March 31, 1948. There have been no expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Bodary, D. A., (national legislative and general representative Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America) 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 107 West Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. (1) Annual compensation of $6,000 and $12 per diem for expenses, hotel, meals, etc. (2) D. A. Bodary. (3) As national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, my duties include handling of legislative matters and handling and progressing of grievances and other activities of my organization. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America.

Bodfish, Morton, United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See attached statement.[1] (2) See attached statement.[1] (3) For travel, hotel, and maintenance in Washington, D. C. (4) Only the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade association periodicals, and in our trade association bulletins. National Defense and Our Business, by Morton Bodfish, July 1948 Directors Digest. (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home-financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Boehne, John W., Jr., 1058 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association Employees—Collectors of internal revenue, $600; printing and postage, $110.24; total, $710.24. (2) John W. Boehne, Jr. (3) Counsel for above association. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employees of Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Bohannon, John N., Asheville, N. C. (1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.); Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) Personal remuneration, including expenses, during the preceding calendar quarter, $2,000; money expended, see (3) below. (2) See (3) below. (3) Personal subsistence, transportation, routine and other customary expenses only; also see (6) Form B heretofore filed. (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect producing, gathering, transportation, distribution, or sale of natural gas.

Bonamarte, Robert F., Sr.,[6] Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Regular Navy, Marine Corps, Fleet Reserve, and retired and veterans' legislation.

Bonamarte, Robert F., Sr.,[7] Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Veterans' legislation and legislation affecting the armed forces of the United States.

Borkin, Joseph, 1017 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.; Federation for Railway Progress, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $459.84. (2) Mimeographing service, Western union, telephone company, office-supplies company. (3) Office supplies and services. (4) [Blank.] (5) The above amount represents expenses in connection with the Washington office of the Federation for Railway Progress and was not paid to me for the support of our opposition to any legislation.

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Sugar Cane League, main office, New Orleans, La.; Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, main office, Saginaw, Mich. (1) $192.60 has been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contacts with Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch when Congress is in session. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) Sugar Bulletin of New Orleans, La.; Sugar Beet Journal of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar producer.

Bowden, Benjamin Edward, 267 Robbins Drive, Newark (Licking County), Ohio; American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $220.22; expense, $147.76; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, various restaurants, pullman fare, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph and postage, laundry, and cleaning. (3) Necessary living, transportation, communication (lodging and meals), laundry, and cleaning. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railroad labor, particularly to oppose legislation detrimental to existing railroad retirement insurance system.

Bowden, Ray B., National Grain Trade Council, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,968, all used for personal purposes, none for lobbying activities; travel expense, $722.12, all used in routine travel; estimate, $2.40 used for taxi fares in Washington, D. C., in connection with lobbying activity. (2) Taxi service, Washington, D. C. (3) Transportation. (4) None, so far as known, having any connection with lobbying activity. (5) Legislation affecting the grain or feed trade. Opposed enactment of international wheat agreement; sought modifying language in CCC charter.

Boyd, H. B., United States Beet Sugar Association as secretary-treasurer, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyd, William R., Jr., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N.Y. (1) See attached schedule[1] for answers to items (1) to (3). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Bradley, Otis T., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Guaranty Trust Co. of New York as trustee of the several trusts described as the Frances G. Phipps trust, Herbert Sanford Ward trust, Sarita E. Barclay trust, and Colville Herbert Sanford Barclay trust, under indenture dated December 24, 1913, and various indentures supplemental thereto made by Charles H. Sanford, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure an amendment to the Federal gift tax acts involving gifts in trust and the effect for gift tax purposes of the surrender by the grantor of a retained power to alter the disposition of the property but not in any way beneficial to himself, and the employment is expected to continue until such amendment is either secured or rejected.

Brady, Joseph E., Brewery Workers International Union, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) None in the preceding quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) None in the preceding quarter. (4) None in the preceding quarter. (5) None in the preceding quarter.

Brewbaker, James M., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employers, $457.58. Expenditures: $457.58. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, railroads, and planes. (3) Traveling, attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents, and trade-marks, wartime control powers, and revision of the RFC and RFC acts.

Bright, O. O., 1302 Eighteenth NW., Washington, D. C.; Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $52.41. (2) To various hotels, cab drivers, etc. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber manufacturing industry.

Brightman, Melvin H., 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C., Dairy Industry Committee. (1) $3,000 salary as executive secretary of Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting dairy industry.

Bromsen,[4][6] Archibald, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $71, May 1948. (2) Registrant. (3) Pay for legal services and expenses. (4) None. (5) Support improved railroad workers' pensions, congressional bills S. 2055; H. R. 4695.

Bromsen, Archibald, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y.; the Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Support improved railroad workers' pensions.

Brooks, A. E., 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.; American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Cock Building, Mexico, D. F. (1) Received $1,250 (partial retainer fee); paid $500 (retainer fee). (2) Fritz G. Lanham. (3) Retainer fee. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

Brooks, William F., National Grain Trade Council, 607 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expense received during period amounted to $2,786.45, of which less than $4 was spent for any purpose covered by the act. (2) Taxicab fares, no one of which was in excess of 70 cents. (3) Transportation. (4) None other than weekly news letter published by employer. (5) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

Brown,[9] Edgar G., National Negro Council, 1717 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $700 membership contributions. (2) National Republic Printers, 511 Eleventh

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

Street NW., $301; telephone and telegrams, $50; postage, $35; traveling expenses, Mr. E. G. Brown, $200. (3) Printing, publicity, advertising, and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Antidiscrimination legislation.

Brown, Russell B., Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act: $15. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Bryson, Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received, $6,280.79; expended, $6,280.79. (2) To self. (3) For personal and family needs. No sums received or expended in connection with activities covered by act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

Buck, Mrs. J. L. Blair, not employed for pay, elected to office of president of the general federation, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For July, August, and September 1948, $1,178.13 travel and expense of entertaining in connection with work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. (2) See question (1). (3) See question (1). (4) General Federation Clubwomen and State federation magazines. (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the general federation supports or opposes legislation, and asks the organization membership to do likewise, when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.; Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla. (1) Received from Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla., for professional services, $750, pro rata. Pro rata expenditures account long-distance telephone calls, July and August 1948, $8.78. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Long-distance telephone service. (4) None. (5 No specific bill as yet. Interested in any legislation providing for or related to improvement of the intracoastal canal between Jacksonville and Miami, Fla.

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.; the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (1) Received from the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J., for professional services, $250, pro rata. Pro rata expenditures account long-distance telephone calls (1) May and June 1948, $120.53; July and August 1948, $4.47; total, $125. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Long-distance telephone service. (4) None. (5) No specific bill since close of second quarter. Interested in any legislation related to tin and the detinning industry.

Bugbee, George, American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $4,749.96; reimbursement of travel expenses, $785.90. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Building Products Institute, room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Contributions, $17,500; expended, $7,296.36. (2) See attached sheet.[1] (3) As indicated by items on attached sheet.[1] (4) Construction Trends, press releases, and certain economic studies. (5) Proposals which may affect the producers of building materials.

Bulow, William J., Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, $2,343.75; money expended, $14.70. (2) Various transportation, telephone, and telegraph companies and United States post office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation, telephone calls, telegrams, and postage. (4) None. (5) Postage rate legislation.

Burger,[2] George J., Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.; self. (1) Received $5,068.05 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent, and acting as director in charge, Washington office, National Federation of Small Business. Expenditures, $4,770.96 for general operating expenses. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel expenses, etc. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Antitrust law enforcement (monopoly); rubber-tires bill; all legislation affecting small business.

Burke, Harold, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for 3 months at $708.33⅓ per month equals $2,125. No expenses received or expended on any legislative activity. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Burnett, Leo, Co., Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (1) For National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $65,222.17. (2) See addendum A.[1] A portion of this sum, not definitely ascertainable, was for purposes referred to in section 307, Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. The reason for our not being able to specify the exact amount used for so-called lobbying purposes is that we handled advertising generally for the Margarine Association. Not only is some of our advertising not directed at the affective legislation at all, but individual advertisements may be partially what may be termed "general advertising" and partially an appeal to support the Margarine Association's position in the legislative matters referred to. (3) See addendum (A).[1] (4) None. (5) Generally, legislation favorable to margarine manufacturers, specifically, the Rivers bill (H. R. 2245).

Burrows, Orrin A., International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,725; expenses, $1,512.60 minus withholding and railroad retirement deductions. The expenses are reimbursable items, such as transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental items. None for lobbying purposes. (2) Railroads, bus companies, taxis for transportation, hotels, motels, and restaurants for meals and lodging, telephone and telegraph companies for messages. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging, telephone calls, telegraph messages, and incidental items, such as tips. (4) The Electrical Workers Journal. (5) All legislation affecting the electrical worker in particular and labor in general.

Butler, Eugene J., Esq., National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $1,758.96; expense account, $150. (2) Eugene J. Butler. (3) Salary, expense account. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

Butts, Joseph G., Jr. (law firm of Gall & Lane), 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Nonsubsidized Insulation Manufacturers Committee, Riverton, Va. (1) Received, $1,000; expended, none. (2) Retainer paid to Gall & Lane. (3) Legal opinions, research, and consultation. (4) None. (5) To support limitation on subsidies.

Caffrey, Charles G., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Manufacturers Association, 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C. (1) One-fourth of per annum salary of $9,000. (2) No payments were made to anyone by Charles G. Caffrey for any purpose whatsoever during the quarter in question; normal expenses excepted. (3) None. (4) None. However, I might state for the record that I spent about $25 during the quarter for taxicab fare, lunches, telephone, and carfare to and from the Capitol to keep informed on legislation. (5) [Blank.]

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Rehabilitation Association, 1025 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) $450 received from the National Rehabilitation Association by the firm of Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for the association. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) No particular legislation. The association is interested in any legislation affecting the vocational rehabilitation program.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $2,100 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for National Tax Equality Association. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Firm retained as Washington counsel on all legal matters affecting NTEA, including legal aspects of various legislative proposals relating to taxation of cooperatives and other corporations enjoying tax exemptions or special privileges.

Carpenter, Austin W., Main Street, Sherburne, N. Y.; New York Associated Businessmen, Inc., Sherburne, N. Y. (1) Received from New York Associated Businessmen, $1,276.28. (2) To self, salary, $750; to railroads and hotels for travel expenses, $526.28; total, $1,276.28. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation which discriminates in any way against the constitutional right of small-business people to quality of competitive opportunity.

Carson, T. J., 1522 East Tenth Street, The Dalles, Oreg.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Amount received including per diem, salary, and travel expenses paid to me by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and expended by me for transportation, living expenses, and incidentals, $699.63. (2) To hotel, restaurants, railroads, taxis, etc. (3) For transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, amendments to minimum-wage law, housing, and anti-inflation. Note: This is final report as above employment was only temporary.

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation; reimbursed $975.65 for expenses advanced; expended $641.55 which will be reimbursed. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Munsey Real Estate Co.; incidentals. (3) Telephone service, rent, incidentals. (4) None. (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislation affecting company's interest.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

and publication of news favorable to margarine legislation desired by our client but I cannot say that I caused any articles to be published. (5) Margarine legislation.

Bloch, Charles J., Macon, Ga.; Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. (1) Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, under which I have registered, requires that reports shall be filed by registrant so long as his activity continues. Inasmuch as my activity did not continue during the preceding quarter, I am filing no formal report. The only money which I have received from the Georgia Southern & Florida Railway Co. during the past quarter is as stated in paragraph 1 of my report for the quarter ending March 31, 1948. There have been no expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Bodary, D. A., (national legislative and general representative Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America) 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 107 West Linwood Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo. (1) Annual compensation of $6,000 and $12 per diem for expenses, hotel, meals, etc. (2) D. A. Bodary. (3) As national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, my duties include handling of legislative matters and handling and progressing of grievances and other activities of my organization. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America.

Bodfish, Morton, United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See attached statement.[1] (2) See attached statement.[1] (3) For travel, hotel, and maintenance in Washington, D. C. (4) Only the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade association periodicals, and in our trade association bulletins. National Defense and Our Business, by Morton Bodfish, July 1948 Directors Digest. (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home-financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Boehne, John W., Jr., 1058 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association Employees—Collectors of internal revenue, $600; printing and postage, $110.24; total, $710.24. (2) John W. Boehne, Jr. (3) Counsel for above association. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employees of Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Bohannon, John N., Asheville, N. C. (1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.); Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) Personal remuneration, including expenses, during the preceding calendar quarter, $2,000; money expended, see (3) below. (2) See (3) below. (3) Personal subsistence, transportation, routine and other customary expenses only; also see (6) Form B heretofore filed. (4) None. (5) Any legislation that might affect producing, gathering, transportation, distribution, or sale of natural gas.

Bonamarte, Robert F., Sr.,[6] Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Regular Navy, Marine Corps, Fleet Reserve, and retired and veterans' legislation.

Bonamarte, Robert F., Sr.,[7] Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Veterans' legislation and legislation affecting the armed forces of the United States.

Borkin, Joseph, 1017 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.; Federation for Railway Progress, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $459.84. (2) Mimeographing service, Western union, telephone company, office-supplies company. (3) Office supplies and services. (4) [Blank.] (5) The above amount represents expenses in connection with the Washington office of the Federation for Railway Progress and was not paid to me for the support of our opposition to any legislation.

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Sugar Cane League, main office, New Orleans, La.; Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, main office, Saginaw, Mich. (1) $192.60 has been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contacts with Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch when Congress is in session. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) Sugar Bulletin of New Orleans, La.; Sugar Beet Journal of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar producer.

Bowden, Benjamin Edward, 267 Robbins Drive, Newark (Licking County), Ohio; American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $220.22; expense, $147.76; no money expended except for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, various restaurants, pullman fare, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph and postage, laundry, and cleaning. (3) Necessary living, transportation, communication (lodging and meals), laundry, and cleaning. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railroad labor, particularly to oppose legislation detrimental to existing railroad retirement insurance system.

Bowden, Ray B., National Grain Trade Council, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,968, all used for personal purposes, none for lobbying activities; travel expense, $722.12, all used in routine travel; estimate, $2.40 used for taxi fares in Washington, D. C., in connection with lobbying activity. (2) Taxi service, Washington, D. C. (3) Transportation. (4) None, so far as known, having any connection with lobbying activity. (5) Legislation affecting the grain or feed trade. Opposed enactment of international wheat agreement; sought modifying language in CCC charter.

Boyd, H. B., United States Beet Sugar Association as secretary-treasurer, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyd, William R., Jr., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N.Y. (1) See attached schedule[1] for answers to items (1) to (3). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Bradley, Otis T., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Guaranty Trust Co. of New York as trustee of the several trusts described as the Frances G. Phipps trust, Herbert Sanford Ward trust, Sarita E. Barclay trust, and Colville Herbert Sanford Barclay trust, under indenture dated December 24, 1913, and various indentures supplemental thereto made by Charles H. Sanford, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure an amendment to the Federal gift tax acts involving gifts in trust and the effect for gift tax purposes of the surrender by the grantor of a retained power to alter the disposition of the property but not in any way beneficial to himself, and the employment is expected to continue until such amendment is either secured or rejected.

Brady, Joseph E., Brewery Workers International Union, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) None in the preceding quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) None in the preceding quarter. (4) None in the preceding quarter. (5) None in the preceding quarter.

Brewbaker, James M., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employers, $457.58. Expenditures: $457.58. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, railroads, and planes. (3) Traveling, attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the following subjects: National labor policy, portal-to-portal wage claims, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, control of atomic energy, Federal subsidization of research, patents, and trade-marks, wartime control powers, and revision of the SEC and RFC acts.

Bright, O. O., 1302 Eighteenth NW., Washington, D. C.; Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $52.41. (2) To various hotels, cab drivers, etc. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber manufacturing industry.

Brightman, Melvin H., 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C., Dairy Industry Committee. (1) $3,000 salary as executive secretary of Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting dairy industry.

Bromsen,[4 6] Archibald, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $71, May 1948. (2) Registrant. (3) Pay for legal services and expenses. (4) None. (5) Support improved railroad workers' pensions, congressional bills S. 2055; H. R. 4695.

Bromsen, Archibald, 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y.; the Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Support improved railroad workers' pensions.

Brooks, A. E., 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.; American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Cock Building, Mexico, D. F. (1) Received $1,250 (partial retainer fee); paid $500 (retainer fee). (2) Fritz G. Lanham. (3) Retainer fee. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

Brooks, William F., National Grain Trade Council, 607 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expense received during period amounted to $2,786.45, of which less than $4 was spent for any purpose covered by the act. (2) Taxicab fares, no one of which was in excess of 70 cents. (3) Transportation. (4) None other than weekly news letter published by employer. (5) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

Brown,[5] Edgar G., National Negro Council, 1717 Euclid Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $700 membership contributions. (2) National Republic Printers, 511 Eleventh

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

Street NW., $301; telephone and telegrams, $50; postage, $35; traveling expenses, Mr. E. G. Brown, $200. (3) Printing, publicity, advertising, and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Antidiscrimination legislation.

Brown, Russell B., Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act: $15. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Bryson, Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received, $6,280.79; expended, $6,280.79. (2) To self. (3) For personal and family needs. No sums received or expended in connection with activities covered by act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

Buck, Mrs. J. L. Blair, not employed for pay, elected to office of president of the general federation, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For July, August, and September 1948, $1,178.13 travel and expense of entertaining in connection with work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. (2) See question (1). (3) See question (1). (4) General Federation Clubwomen and State federation magazines. (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the general federation supports or opposes legislation, and asks the organization membership to do likewise, when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.; Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla. (1) Received from Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla., for professional services, $75C, pro rata. Pro rata expenditures account long-distance telephone calls, July and August 1948, $8.78. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Long-distance telephone service. (4) None. (5 No specific bill as yet. Interested in any legislation providing for or related to improvement of the intracoastal canal between Jacksonville and Miami, Fla.

Buckman, Henry Holland, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.; the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (1) Received from the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J., for professional services, $250, pro rata. Pro rata expenditures account long-distance telephone calls (1) May and June 1948, $120.53; July and August 1948, $4.47; total, $125. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Long-distance telephone service. (4) None. (5) No specific bill since close of second quarter. Interested in any legislation related to tin and the detinning industry.

Bugbee, George, American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $4,749.96; reimbursement of travel expenses, $785.90. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Building Products Institute, room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Contributions, $17,500; expended, $7,296.36. (2) See attached sheet.[1] (3) As indicated by items on attached sheet.[1] (4) Construction Trends, press releases, and certain economic studies. (5) Proposals which may affect the producers of building materials.

Bulow, William J., Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, $2,343.75; money expended, $14.70. (2) Various transportation, telephone, and telegraph companies and United States post office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation, telephone calls, telegrams, and postage. (4) None. (5) Postage rate legislation.

Burger,[2] George J., Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.; self. (1) Received $5,068.05 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent, and acting as director in charge, Washington office, National Federation of Small Business. Expenditures, $4,770.96 for general operating expenses. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel expenses, etc. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Antitrust law enforcement (monopoly); rubber-tires bill; all legislation affecting small business.

Burke, Harold, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for 3 months at $708.33⅓ per month equals $2,125. No expenses received or expended on any legislative activity. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Burnett, Leo, Co., Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (1) For National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $65,222.17. (2) See addendum A.[1] A portion of this sum, not definitely ascertainable, was for purposes referred to in section 307, Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. The reason for our not being able to specify the exact amount used for so-called lobbying purposes is that we handled advertising generally for the Margarine Association. Not only is some of our advertising not directed at the affective legislation at all, but individual advertisements may be partially what may be termed "general advertising" and partially an appeal to support the Margarine Association's position in the legislative matters referred to. (3) See addendum (A).[1] (4) None. (5) Generally, legislation favorable to margarine manufacturers, specifically, the Rivers bill (H. R. 2245).

Burrows, Orrin A., International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,725; expenses, $1,512.60 minus withholding and railroad retirement deductions. The expenses are reimbursable items, such as transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental items. None for lobbying purposes. (2) Railroads, bus companies, taxis for transportation, hotels, motels, and restaurants for meals and lodging, telephone and telegraph companies for messages. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging, telephone calls, telegraph messages, and incidental items, such as tips. (4) The Electrical Workers Journal. (5) All legislation affecting the electrical worker in particular and labor in general.

Butler, Eugene J., Esq., National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for 3 months, $1,758.96; expense account, $150. (2) Eugene J. Butler. (3) Salary, expense account. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

Butts, Joseph G., Jr. (law firm of Gall & Lane), 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Nonsubsidized Insulation Manufacturers Committee, Riverton, Va. (1) Received, $1,000; expended, none. (2) Retainer paid to Gall & Lane. (3) Legal opinions, research, and consultation. (4) None. (5) To support limitation on subsidies.

Caffrey, Charles G., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Manufacturers Association, 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C. (1) One-fourth of per annum salary of $9,000. (2) No payments were made to anyone by Charles G. Caffrey for any purpose whatsoever during the quarter in question; normal expenses excepted. (3) None. (4) None. However, I might state for the record that I spent about $25 during the quarter for taxicab fare, lunches, telephone, and carfare to and from the Capitol to keep informed on legislation. (5) [Blank.]

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Rehabilitation Association, 1025 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) $450 received from the National Rehabilitation Association by the firm of Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for the association. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) No particular legislation. The association is interested in any legislation affecting the vocational rehabilitation program.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $2,100 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for National Tax Equality Association. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Firm retained as Washington counsel on all legal matters affecting NTEA, including legal aspects of various legislative proposals relating to taxation of cooperatives and other corporations enjoying tax exemptions or special privileges.

Carpenter, Austin W., Main Street, Sherburne, N. Y.; New York Associated Businessmen, Inc., Sherburne, N. Y. (1) Received from New York Associated Businessmen, $1,276.28. (2) To self, salary, $750; to railroads and hotels for travel expenses, $526.28; total, $1,276.28. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation which discriminates in any way against the constitutional right of small-business people to quality of competitive opportunity.

Carson, T. J., 1522 East Tenth Street, The Dalles, Oreg.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Amount received including per diem, salary, and travel expenses paid to me by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and expended by me for transportation, living expenses, and incidentals, $699.63. (2) To hotel, restaurants, railroads, taxis, etc. (3) For transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, amendments to minimum-wage law, housing, and anti-inflation. Note: This is final report as above employment was only temporary.

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation; reimbursed $975.65 for expenses advanced; expended $641.55 which will be reimbursed. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.; Munsey Real Estate Co.; incidentals. (3) Telephone service, rent, incidentals. (4) None. (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislation affecting company's interest.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

Carter, Asa L., 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; petitioners and their due successors and joining associates at and after War Department file No. 7040, April 1933 (287 U. S. 627); (supra) extended to all abutters on B lines duly and precisely mapped herein. (1) I received and expended only $106.54, costs and disbursements herein, divided; petty cash, clerical work, researching records, and addressing mail, $80.25; and for postage, printing, telephoning, carfare, etc., $26.29. (2) It was paid to postmasters, printers, public-service companies, and standard clerical help at Pittsburgh, Pa. (3) For the purpose of furthering sentiment for a Rainhill Prize for the best B line electric pipe train locomotive for major heavy freight, maximum ton miles on wheels, one-half pound per square inch absolute. Keep to wheels or be inflated into Dark Ages on barbarian pack animal airplanes. Do not forget communistic preaching of equal distribution of unequal earnings always gives civilization barbarians on cheapest transportation of men and deliberate omission of heavy wheel freight or logistics. Financed racket or robber barons come in for maximum bribery only a misdemeanor. (4) I publish nowhere except by first-class mail to abutters and contributors, and their due and immediate representatives. (5) Everything for or against B line.

Carter, Jack, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $375 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $8 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Carver, Leslie O., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Carver,[6] Leslie O., associate general counsel, National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at the rate reported in last quarterly report for performance of regular and usual duties incident to my employment. Expenses for travel, hotel, subsistence, and incidentals totaled $331.94. I engaged in no activity contemplated by the act, and none of the money received and expended was for the purpose of work under the act. (2) Paid nothing. (3) Performed no activity under the act. (4) None. (5) None.

Carver,[7] Leslie O., associate general counsel, National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at the rate reported in last quarterly report for performance of regular and usual duties incident to my employment. Expenses for travel, hotel, subsistence, and incidentals totaled $331.94. I engaged in no activity contemplated by the act and none of the money received and expended was for the purpose of work under the act. (2) Paid nothing. (3) Performed no activity under the act. (4) None. (5) None.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

Case, Ralph H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Allied Aviation Corp., Cockeysville, Md. (1) Compensation for services rendered and expenses, $9,050. (2) Sundry small items for long-distance telephone calls, taxi fares, stenographic work; total, $50. No item over $10. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) H. R. 631, Eightieth Congress. Work completed; this is my final report.

Case, Ralph H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, Elbowoods, N. Dak. (1) Receipts: Compensation for services rendered under contract, $1,000. (2) Disbursements: Sundry small items, less than $10 each; stenographic service, postage, and telegraph, total $45. (3) Official business transactions and correspondence with Tribal Council, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak. (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 426.

Cates, Larry, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $2,975.96; expended, $200.96. (2) Various companies and business firms for transportation, communications, gasoline, oil, airplane operation, miscellaneous entertainment, meals, hotels, tips, and incidental expenses. (3) Travel and all expenses in connection herewith, taxi, telegraph, telephone, and for the prosecution of a pilot strike on National Airlines where scab pilots are currently employed in a strikebreaking attempt. (4) Air Line Pilot. (5) All legislation concerning aviation safety and hours, wages, and working conditions of pilots on our commercial air lines.

Chace, W. E., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $20 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, H. R. 4417, and S. 1251.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses in Washington reimbursed by employer, $889.98; expenditures in Washington, $889.98; out-of-town expenses, $529.16. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills affecting national labor policy, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, Federal subsidization of research, patents, and trade-marks, control powers, revision of SEC, foreign aid, Federal housing, Government competition with business and such other matters as may affect industry.

Chandler, E. Lawrence, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Nothing. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislative bills regarding which it is considered that the engineering viewpoint can be constructive.

Christman, Miss Elisabeth, National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $935 salary as secretary-treasurer of the National Women's Trade Union League. Legislative work is only one phase of the program of the league. My work is predominantly administrative, but a small percentage of my time is spent in activities in furtherance of our legislative program. (2) No money expended except for an occasional taxi fare. (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin, the league's monthly publication. (5) [Blank.]

Clarke, David R., 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Clorety, Joseph A., Jr., American Veterans Committee, 1200 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary of $5,600 per annum for position as national secretary of the American Veterans Committee plus not more than $10 per month for expenses incurred in connection with activities under the Lobbying Act. (2) Joseph A. Clorety, Jr. (3) To execute duties as national secretary of the organization of which not more than 25 percent involve activities under the Lobbying Act. (4) AVC Bulletin. (5) Legislation relating to international, domestic, and veterans' affairs in accordance with national platform of the American Veterans Committee.

Cohn, Marcus, American Jewish Committee, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During a typical month, the registrant devotes a maximum of 5 percent of his time to matters which may possibly be regarded as embraced in section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures set forth here for the months of July, August, and September 1948 are based upon that percentage: Salary, $93.75; travel, $6.37; telephone, $9.63; office and miscellaneous expenses, $66.50. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) See (1). (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) Legislation dealing with immigration and S. 2764 and H. R. 6817. See original registration statement and (1).

Colborn, Miss Wer[illegible] M., Board of Christian Education Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., Division of Social Education and Action, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No expenses incurred during this period. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress Magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as (3).

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Compton, R. T., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, salary, $3,750; expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,129.10; expenditures, $1,129.10. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social-security research, patents, and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, legislative-Federal relations division, National

Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,223.36, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $244.67; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Condon, Arthur D., attorney, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Morton Salt Co., 310 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) July, August, September 1948, received, $2,103. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717.

Cone, D. C., Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, room 307, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Annual compensation for 1947, $5,250. (2) D. C. Cone. (3) As vice president and part-time national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America covering all service rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act and particularly the interests of the employees represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.

Cone, John C., Pan American Airways, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During the quarter ended September 30, 1948, I have not participated in any way or received or spent any funds in connection with legislation. (2) None received or spent in connection with legislation. (3) Same as above. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose legislation but may be concerned with any legislation relating to aviation which may be pending.

Conroy, Eugene J., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [B'ank.]

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; Veterans Association of Federal Employees, New York Naval Ship Yard, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) None this quarter. (2) Self. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support or oppose legislation affecting veterans' preference in Federal employment.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $2,791.70 as wages, $880 for 8 months' back pay (retroactive to January 1, 1948); $200.01 for office rental; $1,295 expense allowance from January 1 through September 30, 1948. (2) $200.01 to Labor for office rental. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interest of labor.

Cortright, Frank W., National Association of Home Builders, suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $4,375.02; per diem, $644; expenses, general, $1,267.07; expenses, travel, meetings and conference, $1,390.83. The payments reported above as my salary and per diem are for general services as executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders, and are not dependent upon rendition of services which might be considered "lobbying" within the meaning of the act. Similarly, expenses reported include substantial amounts for routine association business which could not be regarded as lobbying within the meaning of the act. Expenses reported do not include items of association expense such as travel, secretary's salary, telephone, and rent, which are part of the general administrative budget of the association and do not represent moneys received by me from the association. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, International News Service, United Press, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. I also write an article each month for the American Builder, a monthly publication devoted to the interests of the housing industry. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter, and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but I am the executive vice president of the trade association of the home-building industry. In that capacity it is incumbent upon me to supervise, among other things, the work of the association's legislative department. The function of that department of the association is to follow all legislation affecting the home-building industry; to advise the membership of the association of all such legislation; and to make known to the public and to the Congress the opinion of the membership on all such legislation.

Costello, John M., 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.; the American League for an Undivided Ireland, 165–167 William Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received as fees for services $760; reimbursement for expenditures, $60.76. (2) (a) Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, $13.36; (b) travel expenses, $47.40. (3) (a) Hotel room rental; (b) gas, oil, meals, etc. (4) CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. (5) Any legislation which may tend to effectuate the unification of all Ireland into a united nation.

Coulter, John Lee, 611 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Renderers Association, 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received during quarter April–June 1948; compensation for the calendar year paid in December. (2) [Blank.] (3) To appear before Senate Finance Committee to recommend amendments to pending legislation. (4) None. (5) Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934, as amended and extended.

Courtney, Paul L., National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses only. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Laws affecting business.

Covington, J. Harry, III, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Smelting & Refining Co. et al. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $115.92. (2) Telephone and telegraph expense, $79.15; travel expense including hotel accommodations, $36.77. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Cowan,[6] Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $1,875; expenses, $910. (2) Hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, railroads, etc. (3) [Blank.] (4) Union News Service and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Cowan,[7] Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, CIO, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, July, August, and September, 1948, $1,875; expenses, $920. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cabs, etc. (3) [Blank.] (4) Union News Service and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Crampton, Charles J., attorney, 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex.; State Rights Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex. (1) No money received during the preceding calendar quarter. Third quarter, 1948, expense account filed for reimbursement, $678.75. (2) Third quarter, 1948, expense account filed for reimbursement. Receipts for all expenditures of $10 or more have been filed with the association. All other expenses are the cumulative totals of small expenditures at numerous cafes, for taxicabs, and other sources. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) To bring about constructive cooperation between community-property and common-law States for the development of a plan of tax equalization which will afford an equitable basis for income, estate, and gift taxation in the Federal tax structure. To support complete retroactive repeal of the 1942 estate and gift tax amendments as they apply to community-property States in an unfair, discriminatory, inequitable manner. We have supported and will continue our support of the American Bar Association's recommendation for tax equalization.

Crawford, William A., Railroad Association of Georgia, 536 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) No money received or expended for any lobbying activities. (2) No one. (See reply to question (1) above.) (3) None. (See reply to question (1) above.) (4) None. (5) None.

Crowley, Leo J., 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) No money received or expended during the preceding calendar quarter in connection with influencing the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads operating in and having trackage in the State of Colorado.

Cullum, Robert M., Committee for Equality in Naturalization, 302 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary totaling $750 for services which terminated August 1, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to provide that the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race.

Cuneo, John C., Post Office Box 1054, 922 Jay Street, Modesto, Calif.; the Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Receipts: Townsend Plan, Inc., gross for operations in California, $1,872.53; less deductions at source, $268.55; net amount for operations in California, $1,603.98; amount paid to John C. Cuneo for his personal use, $780; balance to be used for operations in California, $823.98. Total disbursements for California operations, $2,074.90. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) The Townsend plan.

Curran, Roland, Central Valley Project Association, Box 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (1) Received from Central Valley Project Association for all activities connected with the association July 1 to September 30, 1948,

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

Carter, Asa L., 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; petitioners and their due successors and joining associates at and after War Department file No. 7040, April 1933 (287 U. S. 627); (supra) extended to all abutters on B lines duly and precisely mapped herein. (1) I received and expended only $106.54, costs and disbursements herein, divided; petty cash, clerical work, researching records, and addressing mail, $80.25; and for postage, printing, telephoning, carfare, etc., $26.29. (2) It was paid to postmasters, printers, public-service companies, and standard clerical help at Pittsburgh, Pa. (3) For the purpose of furthering sentiment for a Rainhill Prize for the best B line electric pipe train locomotive for major heavy freight, maximum ton miles on wheels, one-half pound per square inch absolute. Keep to wheels or be inflated into Dark Ages on barbarian pack animal airplanes. Do not forget communistic preaching of equal distribution of unequal earnings always gives civilization barbarians on cheapest transportation of men and deliberate omission of heavy wheel freight or logistics. Financed racket or robber barons come in for maximum bribery only a misdemeanor. (4) I publish nowhere except by first-class mail to abutters and contributors, and their due and immediate representatives. (5) Everything for or against B line.

Carter, Jack, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $375 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $8 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Carver, Leslie O., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Carver,[6] Leslie O., associate general counsel, National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at the rate reported in last quarterly report for performance of regular and usual duties incident to my employment. Expenses for travel, hotel, subsistence, and incidentals totaled $331.94. I engaged in no activity contemplated by the act, and none of the money received and expended was for the purpose of work under the act. (2) Paid nothing. (3) Performed no activity under the act. (4) None. (5) None.

Carver,[7] Leslie O., associate general counsel, National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at the rate reported in last quarterly report for performance of regular and usual duties incident to my employment. Expenses for travel, hotel, subsistence, and incidentals totaled $331.94. I engaged in no activity contemplated by the act and none of the money received and expended was for the purpose of work under the act. (2) Paid nothing. (3) Performed no activity under the act. (4) None. (5) None.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

Case, Ralph H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Allied Aviation Corp., Cockeysville, Md. (1) Compensation for services rendered and expenses, $9,050. (2) Sundry small items for long-distance telephone calls, taxi fares, stenographic work; total, $50. No item over $10. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) H. R. 631, Eightieth Congress. Work completed; this is my final report.

Case, Ralph H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, Elbowoods, N. Dak. (1) Receipts: Compensation for services rendered under contract, $1,000. (2) Disbursements: Sundry small items, less than $10 each; stenographic service, postage, and telegraph, total $45. (3) Official business transactions and correspondence with Tribal Council, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak. (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 426.

Cates, Larry, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $2,975.96; expended, $200.-96. (2) Various companies and business firms for transportation, communications, gasoline, oil, airplane operation, miscellaneous entertainment, meals, hotels, tips, and incidental expenses. (3) Travel and all expenses in connection therewith, taxi, telegraph, telephone, and for the prosecution of a pilot strike on National Airlines where scab pilots are currently employed in a strikebreaking attempt. (4) Air Line Pilot. (5) All legislation concerning aviation safety and hours, wages, and working conditions of pilots on our commercial air lines.

Chace, W. E., the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $20 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, H. R. 4417, and S. 1251.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses in Washington reimbursed by employer, $889.98; expenditures in Washington, $889.98; out-of-town expenses, $529.16. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills affecting national labor policy, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, Federal subsidization of research, patents, and trade-marks, control powers, revision of SEC, foreign aid, Federal housing, Government competition with business and such other matters as may affect industry.

Chandler, E. Lawrence, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Society of Civil Engineers, 33 West Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Nothing. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislative bills regarding which it is considered that the engineering viewpoint can be constructive.

Christman, Miss Elisabeth, National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $935 salary as secretary-treasurer of the National Women's Trade Union League. Legislative work is only one phase of the program of the league. My work is predominantly administrative, but a small percentage of my time is spent in activities in furtherance of our legislative program. (2) No money expended except for an occasional taxi fare. (3) [Blank.] (4) Life and Labor Bulletin, the league's monthly publication. (5) [Blank.]

Clarke, David R., 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Clorety, Joseph A., Jr., American Veterans Committee, 1200 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary of $5,600 per annum for position as national secretary of the American Veterans Committee plus not more than $10 per month for expenses incurred in connection with activities under the Lobbying Act. (2) Joseph A. Clorety, Jr. (3) To execute duties as national secretary of the organization of which not more than 25 percent involve activities under the Lobbying Act. (4) AVC Bulletin. (5) Legislation relating to international, domestic, and veterans' affairs in accordance with national platform of the American Veterans Committee.

Cohn, Marcus, American Jewish Committee, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During a typical month, the registrant devotes a maximum of 5 percent of his time to matters which may possibly be regarded as embraced in section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures set forth here for the months of July, August, and September 1948 are based upon that percentage: Salary, $93.75; travel, $6.37; telephone, $9.63; office and miscellaneous expenses, $66.50. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) See (1). (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) Legislation dealing with immigration and S. 2764 and H. R. 6317. See original registration statement and (1).

Colborn, Miss Wer[illegible] M., Board of Christian Education Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., Division of Social Education and Action, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No expenses incurred during this period. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress Magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as (3).

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Compton, R. T., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, salary, $3,750; expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,129.10; expenditures, $1,129.10. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social-security research, patents, and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, legislative-Federal relations division, National

Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,223.36, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $244.67; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Condon, Arthur D., attorney, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Morton Salt Co., 310 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) July, August, September 1948, received, $2,103. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717.

Cone, D. C., Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, room 307, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Annual compensation for 1947, $5,250. (2) D. C. Cone. (3) As vice president and part-time national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America covering all service rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act and particularly the interests of the employees represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.

Cone, John C., Pan American Airways, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During the quarter ended September 30, 1948, I have not participated in any way or received or spent any funds in connection with legislation. (2) None received or spent in connection with legislation. (3) Same as above. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose legislation but may be concerned with any legislation relating to aviation which may be pending.

Conroy, Eugene J., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; Veterans Association of Federal Employees, New York Naval Ship Yard, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) None this quarter. (2) Self. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support or oppose legislation affecting veterans' preference in Federal employment.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $2,791.70 as wages, $880 for 8 months' back pay (retroactive to January 1, 1948); $200.01 for office rental; $1,295 expense allowance from January 1 through September 30, 1948. (2) $200.01 to Labor for office rental. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interest of labor.

Cortright, Frank W., National Association of Home Builders, suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $4,375.02; per diem, $644; expenses, general, $1,267.07; expenses, travel, meetings and conference, $1,390.83. The payments reported above as my salary and per diem are for general services as executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders, and are not dependent upon rendition of services which might be considered "lobbying" within the meaning of the act. Similarly, expenses reported include substantial amounts for routine association business which could not be regarded as lobbying within the meaning of the act. Expenses reported do not include items of association expense such as travel, secretary's salary, telephone, and rent, which are part of the general administrative budget of the association and do not represent moneys received by me from the association. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, International News Service, United Press, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. I also write an article each month for the American Builder, a monthly publication devoted to the interests of the housing industry. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter, and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but I am the executive vice president of the trade association of the home-building industry. In that capacity it is incumbent upon me to supervise, among other things, the work of the association's legislative department. The function of that department of the association is to follow all legislation affecting the home-building industry; to advise the membership of the association of all such legislation; and to make known to the public and to the Congress the opinion of the membership on all such legislation.

Costello, John M., 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.; the American League for an Undivided Ireland, 165–167 William Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received as fees for services $760; reimbursement for expenditures, $60.76. (2) (a) Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, $13.36; (b) travel expenses, $47.40. (3) (a) Hotel room rental; (b) gas, oil, meals, etc. (4) CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. (5) Any legislation which may tend to effectuate the unification of all Ireland into a united nation.

Coulter, John Lee, 611 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Renderers Association, 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received during quarter April–June 1948; compensation for the calendar year paid in December. (2) [Blank.] (3) To appear before Senate Finance Committee to recommend amendments to pending legislation. (4) None. (5) Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934, as amended and extended.

Courtney, Paul L., National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses only. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Laws affecting business.

Covington, J. Harry, III, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Smelting & Refining Co. et al. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $115.92. (2) Telephone and telegraph expense, $79.15; travel expense including hotel accommodations, $36.77. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Cowan,[6] Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $1,875; expenses, $910. (2) Hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, railroads, etc. (3) [Blank.] (4) Union News Service and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Cowan,[7] Nathan E., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, CIO, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, July, August, and September, 1948, $1,875; expenses, $920. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cabs, etc. (3) [Blank.] (4) Union News Service and CIO News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Crampton, Charles J., attorney, 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex.; State Rights Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex. (1) No money received during the preceding calendar quarter. Third quarter, 1948, expense account filed for reimbursement, $678.75. (2) Third quarter, 1948, expense account filed for reimbursement. Receipts for all expenditures of $10 or more have been filed with the association. All other expenses are the cumulative totals of small expenditures at numerous cafes, for taxicabs, and other sources. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) To bring about constructive cooperation between community-property and common-law States for the development of a plan of tax equalization which will afford an equitable basis for income, estate, and gift taxation in the Federal tax structure. To support complete retroactive repeal of the 1942 estate and gift tax amendments as they apply to community-property States in an unfair, discriminatory, inequitable manner. We have supported and will continue our support of the American Bar Association's recommendation for tax equalization.

Crawford, William A., Railroad Association of Georgia, 536 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) No money received or expended for any lobbying activities. (2) No one. (See reply to question (1) above.) (3) None. (See reply to question (1) above.) (4) None. (5) None.

Crowley, Leo J., 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) No money received or expended during the preceding calendar quarter in connection with influencing the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads operating in and having trackage in the State of Colorado.

Cullum, Robert M., Committee for Equality in Naturalization, 302 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary totaling $750 for services which terminated August 1, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation to provide that the right to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race.

Cuneo, John C., Post Office Box 1054, 922 Jay Street, Modesto, Calif.; the Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Receipts: Townsend Plan, Inc., gross for operations in California, $1,872.53; less deductions at source, $268.55; net amount for operations in California, $1,603.98; amount paid to John C. Cuneo for his personal use, $780; balance to be used for operations in California, $823.98. Total disbursements for California operations, $2,074.90. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) None. (5) The Townsend plan.

Curran, Roland, Central Valley Project Association, Box 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (1) Received from Central Valley Project Association for all activities connected with the association July 1 to September 30, 1948,

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

$874.70. (2) Maintenance of Bakersfield office and activities, travel expense Washington, D. C., to California, and miscellaneous. (3) Same as above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Central Valley project and flood-control projects in same area.

Curry, James E., 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; N. C. A. I., various Apache and Paulte Tribes, Southeast Alaskan natives, Oglala Sioux and Omaha Tribes; N. B. Johnson, president, National Congress of American Indians, Claremore, Okla. (1) $3. (2) Frances Lopinsky. (3) Cab fares. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation dealing with economic and political status of Indians and particularly legislation concerning the tribes above-mentioned.

Curtiss, Ralph E., 111 Kellogg Building, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; retained by Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis. (1) Received, $812.56; expended, $62.56. (2) Hotel, railroad company, and telephone company. (3) Travel expenses and telephone. (4) ATOA News (monthly publication of the association). (5) Any legislation affecting the tavern industry.

Daley, William L., 817 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Receipts and expenditures on behalf of National Editorial Association, $997.78. (2) Telegraph, telephone, taxicabs, office supply companies, $92.78. (3) Reimbursement for expenses, transportation and communications. (4) Interpretative articles in official bulletins of national and State publishers associations; also in trade publications of publishing industry. (5) Measures affecting the press.

Dameron,[6] William V., Grand Lodge representative, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Dameron,[7] William V., Grand Lodge representative, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Damon, Eugene J., St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., chairman, Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) No money was received or expended for Federal legislative matters during the last quarter. July 1, 1948, promoted from position of attorney to assistant general attorney of the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co. and total salary was increased from $708 to $800 per month, otherwise the statements contained in Form B heretofore filed remain the same. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Darby, Frederick R., 3270 Westerville Road, Columbus, Ohio; self. (1) None. (2) Negate. (3) Negate. (4) United Press Radio, July 14, 1948, Columbus, Ohio; the Columbus Citizen, August 8, 1948, Columbus, Ohio. (5) In re S. 2213.

Daugherty, Paul J., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

Davies,[4] Aled P., 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary from American Meat Institute of $2,076.96. Travel expenses when out of Chicago, including lodging, meals, taxicabs, entertainment, transportation, telephone, and telegraph, $470.67. (2) Various railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and telephone and telegraph companies. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry.

Davis,[5] John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $3,000. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed news letter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Davis,[7] John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, 1948, $3,000. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed news letter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Davies,[4] William D., 27 Water Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Since filing my first and only report at the end of the first quarter no activity has been taken by me which necessitates a report; in the event that such activity is taken by me I shall, of course, resume reports. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Dawes, Bourbon, Hotel Association of Washington, 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,624.98; expenses, $54.32. (2) (a) Taxis and transportation, $26.27; (b) miscellaneous lunches and dinners, $19.55; (c) miscellaneous expenses, $8.50. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting hotels in the District of Columbia.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

DeGroot, E. H., Jr., 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.; Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Harwill Building, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See statement attached.[1] (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None. My duties are those of treasurer.

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,875 was received as retainer for services rendered plus $31.39 reimbursements for personal expenses in connection with work for the association. (2) William I. Denning. (3) For general legal representation in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Not called upon during quarter in connection with any legislation.

De Quevedo, Rafael G., Building Products Institute, room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $37.20. (2) Taxi, $22; restaurant, $12.20; publication, $3. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Dickerman, John M., National Association of Home Builders, suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,500; expenses, $52.95. The salary and expenses listed under (1) are charged against that portion of the association's budget allocated to the legislative department, of which I am in charge, which allocation is $20,000 for 1948. Only some of the functions of this department might be deemed as coming within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, hotel rooms, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, International News Service, United Press, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) All legislation affecting the home-building industry.

Disbrow, Walter L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September, 1948, $1,110. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the Retirement Federation on legislation affecting their welfare. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any and all legislation affecting the civil-service retirement laws.

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. See (1). (1) Income: Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., $1,500; Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., $1,250; expenses: Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., $23.52; Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., $472.28 (reimbursed). (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, telephone calls, etc. (4) None. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments; attention to legislative matters affecting oil and gas industry.

Dixon, Loy Thomas, Continental Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Panama Railroad Employees Association, Balboa, C. Z. (1) Received second quarter $128.50 for expenses; expended $295.43 for second quarter for expenses. (2) Hotel, taxicabs, meals, and incidental expenses at Washington. (3) Same as No. 2. (4) None. (5) Support of H. R. 3749, S. 1416. All citizens of the United States employed by the Government in the Panama Canal Zone.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $600 salary and $225 expenses. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., the Postmaster, the Superintendent of Documents, and others. (3) Telephone service, postage, Government publications, rent, and minor office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dorsett, J. Dewey, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the third quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Article entitled "Loss Prevention Is Big Business" made available for

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

publication in house organs of member companies. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

Dougherty, John E., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending September 30, 1948, consequently no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act, and, likewise, no expenses were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Douglas, Proctor, MacIntyre & Gates, a law partnership composed of James H. Douglas, Jr., Robert Proctor, Malcolm A. MacIntyre, and Samuel E. Gates, with whom are associated Carl McGowan, John F. Meck, Maurice Winger, and Roy B. Kelly, 730 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; self-employed (Western Cemetery Alliance). (1) Received from Western Cemetery Alliance $500 as balance of compensation due for legal services rendered in 1947, plus $43.71 as reimbursement for expenses incurred during calendar year 1947; spent, nothing. (2) No payments. (3) No payments. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to the establishment of or extension of national cemeteries.

Dow, Fayette B., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Pipe Line Companies, care of L. F. Kahle, treasurer, Box 1349, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Deponent has rendered no services in the past for the Committee for Pipe Line Companies that come within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. This registration under the act is made in order to comply with its provisions with respect to any such services that he may render in the future. Of total compensation received by deponent, the sum of $500 is believed to be a fair apportionment for such services as might come within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. Also received $301.54 covering postage, telephone, and miscellaneous items to reimburse for corresponding expenses incurred, none of which relate to activities within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No legislation is proposed by Committee for Pipe Line Companies, deponent's employer, and there is no pending legislation which deponent has been called upon to support or oppose.

Dowd, M. J., Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) For third quarter of year 1948: Salary, $960 per month; incidental traveling expenses, $370.22. (2) Th salary is regular compensation for my full-time employment as consulting engineer for Imperial irrigation district on irrigation, power, drainage, and related matters. Expenses represent reimbursement to me for personal travel, hotel, and subsistence expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Colorado River and affecting Imperial irrigation district.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers (now known as Associated Fur Manufacturers, Inc.). (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting the fur industry.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Drake, John, The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1732 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $26.95. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Dresie,[5] Grey, Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) $340.96 from Kansas Independent Business Men's Association for traveling expense to Topeka, Leavenworth, Kansas City, Oklahoma City. (2) Various filling stations, hotels, etc., from Wichita, Kans., to above destinations. (3) Travel. (4) The Friendly Dollar. (5) Tax equality.

Drysdale, Robert M., Jr., Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $2,124.99 as executive vice president of the federation; travel expense, $246.41. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) Travel expense. (4) None. (5) None.

DuBois, Ben, secretary, Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn. (1) I haven't been in Washington this last quarter so there is no expense for lobbying. Our receipts have been solely from new members secured, some by personal solicitation, others through the medium of a circular letter and the circular letters were sent out by directors in different States to the bankers of their State. My salary as secretary remains the same throughout the year—namely, $6,500—and the lobbying I do, if it can be called lobbying, is part of my duties as secretary of the association. We have put out one circular letter this quarter to our members, about 2,350 in number, and a copy of the circular is herewith attached. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

DuBuque, Jean H., National Aviation Trades Association, 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as outlined in Registration Form B. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Letters to membership of National Aviation Trades Association, Inc., for which I am public-relations counsel. (5) Support constructive legislation in connection with Public Law 346, as amended, particularly regarding veterans flight training courses.

DuBrul, Stephen M., General Motors Corp., General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file this report. (4) None. (5) None.

Dudley,[6] Harold and Ruth, American Council of Commercial Laboratories, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 a month for April, May, and June; total of $510 for traveling expenses. (2) Harold Dudley. (3) For representing the interests of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories before Government agencies and serving as the council's executive secretary. (4) [Blank.] (5) Revision of Internal Revenue Form 990.

Dudley,[7] Harold and Ruth, American Council of Commercial Laboratories, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 a month for July, August, and September; total of $322.68 for traveling expenses. (2) Harold Dudley. (3) For representing the interests of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories before Government agencies and serving as the council's executive secretary. (4) [Blank.] (5) Revision of Internal Revenue Form 990.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

Dunn,[4] William M., 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $1,204.98; salary, $1,999.98; total, $3,204.96. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxi cabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communication Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary previously reported. Expenses reimbursed by employer, $901.28. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, retail stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling, and incidental expenses; newspapers, periodicals; cigars, cigarettes, etc.; meals and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum and its products, or natural gas.

Earle, C. E., secretary-treasurer of Independent Business Council of America, Inc., 448 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) Though not in an employed status, Mr. C. E. Earle will be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred. (3) For out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation that in the opinion of the members of this association affects the welfare of small and independent business men and women.

Echols, Oliver P., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Nothing received except salary no part of which was paid for activity covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress; no expenditures. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a National Air Policy.

Edelman, John W., 1031 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,730.70; $464.50 to reimburse actual expenses incurred, $100 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Eichelberger, Frank, suite 1225, No. 1 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co., same address; United Zinc Smelting Corp., 50 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Since I registered only for this Eightieth Congress, have done no work, nor have I received or made any contributions or other expenditures since June 30, 1948, I desire that my registration be withdrawn. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Eliason, Courtleigh W., General Motors Corp., 11-243 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file this report. (4) None. (5) None.

Elliott, John Doyle, 812 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Income: (a) Salary of $60 per week, plus (b) allowance of $30 per week reimbursement for cost of mileage, fares, meals, and hotel costs while away from residence location. (2) Referring to (1) (b) above, $76.75 spent on fares, meals, etc., while away from residence location during this last

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

$874.70. (2) Maintenance of Bakersfield office and activities, travel expense Washington, D. C., to California, and miscellaneous. (3) Same as above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Central Valley project and flood-control projects in same area.

Curry, James E., 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; N. C. A. I., various Apache and Paulte Tribes, Southeast Alaskan natives, Oglala Sioux and Omaha Tribes; N. B. Johnson, president, National Congress of American Indians, Claremore, Okla. (1) $3. (2) Frances Lopinsky. (3) Cab fares. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation dealing with economic and political status of Indians and particularly legislation concerning the tribes above-mentioned.

Curtiss, Ralph E., 111 Kellogg Building, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; retained by Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis. (1) Received, $812.56; expended, $62.56. (2) Hotel, railroad company, and telephone company. (3) Travel expenses and telephone. (4) ATOA News (monthly publication of the association). (5) Any legislation affecting the tavern industry.

Daley, William L., 817 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Receipts and expenditures on behalf of National Editorial Association, $997.78. (2) Telegraph, telephone, taxicabs, office supply companies, $92.78. (3) Reimbursement for expenses, transportation and communications. (4) Interpretative articles in official bulletins of national and State publishers associations; also in trade publications of publishing industry. (5) Measures affecting the press.

Dameron,[5] William V., Grand Lodge representative, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Dameron,[7] William V., Grand Lodge representative, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Damon, Eugene J., St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., chairman, Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) No money was received or expended for Federal legislative matters during the last quarter. July 1, 1948, promoted from position of attorney to assistant general attorney of the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co. and total salary was increased from $708 to $800 per month, otherwise the statements contained in Form B heretofore filed remain the same. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Darby, Frederick R., 3270 Westerville Road, Columbus, Ohio; self. (1) None. (2) Negate. (3) Negate. (4) United Press Radio, July 14, 1948, Columbus, Ohio; the Columbus Citizen, August 8, 1948, Columbus, Ohio. (5) In re S. 2213.

Daugherty, Paul J., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

Davies,[4] Aled P., 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary from American Meat Institute of $2,076.96. Travel expenses when out of Chicago, including lodging, meals, taxicabs, entertainment, transportation, telephone, and telegraph, $470.67. (2) Various railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and telephone and telegraph companies. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry.

Davis,[6] John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $3,000. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed news letter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Davis,[7] John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, 1948, $3,000. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed news letter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Davies,[4] William D., 27 Water Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Since filing my first and only report at the end of the first quarter no activity has been taken by me which necessitates a report; in the event that such activity is taken by me I shall, of course, resume reports. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Dawes, Bourbon, Hotel Association of Washington, 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,624.98; expenses, $54.32. (2) (a) Taxis and transportation, $26.27; (b) miscellaneous lunches and dinners, $19.55; (c) miscellaneous expenses, $8.50. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting hotels in the District of Columbia.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

DeGroot, E. H., Jr., 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.; Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Harwill Building, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See statement attached.[1] (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None. My duties are those of treasurer.

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,875 was received as retainer for services rendered plus $31.39 reimbursements for personal expenses in connection with work for the association. (2) William I. Denning. (3) For general legal representation in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Not called upon during quarter in connection with any legislation.

De Quevedo, Rafael G., Building Products Institute, room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $37.20. (2) Taxi, $22; restaurant, $12.20; publication, $3. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Dickerman, John M., National Association of Home Builders, suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,500; expenses, $52.95. The salary and expenses listed under (1) are charged against that portion of the association's budget allocated to the legislative department, of which I am in charge, which allocation is $20,000 for 1948. Only some of the functions of this department might be deemed as coming within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, hotel rooms, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, International News Service, United Press, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) All legislation affecting the home-building industry.

Disbrow, Walter L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September, 1948, $1,110. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the Retirement Federation on legislation affecting their welfare. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any and all legislation affecting the civil-service retirement laws.

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. See (1). (1) Income: Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., $1,500; Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., $1,250; expenses: Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., $23.52; Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., $472.28 (reimbursed). (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, telephone calls, etc. (4) None. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments; attention to legislative matters affecting oil and gas industry.

Dixon, Loy Thomas, Continental Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Panama Railroad Employees Association, Balboa, C. Z. (1) Received second quarter $128.50 for expenses; expended $295.43 for second quarter for expenses. (2) Hotel, taxicabs, meals, and incidental expenses at Washington. (3) Same as No. 2. (4) None. (5) Support of H. R. 3749, S. 1416. All citizens of the United States employed by the Government in the Panama Canal Zone.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $600 salary and $225 expenses. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., the Postmaster, the Superintendent of Documents, and others. (3) Telephone service, postage, Government publications, rent, and minor office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dorsett, J. Dewey, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the third quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Article entitled "Loss Prevention Is Big Business" made available for

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

publication in house organs of member companies. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

Dougherty, John E., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending September 30, 1948, consequently no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act, and, likewise, no expenses were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Douglas, Proctor, MacIntyre & Gates, a law partnership composed of James H. Douglas, Jr., Robert Proctor, Malcolm A. MacIntyre, and Samuel E. Gates, with whom are associated Carl McGowan, John F. Meck, Maurice Winger, and Roy B. Kelly, 730 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; self-employed (Western Cemetery Alliance). (1) Received from Western Cemetery Alliance $500 as balance of compensation due for legal services rendered in 1947, plus $48.71 as reimbursement for expenses incurred during calendar year 1947; spent, nothing. (2) No payments. (3) No payments. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to the establishment of or extension of national cemeteries.

Dow, Fayette B., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Pipe Line Companies, care of L. F. Kahle, treasurer, Box 1349, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Deponent has rendered no services in the past for the Committee for Pipe Line Companies that come within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. This registration under the act is made in order to comply with its provisions with respect to any such services that he may render in the future. Of total compensation received by deponent, the sum of $500 is believed to be a fair apportionment for such services as might come within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. Also received $301.54 covering postage, telephone, and miscellaneous items to reimburse for corresponding expenses incurred, none of which relate to activities within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No legislation is proposed by Committee for Pipe Line Companies, deponent's employer, and there is no pending legislation which deponent has been called upon to support or oppose.

Dowd, M. J., Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) For third quarter of year 1948: Salary, $960 per month; incidental traveling expenses, $370.22. (2) Th salary is regular compensation for my full-time employment as consulting engineer for Imperial irrigation district on irrigation, power, drainage, and related matters. Expenses represent reimbursement to me for personal travel, hotel, and subsistence expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Colorado River and affecting Imperial irrigation district.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Associated Fur Coat and Trimming Manufacturers (now known as Associated Fur Manufacturers, Inc.). (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting the fur industry.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2910, Emergency Temporary Displaced Persons Admission Act.

Drake, John, The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1732 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $26.95. (2) Various. (3) Various. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Dresie,[5] Grey, Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) $340.96 from Kansas Independent Business Men's Association for traveling expense to Topeka, Leavenworth, Kansas City, Oklahoma City. (2) Various filling stations, hotels, etc., from Wichita, Kans., to above destinations. (3) Travel. (4) The Friendly Dollar. (5) Tax equality.

Drysdale, Robert M., Jr., Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $2,124.99 as executive vice president of the federation; travel expense, $246.41. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) Travel expense. (4) None. (5) None.

DuBois, Ben, secretary, Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn. (1) I haven't been in Washington this last quarter so there is no expense for lobbying. Our receipts have been solely from new members secured, some by personal solicitation, others through the medium of a circular letter and the circular letters were sent out by directors in different States to the bankers of their State. My salary as secretary remains the same throughout the year—namely, $6,500—and the lobbying I do, if it can be called lobbying, is part of my duties as secretary of the association. We have put out one circular letter this quarter to our members, about 2,350 in number, and a copy of the circular is herewith attached. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

DuBuque, Jean H., National Aviation Trades Association, 1344 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 1010. (1) None; compensation and expenses received as outlined in Registration Form B. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Letters to membership of National Aviation Trades Association, Inc., for which I am public-relations counsel. (5) Support constructive legislation in connection with Public Law 346, as amended, particularly regarding veterans flight training courses.

DuBrul, Stephen M., General Motors Corp., General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file this report. (4) None. (5) None.

Dudley,[6] Harold and Ruth, American Council of Commercial Laboratories, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 a month for April, May, and June; total of $510 for traveling expenses. (2) Harold Dudley. (3) For representing the interests of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories before Government agencies and serving as the council's executive secretary. (4) [Blank.] (5) Revision of Internal Revenue Form 990.

Dudley,[7] Harold and Ruth, American Council of Commercial Laboratories, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 a month for July, August, and September; total of $322.68 for traveling expenses. (2) Harold Dudley. (3) For representing the interests of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories before Government agencies and serving as the council's executive secretary. (4) [Blank.] (5) Revision of Internal Revenue Form 990.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

Dunn,[4 6] William M., 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $1,204.98; salary, $1,999.98; total, $3,204.96. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxi cabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communication Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary previously reported. Expenses reimbursed by employer, $901.28. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, retail stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling, and incidental expenses; newspapers, periodicals; cigars, cigarettes, etc.; meals and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum and its products, or natural gas.

Earle, C. E., secretary-treasurer of Independent Business Council of America, Inc., 448 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) Though not in an employed status, Mr. C. E. Earle will be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred. (3) For out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation that in the opinion of the members of this association affects the welfare of small and independent business men and women.

Echols, Oliver P., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Nothing received except salary no part of which was paid for activity covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress; no expenditures. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a National Air Policy.

Edelman, John W., 1031 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,730.70; $464.50 to reimburse actual expenses incurred, $100 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Eichelberger, Frank, suite 1225, No. 1 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Goldfield Consolidated Mines Co., same address; United Zinc Smelting Corp., 50 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Since I registered only for this Eightieth Congress, have done no work, nor have I received or made any contributions or other expenditures since June 30, 1948, I desire that my registration be withdrawn. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Eliason, Courtleigh W., General Motors Corp., 11-243 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file this report. (4) None. (5) None.

Elliott, John Doyle, 812 East Capitol Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Income: (a) Salary of $60 per week, plus (b) allowance of $30 per week reimbursement for cost of mileage, fares, meals, and hotel costs while away from residence location. (2) Referring to (1) (b) above, $76.75 spent on fares, meals, etc., while away from residence location during this last

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

quarter of 1948 (July, August, and September). (3) Contacting Townsend clubs and other organizations and citizens on behalf of furthering the Townsend plan. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, Eightieth Congress, first session, generally known as the Townsend plan.

Ellis,[4] Clyde T., executive manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (3 months ending September 30, 1948), $3,300; expense accounts, $460.52; total, $3,760.52. (2) Self for salary and reimbursement for meals, hotel, tips, and transportation, $3,760.52. (3) Travel incident to members' meetings. Board of directors' meetings, etc. (4) Rural electrification. (5) (Although not employed primarily for this purpose and same requires but a relatively small percentage of his time.) Legislation affecting the growth and welfare of rural electric cooperative corporations, public power, and public utility districts, including legislation affecting public power developments where they would in turn affect the rural electric cooperative corporations, public power, and public utility districts.

Ellsworth; Charles K., Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,250; expenses, $15. (2) Expense money paid out only to hotel, restaurants, and cab drivers. (3) Covered above. (4) Have no records of any such publication. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Have been assigned by Hill & Knowlton, Inc., to prepare educational information and material showing consequences of measures proposing to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; general counsel, American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Services to date have not involved the supporting or opposing legislation. At the request of the association legal analyses and opinions are rendered from time to time on legislation affecting public power.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) $2,191.21 as legal fees and expenses for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, etc. Of this figure $91.21 represents reimbursement of expenses. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by this report; work done related to litigation and departmental conferences.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (1) $1,500, the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during quarter covered by this report. Work done related to conferences with Government departments.

Ely,[4] Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel for Colorado River Board of California and Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $3,886.65 representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with matters affecting California's interest in the Colorado River. Of this amount $586.65 represents reimbursement of expenses, $2,000 of the total figure was paid by the Colorado River Board and $1,886.65 by the Six Agency Committee. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph, and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by this report. Work related to conferences with Federal Government departments, and agencies of the State government.

Ely,[4] Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; employed as special counsel, Department of Water and Power, city of Los Angeles. (1) $2,100 representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, and litigation. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph, and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by this report; work done related to litigation and departmental conferences.

Euler, W. A. F., 50 Union Square, New York, N. Y.; United Zinc Smelting Corp., same address. (1) Further to my registration filed with your office on April 12, 1948, and my subsequent quarterly report of receipts and expenditures for the period ended June 30, 1948, filed with your office pursuant to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Please consider this registration withdrawn since I have neither receipts nor expenditures during the third quarter, my activities having terminated before June 30, 1948.

Evans, Mrs. Ruth M., Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $125; expenses. (2) Self (salary), expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Fahy,[5] Kathleen (Mrs. Jack B.), 132 Third Street SE.; American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $101.67 for miscellaneous expenses, expended $101.67. (2) Various. (3) Entertainment, miscellaneous expenses, travel. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriations for United States Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education bill.

Fahy,[5] Kathleen M. (Mrs. Jack B.) 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $85.35; expended $85.35. (2) Various. (3) Entertainment and miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriation for United States children's bill; Federal aid for education bill.

Fain, David, care of Black & Kendall, 1200 Cascade Building, Portland, Oreg.; Anacortes Shipways, Inc., 904 Lewis Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) The undersigned has heretofore filed in your office, pursuant to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, the requisite forms in connection with his activities in support of S. 2476 and H. R. 6057.

Would you be good enough to withdraw this registration since all the work performed in connection with the above described proposed legislation was performed prior to June 30, 1948, and neither the writer nor this office has received any contribution nor has made any contribution or other expenditure in connection therewith, subsequent to June 30, 1948.

Fakler, Herman, 847 National Press Building; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) I received $5,166.67 salary as an officer of the Millers' National Federation. I am not employed specifically to engage in activities described in section 307 of title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. During the preceding quarter I devoted approximately 1 day to such activities. During that period, I made no expenditures for these activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. On August 1, 1948, I participated in a radio forum conducted by the National Grange on the question "Should the Senate Ratify the International Wheat Agreement?" I took the negative side of this question.

Farrington, Charles J., National Coal Association, 803 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,949.85 salary and expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxi, phone, meals, and transportation. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the coal industry.

Farshing, Donald D., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,300 gross salary received; $344.65 expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Ferguson, Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Building and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Telephone calls and telegrams, $21.20; general retainer as Washington counsel, United States Building and Loan League, less than one-half of work is in connection with legislation, $1,750; total, $1,771.20. (2) American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting building and loan associations and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson,[4] H. T., Langdon Street, Madison, Wis. (1) No money received or expended during the calendar quarter ending September 30, 1948. My employment as legislative agent for all persons represented previously was terminated as of June 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Ferguson, John A., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,125 (allocated). (2) No legislation pending, no

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) No legislation pending.

Ferris, Muriel, League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $185.42 salary every 2 weeks; received and expended, carfare to and from the Capitol and travel, $21.60. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government, Member Magazine, publications of the League of Women Voters. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters, secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see league program adopted by national convention, 1948, attached.[1]

Fifer, Russell, American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Expenses, $376.02. (2) To hotels, air lines, etc., for services rendered. (3) Normal business and traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) General farm legislation affecting the butter and dairy industry.

Filer, Harry L., New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $5,300, and no expenses. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Finucane, James, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Compensation at the rate of $3,600 a year; expenses, $68.75. (2) Usual suppliers of miscellaneous services, such as railroad companies, newsstands, book stores, etc. (3) Transportation, papers, etc. (4) Peace Action; newspapers around the country which would use our regular releases, usually distributed by United Press, Associated Press, or International News Service. (5) Any bills affecting the peaceful prospects of international amity, such as conscription bills, restrictive immigration bills, or excessive military appropriations.

Fisher, Lewis H., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Canal Construction Service Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z.; Dr. Alexander Renner, temporarily at San Marino, Calif. (1) National Association of Retired Civil Employees, $300; Canal Construction Service Committee, $3,833; Dr. Alexander Renner, temporarily at San Marino, Calif., $100. (2) Various individuals and corporations. (3) Telephone and telegrams, $38; taxicabs and streetcars, $7.20; stationery, $9.50; postage, $15; 1 meal, $4.40; office help, $125. (4) Annuitant. (5) Assisting displaced persons under Public Law 774.

Fistere, Charles M., American Butter Institute, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $397.18, of which $22.18 was received in reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) District of Columbia cab drivers, $4.80; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $17.18. (3) Transportation and communication. (4) None. (5) Legislation proposing to amend or repeal internal-revenue regulations of oleomargarine.

Fitzpatrick, F. Stuart, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, salary, $3,625; expenses, luncheons, $7.50. (2) Statler Hotel. (3) Necessary normal expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the general fields of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

Fleming, Charles Henry, Coast Guard League, 1011 Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) Nothing. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting veterans of service in the United States Coast Guard, or any legislation affecting the United States Coast Guard in which the league has a definite interest.

Fleming, Roger W., 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $2.40 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed May 1948.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: International wheat agreement; authorization with respect to the construction of headquarters for the United Nations; monetary and fiscal policies.

Flinn,[2] W. G., grand lodge representative, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (International Association of Machinists). (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Flinn,[1] W. G., grand lodge representative, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (International Association of Machinists). (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Forbes, E. F., Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., room 304, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $5,000.04; expenses, $2,530.02. (2) For ordinary traveling expenses, such as railroad fares, taxi fares, pullman fares, hotel accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph, etc. (3) Ordinary expenses in connection with routine work as president and general manager of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc. (4) None. (5) Not employed to propose or oppose legislation. This work is only incidental to the regular work of the president and general manager of the association.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Average approximately $30 per week expenses. (2) Hotel and meals when away from own home, and traveling expenses. (3) Above. (4) The Townsend National Weekly. (5) A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Ford, John B., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A fair proportion of my salary chargeable to lobbying purposes is $50 per month—$150 for the quarter. I have not expended or received any other money for lobbying purposes. (2) To me. (3) Compensation for personal services. (4) I caused no articles or editorials to be published, relating to legislation. (5) Legislation affecting the American merchant marine, specifically legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (H. J. Res. 377, 398, 412, 413, and companion bills), overtime-on-overtime legislation, and other legislation affecting shipping.

Ford, Tirey L., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Fort, J. Carter, Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For all services rendered to the Association of American Railroads, described in Registration Form B, filed December 1946, registrant received salary during the third quarter of 1948 at the rate shown in such registration, as amended by the supplement thereto, filed January 10, 1948, and received in addition $230.63 as reimbursement for all traveling expenses while away from Washington and all reimbursable business expenses in Washington, such as cab fares, business meals, etc. Of the salary received, $1,891.67 is estimated to be allocable to legislative activities. Of the expenses for which registrant was reimbursed, $64.10 is estimated to be allocable to legislative activities. The legislative activities above referred to include activities with respect to possible legislation which registrant was called upon to consider, analyze, etc., but which was neither supported nor opposed by him. (2) The expenses above shown were paid to various restaurants, taxicabs, dining cars, etc., and to the Chicago Club, Chicago, Ill. (3) Traveling expenses while away from Washington and such expenses in Washington as business meals, taxis, etc. (4) None. (5) Generally, to support all legislation in the interests of the railroads and of a sound national transportation policy and to oppose all legislation contrary to the interests of the railroads and to a sound national transportation policy. No such legislation was under consideration by Congress during the third quarter of 1948. For bills supported or opposed during the second quarter, see registrant's return on Form C for that quarter.

Foster, Charles E., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: July, August, September, 1948 (after taxes and social security), $1,037.93; bonus: 10 percent of annual salary (after taxes and social security), $220.57; incidental expenses and travel, July, August, September, 1948, $112.71; total, $1,371.21. (2) Charles E. Foster, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (3) See No. (1) above. (4) DAV semi-monthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the survivors of deceased service men and women.

Francis, Joseph H., Morgan, Utah; National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Post Office Box 338, Morgan, Utah. (1) $5,892.89 received from the National Board of Fur Farm Organizations. (2) $3,000 represents salary for acting as executive secretary of organization, April, May, June, 1948; $2,892.89 represents personal expenses April, May, June, 1948. (3) Personal expenses as shown under item 2 include transportation, hotel and meals, telephone, telegraph, and minor personal miscellaneous expenses. (4) American Fur Breeder, National Fur News, Fur Journal, and Black Fox Magazine. (5) Any and all legislation affecting the fur farming industry of the United States.

Franklin, L. S., director, The National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 94, Route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Received $600 for July, August, September, 1948; paid out, $1,309. (2) Operation, upkeep, auto, 500 miles per week, $30, for 13 weeks, $390; lodging, meals, $8.65 per day for 13 weeks, $519; salary for 13 weeks, $375; mimeographing bulletins, $25; total, $1,309. (3) Tax reform. (4) None. (5) Tax reform.

Fredrickson, Fred J., Valley City, N. Dak.; North Dakota Resources Board, 311 North Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak., and State water conservation commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (1) Quarterly salary for July, August, and September, 1948, before deductions for withholding and social-security taxes, $1,350; and reimbursed expenses for same period, $602.83, none of which was for lobbying purposes. (2) Hotels, eating establishments, railroad and bus companies, car expense,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[1] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

quarter of 1948 (July, August, and September). (3) Contacting Townsend clubs and other organizations and citizens on behalf of furthering the Townsend plan. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, Eightieth Congress, first session, generally known as the Townsend plan.

Ellis,[4] Clyde T., executive manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (3 months ending September 30, 1948), $3,300; expense accounts, $460.52; total, $3,760.52. (2) Self for salary and reimbursement for meals, hotel, tips, and transportation, $3,760.52. (3) Travel incident to members' meetings. Board of directors' meetings, etc. (4) Rural electrification. (5) (Although not employed primarily for this purpose and same requires but a relatively small percentage of his time.) Legislation affecting the growth and welfare of rural electric cooperative corporations, public power, and public utility districts, including legislation affecting public power developments where they would in turn affect the rural electric cooperative corporations, public power, and public utility districts.

Elisworth; Charles K., Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,250; expenses, $15. (2) Expense money paid out only to hotel, restaurants, and cab drivers. (3) Covered above. (4) Have no records of any such publication. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Have been assigned by Hill & Knowlton, Inc., to prepare educational information and material showing consequences of measures proposing to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; general counsel, American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Services to date have not involved the supporting or opposing legislation. At the request of the association legal analyses and opinions are rendered from time to time on legislation affecting public power.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) $2,191.21 as legal fees and expenses for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, etc. Of this figure $91.21 represents reimbursement of expenses. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by this report; work done related to litigation and departmental conferences.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (1) $1,500, the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during quarter covered by this report. Work done related to conferences with Government departments.

Ely,[4] Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel for Colorado River Board of California and Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $3,886.65 representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with matters affecting California's interest in the Colorado River. Of this amount $586.65 represents reimbursement of expenses, $2,000 of the total figure was paid by the Colorado River Board and $1,886.65 by the Six Agency Committee. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph, and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by this report. Work related to conferences with Federal Government departments, and agencies of the State government.

Ely,[4] Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; employed as special counsel, Department of Water and Power, city of Los Angeles. (1) $2,100 representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, and litigation. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph, and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) None under this employment during the quarter covered by this report; work done related to litigation and departmental conferences.

Euler, W. A. F., 50 Union Square, New York, N. Y.; United Zinc Smelting Corp., same address. (1) Further to my registration filed with your office on April 12, 1948, and my subsequent quarterly report of receipts and expenditures for the period ended June 30, 1948, filed with your office pursuant to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Please consider this registration withdrawn since I have neither receipts nor expenditures during the third quarter, my activities having terminated before June 30, 1948.

Evans, Mrs. Ruth M., Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $125; expenses. (2) Self (salary), expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Fahy,[5] Kathleen (Mrs. Jack B.), 132 Third Street SE.; American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $101.67 for miscellaneous expenses, expended $101.67. (2) Various. (3) Entertainment, miscellaneous expenses, travel. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriations for United States Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education bill.

Fahy,[5] Kathleen M. (Mrs. Jack B.) 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $85.35; expended $85.35. (2) Various. (3) Entertainment and miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriation for United States children's bill; Federal aid for education bill.

Fain, David, care of Black & Kendall, 1200 Cascade Building, Portland, Oreg.; Anacortes Shipways, Inc., 904 Lewis Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) The undersigned has heretofore filed in your office, pursuant to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, the requisite forms in connection with his activities in support of S. 2476 and H. R. 6057.

Would you be good enough to withdraw this registration since all the work performed in connection with the above described proposed legislation was performed prior to June 30, 1948, and neither the writer nor this office has received any contribution nor has made any contribution or other expenditure in connection therewith, subsequent to June 30, 1948.

Fakler, Herman, 847 National Press Building; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) I received $5,166.67 salary as an officer of the Millers' National Federation. I am not employed specifically to engage in activities described in section 307 of title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. During the preceding quarter I devoted approximately 1 day to such activities. During that period, I made no expenditures for these activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. On August 1, 1948, I participated in a radio forum conducted by the National Grange on the question "Should the Senate Ratify the International Wheat Agreement?" I took the negative side of this question.

Farrington, Charles J., National Coal Association, 803 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,949.85 salary and expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxi, phone, meals, and transportation. (4) [Blank.] (5) All bills affecting the coal industry.

Farshing, Donald D., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,300 gross salary received; $344.65 expenses. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Ferguson, Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Building and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Telephone calls and telegrams, $21.20; general retainer as Washington counsel, United States Building and Loan League, less than one-half of work is in connection with legislation, $1,750; total, $1,771.20. (2) American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting building and loan associations and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson,[4] H. T., Langdon Street, Madison, Wis. (1) No money received or expended during the calendar quarter ending September 30, 1948. My employment as legislative agent for all persons represented previously was terminated as of June 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Ferguson, John A., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,125 (allocated). (2) No legislation pending, no

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) No legislation pending.

Ferris, Muriel, League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $185.42 salary every 2 weeks; received and expended, carfare to and from the Capitol and travel, $21.60. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government. Member Magazine, publications of the League of Women Voters. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters, secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see league program adopted by national convention, 1948, attached.[1]

Fifer, Russell, American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Expenses, $376.02. (2) To hotels, air lines, etc., for services rendered. (3) Normal business and traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) General farm legislation affecting the butter and dairy industry.

Filer, Harry L., New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $5,300, and no expenses. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Finucane, James, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Compensation at the rate of $3,600 a year; expenses, $68.75. (2) Usual suppliers of miscellaneous services, such as railroad companies, newsstands, book stores, etc. (3) Transportation, papers, etc. (4) Peace Action; newspapers around the country which would use our regular releases, usually distributed by United Press, Associated Press, or International News Service. (5) Any bills affecting the peaceful prospects of international amity, such as conscription bills, restrictive immigration bills, or excessive military appropriations.

Fisher, Lewis H., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Canal Construction Service Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z.; Dr. Alexander Renner, temporarily at San Marino, Calif. (1) National Association of Retired Civil Employees, $300; Canal Construction Service Committee, $3,833; Dr. Alexander Renner, temporarily at San Marino, Calif., $100. (2) Various individuals and corporations. (3) Telephone and telegrams, $38; taxicabs and streetcars, $7.20; stationery, $9.50; postage, $15; 1 meal, $4.40; office help, $125. (4) Annuitant. (5) Assisting displaced persons under Public Law 774.

Fistere, Charles M., American Butter Institute, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $397.18, of which $22.18 was received in reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) District of Columbia cab drivers, $4.80; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $17.18. (3) Transportation and communication. (4) None. (5) Legislation proposing to amend or repeal internal-revenue regulations of oleomargarine.

Fitzpatrick, F. Stuart, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, salary, $3,625; expenses, lunches, $7.50. (2) Statler Hotel. (3) Necessary normal expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the general fields of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

Fleming, Charles Henry, Coast Guard League, 1011 Dupont Circle Building, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) Nothing. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting veterans of service in the United States Coast Guard, or any legislation affecting the United States Coast Guard in which the league has a definite interest.

Fleming, Roger W., 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $2.40 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed May 1948.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: International wheat agreement; authorization with respect to the construction of headquarters for the United Nations; monetary and fiscal policies.

Flinn,[6] W. G., grand lodge representative, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (International Association of Machinists). (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Flinn,[7] W. G., grand lodge representative, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (International Association of Machinists). (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Forbes, E. F., Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., room 304, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $5,000.04; expenses, $2,530.02. (2) For ordinary traveling expenses, such as railroad fares, taxi fares, pullman fares, hotel accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph, etc. (3) Ordinary expenses in connection with routine work as president and general manager of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc. (4) None. (5) Not employed to propose or oppose legislation. This work is only incidental to the regular work of the president and general manager of the association.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Average approximately $30 per week expenses. (2) Hotel and meals when away from own home, and traveling expenses. (3) Above. (4) The Townsend National Weekly. (5) A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Ford, John B., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A fair proportion of my salary chargeable to lobbying purposes is $50 per month—$150 for the quarter. I have not expended or received any other money for lobbying purposes. (2) To me. (3) Compensation for personal services. (4) I caused no articles or editorials to be published, relating to legislation. (5) Legislation affecting the American merchant marine, specifically legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (H. J. Res. 377, 398, 412, 413, and companion bills), overtime-on-overtime legislation, and other legislation affecting shipping.

Ford, Tirey L., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Fort, J. Carter, Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For all services rendered to the Association of American Railroads, described in Registration Form B, filed December 1946, registrant received salary during the third quarter of 1948 at the rate shown in such registration, as amended by the supplement thereto, filed January 10, 1948, and received in addition $230.63 as reimbursement for all traveling expenses while away from Washington and all reimbursable business expenses in Washington, such as cab fares, business meals, etc. Of the salary received, $1,891.67 is estimated to be allocable to legislative activities. Of the expenses for which registrant was reimbursed, $64.10 is estimated to be allocable to legislative activities. The legislative activities above referred to include activities with respect to possible legislation which registrant was called upon to consider, analyze, etc., but which was neither supported nor opposed by him. (2) The expenses above shown were paid to various restaurants, taxicabs, dining cars, etc., and to the Chicago Club, Chicago, Ill. (3) Traveling expenses while away from Washington and such expenses in Washington as business meals, taxis, etc. (4) None. (5) Generally, to support all legislation in the interests of the railroads and of a sound national transportation policy and to oppose all legislation contrary to the interests of the railroads and to a sound national transportation policy. No such legislation was under consideration by Congress during the third quarter of 1948. For bills supported or opposed during the second quarter, see registrant's return on Form C for that quarter.

Foster, Charles E., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: July, August, September, 1948 (after taxes and social security), $1,037.93; bonus: 10 percent of annual salary (after taxes and social security), $220.57; incidental expenses and travel, July, August, September, 1948, $112.71; total, $1,371.21. (2) Charles E. Foster, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 9, D. C. (3) See No. (1) above. (4) DAV semi-monthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the survivors of deceased service men and women.

Francis, Joseph H., Morgan, Utah; National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Post Office Box 338, Morgan, Utah. (1) $5,892.89 received from the National Board of Fur Farm Organizations. (2) $3,000 represents salary for acting as executive secretary of organization, April, May, June, 1948; $2,892.89 represents personal expenses April, May, June, 1948. (3) Personal expenses as shown under item 2 include transportation, hotel and meals, telephone, telegraph, and minor personal miscellaneous expenses. (4) American Fur Breeder, National Fur News, Fur Journal, and Black Fox Magazine. (5) Any and all legislation affecting the fur farming industry of the United States.

Franklin, L. S., director, The National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 94, Route 7, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Received $600 for July, August, September, 1948; paid out, $1,309. (2) Operation, upkeep, auto, 500 miles per week, $30, for 13 weeks, $390; lodging, meals, $8.65 per day for 13 weeks, $519; salary for 13 weeks, $375; mimeographing bulletins, $25; total, $1,309. (3) Tax reform. (4) None. (5) Tax reform.

Fredrickson, Fred J., Valley City, N. Dak.; North Dakota Resources Board, 311 North Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak., and State water conservation commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (1) Quarterly salary for July, August, and September, 1948, before deductions for withholding and social-security taxes, $1,350; and reimbursed expenses for same period, $602.83, none of which was for lobbying purposes. (2) Hotels, eating establishments, railroad and bus companies, car expense,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

telephone and telegraph companies, mimeographers, and United States post office. (3) Lodging, meals, transportation, communications, mimeographing, office supplies, and postage. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting irrigation, reclamation, water conservation, flood control, land and mineral development and utilization in North Dakota, and allied legislation.

Freeman, Milton V., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Silver Rod Sales Co., Inc., 660 Newark Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.; Ace Mail Order Co., East Orange, N. J.; Black Cigar Store, Newark, N. J., Globe Mail Order Co., Jersey City, N. J. (1) $2,500 received on account of legal fees (for funds expended see attached letter to Clerk of the House of Representatives.[1] (2) [Blank.] (3) Telephone, telegraph, railroad, taxi fares, and other actual expenses of registrant have been paid by the firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter in the total amount of $694.04, for which amount the firm has been reimbursed (see attached letter to the Clerk of the House).[1] (4) None. (5) Oppose H. R. 5645.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) July, $248.96; August, none; September, none. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Entertainment and transportation. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Fyffe & Clarke (David R. Clarke, John Harrington, Albert J. Smith), Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Gaither, H. Rowan, Jr., 333 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., Mills Building, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None during quarter from July 1 to September 30, 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6253.

Galvin, M. J., 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.; Minnesota railroads, St. Paul, Minn. (1) None. All of the undersigned's clients as listed on this registration have paid the expenses reported herein, and the undersigned's salary, on the ratio of the mileage which they have within the State of Minnesota. Amount paid is the same as that expended. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Gammons, Earl H., Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., Warner Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $390. (2) Restaurants, hotels, and incidental expenses. (3) Entertainment and out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Garstang, Marion R., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $1.55. See attached schedule. (2) Travel. (3) Taxicab. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Gavitt, Frank, Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., registered in accordance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, and retained as public relations counsel for Schenley Distillers Corporation, did not, during the third calendar quarter of 1948 (the period covered by this report), conduct any lobbying activities. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Geary, Paul M., National Electrical Contractors Association, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenses incurred and no money received other than salary originally reported on form B, filed May 22, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) No special legislation under consideration.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Geaslin, Bon, 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. (1) No expenditures made during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

Gebhard, Mrs. Paul, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No expenses incurred during this period. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian general assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as No. 3.

George, Leo E., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September 1948, $2,499.99; travel and general organization expenses, $1,157.27. (2) Travel and general organization expenses including hotels, meals, and minor incidental expenses due to attendance at local, State, and National meetings and conventions, plus transportation as follows: Pennsylvania Railroad, $85.62; Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $86.15; Southern Railroad, $58.88; and American Airlines, $26.62; total, $1,157.27. (3) Expenditures for hotels, meals, and incidental expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended in connection with attendance at meetings and conventions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the Civil Service Retirement System; improve the wages, hours, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Gerrity, Harry J., 1001 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.; Oregon-Washington Bridge Co., Olympia, Wash. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 569 and S. 570.

Giddings, Ernest, assistant director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,331.68, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities estimated for legislative service, $276.34; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Gilbert, C. C., Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $1,725 salary as secretary Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation as affects industry generally.

Gilbert, R. C., 159 Hotel English, Indianapolis, Ind., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $82.60, hotel and meals; $13.12, transportation. (2) Undersigned. (3) Expenses at Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act; amendments to minimum-wage law; housing and anti-inflation.

Goddard, Livingston, 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $833.31 as secretary-treasurer of the Federation; traveling expenses, $124.12. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) Travel expense. (4) None. (5) None.

Goodman,[2] Leo, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,000 salary; $442.50 expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) CIO News, Autoworker. (5) Rent control, housing, and community development and planning.

[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

Goodwin, William J., the Loch, Roslyn, New York & Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Resources Commission of China, 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, $10,000 on September 24, 1948 (in addition to $30,000 received earlier this year, making a total of $40,000), representing additional retainer under my contract with the National Resources Commission of China, which contract was previously reported; total expended, $5,364.02. (See schedule attached.[1] (2) See schedule attached.[1] The attached schedule of expenses during the last 3 months includes some expenses perhaps not pertinent to the purposes of this retainer. Other expenses, not included, definitely do not pertain to this account, as I have other income and other accounts which do not come under this act. (3) See schedule attached.[1] (4) None, although I have introduced representatives of the Chinese Government to newspaper editors, legislators, businessmen, and others, in order that they would learn the truth about China. (5) Reference is made to my letter of July 1, 1948, which accompanied my registration statement.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received from the American Institute of Accountants, July 30, 1948, $12,050.42, representing fees of $10.500 from March 1947 to date, reimbursement of $1,250 paid to Gordon Rule, associate counsel, as shown in prior quarterly reports, and $300.42 for reimbursement of telegraph and telephone charges, printing, mimeographing, etc., during a period of approximately a year and a half. This was the first payment received, and paid the account to date. (2) Small amounts to telegraph and telephone companies. (3) Telegrams and long-distance telephone calls. (4) The Journal of Accountancy and the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Advancing the interests of the accounting profession in reference to bills relating to practice before Government agencies and practice before the Tax Court.

Goss,[2] Albert S., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I received $1,875 in salary for the quarter, which is my total compensation for all my services as master of the National Grange, of which legislative activities form only a part. I paid out none of it. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The National Grange Monthly. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. As master of the National Grange, however, it is my duty to support or oppose legislation in conformity with the policies of the National Grange.

Goss, Bert C., 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received no money other than salary as vice president of Hill & Knowlton, plus essential travel and entertainment expenses. I estimate that of my travel and entertainment expenses for the 3 months ended September 30, 1948, less than $100 was expended for purposes that might be interpreted as subject to being reported under this law. (2) Paid to taxicabs and restaurants. (3) For travel to and from the Capitol, for luncheons and dinners for committee personnel and Congressmen, etc. (4) Maintain no such records. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose legislation. Interested in legislation affecting aviation, in proposals to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine, and in other legislation affecting interests of clients of Hill & Knowlton.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

Courley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $3,000 retainer. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building; Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, P. O. box 2450, Honolulu, Hawaii. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Griffiths, Dr. H. M., National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $1,900; expenses, one trip to Washington, $64.23. (2) Expense money paid to railroad, hotel, taxis, restaurants for meals. (3) Normal expense of trip. (4) Mimeographed brief: The President's Anti-Inflation Proposals; They Are Unrealistic, Unsound, and Contradictory; a Brief Economic Analysis of the Fallacies of President Truman's Bill and the Inadequacies of the Republican Measure. Addressed to Senate and House committees and to Members of the Congress, August 6, 1948. By National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York. (5) Opposed to any legislation for public housing, price controls, Federal aid to education, FEPC legislation, increased Government expenditures. In favor of sound monetary policies for control of inflation, reduced Government expenditures.

Grimes, Weston B., 436 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Received: (includes office and general expenses totaling $1,136.71) $18,761.39; expended: (for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act) $8.50. (2) Taxicabs, $3.50; restaurants, $5. (3) Taxicabs to and from the Capitol; restaurants, meals, entertainment for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) Legislation concerning commodity exchanges, international commodity agreements, exports and imports, taxes and regulation of business generally.

Grinberg,[5] P. Irving, Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Jeweler, Jewelers' Circular-Keystone, Jewelry, Jewelers' Outlook, Jewelers' Newsletter, Executive Jeweler, ANRJA Bulletin, NACJ Bulletin, Mid-Continent Jeweler, Northwestern Jeweler, Southern Jeweler, Pacific Goldsmith, Trader & Canadian Jeweler, Manufacturing Jeweler. (5) Interested in securing relief from excise taxes as applied to jewelry.

Haas, Frank E., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the third quarter of 1948 this registrant was not assigned to and did not engage in activity in connection with Federal legislation or covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and thus received no compensation and incurred no expense subject to report thereunder. (2) Not any (see No. (1)). (3) Not any (see No. (1)). (4) Not any (see No. (1)). (5) Not any (see No. (1)).

Haas, Herbert A., Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $75 from the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits for expenses incurred July, August, and September, 1948. (2) Money received spent for carfare, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses. (3) Necessary expenses while engaged in further corrective legislation to H. R. 1362, passed into law July 31, 1946. (4) None. (5) Crosser Act (H. R. 1362) passed into law July 31, 1946.

Haddock, Hoyt C., CIO Martime Committee, 132 Third Street SE. (1) $1,560 in salary; $130 expenses. No legislative activities engaged in due to adjournment of Congress. (2) Taxi companies, telephone company, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxi, telephone calls, papers and periodicals. (4) NMU Pilot, Meba Marine Engineer. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen; oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Haddon, George A., treasurer, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Received and paid out $550 for fares and expenses while commuting to and from Washington, D. C., during the last quarter from July 1 to October 1, 1948. Also, for the National Conference on Public Employee Retirement Systems. (2) George A. Haddon, treasurer, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, room 419, City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) For train and taxi fares commuting and for meals, refreshments, etc. (4) None. (5) Trying to have Federal and municipal employee pensions exempt up to $1,440 from income tax as are railroad pensions. Also, trying to keep members of existing pension funds out of social security.

Hadley, Harlan V., 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None, other than one-quarter of the annual compensation of $2,500 as set forth in supplemental registration (form B) filed April 9, 1948, and miscellaneous expenses not to exceed $15. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Federal tax (excise) legislation, materials control legislation, and such other legislation as the association may hereafter from time to time indicate.

Haines, Samuel P. 4407 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, 171 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $5,500; expended, $5,287.18. (2) See exhibit B attached.[1] (3) See exhibit B attached.[1] (4) None. (5) Reduction or repeal of the 20 percent excise tax applying to dine and dance rooms of hotels.

Hale, William C., Tennessee Eastman Corp., Kingsport, Tenn. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Revisions in the Tariff Act—draw-back regulations

Hallbeck, E. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September 1948, $1,999.98; legislative expenses, July, August, and September 1948, $357.70; travel and general organization expenses, $1,914.78. (2) Legislative expenses include meals, streetcar, taxi, and minor incidental expenses, $367.70; travel and general organization expenses include attendance at State and National conventions and necessary expenses for hotels, meals, and incidentals plus transportation to Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $74.47 and $234.63, and Seaboard Railroad, $53.19, $1,914.78. (3) All expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended on account of travel and attendance at meetings and conventions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the Civil Service; improve the Civil Service Retirement System; improve the wages, hours, and conditions of post-office clerks, and to improve the postal service.

Hamlet, Harry G., Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $600. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended, nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Hanscom,[6] William A., 1700 I Street, room 406, Washington, D. C.; Oil Workers International Union-CIO, 301 East Fifth Street, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Received salary, $1,125; expenses, $345. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Hanscom,[7] William A., 1700 I Street NW., room 406, Washington, D. C.; Oil Workers International Union-CIO, Ledger Building, 301 East Fifth Street, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Received salary, $1,300; expenses $245. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Harmanson,[6] L. James, Jr., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $1,625. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Agricultural legislation. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Harmanson,[7] L. James, Jr., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, 1948, $1,625. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $425; expenses, $280. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below of the convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially and (b) the opinion of the national board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social and economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harris, Ronald B., Irrigation Districts Association of California, T. W. Patterson Building, Fresno, Calif. (1) I have engaged in no activities in Washington for the Irrigation Districts Association of California for the quarter ending June 30, 1948, or at all. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Harris, Winder R., Room 203, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received: Office expense, $124.18; personal expense, $86.85; total, $211.03. Expended: Office, $126.06; personal, $86.85; total, $212.91; refunded, $1.88; total, $211.03. (2) Various. (3) Office and personal expenses. (4) None. (5) None for quarter for which report is made.

Hart, Merwin K., National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,640.86. (2) [Blank.] (3) Much of the period covered by the 3 months July 1 to September 30, 1948, was spent by me in Europe. I think a fair allocation, if any, to lobbying expenses would be the sum of $421, which was one-fourth of the expenses of my trip. I include this only for the reason that some of the

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

telephone and telegraph companies, mimeographers, and United States post office. (3) Lodging, meals, transportation, communications, mimeographing, office supplies, and postage. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting irrigation, reclamation, water conservation, flood control, land and mineral development and utilization in North Dakota, and allied legislation.

Freeman, Milton V., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Silver Rod Sales Co., Inc., 660 Newark Avenue, Jersey City, N. J.; Ace Mail Order Co., East Orange, N. J.; Black Cigar Store, Newark, N. J., Globe Mail Order Co., Jersey City, N. J. (1) $2,500 received on account of legal fees (for funds expended see attached letter to Clerk of the House of Representatives.[1] (2) [Blank.] (3) Telephone, telegraph, railroad, taxi fares, and other actual expenses of registrant have been paid by the firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter in the total amount of $694.04, for which amount the firm has been reimbursed (see attached letter to the Clerk of the House).[1] (4) None. (5) Oppose H. R. 5645.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) July, $248.96; August, none; September, none. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Entertainment and transportation. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Fyffe & Clarke (David R. Clarke, John Harrington, Albert J. Smith), Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Gaither, H. Rowan, Jr., 333 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., Mills Building, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None during quarter from July 1 to September 30, 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6253.

Galvin, M. J., 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.; Minnesota railroads, St. Paul, Minn. (1) None. All of the undersigned's clients as listed on this registration have paid the expenses reported herein, and the undersigned's salary, on the ratio of the mileage which they have within the State of Minnesota. Amount paid is the same as that expended. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Gammons, Earl H., Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., Warner Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $390. (2) Restaurants, hotels, and incidental expenses. (3) Entertainment and out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Garstang, Marion R., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended. $1.55. See attached schedule. (2) Travel. (3) Taxicab. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Gavitt, Frank, Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., registered in accordance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, and retained as public relations counsel for Schenley Distillers Corporation, did not, during the third calendar quarter of 1948 (the period covered by this report), conduct any lobbying activities. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Geary, Paul M., National Electrical Contractors Association, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenses incurred and no money received other than salary originally reported on form B, filed May 22, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) No special legislation under consideration.

Geaslin, Bon, 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., Merchants National Bank Building, Mobile, Ala. (1) No expenditures made during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

Gebhard, Mrs. Paul, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No expenses incurred during this period. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian general assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as No. 3.

George, Leo E., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September 1948, $2,499.99; travel and general organization expenses, $1,157.27. (2) Travel and general organization expenses including hotels, meals, and minor incidental expenses due to attendance at local, State, and National meetings and conventions, plus transportation as follows: Pennsylvania Railroad, $85.62; Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $86.15; Southern Railroad, $58.88; and American Airlines, $26.62; total, $1,157.27. (3) Expenditures for hotels, meals, and incidental expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended in connection with attendance at meetings and conventions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the Civil Service Retirement System; improve the wages, hours, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Gerrity, Harry J., 1001 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.; Oregon-Washington Bridge Co., Olympia, Wash. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 569 and S. 570.

Giddings, Ernest, assistant director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,331.68, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities estimated for legislative service, $276.34; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Gilbert, C. C., Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $1,725 salary as secretary Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation as affects industry generally.

Gilbert, R. C., 159 Hotel English, Indianapolis, Ind., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $82.60, hotel and meals; $13.12, transportation. (2) Undersigned. (3) Expenses at Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act; amendments to minimum-wage law; housing and anti-inflation.

Goddard, Livingston, 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $833.31 as secretary-treasurer of the Federation; traveling expenses, $124.12. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) Travel expense. (4) None. (5) None.

Goodman,[9] Leo, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,000 salary; $442.50 expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) CIO News, Autoworker. (5) Rent control, housing, and community development and planning.

Goodwin, William J., the Loch, Roslyn, New York & Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Resources Commission of China, 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, $10,000 on September 24, 1948 (in addition to $30,000 received earlier this year, making a total of $40,000), representing additional retainer under my contract with the National Resources Commission of China, which contract was previously reported; total expended, $5,364.02. (See schedule attached.[1] (2) See schedule attached.[1] The attached schedule of expenses during the last 3 months includes some expenses perhaps not pertinent to the purposes of this retainer. Other expenses, not included, definitely do not pertain to this account, as I have other income and other accounts which do not come under this act. (3) See schedule attached.[1] (4) None, although I have introduced representatives of the Chinese Government to newspaper editors, legislators, businessmen, and others, in order that they would learn the truth about China. (5) Reference is made to my letter of July 1, 1948, which accompanied my registration statement.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received from the American Institute of Accountants, July 30, 1948, $12,050.42, representing fees of $10.500 from March 1947 to date, reimbursement of $1,250 paid to Gordon Rule, associate counsel, as shown in prior quarterly reports, and $300.42 for reimbursement of telegraph and telephone charges, printing, mimeographing, etc., during a period of approximately a year and a half. This was the first payment received, and paid the account to date. (2) Small amounts to telegraph and telephone companies. (3) Telegrams and long-distance telephone calls. (4) The Journal of Accountancy and the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Advancing the interests of the accounting profession in reference to bills relating to practice before Government agencies and practice before the Tax Court.

Goss,[9] Albert S., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I received $1,875 in salary for the quarter, which is my total compensation for all my services as master of the National Grange, of which legislative activities form only a part. I paid out none of it. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The National Grange Monthly. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. As master of the National Grange, however, it is my duty to support or oppose legislation in conformity with the policies of the National Grange.

Goss, Bert C., 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received no money other than salary as vice president of Hill & Knowlton, plus essential travel and entertainment expenses. I estimate that of my travel and entertainment expenses for the 3 months ended September 30, 1948, less than $100 was expended for purposes that might be interpreted as subject to being reported under this law. (2) Paid to taxicabs and restaurants. (3) For travel to and from the Capitol, for luncheons and dinners for committee personnel and Congressmen, etc. (4) Maintain no such records. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose legislation. Interested in legislation affecting aviation, in proposals to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine, and in other legislation affecting interests of clients of Hill & Knowlton.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

Courley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $3,000 retainer. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building; Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, P. O. box 2450, Honolulu, Hawaii. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Griffiths, Dr. H. M., National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $1,900; expenses, one trip to Washington, $64.23. (2) Expense money paid to railroad, hotel, taxis, restaurants for meals. (3) Normal expense of trip. (4) Mimeographed brief: The President's Anti-Inflation Proposals; They Are Unrealistic, Unsound, and Contradictory; a Brief Economic Analysis of the Fallacies of President Truman's Bill and the Inadequacies of the Republican Measure. Addressed to Senate and House committees and to Members of the Congress, August 6, 1948. By National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York. (5) Opposed to any legislation for public housing, price controls, Federal aid to education, FEPC legislation, increased Government expenditures. In favor of sound monetary policies for control of inflation, reduced Government expenditures.

Grimes, Weston B., 436 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Received: (includes office and general expenses totaling $1,136.71) $18,761.39; expended: (for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act) $8.50. (2) Taxicabs, $3.50; restaurants, $5. (3) Taxicabs to and from the Capitol; restaurants, meals, entertainment for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) Legislation concerning commodity exchanges, international commodity agreements, exports and imports, taxes and regulation of business generally.

Grinberg,[5] P. Irving, Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Jeweler, Jewelers' Circular-Keystone, Jewelry, Jewelers' Outlook, Jewelers' Newsletter, Executive Jeweler, ANRJA Bulletin, NACJ Bulletin, Mid-Continent Jeweler, Northwestern Jeweler, Southern Jeweler, Pacific Goldsmith, Trader & Canadian Jeweler, Manufacturing Jeweler. (5) Interested in securing relief from excise taxes as applied to jewelry.

Haas, Frank E., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the third quarter of 1948 this registrant was not assigned to and did not engage in activity in connection with Federal legislation or covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and thus received no compensation and incurred no expense subject to report thereunder. (2) Not any (see No. (1)). (3) Not any (see No. (1)). (4) Not any (see No. (1)). (5) Not any (see No. (1)).

Haas, Herbert A., Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits, 1186 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $75 from the Employees Committee for Low Cost Retirement Benefits for expenses incurred July, August, and September, 1948. (2) Money received spent for carfare, telephone, and miscellaneous expenses. (3) Necessary expenses while engaged in further corrective legislation to H. R. 1362, passed into law July 31, 1946. (4) None. (5) Crosser Act (H. R. 1362) passed into law July 31, 1946.

Haddock, Hoyt C., CIO Martime Committee, 132 Third Street SE. (1) $1,560 in salary; $130 expenses. No legislative activities engaged in due to adjournment of Congress. (2) Taxi companies, telephone company, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxi, telephone calls, papers and periodicals. (4) NMU Pilot, Meba Marine Engineer. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen; oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Haddon, George A., treasurer, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Received and paid out $550 for fares and expenses while commuting to and from Washington, D. C., during the last quarter from July 1 to October 1, 1948. Also, for the National Conference on Public Employee Retirement Systems. (2) George A. Haddon, treasurer, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, room 419, City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) For train and taxi fares commuting and for meals, refreshments, etc. (4) None. (5) Trying to have Federal and municipal employee pensions exempt up to $1,440 from income tax as are railroad pensions. Also, trying to keep members of existing pension funds out of social security.

Hadley, Harlan V., 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None, other than one-quarter of the annual compensation of $2,500 as set forth in supplemental registration (form B) filed April 9, 1948, and miscellaneous expenses not to exceed $15. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Federal tax (excise) legislation, materials control legislation, and such other legislation as the association may hereafter from time to time indicate.

Haines, Samuel P. 4407 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, 171 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $5,500; expended, $5,287.18. (2) See exhibit B attached.[1] (3) See exhibit B attached.[1] (4) None. (5) Reduction or repeal of the 20 percent excise tax applying to dine and dance rooms of hotels.

Hale, William C., Tennessee Eastman Corp., Kingsport, Tenn. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Revisions in the Tariff Act—draw-back regulations

Hallbeck, E. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September 1948, $1,999.98; legislative expenses, July, August, and September 1948, $357.70; travel and general organization expenses, $1,914.78. (2) Legislative expenses include meals, streetcar, taxi, and minor incidental expenses, $367.70; travel and general organization expenses include attendance at State and National conventions and necessary expenses for hotels, meals, and incidentals plus transportation to Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $74.47 and $234.63, and Seaboard Railroad, $53.19, $1,914.78. (3) All expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended on account of travel and attendance at meetings and conventions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the Civil Service; improve the Civil Service Retirement System; improve the wages, hours, and conditions of post-office clerks, and to improve the postal service.

Hamlet, Harry G., Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $600. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended, nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Hanscom,[6] William A., 1700 I Street, room 406, Washington, D. C.; Oil Workers International Union-CIO, 301 East Fifth Street, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Received salary, $1,125; expenses, $345. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Hanscom,[7] William A., 1700 I Street NW., room 406, Washington, D. C.; Oil Workers International Union-CIO, Ledger Building, 301 East Fifth Street, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Received salary, $1,300; expenses $245. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) Union News Service and the International Oil Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to those objectives.

Harmanson,[6] L. James, Jr., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $1,625. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Agricultural legislation. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Harmanson,[7] L. James, Jr., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, 1948, $1,625. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $425; expenses, $280. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below of the convention of the Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially and (b) the opinion of the national board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social and economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harris, Ronald B., Irrigation Districts Association of California, T. W. Patterson Building, Fresno, Calif. (1) I have engaged in no activities in Washington for the Irrigation Districts Association of California for the quarter ending June 30, 1948, or at all. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Harris, Winder R., Room 203, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received: Office expense, $124.18; personal expense, $86.85; total, $211.03. Expended: Office, $126.06; personal, $86.85; total, $212.91; refunded, $1.88; total, $211.03. (2) Various. (3) Office and personal expenses. (4) None. (5) None for quarter for which report is made.

Hart, Merwin K., National Economic Council, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,640.86. (2) [Blank.] (3) Much of the period covered by the 3 months July 1 to September 30, 1948, was spent by me in Europe. I think a fair allocation, if any, to lobbying expenses would be the sum of $421, which was one-fourth of the expenses of my trip. I include this only for the reason that some of the

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

knowledge obtained by me on this trip was later used in the writing of certain council letters. (4) Economic Council letters. (5) I have opposed legislation believed by me to be against private enterprise, and supported legislation believed to favor it. I have made no specific appearances on any legislation during this period.

Hart, Stephen H., 350 Equitable Building; National Livestock Tax Committee, Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) During the quarter the National Livestock Tax Committee paid to me a per diem of $50 for office work and $100 out of town for actual time spent in study, advice, conferences and correspondence concerning general livestock tax questions including the analysis of the present provision of the Internal Revenue Code and current rulings and decisions concerning Federal taxation of livestock operators. (2) Such activities also included work in connection with proposal of the National Livestock Tax Committee to amend the Internal Revenue Code, recognizing capital gains in sale of breeding livestock and permitting deduction of ordinary recurring ranching expenditures. It is impossible to determine what part of my services related to this problem, but it is my opinion that only a portion of my activity, if any, during the preceding quarter could be interpreted as lobbying. (3) During the quarter a total of $675 for legal services was paid to me for all my activities and services. I was also reimbursed $41.01 for out-of-pocket expenses. (4) During the quarter I wrote an article on the general tax problems arising from the sale of cattle because of drouth. This article was published by the California Cattleman, the Producer, Cow Country, and perhaps other livestock periodicals. (5) [Blank.]

Harter, Dow W., 412–14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (1) Received annual retainer from the B. F. Goodrich Co. for all services as its Washington counsel. Allocation of amount paid for my services between legal and legislative activities is not feasible. Amount received during third quarter of 1948, $1,875. In addition, received reimbursement for long-distance telephone, travel, taxicab fares, and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co. is interested in legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of synthetic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes. It is interested in various proposals now under study by Congress for a long-range rubber program for this country. It is also interested in the repeal of the present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in other legislative proposals which come before Congress from time to time.

Hawes, Robert N., 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.: Grays Harbor Industries, Aberdeen, Wash.; Forks Chamber of Commerce, Forks, Wash.; Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, Port Townsend, Wash.; Sequim Chamber of Commerce, Sequim, Wash.; and Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Port Angeles, Wash. (1) From Grays Harbor Industries: $3,333.32, compensation; $423.51, expenses. (2) Out-of-pocket expenses. (3) Telephone, telegraph, travel, entertainment, postage, etc. (4) None. (5) Reference Olympic National Park.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York., N. Y. (1) Received $1,800 salary, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $197.72 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, air lines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $250 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social security taxes, $12.75 incidental expenses for months of July, August, and September 1948. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) $12.75 incidental expenses for months of July, August, and September 1948 (taxi, car fare, phone calls, meals). (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, re-education, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalizaton laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the National Convention of the Americn Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Hays, Joseph H., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the third quarter of 1948 this registrant was not assigned to and did not engage in activity in connection with Federal legislation or covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and thus received no compensation and incurred no expense subject to report thereunder. (2) Not any (see No. (1)). (3) Not any (see No. (1)). (4) Not any (see No. (1)). (5) Not any (see No. (1)).

Hazen, John C., 1008 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Meals, $107.65; hotel, $46.56; taxes, $49.25; transportation, railplane, $40; miscellaneous, $4.90. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Special Bulletin of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, published weekly. (5) [Blank.]

Hebert, Felix, 702 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (1) Hotel rooms, $32.50; meals, $28.25; railroad fares, cabs, $42.50. (2) Hotel rooms, Mayflower, Washington, D. C.; meals, Mayflower, Pennsylvania Railroad, Senate Restaurant; transportation, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; Pennsylvania Railroad; cabs. (3) Travel expenses. (4) None. (5) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code.

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $800 per month, which is paid for all services rendered, only a part of which concerns legislation. Out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $97.50. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.; American Parents Committee (without salary), 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $29.50 for traveling expense, entertainment, etc.; expended, $29.50. (2) Various. (3) Railroad fare, miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriations for U. S. Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education.

Heiney, Robert B., National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,625 as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary of association for all work performed; $27.10 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses, $27.10. (3) See above. (4) National Canners Information Letter. (5) Opposing marketing orders on commodities for canning; supporting S. 2386, H. R. 6050 and S. 2409.

Hensel, Robert E., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended the sum of 10 cents in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Additional charge for a telegram. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Hebert, Felix, 702 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies.) (1) Hotel rooms, $8.50; meals, $28.50; railroad fares, cabs, $53.83; total, $90.83. (2) Hotel room, the Mayflower, Washington, D. C.; meals, the Mayflower Hotel, Pennsylvania Railroad, Washington Station Restaurant; transportation, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, Pennsylvania Railroad, cabs. (3) Travel expenses. (4) None. (5) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code.

Herndon, Maurice G., 1001–2 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Herrmann, Louis F., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) August 10, 1948, taxi, 80 cents. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Hess,[9] Amiel Edgerton, 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.; Oil-Heat Institute of America, Inc., 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Nothing at present.

Hester, Ewart A., law offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September, $2,500; no expenses for this quarter. (2) No expenses reported. (3) None. (4) None. (5) See supplementary statement paragraph 2 attached to Form B filed by me January 9, 1948. H. R. 7036.

Hewes and Awalt, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, and Maxwell M. Merritt, 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn.; 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) (a) This registrant received no money or other com-

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

pensation from the Life Insurance Association of America during the calendar quarter ended September 30, 1948. (b) This registrant made certain out-of-pocket expenditures during the calendar quarter ended September 30, 1948, in connection with its employment by the above-named association for which registrant has not received reimbursement, these being listed in detail, as follows: to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for long distance calls, $9.90; to taxicab drivers, 70 cents; total, $10.60. (2) See (1). (3) Expenses for transportation and communication, as listed in the attached statement. (4) None. (5) Any revision of Internal Revenue Code affecting life insurance and annuities.

Hickman, R. L., Bayou Rapides Road, Alexandria, La.; Brotherhood Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, 1370 Ontario Street, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $573.30, and expended by me for transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (2) To hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxis, etc. (3) Transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Anti-inflation and housing, amendments to minimum-wage law, repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, and public education. This is final report as above employment was only temporary.

Hill and Knowlton, Inc., room 300, Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached.[1] (2) See attached.[1] (3) See attached.[1] (4) Have no records of such publication. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Are retained to prepare educational information and material.

Hinders, Justin, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended, $29.96. (2) Various. (3) Expenses. (4) Attached list shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Hines, Lewis G., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, $2,200; expenses for July, August, and September, $108.75. (2) Taxi drivers and phone company when away from office. (3) As stated in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Hinman, Ray C., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary, this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act, $1,250; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $157.66. Money expended in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act, $1,407.66. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Hoffmann,[6] Frank N., 718 Jackson Place NW., United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,530.01, salary, $1,901, expenses. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel in and away from Washington. (4) None. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the National CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Hoffmann,[7] Frank N., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,999.99, salary; $2,884, expenses. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel in and away from Washington. (4) None. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the National CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Hollister,[6] R. F., Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received: Salary, $1,800; money expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Holloway, William J., 2816 First National Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) (a) Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La., $5,000; (b) Public Service Co., Tulsa, Okla., $2,500; (c) Carroll B. Huntress, New York, N. Y., $500. (2) William J. Holloway, as above set forth. (3) Attorney's fees. (4) None. (5) (a) Oppose certain appropriations for Southwestern Power Administration; (b) oppose certain appropriations for Southwestern Power Administration; (c) oppose House legislation for St. Lawrence waterway.

Holman, Charles W., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $10.90. (2) Various. (3) Taxicabs. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Holmes, George T., Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Holste, Oscar W., room 301, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW. Washington, D. C., Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. Court and Vine Streets, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,296; expenses, $711.17; no other expenses than personal maintenance. (2) Hotel Annapolis, taxicabs, telephone, postage, laundry, pullman fare, and various eating places. (3) All living, transportation, and telephone expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation pertaining to railroad labor, particularly opposing all bills pertaining to the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts, which legislation would be detrimental to the acts.

Hood, J. M., president, the American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received from the American Short Line Railroad Association, $4,125; expenses incurred for account of the American Short Line Railroad Association for which reimbursement has been or will be made, $720.75; impossible to accurately allocate either salary or expenses, but carefully calculated estimate is that 5 percent of salary, $206.25, and 10 percent of expenses, $72.08; total, $278.33, expended for purpose of influencing legislation. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, clubs, transportation and communication companies. (3) For travel and entertainment in connection with the furtherance of the legislative program of the 312 common carriers by rail members of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting member lines of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (See text of legislative program attached to return for first quarter by that association.)

Hooks, Homer E., Canners League of Florida, P. O. Box 1252, Lakeland, Fla. (1) No activity during quarter; temporary work on specific legislation terminated with adjournment of last session, Eightieth Congress. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash.; Libby, McNeill & Libby, food products, Chicago, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kadiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (1) Received, none; expended, none. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of the Interior, relating to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Hosking, Floyd J., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.03 as miscellaneous expenses (see below). (2) Notary public, $2; postage, 3 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report, postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Howard,[6] S. H., 1328 Evergreen, Millvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $1,162.50 for the second quarter of 1948 and had expenses of $617.60 for this quarter. (2) Hamilton Hotel, various restaurants, taxicab, streetcar, and Pullman fares. (3) Lodging, meals, and transportation. (4) None. (5) All legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular. Working in behalf of proposed laws to amend the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Acts.

Howard,[7] S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received for third quarter, $1,162.50; working as grand lodge representative; not assigned to legislative activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Howard, Paul, 1709 M Street NW.; American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Attached.[1] (2) See attached.[1] (3) Operation of office. (4) ALA Bulletin, Library Journal, San Antonio Express, New York Times, and any other who use our releases; since we do not subscribe to a clipping service, we do not know who they are. (5) Any legislation affecting American Library Association members and/or the library profession.

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $1,500 as salary and $313.99 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various. See answer to question (3). (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof. My primary function as to legislation is to report status, prospects, etc., to my employer—the American Institute of Laundering. See also letter attached to Registration Form B, which is made a part hereof.

Howe, Robert E., Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Mine Workers of America.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

knowledge obtained by me on this trip was later used in the writing of certain council letters. (4) Economic Council letters. (5) I have opposed legislation believed by me to be against private enterprise, and supported legislation believed to favor it. I have made no specific appearances on any legislation during this period.

Hart, Stephen H., 350 Equitable Building; National Livestock Tax Committee, Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) During the quarter the National Livestock Tax Committee paid to me a per diem of $50 for office work and $100 out of town for actual time spent in study, advice, conferences and correspondence concerning general livestock tax questions including the analysis of the present provision of the Internal Revenue Code and current rulings and decisions concerning Federal taxation of livestock operators. (2) Such activities also included work in connection with proposal of the National Livestock Tax Committee to amend the Internal Revenue Code, recognizing capital gains in sale of breeding livestock and permitting deduction of ordinary recurring ranching expenditures. It is impossible to determine what part of my services related to this problem, but it is my opinion that only a portion of my activity, if any, during the preceding quarter could be interpreted as lobbying. (3) During the quarter a total of $675 for legal services was paid to me for all my activities and services. I was also reimbursed $41.01 for out-of-pocket expenses. (4) During the quarter I wrote an article on the general tax problems arising from the sale of cattle because of drouth. This article was published by the California Cattleman, the Producer, Cow Country, and perhaps other livestock periodicals. (5) [Blank.]

Harter, Dow W., 412–14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (1) Received annual retainer from the B. F. Goodrich Co. for all services as its Washington counsel. Allocation of amount paid for my services between legal and legislative activities is not feasible. Amount received during third quarter of 1948, $1,875. In addition, received reimbursement for long-distance telephone, travel, taxicab fares, and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co. is interested in legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of synthetic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes. It is interested in various proposals now under study by Congress for a long-range rubber program for this country. It is also interested in the repeal of the present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in other legislative proposals which come before Congress from time to time.

Hawes, Robert N., 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.: Grays Harbor Industries, Aberdeen, Wash.; Forks Chamber of Commerce, Forks, Wash.; Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, Port Townsend, Wash.; Sequim Chamber of Commerce, Sequim, Wash.; and Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Port Angeles, Wash. (1) From Grays Harbor Industries: $3,333.32, compensation; $423.51, expenses. (2) Out-of-pocket expenses. (3) Telephone, telegraph, travel, entertainment, postage, etc. (4) None. (5) Reference Olympic National Park.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York., N. Y. (1) Received $1,800 salary, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $197.72 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, air lines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $250 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social security taxes, $12.75 incidental expenses for months of July, August, and September 1948. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) $12.75 incidental expenses for months of July, August, and September 1948 (taxi, car fare, phone calls, meals). (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, re-education, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalizaton laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the National Convention of the Americn Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Hays, Joseph H., Western Association of Railway Executives, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the third quarter of 1948 this registrant was not assigned to and did not engage in activity in connection with Federal legislation or covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and thus received no compensation and incurred no expense subject to report thereunder. (2) Not any (see No. (1)). (3) Not any (see No. (1)). (4) Not any (see No. (1)). (5) Not any (see No. (1)).

Hazen, John C., 1008 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Meals, $107.65; hotel, $46.56; taxes, $49.25; transportation, railplane, $40; miscellaneous, $4.90. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Special Bulletin of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, published weekly. (5) [Blank.]

Hebert, Felix, 702 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (1) Hotel rooms, $32.50; meals, $28.25; railroad fares, cabs, $42.50. (2) Hotel rooms, Mayflower, Washington, D. C.; meals, Mayflower, Pennsylvania Railroad, Senate Restaurant; transportation, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; Pennsylvania Railroad; cabs. (3) Travel expenses. (4) None. (5) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code.

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $800 per month, which is paid for all services rendered, only a part of which concerns legislation. Out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $97.50. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.; American Parents Committee (without salary), 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $29.50 for traveling expense, entertainment, etc.; expended, $29.50. (2) Various. (3) Railroad fare, miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act, National Science Foundation bill, appropriations for U. S. Children's Bureau, Federal aid for education.

Heiney, Robert B., National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,625 as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary of association for all work performed; $27.10 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses, $27.10. (3) See above. (4) National Canners Information Letter. (5) Opposing marketing orders on commodities for canning; supporting S. 2386, H. R. 6050 and S. 2409.

Hensel, Robert E., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended the sum of 10 cents in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Additional charge for a telegram. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Hebert, Felix, 702 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies.) (1) Hotel rooms, $8.50; meals, $28.50; railroad fares, cabs, $53.83; total, $90.83. (2) Hotel room, the Mayflower, Washington, D. C.; meals, the Mayflower Hotel, Pennsylvania Railroad, Washington Station Restaurant; transportation, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, Pennsylvania Railroad, cabs. (3) Travel expenses. (4) None. (5) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code.

Herndon, Maurice G., 1001–2 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Herrmann, Louis F., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) August 10, 1948, taxi, 80 cents. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Hess,[9] Amiel Edgerton, 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.; Oil-Heat Institute of America, Inc., 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Nothing at present.

Hester, Ewart A., law offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, and September, $2,500; no expenses for this quarter. (2) No expenses reported. (3) None. (4) None. (5) See supplementary statement paragraph 2 attached to Form B filed by me January 9, 1948. H. R. 7036.

Hewes and Awalt, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, and Maxwell M. Merritt, 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn.; 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) (a) This registrant received no money or other com-

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

pensation from the Life Insurance Association of America during the calendar quarter ended September 30, 1948. (b) This registrant made certain out-of-pocket expenditures during the calendar quarter ended September 30, 1948, in connection with its employment by the above-named association for which registrant has not received reimbursement, these being listed in detail, as follows: to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for long distance calls, $9.90; to taxicab drivers, 70 cents; total, $10.60. (2) See (1). (3) Expenses for transportation and communication, as listed in the attached statement. (4) None. (5) Any revision of Internal Revenue Code affecting life insurance and annuities.

Hickman, R. L., Bayou Rapides Road, Alexandria, La.; Brotherhood Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, 1370 Ontario Street, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $573.30, and expended by me for transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (2) To hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxis, etc. (3) Transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Anti-inflation and housing, amendments to minimum-wage law, repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, and public education. This is final report as above employment was only temporary.

Hill and Knowlton, Inc., room 300, Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached.[1] (2) See attached.[1] (3) See attached.[1] (4) Have no records of such publication. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Are retained to prepare educational information and material.

Hinders, Justin, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended, $29.96. (2) Various. (3) Expenses. (4) Attached list shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Hines, Lewis G., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, $2,200; expenses for July, August, and September, $108.75. (2) Taxi drivers and phone company when away from office. (3) As stated in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Hinman, Ray C., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary, this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act, $1,250; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $157.66. Money expended in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act, $1,407.66. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Hoffmann,[6] Frank N., 718 Jackson Place NW., United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,530.01, salary, $1,901, expenses. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel in and away from Washington. (4) None. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the National CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Hoffmann,[7] Frank N., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,999.99, salary; $2,884, expenses. (2) Hotels, railroads, air lines, restaurants, cab drivers, etc., for expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel in and away from Washington. (4) None. (5) Support legislation authorized by the convention and executive board of the United Steelworkers, and by the convention and executive board of the National CIO; oppose legislation contrary to the stand of these organizations.

Hollister,[6] R. F., Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received: Salary, $1,800; money expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Holloway, William J., 2816 First National Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) (a) Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La., $5,000; (b) Public Service Co., Tulsa, Okla., $2,500; (c) Carroll B. Huntress, New York, N. Y., $500. (2) William J. Holloway, as above set forth. (3) Attorney's fees. (4) None. (5) (a) Oppose certain appropriations for Southwestern Power Administration; (b) oppose certain appropriations for Southwestern Power Administration; (c) oppose House legislation for St. Lawrence waterway.

Holman, Charles W., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $10.90. (2) Various. (3) Taxicabs. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Holmes, George T., Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Holste, Oscar W., room 301, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW. Washington, D. C., Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees. Court and Vine Streets, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,296; expenses, $711.17; no other expenses than personal maintenance. (2) Hotel Annapolis, taxicabs, telephone, postage, laundry, pullman fare, and various eating places. (3) All living, transportation, and telephone expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation pertaining to railroad labor, particularly opposing all bills pertaining to the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Acts, which legislation would be detrimental to the acts.

Hood, J. M., president, the American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received from the American Short Line Railroad Association, $4,125; expenses incurred for account of the American Short Line Railroad Association for which reimbursement has been or will be made, $720.75; impossible to accurately allocate either salary or expenses, but carefully calculated estimate is that 5 percent of salary, $206.25, and 10 percent of expenses, $72.08; total, $278.33, expended for purpose of influencing legislation. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, clubs, transportation and communication companies. (3) For travel and entertainment in connection with the furtherance of the legislative program of the 312 common carriers by rail members of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting member lines of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (See text of legislative program attached to return for first quarter by that association.)

Hooks, Homer E., Canners League of Florida, P. O. Box 1252, Lakeland, Fla. (1) No activity during quarter; temporary work on specific legislation terminated with adjournment of last session, Eightieth Congress. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash.; Libby, McNeill & Libby, food products, Chicago, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kadiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (1) Received, none; expended, none. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of the Interior, relating to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Hosking, Floyd J., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.03 as miscellaneous expenses (see below). (2) Notary public, $2; postage, 3 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report, postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Howard,[6] S. H., 1328 Evergreen, Millvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $1,162.50 for the second quarter of 1948 and had expenses of $617.60 for this quarter. (2) Hamilton Hotel, various restaurants, taxicab, streetcar, and Pullman fares. (3) Lodging, meals, and transportation. (4) None. (5) All legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular. Working in behalf of proposed laws to amend the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Acts.

Howard,[7] S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received for third quarter, $1,162.50; working as grand lodge representative; not assigned to legislative activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Howard, Paul, 1709 M Street NW.; American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Attached.[1] (2) See attached.[1] (3) Operation of office. (4) ALA Bulletin, Library Journal, San Antonio Express, New York Times, and any other who use our releases; since we do not subscribe to a clipping service, we do not know who they are. (5) Any legislation affecting American Library Association members and/or the library profession.

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $1,500 as salary and $313.99 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various. See answer to question (3). (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof. My primary function as to legislation is to report status, prospects, etc., to my employer—the American Institute of Laundering. See also letter attached to Registration Form B, which is made a part hereof.

Howe, Robert E., Jr., 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United Mine Workers of America.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

(1) Since April 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,125 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $546, a total of $2,671. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Howrey, Edward F., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 914 Eleventh Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Peanut and Nut Salters Association. Fee: None this quarter; expenses, $14.62. (2) Telephone, $10.57; notary fees, $1; restaurant expenses in Washington, $3.05; total, $14.62. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) Proposals affecting peanuts and tree nuts, particularly those placing limitations and restrictions on importation of nuts.

Huff, George B., secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual travel expenses (Philadelphia conventions and Chicago), $668.12. (2) American Airlines, TWA, Scott & Schuler, taxicab operators, various filling stations, and restaurants. (3) Procurement of travel, housing, and subsistence. (4) None. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Huntress, Carroll B., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.; National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y., acting as chairman for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference without compensation and for reimbursement of expenses. (2) Railroads, hotels, $439.50; New York Telephone Co., Western Union, $32.19; United States Post Office, $7. (3) To carry on duties as chairman. (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate Joint Resolution 111; House Joint Resolution 192.

Hushing, W. C., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, $2,200. Expenses for July, August and September, $105.90. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (when away from office), and messengers. (3) As stated in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Hutson, John B., suite 719, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., Tobacco Associates, Inc., Raleigh, N. C. (1) Salary at the rate previously reported on form B, which registrant filed as a matter of information to the Congress, although of the opinion that he does not come within the purview of the act (Pub. No. 601, 79th Cong.) (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See schedule A[1] for all money received during preceding calendar quarter and attachment for allocated expenditures. (2) See attachment.[1] (3) See attachment.[1] (4) Regular Association publications. (5) No legislation pending.

Ingles, William, 1624 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. et al.) (1) See schedule 1 (a) and 1 (B) attached.[1] (2) See Schedule 1 (B).[1] (3) Normal office operating expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Jackson, Charles E., general manager, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 228 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Jackson,[2] Robert C., National Cotton Council of America, post-office box 18, Memphis, Tenn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None: (5) None.

Jhung, Walter, post-office box 1706, Washington, D. C.; Korean-American Trading Co., 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (1) July salary of $333.33 as an employee of the Korean-American Trading Co., 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. Expended, $83.50. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) S. 152 and H. R. 860 to place Korea upon immigration quota and to seek naturalization privileges for Korean nationals in the USA.

Jobe, William T., National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Employed on a full-time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,800 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the past calendar quarter of 1948 and nothing more. Pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Johnson, Elmer, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The sum of $747.90 was received during the third quarter of 1948. (2) None. (3) Fee of $225 per month; $72.90 to cover transportation, meals, etc. (4) The Annuitant. (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal Retirement system.

Johnson, Gilbert R., Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Pro rata of annual retainer as legal counsel (including 8-percent increase effective September 1, 1948) as set forth in my letter of April 9, 1948, amending initial registration dated January 10, 1947. No expenses were incurred during this period. (2) Retainer to self. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) During this quarter I have given attention to legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping as part of my work as legal counsel for Lake Carriers' Association. I do not consider that I am engaged for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation and this report is made without prejudice to that position.

Johnson, James G., Jr., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Graves, Kizer & Graves, Old National Bank Building, Spokane, Wash. (1) Receipts, $2,852.54; expenditures, publications, 85 cents. (2) Congressional Intelligence, Washington, D. C. (publications). (3) For normal legal services, consisting primarily of advice and assistance in the drafting of proposed legislation, the collection of information in relation thereto and discussions thereof with members of Congress and representatives of interested executive departments. (4) [Blank.] (5) S. 2105 and H. R. 6536.

Johnson, Lee F., National Public Housing Conference, Inc., 1015 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 salary, less withholding tax. No funds expended under Public Law 601, except as perhaps 20 percent of my time was devoted to national legislative work. No expense account received. (2) Nothing paid out except for living expenses and transportation. (3) [Blank.] (4) Public Housing—editor of that journal. (5) Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill, S. 866.

Johnson, Vernon A., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW. Washington, D. C.; Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (1) Received a total of $4,008.45, all from the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., $2,750 of this was for salary. The balance of $1,258.45 was for expenses, itemized as follows: $17.17 for automobile travel, $44.50 for taxicab fares, $679.77 for entertainment, $334.06 for travel tickets, $73.50 for hotel room rent, and $109.45 for meals. (2) Various taxicab companies, hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, etc. (3) For normal business activities and relationships. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) January 1948, annual compensation of $3,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor, generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Johnson, Walter R., National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $444 for July, $222.50 for August. (2) Registrant. (3) Transportation, $300; meals for self and guests, $320; miscellaneous, $46.50. (4) None. (5) To confirm and establish titles in States to land beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

Jones, Bascom F., Tennessee Railroad Association, 990 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Salary, $2,100. (2) [Blank.] (3) No lobbying expense for third quarter 1948. (4) The National Wool Grower, coeditor, J. M. Jones. (5) [Blank.]

Jones, L. Dan, Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered to be within the scope of the act, $12.55. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Jones, Lyle W., 1737 De Sales Street NW.; National Small Business Men's Association, Akron, Ohio. (1) $600 monthly salary less withholding tax and social security tax. $100 personal expenses for July, August, and September. (2) Lyle W. Jones, 1737 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Luncheons, taxicabs, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) Pulling Together—monthly bulletin, National Small Business Men's Association. (5) [Blank.]

Jones, Walter J., care of W. C. Hushing, Room 607, A. F. of L. Building, Washington, D. C.; Canal Zone Central Labor Union, Box 1494, Balboa, C. Z. (1) $1,500 at $500 per month for April, May, and June 1948. (2) Tuition at Harvard, railroads for fare, landlord for rent, various groceries for food, service stations for gasoline and oil, cab fare, tips, and miscellaneous items incidental to living in Washington. (3) Studies at Harvard, fares, rent, food, operation of automobile, etc. (4) None. (5) Retirement for Canal Zone employees, pay legislation, increased injury compensation, any other affecting Federal employees.

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported in Form B heretofore filed pursuant to act; expenses reimbursed by employer, $279.15. (2) Various taxicab companies, restaurants, hotels, other service establishments. (3) Administrative expenses, transportation, meals, gratuities. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

Kane, John E., District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $498.31 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee. The sum of $498.31 expended on behalf of committee during quarter. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Keehn,[9] Thomas B., legislative secretary, the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches of the United States of America, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During recent months the activities which I have carried on which could conceivably be designated as lobbying have been so negligible that it does not appear to us to be necessary to file a quarterly report under the regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Keesling, Francis V., Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; city and county of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $2,806.45 retainer; $1,146.55 reimbursement for travel, subsistence, secretarial, stenographic, telephone, telegraph, and postage expenses. (This also covers services concerning matters before the various executive departments, in addition to legislative matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, and includes expenses at Washington, D. C.; San Francisco; and elsewhere.) (2) No payments made except as set forth in (1) above. (3) In connection with various legislative matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco. (4) None. (5) Various bills of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including Army civil functions, housing, surplus property, in lieu taxes.

Kennedy, Gilbert F., Esq., partner of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Washington, D. C.; and 1, Garden Court, Middle Temple, London, England; Mr. Louis Dreyfus, of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York, N. Y., and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50, New Bond Street, London, England. (1) Nothing received during the quarter; $2 expended during the quarter. (2) H. W. H. Smith Howard, commissioner for oaths, $2. (3) Commissioner's fees. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, being a bill to enable wife (Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus) to regain her United States citizenship.

Kennedy, Harold L., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.; Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa 3, Okla. (1) Received 3 months' retainer in the amount of $3,000; expended, $27. (2) See No. (3) below. (3) Expended $12 for 30 taxi fares (40 cents each) to and from the Capitol; 10 meals at $1.50 each, comprising a total of $15. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Kent, Arthur H., 1720 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif.; American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Payment of $1,148.22 received from American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., July 15, 1948. (2) United Airlines—transportation San Francisco to Washington and return and excess baggage charges, $361.53; American Airlines—transportation Washington, D. C. to New York and return, $28.06; Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., charges room, etc., $250.46; C. K. Leith, Washington, D. C., rent of apartment, $150; telephone and telegraph tolls, $38.63; meals, taxis, etc., Washington, D. C. and New York, $319.54. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses incurred to July 1, 1948, and reimbursed by above payment. (4) None. (5) Support of amendment to section 116 (a), Internal Revenue Code, relating to taxation of earned income of United States citizens from foreign sources.

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

Kern, George A., Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Ketchum, Inc., 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Education Association: April 20, 1948, $4,717.54; May 29, 1948, $4,108.89; June 21, 1948, $1,600; total, $10,426.43. (2) Ketchum, Inc., $10,426.43. (3) Services, $8,800; expenses living, travel, and incidental expenses), $1,626.43; total, $10,426.43. (4) News releases sent to Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (Information also distributed to Members of Congress.) (5) Current educational problems in furtherance of the passage of H. R. 2953 and S. 472.

Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Received from Main & Co., April 7, 1948, $473; May-June 8, 1948, $264; total, $737. (2) (a) Romeike Press Clipping Bureau, $21; (b) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $716; total, $737. (3) (a) Clipping service, (b) services. (4) News releases sent to Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wall Street Journal, Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, and general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (5) The incentive income tax plan, a program of income-tax revision prepared by Frank Wilbur Main and other partners in Main & Co., certified public accountants, with headquarters office in Pittsburgh.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $833 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $76.35 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) V. F. W. Foreign Service, V. F. W. legislative newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security; immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration.

King, Joseph T., National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, suite 302, the Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,800 salary and $69.35 expenses. (2) Restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business; business luncheons; entertainment. (4) National Affairs Report and bulletins. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building supply dealers, such as Fair Labor Standards Act, wage-and-hour legislation, housing legislation, and tax legislation.

King, Joseph T. (Robert N. Hawes), Suite 1028, Barr Building, 912 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to Olympic National Park.

King, Thomas H., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

King, Williford I., Room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During this past quarter, I received an overall of $2,791.69, including salary and expenses. (2) I am not a disbursing officer and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kitchen, C. W., United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade periodicals and association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Kline, Allan B., American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $256.14 expended (see item (6) of Form B filed January 1948). (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotel, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: International wheat agreement, authorization with respect to the construction of headquarters for the United Nations, monetary and fiscal policies.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington counsel for Kirlin, Campbell, Hickox & Keating, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Kneipp, Leon F., 3700 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Organization of Professional Employees of United States Department of Agriculture, South Building, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. (1) Only money received was compensation for services during months of July and August at rate of $100 per month. Total $200. (2) No money paid to any person, company, corporation, or otherwise. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Measures relating to interests of Federal professional employees, viz: Pay rates, retirement, disability compensation, per diem allowances, etc.

Koch, Robert M., National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) It is estimated that, as secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $500 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the third quarter of 1948. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $25 for reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Krebs, Alfred U., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant believes that $166.66 per month represents a fair allocation of his salary for the third quarter of 1948, to the activities referred to in Form B. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None (5) Registrant is not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

(1) Since April 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,125 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $546, a total of $2,671. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Howrey, Edward F., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Peanut and Nut Salters Association, 914 Eleventh Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Peanut and Nut Salters Association. Fee: None this quarter; expenses, $14.62. (2) Telephone, $10.57; notary fees, $1; restaurant expenses in Washington, $3.05; total, $14.62. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) Proposals affecting peanuts and tree nuts, particularly those placing limitations and restrictions on importation of nuts.

Huff, George B., secretary, the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., room 315, 38 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) Money received for salary, none; money received for reimbursement of actual travel expenses (Philadelphia conventions and Chicago), $668.12. (2) American Airlines, TWA, Scott & Schuler, taxicab operators, various filling stations, and restaurants. (3) Procurement of travel, housing, and subsistence. (4) None. (5) Legislation to promote tax equality between competing businesses.

Huntress, Carroll B., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.; National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y., acting as chairman for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference without compensation and for reimbursement of expenses. (2) Railroads, hotels, $439.50; New York Telephone Co., Western Union, $32.19; United States Post Office, $7. (3) To carry on duties as chairman. (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate Joint Resolution 111; House Joint Resolution 192.

Hushing, W. C., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, $2,200. Expenses for July, August and September, $105.90. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (when away from office), and messengers. (3) As stated in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Hutson, John B., suite 719, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., Tobacco Associates, Inc., Raleigh, N. C. (1) Salary at the rate previously reported on form B, which registrant filed as a matter of information to the Congress, although of the opinion that he does not come within the purview of the act (Pub. No. 601, 79th Cong.) (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See schedule A[1] for all money received during preceding calendar quarter and attachment for allocated expenditures. (2) See attachment.[1] (3) See attachment.[1] (4) Regular Association publications. (5) No legislation pending.

Ingles, William, 1624 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co. et al.) (1) See schedule 1 (a) and 1 (B) attached.[1] (2) See Schedule 1 (B).[1] (3) Normal office operating expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Jackson, Charles E., general manager, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 228 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Jackson,[2] Robert C., National Cotton Council of America, post-office box 18, Memphis, Tenn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None: (5) None.

Jhung, Walter, post-office box 1706, Washington, D. C.; Korean-American Trading Co., 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (1) July salary of $333.33 as an employee of the Korean-American Trading Co., 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. Expended, $83.50. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) S. 152 and H. R. 860 to place Korea upon immigration quota and to seek naturalization privileges for Korean nationals in the USA.

Jobe, William T., National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW, Washington, D. C. (1) Employed on a full-time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,800 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the past calendar quarter of 1948 and nothing more. Pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Johnson, Elmer, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The sum of $747.90 was received during the third quarter of 1948. (2) None. (3) Fee of $225 per month; $72.90 to cover transportation, meals, etc. (4) The Annuitant. (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal Retirement system.

Johnson, Gilbert R., Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Pro rata of annual retainer as legal counsel (including 8-percent increase effective September 1, 1948) as set forth in my letter of April 9, 1948, amending initial registration dated January 10, 1947. No expenses were incurred during this period. (2) Retainer to self. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) During this quarter I have given attention to legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping as part of my work as legal counsel for Lake Carriers' Association. I do not consider that I am engaged for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation and this report is made without prejudice to that position.

Johnson, James G., Jr., 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Graves, Kizer & Graves, Old National Bank Building, Spokane, Wash. (1) Receipts, $2,852.54; expenditures, publications, 85 cents. (2) Congressional Intelligence, Washington, D. C. (publications). (3) For normal legal services, consisting primarily of advice and assistance in the drafting of proposed legislation, the collection of information in relation thereto and discussions thereof with members of Congress and representatives of interested executive departments. (4) [Blank.] (5) S. 2105 and H. R. 6536.

Johnson, Lee F., National Public Housing Conference, Inc., 1015 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 salary, less withholding tax. No funds expended under Public Law 601, except as perhaps 20 percent of my time was devoted to national legislative work. No expense account received. (2) Nothing paid out except for living expenses and transportation. (3) [Blank.] (4) Public Housing—editor of that journal. (5) Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill, S. 866.

Johnson, Vernon A., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW. Washington, D. C.; Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (1) Received a total of $4,008.45, all from the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., $2,750 of this was for salary. The balance of $1,258.45 was for expenses, itemized as follows: $17.17 for automobile travel, $44.50 for taxicab fares, $679.77 for entertainment, $334.06 for travel tickets, $73.50 for hotel room rent, and $109.45 for meals. (2) Various taxicab companies, hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, etc. (3) For normal business activities and relationships. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

[2] Filed with the Clerk only.

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) January 1948, annual compensation of $3,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor, generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Johnson, Walter R., National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $444 for July, $222.50 for August. (2) Registrant. (3) Transportation, $300; meals for self and guests, $320; miscellaneous, $46.50. (4) None. (5) To confirm and establish titles in States to land beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

Jones, Bascom F., Tennessee Railroad Association, 990 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Salary, $2,100. (2) [Blank.] (3) No lobbying expense for third quarter 1948. (4) The National Wool Grower, coeditor, J. M. Jones. (5) [Blank.]

Jones, L. Dan, Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered to be within the scope of the act, $12.55. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Jones, Lyle W., 1737 De Sales Street NW.; National Small Business Men's Association, Akron, Ohio. (1) $600 monthly salary less withholding tax and social security tax. $100 personal expenses for July, August, and September. (2) Lyle W. Jones, 1737 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Luncheons, taxicabs, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) Pulling Together—monthly bulletin, National Small Business Men's Association. (5) [Blank.]

Jones, Walter J., care of W. C. Hushing, Room 607, A. F. of L. Building, Washington, D. C.; Canal Zone Central Labor Union, Box 1494, Balboa, C. Z. (1) $1,500 at $500 per month for April, May, and June 1948. (2) Tuition at Harvard, railroads for fare, landlord for rent, various groceries for food, service stations for gasoline and oil, cab fare, tips, and miscellaneous items incidental to living in Washington. (3) Studies at Harvard, fares, rent, food, operation of automobile, etc. (4) None. (5) Retirement for Canal Zone employees, pay legislation, increased injury compensation, any other affecting Federal employees.

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported in Form B heretofore filed pursuant to act; expenses reimbursed by employer, $279.15. (2) Various taxicab companies, restaurants, hotels, other service establishments. (3) Administrative expenses, transportation, meals, gratuities. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

Kane, John E., District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $498.31 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee. The sum of $498.31 expended on behalf of committee during quarter. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Keehn,[9] Thomas B., legislative secretary, the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches of the United States of America, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During recent months the activities which I have carried on which could conceivably be designated as lobbying have been so negligible that it does not appear to us to be necessary to file a quarterly report under the regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Keesling, Francis V., Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; city and county of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $2,806.45 retainer; $1,146.55 reimbursement for travel, subsistence, secretarial, stenographic, telephone, telegraph, and postage expenses. (This also covers services concerning matters before the various executive departments, in addition to legislative matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, and includes expenses at Washington, D. C.; San Francisco; and elsewhere.) (2) No payments made except as set forth in (1) above. (3) In connection with various legislative matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco. (4) None. (5) Various bills of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including Army civil functions, housing, surplus property, in lieu taxes.

Kennedy, Gilbert F., Esq., partner of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Washington, D. C.; and 1, Garden Court, Middle Temple, London, England; Mr. Louis Dreyfus, of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York, N. Y., and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50, New Bond Street, London, England. (1) Nothing received during the quarter; $2 expended during the quarter. (2) H. W. H. Smith Howard, commissioner for oaths, $2. (3) Commissioner's fees. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, being a bill to enable wife (Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus) to regain her United States citizenship.

Kennedy, Harold L., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.; Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa 3, Okla. (1) Received 3 months' retainer in the amount of $3,000; expended, $27. (2) See No. (3) below. (3) Expended $12 for 30 taxi fares (40 cents each) to and from the Capitol; 10 meals at $1.50 each, comprising a total of $15. (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Kent, Arthur H., 1720 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif.; American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Payment of $1,148.22 received from American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., July 15, 1948. (2) United Airlines—transportation San Francisco to Washington and return and excess baggage charges, $361.53; American Airlines—transportation Washington, D. C. to New York and return, $28.06; Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., charges room, etc., $250.46; C. K. Leith, Washington, D. C., rent of apartment, $150; telephone and telegraph tolls, $38.63; meals, taxis, etc., Washington, D. C. and New York, $319.54. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses incurred to July 1, 1948, and reimbursed by above payment. (4) None. (5) Support of amendment to section 116 (a), Internal Revenue Code, relating to taxation of earned income of United States citizens from foreign sources.

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

Kern, George A., Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Ketchum, Inc., 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Education Association: April 20, 1948, $4,717.54; May 29, 1948, $4,108.89; June 21, 1948, $1,600; total, $10,426.43. (2) Ketchum, Inc., $10,426.43. (3) Services, $8,800; expenses living, travel, and incidental expenses), $1,626.43; total, $10,426.43. (4) News releases sent to Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (Information also distributed to Members of Congress.) (5) Current educational problems in furtherance of the passage of H. R. 2953 and S. 472.

Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Received from Main & Co., April 7, 1948, $473; May-June 8, 1948, $264; total, $737. (2) (a) Romeike Press Clipping Bureau, $21; (b) Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc., $716; total, $737. (3) (a) Clipping service, (b) services. (4) News releases sent to Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wall Street Journal, Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, and general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (5) The incentive income tax plan, a program of income-tax revision prepared by Frank Wilbur Main and other partners in Main & Co., certified public accountants, with headquarters office in Pittsburgh.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $833 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $76.35 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) V. F. W. Foreign Service, V. F. W. legislative newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security; immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration.

King, Joseph T., National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, suite 302, the Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,800 salary and $69.35 expenses. (2) Restaurants, cab drivers. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business; business luncheons; entertainment. (4) National Affairs Report and bulletins. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building supply dealers, such as Fair Labor Standards Act, wage-and-hour legislation, housing legislation, and tax legislation.

King, Joseph T. (Robert N. Hawes), Suite 1028, Barr Building, 912 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to Olympic National Park.

King, Thomas H., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

King, Williford I., Room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During this past quarter, I received an overall of $2,791.69, including salary and expenses. (2) I am not a disbursing officer and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kitchen, C. W., United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade periodicals and association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Kline, Allan B., American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $256.14 expended (see item (6) of Form B filed January 1948). (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotel, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: International wheat agreement, authorization with respect to the construction of headquarters for the United Nations, monetary and fiscal policies.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington counsel for Kirlin, Campbell, Hickox & Keating, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Kneipp, Leon F., 3700 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Organization of Professional Employees of United States Department of Agriculture, South Building, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. (1) Only money received was compensation for services during months of July and August at rate of $100 per month. Total $200. (2) No money paid to any person, company, corporation, or otherwise. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Measures relating to interests of Federal professional employees, viz: Pay rates, retirement, disability compensation, per diem allowances, etc.

Koch, Robert M., National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) It is estimated that, as secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $500 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the third quarter of 1948. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $25 for reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Krebs, Alfred U., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant believes that $166.66 per month represents a fair allocation of his salary for the third quarter of 1948, to the activities referred to in Form B. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See item (2). (4) None (5) Registrant is not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Kreutz, Oscar R., executive manager, National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $4,500 salary and $1,698.01 special expense. Approximately 10 percent of my time was devoted to legislative matters so that $450 of my salary would be allocable. Of the special expense item, none of it could be construed as applicable. (2) No one (none expended by me). (3) None expended by me. (4) National Letter and National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry.

Krueger, A. H., 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the quarter July-September 1948 I was paid a total of $2,049.98 as an employee of Millers' National Federation for various services which have no relation to the activities described in section 307, title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Section 307 activities, if any, would be incidental to my regular employment, and no specific amount of my salary is allocated for activities covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. I made no expenditures for the quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) New York Times, July 7, 1948. (5) Prepared short statistical article on International Wheat Agreement, incidental to my regular employment.

Kruse, Herman C., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No activity during quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

La France, Francis X., Esq., Swan, Keeney & Smith, 911 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.; Narragansett Brewing Co., New Depot Avenue, Cranston, R. I. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2759 and any correlative bill.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) From the National Patent Council, Inc., as retainer, $1,500; from the American Fair Trade Council, Inc., as retainer, $1,000; from the Trinity Improvement Association for rental and other expenses, $750. Other than as herein recited, I have made no expenditures except for postage, stationery, taxi fares, etc. (2) $408 to Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (3) Rental and garage. (4) None. (5) My employers are nonprofit organizations, and I am employed in an advisory capacity and not for the purposes of supporting or opposing legislation in Congress. Their purposes are principally educational with reference to the objectives of their organizations.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C.; A. E. Brooks, 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) $500 in further payment of retainer. No expenditures except for postage and stationery. (2) No expenditures except as recited above. (3) Postage and stationery. (4) None. (5) Legislation with reference to taxation of citizens of the United States engaged in business abroad.

Larkin, Frederick, Jr., Independent Business Council of America, Inc., 448 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $435. (2) Frederick Larkin, Jr. (3) Living expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation that in the opinion of the members of this organization affects the welfare of independent and the small-business men and women.

Laugherty, R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., Room 1309, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500. Expenses, $750. No money expended only for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxi fare, postage, telephone and telegraph, cleaning, and food. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting and detrimental to railroad employees.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $36.70. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., American Medical Association, Suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $400.12; expenses, $181.28. (2) Capital Airlines, Eastern Airlines, Palmer House. (3) Travel, hotels, meals, local transportation, conferences, incidental expenses. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the section of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has received no contributions for the purposes designated in subparagraph (a) or (b) of section 307, Public Law 601. Expenditures: Salary, carfare, telephone, telegraph, postage, publications, $1,448.10. (2) Muriel Ferris, salary and carfare. Balance as indicated in (1). (3) As indicated in (1). (4) Trends in Government and Member magazine, both published by registrant. (5) See attached program [1] of the League of Women Voters of the United States.

Lee, Ivy, and Ross, T. J., United States Cuban Sugar Council, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) See appended statement I.[1] (2) See appended statement I.[1] (3) See appended statement I.[1] (4) See appended statement II.[1] (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public relations matters pertaining to sugar legislation relating the Sugar Act of 1948.

Leith,[6] W. Gordon, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $1,500 (before withholding taxes were deducted). Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Leith,[7] W. Gordon, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September 1948, $1,500. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Letts, David S., attorney, 901 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; American Transit Association, 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,950 salary as attorney for the American Transit Association. Received $136.61 for actual business expenses. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, etc.; hotels and restaurants; merchants and others. (3) Traveling and living expenses away from Washington. Expenses in Washington for transportation, fees, dues, entertainment and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) In connection with proposed legislation affecting the transit industry, registrant may present the views of members of the American Transit Association.

Levine, Seth, CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,365 in salary; $130 expenses. Very little time spent in legislative activities. Major portion of quarter attributed economic research. (2) Taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxies, telephone calls, periodicals, and newspapers. (4) CIO News, NMU Pilot, IFAWA Fisherman, The American Marine Engineer.. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, longshoremen, fishermen, and allied maritime workers. Oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Levy,[4] Herman M., 152 Temple Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) No contributions or compensations other than that received as an annual retainer for duties as general counsel of Theatre Owners of America, Inc., plus hotel (or its equivalent) and traveling expenses. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Affecting motion picture theater owners and operators.

Lewis, George J., Union Station, Lexington, Ky.; Kentucky Railroad Association, Louisville, Ky. (for fuller details see Form B, filed by me on June 3, 1947). (1) No moneys received. None expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Employed to support legislation favorable to the railroad industry and to oppose legislation detrimental to that industry.

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,149.99; expenses, $87.75; total, $1,237.74. (2) Expenses for railroad tickets, hotels, taxies, porters, telephone and telegraph services, postage, and miscellaneous expenses when away from Washington. (3) Speaking trips, attending conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Peace Action, monthly news bulletin of the National Council for Prevention of War. (5) Supports, in pursuance to the purposes of the organization, legislation which promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Liljenquist,[6] L. Blaine, room 300, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; E. F. Forbes, president, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary during April-June 1948 quarter, $2,000; expenses incurred with respect to legislation, $76.98. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, postage stamps, notary fees, printing and mimeographing. (4) None. (5) Supported legislation dealing with Federal meat inspection. Also supported legislation designed to correct the overtime-on-overtime problems.

Liljenquist,[7] L. B., 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Linton, Donald H., Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates; 250 Stuart Street, Boston, Mass. (1) None during period. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Lipman,[8] Leonard H., New Jersey Businessmen Association, Inc.; Tunison Lane, New Brunswick, N. J. (1) Received from New Jersey Businessmen Association, Inc., $38.65. (2) Expenses in connection with traveling, telephone, and telegraph, $39.95. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Tax equality, reduction of Federal expenses.

Littell, Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Navajo Tribe of Indians, residing in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and

[1] Not printed. Filed in Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

Colorado, address of superintendent of the Navajo Service, Window Rock, Ariz. (1) Received $1,785.36, which entire sum was paid to expert witnesses, O. A. Larrazolo and Martin Van Couvering, for preparation of claim on behalf of the Navajo Tribe of Indians. (2) To employees of registrant's law office, including stenographers, and to expert witnesses in connection with the proving of the claims. (3) For legal services in connection with the Navajo business. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the Navajos as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting the Navajos is being considered.

Little, Charles R., Kenwood Road, Box 153–M, Rural Route 508, Cincinnati, Ohio; executive secretary, Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress, Dr. Charles E. Holzer, Sr., president, Holzer Hospital, Gallipolis, Ohio. (1) Total received for salary, $900; total received for expenses, $600; total expenses, $412.60 (actual amounts directly chargeable to lobbying are less than totals shown above). (2) Various hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Transportation $191.45, lodging $46.07, meals $51.39, tips $11.82, office (periodicals, communication, postage, stationery, supplies, etc.) $111.87. (4) None. (5) Not solely employed for this purpose, but concerned with any legislation dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley, including appropriations.

Little,[4] Charles R., executive secretary, Kenwood Road, Box 153–M, Rural Route 508, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Total received for salary, $900; total received for expenses, $600; total expenses, $412.60 (actual amounts directly chargeable to "lobbying" are less than totals shown above). (2) Various hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Transportation, $191.45; lodging, $46.07; meals, $51.39; tips, $11.82; office (periodicals, communication, postage, stationery, supplies, etc.) $111.87. (4) None. (5) Not solely employed for this purpose, but concerned with any legislation dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley, including appropriations.

Little, Walter J., Southern Pacific Co., et al., 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Lodge, F. S., the National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $150 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News, Fertilizer Review, Agronomic Notes, and Pasture Progress, all published by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington, D. C. I issued and distributed, in the customary manner, a press release relative to the election of Dr. Russell Coleman as president of the association, and one relative to a conference on mineral nutrition, but do not know what publications may have published them in whole or in part. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Lofgren,[6] Charles E., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500. (2) Charles E. Lofgren. (3) Salary. (4) Naval Affairs Magazine, official publication of the Fleet Reserve Association. Various monthly publications of chartered branches of the Fleet Reserve Association. (5) Personnel and veterans legislation pertaining particularly to Navy and Marine Corps, and generally to armed services.

Lofgren,[7] Charles E., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500 (salary). (2) No expenditures other than personal living expenses. (3) Receipts, $1,500 salary; expenditures, none, other than personal living expenses. (4) Naval Affairs Magazine, official publication of Fleet Reserve Association. (5) Armed services personnel legislation and veteran legislation.

Lopinsky, Frances, Curry, Cohen & Bingham, 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) About $3. (2) Cab drivers. (3) Cabs to and from Capitol. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation concerning Indian affairs, particularly concerning members of National Congress of American Indians, Alaskan natives, Apaches, Piautes.

Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York; 1216 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $31,544.80. (2) No disbursements made during third quarter of 1948. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

Lorence,[8 9] Walter E., The Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 730 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Regular salary for April, May, and June 1948, as reported on Form B; reimbursements of $178.03 for personal out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses (various). (3) Personal out-of-pocket expenses for lodgings, food, travel, telephone calls while in Washington, D. C. (4) Progress News, a publication of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc. (5) In the interest of navigation and flood-control projects in the Ohio Valley.

Lorence,[7 9] Walter E., The Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 730 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Regular salary for July, August, and September 1948 as reported on Form B. (2) Self. (3) [Blank.] (4) Progress News, a publication of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association Inc. (5) In the interest of navigation and flood-control projects in the Ohio Valley. No lobbying activities performed during this quarter.

Lovelady, Rufus M., care of American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Canal Zone District of the American Federation of Government Employees, Box 1703, Balboa, C. Z. (1) During special session of Congress from July 26 to August 7, 1948, expenses, as follows: Plane fare from Canal Zone to Washington, $172.20; board and lodging while in Washington, $63; steamship fare on return to Canal Zone, $62.25; total, $297.45. (2) Pan American Airways, hotels and restaurants in Washington; Panama Railroad Company. (3) Transportation, board, and lodging. (4) None. (5) Retirement legislation applicable to employees of the Panama Canal; preservation of competitive civil-service positions on the Canal Zone for citizens of the United States.

Lucas, James C., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200, salary; $14.45, expenses. (2) Taxi drivers and publishers. (3) Transportation and publications. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable-fabric legislation.

Lusk,[10] Rufus S., Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $31.04; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $424.11. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown below. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, therefore the sum of $15 is allocated to those purposes. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation whether national or local in scope that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[11] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW.; National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $46.57; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $709.24; from National Association of Home Builders, $795.01. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses, and supervisory fees as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, therefore the sum of $22.50 is allocated to those purposes. Registrant was employed by National Association of Home Builders to conduct and supervise a public housing survey in connection with legislation pending before the Congress. Therefore, he sets forth the entire amount of compensation so received. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation whether national or local in scope that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[12] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW.; National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $40; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $2,602.65; from National Association of Home Builders, $106.40. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses, and supervisory fees as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.
[10] Filed for third quarter, 1946.
[11] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[12] Filed for first quarter, 1947.

Kreutz, Oscar R., executive manager, National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $4,500 salary and $1,698.01 special expense. Approximately 10 percent of my time was devoted to legislative matters so that $450 of my salary would be allocable. Of the special expense item, none of it could be construed as applicable. (2) No one (none expended by me). (3) None expended by me. (4) National Letter and National Savings and Loan Journal. (5) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry.

Krueger, A. H., 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the quarter July-September 1948 I was paid a total of $2,049.98 as an employee of Millers' National Federation for various services which have no relation to the activities described in section 307, title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Section 307 activities, if any, would be incidental to my regular employment, and no specific amount of my salary is allocated for activities covered by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. I made no expenditures for the quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) New York Times, July 7, 1948. (5) Prepared short statistical article on International Wheat Agreement, incidental to my regular employment.

Kruse, Herman C., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No activity during quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

La France, Francis X., Esq., Swan, Keeney & Smith, 911 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.; Narragansett Brewing Co., New Depot Avenue, Cranston, R. I. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2759 and any correlative bill.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.; National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) From the National Patent Council, Inc., as retainer, $1,500; from the American Fair Trade Council, Inc., as retainer, $1,000; from the Trinity Improvement Association for rental and other expenses, $750. Other than as herein recited, I have made no expenditures except for postage, stationery, taxi fares, etc. (2) $408 to Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (3) Rental and garage. (4) None. (5) My employers are nonprofit organizations, and I am employed in an advisory capacity and not for the purposes of supporting or opposing legislation in Congress. Their purposes are principally educational with reference to the objectives of their organizations.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C.; A. E. Brooks, 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) $500 in further payment of retainer. No expenditures except for postage and stationery. (2) No expenditures except as recited above. (3) Postage and stationery. (4) None. (5) Legislation with reference to taxation of citizens of the United States engaged in business abroad.

Larkin, Frederick, Jr., Independent Business Council of America, Inc., 448 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $435. (2) Frederick Larkin, Jr. (3) Living expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation that in the opinion of the members of this organization affects the welfare of independent and the small-business men and women.

Laugherty, R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., Room 1309, 60½ South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500. Expenses, $750. No money expended only for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxi fare, postage, telephone and telegraph, cleaning, and food. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting and detrimental to railroad employees.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $36.70. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., American Medical Association, Suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $400.12; expenses, $181.28. (2) Capital Airlines, Eastern Airlines, Palmer House. (3) Travel, hotels, meals, local transportation, conferences, incidental expenses. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the section of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has received no contributions for the purposes designated in subparagraph (a) or (b) of section 307, Public Law 601. Expenditures: Salary, carfare, telephone, telegraph, postage, publications, $1,448.10. (2) Muriel Ferris, salary and carfare. Balance as indicated in (1). (3) As indicated in (1). (4) Trends in Government and Member magazine, both published by registrant. (5) See attached program [1] of the League of Women Voters of the United States.

Lee, Ivy, and Ross, T. J., United States Cuban Sugar Council, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) See appended statement I.[1] (2) See appended statement I.[1] (3) See appended statement I.[1] (4) See appended statement II.[1] (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public relations matters pertaining to sugar legislation relating the Sugar Act of 1948.

Leith,[6] W. Gordon, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $1,500 (before withholding taxes were deducted). Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Leith,[7] W. Gordon, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September 1948, $1,500. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Letts, David S., attorney, 901 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; American Transit Association, 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,950 salary as attorney for the American Transit Association. Received $136.61 for actual business expenses. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, etc.; hotels and restaurants; merchants and others. (3) Traveling and living expenses away from Washington. Expenses in Washington for transportation, fees, dues, entertainment and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) In connection with proposed legislation affecting the transit industry, registrant may present the views of members of the American Transit Association.

Levine, Seth, CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,365 in salary; $130 expenses. Very little time spent in legislative activities. Major portion of quarter attributed economic research. (2) Taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxies, telephone calls, periodicals, and newspapers. (4) CIO News, NMU Pilot, IFAWA Fisherman, The American Marine Engineer.. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, longshoremen, fishermen, and allied maritime workers. Oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Levy,[4] Herman M., 152 Temple Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) No contributions or compensations other than that received as an annual retainer for duties as general counsel of Theatre Owners of America, Inc., plus hotel (or its equivalent) and traveling expenses. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Affecting motion picture theater owners and operators.

Lewis, George J., Union Station, Lexington, Ky.; Kentucky Railroad Association, Louisville, Ky. (for fuller details see Form B, filed by me on June 3, 1947). (1) No moneys received. None expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Employed to support legislation favorable to the railroad industry and to oppose legislation detrimental to that industry.

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,149.99; expenses, $87.75; total, $1,237.74. (2) Expenses for railroad tickets, hotels, taxies, porters, telephone and telegraph services, postage, and miscellaneous expenses when away from Washington. (3) Speaking trips, attending conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Peace Action, monthly news bulletin of the National Council for Prevention of War. (5) Supports, in pursuance to the purposes of the organization, legislation which promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Liljenquist,[8] L. Blaine, room 300, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; E. F. Forbes, president, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary during April–June 1948 quarter, $2,000; expenses incurred with respect to legislation, $76.98. (2) Varicus. (3) Taxi fares, postage stamps, notary fees, printing and mimeographing. (4) None. (5) Supported legislation dealing with Federal meat inspection. Also supported legislation designed to correct the overtime-on-overtime problems.

Liljenquist,[7] L. B., 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Linton, Donald H., Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates; 250 Stuart Street, Boston, Mass. (1) None during period. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Lipman,[9] Leonard H., New Jersey Businessmen Association, Inc.; Tunison Lane, New Brunswick, N. J. (1) Received from New Jersey Businessmen Association, Inc., $38.65. (2) Expenses in connection with traveling, telephone, and telegraph, $39.95. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Tax equality, reduction of Federal expenses.

Littell, Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Navajo Tribe of Indians, residing in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and

[1] Not printed. Filed in Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

Colorado, address of superintendent of the Navajo Service, Window Rock, Ariz. (1) Received $1,785.36, which entire sum was paid to expert witnesses, O. A. Larrazolo and Martin Van Couvering, for preparation of claim on behalf of the Navajo Tribe of Indians. (2) To employees of registrant's law office, including stenographers, and to expert witnesses in connection with the proving of the claims. (3) For legal services in connection with the Navajo business. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the Navajos as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting the Navajos is being considered.

Little, Charles R., Kenwood Road, Box 153–M, Rural Route 508, Cincinnati, Ohio; executive secretary, Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress, Dr. Charles E. Holzer, Sr., president, Holzer Hospital, Gallipolis, Ohio. (1) Total received for salary, $900; total received for expenses, $600; total expenses, $412.60 (actual amounts directly chargeable to lobbying are less than totals shown above). (2) Various hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Transportation $191.45, lodging $46.07, meals $51.39, tips $11.82, office (periodicals, communication, postage, stationery, supplies, etc.) $111.87. (4) None. (5) Not solely employed for this purpose, but concerned with any legislation dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley, including appropriations.

Little,[4] Charles R., executive secretary, Kenwood Road, Box 153–M, Rural Route 508, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Total received for salary, $900; total received for expenses, $600; total expenses, $412.60 (actual amounts directly chargeable to "lobbying" are less than totals shown above). (2) Various hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Transportation, $191.45; lodging, $46.07; meals, $51.39; tips, $11.82; office (periodicals, communication, postage, stationery, supplies, etc.) $111.87. (4) None. (5) Not solely employed for this purpose, but concerned with any legislation dealing with conservation and flood control in the Ohio Valley, including appropriations.

Little, Walter J., Southern Pacific Co., et al., 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Lodge, F. S., the National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $150 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News, Fertilizer Review, Agronomic Notes, and Pasture Progress, all published by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington, D. C. I issued and distributed, in the customary manner, a press release relative to the election of Dr. Russell Coleman as president of the association, and one relative to a conference on mineral nutrition, but do not know what publications may have published them in whole or in part. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Lofgren,[6] Charles E., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500. (2) Charles E. Lofgren. (3) Salary. (4) Naval Affairs Magazine, official publication of the Fleet Reserve Association. Various monthly publications of chartered branches of the Fleet Reserve Association. (5) Personnel and veterans legislation pertaining particularly to Navy and Marine Corps, and generally to armed services.

Lofgren,[7] Charles E., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,500 (salary). (2) No expenditures other than personal living expenses. (3) Receipts, $1,500 salary; expenditures, none, other than personal living expenses. (4) Naval Affairs Magazine, official publication of Fleet Reserve Association. (5) Armed services personnel legislation and veteran legislation.

Lopinsky, Frances, Curry, Cohen & Bingham, 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) About $3. (2) Cab drivers. (3) Cabs to and from Capitol. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation concerning Indian affairs, particularly concerning members of National Congress of American Indians, Alaskan natives, Apaches, Piautes.

Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York; 1216 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $31,544.80. (2) No disbursements made during third quarter of 1948. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

Lorence,[8 9] Walter E., The Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 730 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Regular salary for April, May, and June 1948, as reported on Form B; reimbursements of $178.03 for personal out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses (various). (3) Personal out-of-pocket expenses for lodgings, food, travel, telephone calls while in Washington, D. C. (4) Progress News, a publication of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc. (5) In the interest of navigation and flood-control projects in the Ohio Valley.

Lorence,[7 9] Walter E., The Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 730 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Regular salary for July, August, and September 1948 as reported on Form B. (2) Self. (3) [Blank.] (4) Progress News, a publication of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association Inc. (5) In the interest of navigation and flood-control projects in the Ohio Valley. No lobbying activities performed during this quarter.

Lovelady, Rufus M., care of American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Canal Zone District of the American Federation of Government Employees, Box 1703, Balboa, C. Z. (1) During special session of Congress from July 26 to August 7, 1948, expenses, as follows: Plane fare from Canal Zone to Washington, $172.20; board and lodging while in Washington, $63; steamship fare on return to Canal Zone, $62.25; total, $297.45. (2) Pan American Airways, hotels and restaurants in Washington; Panama Railroad Company. (3) Transportation, board, and lodging. (4) None. (5) Retirement legislation applicable to employees of the Panama Canal; preservation of competitive civil-service positions on the Canal Zone for citizens of the United States.

Lucas, James C., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200, salary; $14.45, expenses. (2) Taxi drivers and publishers. (3) Transportation and publications. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable-fabric legislation.

Lusk,[10] Rufus S., Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $31.04; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $424.11. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown below. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, therefore the sum of $15 is allocated to those purposes. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation whether national or local in scope that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[11] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW.; National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $46.57; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $709.24; from National Association of Home Builders, $795.01. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses, and supervisory fees as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, therefore the sum of $22.50 is allocated to those purposes. Registrant was employed by National Association of Home Builders to conduct and supervise a public housing survey in connection with legislation pending before the Congress. Therefore, he sets forth the entire amount of compensation so received. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation whether national or local in scope that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[12] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW.; National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $40; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $2,602.65; from National Association of Home Builders, $106.40. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses, and supervisory fees as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.
[10] Filed for third quarter, 1946.
[11] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[12] Filed for first quarter, 1947.

on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, therefore the sum of $37.50 is allocated to those purposes. Registrant was employed by National Association of Home Builders to conduct and supervise a public housing survey in connection with legislation pending before the Congress. Therefore, he sets forth the entire amount of compensation so received. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation whether national or local in scope that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[12] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $40; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $3,270.09. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington. Therefore, the sum of $37.50 is allocated to those purposes. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation, whether national or local in scope, that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[13] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $40; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $3,023.51. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown below: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington. Therefore, the sum of $37.50 is allocated to those purposes. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation, whether national or local in scope, that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[14] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $40; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $3,068.86. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington. Therefore, the sum of $37.50 is allocated to those purposes. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation, whether national or local in scope, that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[15] Rufus S., Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $32.99. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above association. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. (3) See paragraph 2. (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation whether national or local in scope that affects the real estate industry.

Lusk,[6] Rufus S., Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $32.99. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above association. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. (3) See paragraph 2. (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation whether national or local in scope that affects the real estate industry.

Lyon, A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250. Total expenses for quarter, $682.58. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

Lyon, R. B. H., 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Kinsman Optical Co., 1320 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $400 final fee. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 5241, Eightieth Congress, second session.

McAvoy,[8 9] Harold, 705 Manhattan Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.; National Association Post Office and Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen and Messengers, 1113 Arch Street, North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,500, which must take care of all expenses for the quarter. (2) Harold McAvoy, our legislative representative. (3) Legislation for the benefit of all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department. (4) Mail Handlers Journal. (5) He must support all legislation that will benefit all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department.

McAvoy,[7 9] Harold, 705 Manhattan Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. National Association of Post Office and Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen and Messengers, 1113 Arch Street, North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,400, which must take care of all expenses for the quarter. (2) Harold McAvoy, our legislative representative. (3) Legislation for the benefit of all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department. (4) Mail Handlers Journal. (5) He must support all legislation that will benefit all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department.

McBreen, Thomas J., National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $348.71 (60 percent of time devoted to legislative activities). (2) No expenses. (3) No expenses. (4) Attached list [1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary of Jonas A. McBride, $2,500; salary of Glenn C. Russell, stenographer, $1,303.95; salary of Jo Ann Jones, stenographer, $100; printing and supplies, $49.39; rent, $180; personal expenses, Jonas A. McBride, $863.92; telephone and telegrams, $68.95; postage, $30. (2) Salaries to Jonas A. McBride, Glenn C. Russell, and Jo Ann Jones as indicated; printing and supplies to various printers and stationery supply companies; rent to Labor, 10 Independence Avenue SW. (3) For maintenance of office of national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending September 30, 1948, consequently no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act, and, likewise, no expenses

[12] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[13] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[15] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[16] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[8] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

McCaskill, J. L., associate secretary, Department of Higher Education, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,631.68, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Estimated for legislative services, $100. Expense: None. (2) Self—salary. Expenses: None. (3) No expense incurred. (4) College and University Bulletin. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

McClure, Warren C., box 207, Camden, Ark.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

McDonald, Angus, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers' Union), 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., the Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) Salary, $750; expenses, $250; total, $1,000. (2) Salary to self. Expenses for travel. (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) Support a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

McGough, Richard, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.; Northern Pacific Railway Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Great Northern Railway Co., the Milwaukee Road, Seattle, Wash. (1) Salary as stated in original registration. Expenditures in connection with Federal legislation, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Washington.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, general delivery, Washington, D. C. (1) Approximately $165. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) To use as I see fit. (4) For a fee—none. (5) [Blank.]

McIsaac, John R., 96 Brooks Street, Brighton, Mass.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, July 26 to August 7, inclusive, $269.22; per diem, $154. (2) Hotel, restaurants, taxis, etc. (3) Living expenses, transportation, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley law, amendments to minimum-wage law, housing, and anti-inflation. This is a final report.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; the Lincoln Electric Co., 12818 Coit Road, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Pension trust statutes; Internal Revenue Code, section 23 (a).

McKercher, M. C., the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Received salary, $362.50 and expenses, $294.46. No money expended in connection with legislative work. (2) Hotel Hamilton, various restaurants, telephone, telegraph, postage, railroad and Pullman fares, streetcar and taxi fares. (3) Necessary living and transportation. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

McLaughlin, Robert E., AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 410 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended except petty cash for taxi fares and actual expenses in connection with attendance at the national convention. I am national legislative director and general counsel of AMVETS at a modest per diem rate for time actually consumed. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National AMVET and AMVET letter. (5) To support legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II and their dependents.

McLaughlin, Robert E., National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received quarterly retainer of $250. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) To support legislation beneficial to this client and civil-service employees in general.

McMains, W. H., Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary same as previous report. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the industry represented is reported to members.

McMillan, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,100, with less than one-twentieth of the time and services for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $76.65, reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

McQuatters, Geneva F., 1917 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $202.90. (2) Railroads and air lines, post office, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Travel, postage, office supplies, telephone, and telegraph. (4) The Independent Woman, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (5) Equal-rights amendment, opposition to discriminations against women, Federal aid to education, displaced persons, amendments to the Pure Food and Drug Act, equal pay for equal work, universal military training, Women's Bureau appropriations, jury service for women, United Nations participation.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, O. D., 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio. (1) From the American Optometric Association development fund, the total sum of $2,713.86, $2,500 of which was for professional services from February 1 to August 1, 1948; $81.61 for traveling expenses during said period, and $132.25 for long-distance telephone and telegraph tolls during said period. From Remington Rand, Inc., the sum of $2,500 for professional services from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, in connection with the appropriation bill limiting the price which the Government can pay for typewriters. (2) During this quarter, I expended $34.83 for traveling expenses; $26.01 for telephone tolls; $1.16 for telegram tolls; and $34.15 for miscellaneous expenses. Total disbursements during this quarter were $96.15. All for American Optometric Association development fund. (3) See (1) and (2) above. (4) None. (5) On behalf of the American Optometric Association, I supported in a special session of Congress the action of the District of Columbia Optometric Association in requesting an amendment to the District of Columbia optometry law for the purpose of raising the standards of the profession in providing better visual care for residents of the District of Columbia.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association, all reimbursed by association, $587.11. (2) Railroads, etc., $264.85; hotels and miscellaneous, $322.26. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

MacMillen, William C., Jr., 165 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress (until September 21, 1948), 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $96.14, as president of the federation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Macnamee, W. Bruce, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A fair proportion of my salary chargeable to lobbying purposes is $300 per month, $900 for the quarter. In addition I have received $19.35 reimbursement for expense of luncheon. (2) To me. (3) $900 compensation for personal services; $19.35 reimbursement of luncheon expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the American merchant marine, specifically legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (H. J. Res. 377, 378, 412, and 413, and companion bills); overtime-on-overtime legislation; and other legislation affecting shipping.

Madaris, James B., 220 South Alfred Street, Alexandria, Va.; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Magee, Miss Elizabeth S., National Consumers League, 348 Engineers' Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary; part time, $83.33. (2) [Blank.] (3) Part-time salary. (4) National Consumers League Bulletin. (5) Supporting minimum wage legislation; extension of social security.

Margolin, Mrs. Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) $1,125 gross (before income-tax deduction) in salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y., none of which was spent in connection with work; $20.15 received from above, spent for carfare, postage, etc. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

Markham, Baird H., American Petroleum Institution, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule [1] for answers to items 1-5. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marks, Herbert S., room 305, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the Detroit Edison Co.; 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) In connection with all legal services to this client, including some services relating to legislation, registrant received $2,555 total fee during this quarter and reimbursement for disbursements of $259.68; total disbursements in connection with all matters for this client during quarter $276.82. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $26.20; transportation and other expenses of trips to Detroit, $238.27; miscellaneous, $12.35. (3) Telephone, traveling expenses, and miscellaneous, including taxies, postage, etc. (4) None. (5) General legal services to this client include services in connection with proposed amendment to exempt limited interstate and international electric connections under the Federal Power Act.

Marks, Raymond E., Southern Pacific Co., 139 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nev. (1) Nothing to report for the third quarter of 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marran,[2] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, therefore the sum of $37.50 is allocated to those purposes. Registrant was employed by National Association of Home Builders to conduct and supervise a public housing survey in connection with legislation pending before the Congress. Therefore, he sets forth the entire amount of compensation so received. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation whether national or local in scope that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[12] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $40; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $3,270.09. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington. Therefore, the sum of $37.50 is allocated to those purposes. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation, whether national or local in scope, that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[14] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $40; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $3,023.51. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown below: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington. Therefore, the sum of $37.50 is allocated to those purposes. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation, whether national or local in scope, that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[15] Rufus S., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW.; Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $40; from Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington, $3,068.86. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above associations. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. Not more than 5 percent of registrant's time and efforts are devoted to legislative activities on behalf of Building Owners and Managers of Metropolitan Washington. Therefore, the sum of $37.50 is allocated to those purposes. (3) See paragraph (2). (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning the District of Columbia taxation, appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation, whether national or local in scope, that affects the real-estate industry.

Lusk,[16] Rufus S., Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $32.99. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above association. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. (3) See paragraph 2. (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation whether national or local in scope that affects the real estate industry.

Lusk,[6] Rufus S., Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) From Washington Taxpayers Association (allocated), $32.99. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fees and reimbursement of office salaries and expenses as shown: Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to the legislative affairs of the above association. That part of his time and efforts so devoted to Washington Taxpayers Association has already been allocated in that organization's registration, now on file. (3) See paragraph 2. (4) Washington Post, Washington Daily News, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, BOMA Letter, Washington Taxpayers Bulletin, Washington Business Review. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government and any legislation whether national or local in scope that affects the real estate industry.

Lyon, A. E., executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250. Total expenses for quarter, $682.58. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

Lyon, R. B. H., 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Kinsman Optical Co., 1320 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $400 final fee. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 5241, Eightieth Congress, second session.

McAvoy,[8 9] Harold, 705 Manhattan Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.; National Association Post Office and Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen and Messengers, 1113 Arch Street, North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,500, which must take care of all expenses for the quarter. (2) Harold McAvoy, our legislative representative. (3) Legislation for the benefit of all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department. (4) Mail Handlers Journal. (5) He must support all legislation that will benefit all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department.

McAvoy,[7 9] Harold, 705 Manhattan Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. National Association of Post Office and Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen and Messengers, 1113 Arch Street, North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,400, which must take care of all expenses for the quarter. (2) Harold McAvoy, our legislative representative. (3) Legislation for the benefit of all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department. (4) Mail Handlers Journal. (5) He must support all legislation that will benefit all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department.

McBreen, Thomas J., National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $348.71 (60 percent of time devoted to legislative activities). (2) No expenses. (3) No expenses. (4) Attached list [1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary of Jonas A. McBride, $2,500; salary of Glenn C. Russell, stenographer, $1,303.95; salary of Jo Ann Jones, stenographer, $100; printing and supplies, $49.39; rent, $180; personal expenses, Jonas A. McBride, $863.92; telephone and telegrams, $68.95; postage, $30. (2) Salaries to Jonas A. McBride, Glenn C. Russell, and Jo Ann Jones as indicated; printing and supplies to various printers and stationery supply companies; rent to Labor, 10 Independence Avenue SW. (3) For maintenance of office of national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending September 30, 1948, consequently no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act, and, likewise, no expenses

[12] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[14] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[15] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[16] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[8] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

McCaskill, J. L., associate secretary, Department of Higher Education, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: $1,631.68, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities. Estimated for legislative services, $100. Expense: None. (2) Self—salary. Expenses: None. (3) No expense incurred. (4) College and University Bulletin. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

McClure, Warren C., box 207, Camden, Ark.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

McDonald, Angus, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers' Union), 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., the Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) Salary, $750; expenses, $250; total, $1,000. (2) Salary to self. Expenses for travel. (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) Support a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

McGough, Richard, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.; Northern Pacific Railway Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Great Northern Railway Co., the Milwaukee Road, Seattle, Wash. (1) Salary as stated in original registration. Expenditures in connection with Federal legislation, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Washington.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, general delivery, Washington, D. C. (1) Approximately $165. (2) Thomas Edward McGrath. (3) To use as I see fit. (4) For a fee—none. (5) [Blank.]

McIsaac, John R., 96 Brooks Street, Brighton, Mass.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, July 26 to August 7, inclusive, $269.22; per diem, $154. (2) Hotel, restaurants, taxis, etc. (3) Living expenses, transportation, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley law, amendments to minimum-wage law, housing, and anti-inflation. This is a final report.

McKeehan, Merrick, Arter & Stewart, 2800 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; the Lincoln Electric Co., 12818 Coit Road, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Pension trust statutes; Internal Revenue Code, section 23 (a).

McKercher, M. C., the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Received salary, $362.50 and expenses, $294.46. No money expended in connection with legislative work. (2) Hotel Hamilton, various restaurants, telephone, telegraph, postage, railroad and Pullman fares, streetcar and taxi fares. (3) Necessary living and transportation. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

McLaughlin, Robert E., AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 410 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended except petty cash for taxi fares and actual expenses in connection with attendance at the national convention. I am national legislative director and general counsel of AMVETS at a modest per diem rate for time actually consumed. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National AMVET and AMVET letter. (5) To support legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II and their dependents.

McLaughlin, Robert E., National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received quarterly retainer of $250. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) To support legislation beneficial to this client and civil-service employees in general.

McMains, W. H., Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary same as previous report. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the industry represented is reported to members.

McMillan, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,100, with less than one-twentieth of the time and services for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $76.65, reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

McQuatters, Geneva F., 1917 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $202.90. (2) Railroads and air lines, post office, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Travel, postage, office supplies, telephone, and telegraph. (4) The Independent Woman, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (5) Equal-rights amendment, opposition to discriminations against women, Federal aid to education, displaced persons, amendments to the Pure Food and Drug Act, equal pay for equal work, universal military training, Women's Bureau appropriations, jury service for women, United Nations participation.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, O. D., 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio. (1) From the American Optometric Association development fund, the total sum of $2,713.86, $2,500 of which was for professional services from February 1 to August 1, 1948; $81.61 for traveling expenses during said period, and $132.25 for long-distance telephone and telegraph tolls during said period. From Remington Rand, Inc., the sum of $2,500 for professional services from January 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, in connection with the appropriation bill limiting the price which the Government can pay for typewriters. (2) During this quarter, I expended $34.83 for traveling expenses; $26.01 for telephone tolls; $1.16 for telegram tolls; and $34.15 for miscellaneous expenses. Total disbursements during this quarter were $96.15. All for American Optometric Association development fund. (3) See (1) and (2) above. (4) None. (5) On behalf of the American Optometric Association, I supported in a special session of Congress the action of the District of Columbia Optometric Association in requesting an amendment to the District of Columbia optometry law for the purpose of raising the standards of the profession in providing better visual care for residents of the District of Columbia.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association, all reimbursed by association, $587.11. (2) Railroads, etc., $264.85; hotels and miscellaneous, $322.26. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.

MacMillen, William C., Jr., 165 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress (until September 21, 1948), 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $96.14, as president of the federation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Macnamee, W. Bruce, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A fair proportion of my salary chargeable to lobbying purposes is $300 per month, $900 for the quarter. In addition I have received $19.35 reimbursement for expense of luncheon. (2) To me. (3) $900 compensation for personal services; $19.35 reimbursement of luncheon expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the American merchant marine, specifically legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (H. J. Res. 377, 378, 412, and 413, and companion bills); overtime-on-overtime legislation; and other legislation affecting shipping.

Madaris, James B., 220 South Alfred Street, Alexandria, Va.; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Magee, Miss Elizabeth S., National Consumers League, 348 Engineers' Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary; part time, $83.33. (2) [Blank.] (3) Part-time salary. (4) National Consumers League Bulletin. (5) Supporting minimum wage legislation; extension of social security.

Margolin, Mrs. Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y. (1) $1,125 gross (before income-tax deduction) in salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York 23, N. Y., none of which was spent in connection with work; $20.15 received from above, spent for carfare, postage, etc. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

Markham, Baird H., American Petroleum Institution, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule [1] for answers to items 1–5. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marks, Herbert S., room 305, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the Detroit Edison Co.; 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) In connection with all legal services to this client, including some services relating to legislation, registrant received $2,555 total fee during this quarter and reimbursement for disbursements of $259.68; total disbursements in connection with all matters for this client during quarter $276.82. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $26.20; transportation and other expenses of trips to Detroit, $238.27; miscellaneous, $12.35. (3) Telephone, traveling expenses, and miscellaneous, including taxies, postage, etc. (4) None. (5) General legal services to this client include services in connection with proposed amendment to exempt limited interstate and international electric connections under the Federal Power Act.

Marks, Raymond E., Southern Pacific Co., 139 North Virginia Street, Reno, Nev. (1) Nothing to report for the third quarter of 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marran,[2] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, did not receive or expend any sums during the quarter ended June 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation proposing to amend section 116 (a) and section 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code, pertaining to United States citizens earning income from sources outside the United States and withholding required on such income.

Marran,[7] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, did not receive or expend any sums during the quarter ended September 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation proposing to amend section 116 (a) and section 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code, pertaining to United States citizens earning income from sources outside the United States and withholding required on such income.

Marran,[6] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended the sum of 10 cents in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Additional charge for a telegram. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Marsh, Benjamin C., Peoples Lobby, Inc., room 31, 810 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts, $1,603.57; salaries and wages, $891.30; bulletin and printing, $1,013.50; postage, $262.54; rent, $165.00; A. J. Walker, $51.30; Addressograph Corp., $38.07; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone, $23.28; B. C. Marsh, trip to convention, $19.30; incidentals, $19.46. (2) Benjamin C. Marsh, Arlene Ryan, Graphic Arts Press, postage, J. B. Stein, Andrew Walker, Addressograph Corp., Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., cleaning, etc. (3) Salaries and wages for publicity and clerical work, other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) We have not caused any article to be published, but have sent material and releases to hundreds of papers. (5) Support attached program and oppose that against it.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; William J. Goodwin, the Loch, Roslyn, N. Y. (1) $7,500 received from William J. Goodwin; $4.20 expended. (2) Leet Bros., Inc. (3) Photostatic copies of letter. (4) None. (5) See letter attached to registration statement of William J. Goodwin, dated July 1, 1948.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Magothy River Association, 908 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md. (1) $1,000 received from Magothy River Association, $1 expended. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) Long distance calls to Annapolis and Baltimore, Md. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3314, H. R. 6341, S. 1675, S. 230.

Marston, R. B., director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,069.18, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $413.83; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Martin,[8] Robert F., Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, Japanese-American Citizens' League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Post Office box 1628, Washington, D. C.; Japanese-American Citizens' League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in form B, filed January 22, 1947; see attached supplementary sheet.[1] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list.[1] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American Jewish Congress, 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $112.50 for services under Public Law 601; expended $30; in addition, I received for services not under Public Law 601, $2,500. (2) Rail and hotel expenses for one trip to Washington, D. C., to testify before Senate Subcommittee on Immigration. (3) Same as (2). (4) Law and Social Action, May–June 1948, July–August 1948; book reviews in Iowa Law Review; Yale Law Journal; Saturday Review of Literature; and one article in magazine Jewish Community. (5) Legislation designed to implement the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights; to keep separate church and state; to liberalize immigration laws; to liberalize Senate rules.

Mason, Walter J., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, $2,200; expenses for months of July, August, and September, $93. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (when out of office). (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Mathews, John Clifford, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America for the Christian Amendment Movement, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary received from J. S. Tibby for July, August, September, $750; preaching fees to be applied on expense account, $100. (2) Salary used for personal and family expenses only. Preaching fees applied to expense account and used for paying railway fare, cost of hotel rooms, meals, etc., in necessary travel for the Christian Amendment Movement. (3) See above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) In support of an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States to acknowledge Jesus Christ as Saviour and King of nations.

Mathews, P. H., 170 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.; New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 61 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Total expenses, $1,247.86; salary (net), $2,268.96; total, $3,516.82. It is to be noted that registrant's principal employment is legislative and public-relations work within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Only a portion of 1 month of this quarter was spent in connection with Federal legislation. However, all moneys received for salary and expenses are reported herewith. This is to advise you that on October 1, 1948, I resigned my position with the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., under whose employment I registered pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, such registration being filed with your office under date of May 2, 1947. Accordingly, I respectfully ask that your files containing any and all matters in connection with this registration be closed. (2) Various sources—for traveling expenses, transportation, and other necessary expenses when traveling and living away from home. (3) See item 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to the railroad industry.

Maudlin, C. V., 716 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.; Georgia Power Co. and its associate company, Savannah River Electric Co., Electric Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) All money received and expended during quarter ended September 30, 1948, was for nonlegislative activities. (2) None for legislative activities during quarter ended September 30, 1948. (3) None for legislative activities during quarter ended September 30, 1948. (4) None during quarter ended September 30, 1948. (5) None during quarter ended September 30, 1948.

Mechem, Frank L., P. E. Harris & Co., Libby, McNeill & Libby Food Products et al., 603 Central Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) As stated in answer to question (4) on form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per diem basis for services performed, and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter by way of legal fees, and no money was received as reimbursement for traveling expenses. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering air and railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone, and telegraph tolls. (4) None. The formulation and presentation of proposed legislative program designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

Meeks,[6] E. A., National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary only, $1,500 for quarter ending June 30, 1948. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation affecting postmasters.

Meeks,[7] E. A., National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary only, $1,500 for quarter ending September 30, 1948. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation affecting postmasters.

Meixell, Harry, National Aviation Trades Association, 1344 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as outlined in registration form B. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Letters to membership of National Aviation Trades Association, Inc., for which I am executive director. (5) Support constructive legislation in connection with Public Law 346, as amended, particularly regarding veterans' flight training courses.

Messer, James, Jr., Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla. (1) Total amount received and expended, $13.77. (2) Southeastern Telephone Co., Tallahassee, Fla. (3) Telephone and telegraph expense in connection with S. 110 (Reed-Bulwinkle bill), which was theretofore pending in the Congress. (4) None. (5) Any legislation in which I might be directed to support or oppose by Florida Railroad Association, generally legislation affecting railroads.

Messer, Ross A., National Association of Post Office Maintenance Employees, formerly

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Custodial Employees, name changed at national convention, Cincinnati, Ohio, August 23, 24, 25, 26, 1948, Post Office box 1611 (room 527 Victor Building), Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,333.32; expenses, $632.55; expenses include postage, office supplies, box rent, taxi, postage for mailing monthly publication and bulletins and other necessary expenses for handling legislation and grievances; $161.77 of the above expenses were for expenses to, from, and while attending our recent national convention at Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) [Blank.] (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for postal employees, and in handling grievances between the membership and the Post Office Department. (4) The Post Office Custodial News and Special News Bulletin advising the membership of legislation activities or other beneficial information for the membership. (5) All beneficial legislation for postal employees and custodial employees in particular.

Middleton, P. Harvey, Railway Business Association, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) The only money received by me during the period from July 1 to September 30, 1948, was $5,666.66 in salary gross. No part of this salary was spent in legislative activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Miles, Clarence R., Chamber of Commerce of the USA, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: Salary, $4,125. Expenses, $34.32. Expended: Transportation, $11.25; telephone, $23.07. (2) Taxi companies, railroad, and telephone company. (3) Transportation to and communication with the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Miles, Harold M., Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None for Federal legislation. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Miller, Charles C., 715 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) I have received from my employers, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., for the quarter ended September 30, 1948, prorated on the basis of total expenditures at 10 percent to cover time spent on legislative work in the period, a total of $497.08. (2) $14.96 to hotels for guest meals; $6.07 for taxis; $5.95 for tips and miscellaneous expenses; $30 for telephone and telegraph; $1.59 for postage; $10.05 for office supplies and equipment; $64.50 for rent; $314.80 for salaries of registrant and secretary; $29.33 air travel; $19.38 for hotel, meals, and travel expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) Press coverage consisted of general news reports on tire and tube production and rubber consumption. (5) Revision of excise tax on tires; measures pertaining to regulation of transportation of coated fabrics; investigation of the effects of recent basing point decisions on industry.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana & Texas, Houston, Tex.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Company, Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y. (1) Received: $1,500 plus $750 expenses, from Dallas Chamber of Commerce; $1,500 plus $296.27 expenses, from Intracoastal Canal Association; $1,500 plus $1,069.53 expenses, from Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. Expended: $2,115.80. This sum includes all business expenses in Washington, only a small portion of which would apply to activities within the purview of the act. (2) Carlyn Apartments, Mayflower Hotel, United States Post Office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, stationers, food and beverage establishments. (3) Apartment rent, $481.50; office rent, $780; taxi fares, etc., $108; telephone and telegraph companies, $158.30; stamps, stationery, other usual office expenses, $150; entertainment and miscellaneous, $438. (4) Monthly article in Dallas magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, appropriations, and taxes.

Milton, Charles J., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3237 and S. 249.

Mollin, F. E., American National Live Stock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Have had no special contributions for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. My compensation as executive secretary of the American National Live Stock Association is $1,000 a month. In addition I received in January of this year a bonus of $1,000 for last year. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities. Only part of the expense of myself as executive secretary of the association on trip to Washington in past quarter could be chargeable to such. Total expense for this purpose was: $305.28; telephone and telegraph, $10.51; Washington stenographer, $14.35. (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own official magazine, the American Cattle Producer. (5) Attended congressional hearings on price control and inflation.

Montgomery, Donald E., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks at $100, $1,300; subsistence, 13 weeks, $819; expenses, 13 weeks, $650.32; total, $2,769.32. This amount covers nonlegislative work as described under (4) in Form B, as well as legislative work. Legislative work accounts for less than half of total duties. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker, Washington Report, and Ammunition (UAW-CIO publications), Economic Outlook (CIO publication), Antioch Review, Labor and Nation. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Mooney, William W., 406 Bernice Building, Tacoma, Wash.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Total amount received after deductions of $152.10 for withholding tax, hospital, etc., was $1,146.64. From that amount $423.93 was paid out for travel expenses for travel in auto, bus, train, and hotel and incidental expenses, leaving $722.66 for personal use. (2) William W. Mooney, traveling field representative. (3) Traveling over the State of Washington promoting Townsend Plan activities and creating interest and organizing new clubs or helping to build stronger clubs with side trips to other States to give talks, by arrangement. (4) Send notices and articles to the Townsend National Weekly, printed in Cleveland, Ohio, also mail to clubs over the State, bulletins and letters of a promotional nature, and give talks to clubs and groups by arrangement. (5) Supporting the Townsend plan bills in United States Congress for a national security plan for the aged and permanently disabled.

Moore, Chester B., Western Growers Association, 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Regular salary as managing director of Western Growers Association, plus traveling expenses. (2) To all regular accounts of my personal and business life. (3) [Blank.] (4) Western Grower and Shipper. (5) Am paid regular salary. Not directly employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. I do oppose or support any legislation of interest to our members.

Moore, Clayton, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Fourth and Main Streets, Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) Actual expenses incurred, $215.69. (Salary for full-time services as associate counsel same as amount in last quarterly report and for the purposes more fully set out in registration form.) (2) Airline fares, $69.69; hotel, meals, phones, and taxicabs, $146. (3) Travel, hotel, meals, phones, and taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation affecting R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Moran, Raymond H., 46 Burnside Avenue, Cranford, N. J.; International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, none; expenses, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Morgan, George W., Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made, no money has been received or expended by the registrant for activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601. (2) Inapplicable. (3) Inapplicable. (4) Copies of the only two issues of any publication in which the registrant caused any article or editorial to be published during the quarter for which this report is filed are annexed hereto[1] and made a part hereof. (5) The registrant is employed as president of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the quarter for which this report is filed the registrant did not support or oppose any proposed legislation.

Morgan, Gerald D., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Alaska Transportation Co., Pier 57, Seattle, Wash. (1) Engaged in legislative activity on behalf of Alaska Transportation Co. for approximately 10½ days, for which firm of Morgan & Calhoun received $1,050. Expended during this period $132.69 for telephone and teletype messages, for which the firm received reimbursement from Alaska Transportation Co. Thus sum includes expenses in connection with nonlegislative matters, but an allocation is impossible. (2) $132.69 paid to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., for telephone and teletype service. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Legislative activity consisted of conferences with various persons in the Maritime Commission and the Department of the Interior, as well as various Members of Congress respecting legislation to take the place of Public Law 12, Eightieth Congress, relating to Alaska shipping, when that law expired on June 30, 1948.

Morris Plan Corp. of America, the, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received, none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The corporation in its interests and in the interests of its stockholders opposes the adoption of bank holding company legislation in the form represented by S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Morrow,[6] Giles, Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary at the rate reported on Form B filed on January 24, 1947, as amended January 14, 1948, and in addition received $105.90 as reimbursement for expenses incurred. Reimbursement covered expenses incurred in Washington in connection with business of the institute, including taxicab fares, meals, and tips. (2) Washington taxicabs and restaurants. (3) Local transportation on office business, and business luncheons. (4) I. C. C. Practitioners' Journal (editor in chief). (5) Any legislation directly affecting the freight forwarding industry. Testified on national transportation inquiry before House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Morrow,[7] Giles, the Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary at the rate reported on Form B filed on January 24, 1947,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, did not receive or expend any sums during the quarter ended June 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation proposing to amend section 116 (a) and section 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code, pertaining to United States citizens earning income from sources outside the United States and withholding required on such income.

Marran,[7] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, did not receive or expend any sums during the quarter ended September 30, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation proposing to amend section 116 (a) and section 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code, pertaining to United States citizens earning income from sources outside the United States and withholding required on such income.

Marran,[6] Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended the sum of 10 cents in connection with the proposed legislation described in item (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) Additional charge for a telegram. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Marsh, Benjamin C., Peoples Lobby, Inc., room 31, 810 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts, $1,603.67; salaries and wages, $891.30; bulletin and printing, $1,013.50; postage, $262.54; rent, $165.00; A. J. Walker, $51.30; Addressograph Corp., $38.07; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone, $23.28; B. C. Marsh, trip to convention, $19.30; incidentals, $19.46. (2) Benjamin C. Marsh, Arlene Ryan, Graphic Arts Press, postage, J. B. Stein, Andrew Walker, Addressograph Corp., Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., cleaning, etc. (3) Salaries and wages for publicity and clerical work, other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) We have not caused any article to be published, but have sent material and releases to hundreds of papers. (5) Support attached program and oppose that against it.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; William J. Goodwin, the Loch, Roslyn, N. Y. (1) $7,500 received from William J. Goodwin; $4.20 expended. (2) Leet Bros., Inc. (3) Photostatic copies of letter. (4) None. (5) See letter attached to registration statement of William J. Goodwin, dated July 1, 1948.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Magothy River Association, 908 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md. (1) $1,000 received from Magothy River Association, $1 expended. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (3) Long distance calls to Annapolis and Baltimore, Md. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3314, H. R. 6341, S. 1675, S. 230.

Marston, R. B., director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,069.18, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $413.83; expenses. (2) Self (salary); expenses: hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Martin,[8] Robert F., Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, Japanese-American Citizens' League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Post Office box 1628, Washington, D. C.; Japanese-American Citizens' League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in form B, filed January 22, 1947; see attached supplementary sheet.[1] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs. (3) Information, contacts, transportation. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. See accompanying list.[1] (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American Jewish Congress, 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $112.50 for services under Public Law 601; expended $30; in addition, I received for services not under Public Law 601, $2,500. (2) Rail and hotel expenses for one trip to Washington, D. C., to testify before Senate Subcommittee on Immigration. (3) Same as (2). (4) Law and Social Action, May–June 1948, July–August 1948; book reviews in Iowa Law Review; Yale Law Journal; Saturday Review of Literature; and one article in magazine Jewish Community. (5) Legislation designed to implement the Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights; to keep separate church and state; to liberalize immigration laws; to liberalize Senate rules.

Mason, Walter J., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September, $2,200; expenses for months of July, August, and September, $93. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (when out of office). (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Mathews, John Clifford, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America for the Christian Amendment Movement, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary received from J. S. Tibby for July, August, September, $750; preaching fees to be applied on expense account, $100. (2) Salary used for personal and family expenses only. Preaching fees applied to expense account and used for paying railway fare, cost of hotel rooms, meals, etc., in necessary travel for the Christian Amendment Movement. (3) See above. (4) The Christian Patriot, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans.; the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) In support of an amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States to acknowledge Jesus Christ as Saviour and King of nations.

Mathews, P. H., 170 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.; New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 61 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Total expenses, $1,247.86; salary (net), $2,268.96; total, $3,516.82. It is to be noted that registrant's principal employment is legislative and public-relations work within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Only a portion of 1 month of this quarter was spent in connection with Federal legislation. However, all moneys received for salary and expenses are reported herewith. This is to advise you that on October 1, 1948, I resigned my position with the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., under whose employment I registered pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, such registration being filed with your office under date of May 2, 1947. Accordingly, I respectfully ask that your files containing any and all matters in connection with this registration be closed. (2) Various sources—for traveling expenses, transportation, and other necessary expenses when traveling and living away from home. (3) See item 2. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to the railroad industry.

Maudlin, C. V., 716 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.; Georgia Power Co. and its associate company, Savannah River Electric Co., Electric Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) All money received and expended during quarter ended September 30, 1948, was for nonlegislative activities. (2) None for legislative activities during quarter ended September 30, 1948. (3) None for legislative activities during quarter ended September 30, 1948. (4) None during quarter ended September 30, 1948. (5) None during quarter ended September 30, 1948.

Mechem, Frank L., P. E. Harris & Co., Libby, McNeill & Libby Food Products et al., 603 Central Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) As stated in answer to question (4) on form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per diem basis for services performed, and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter by way of legal fees, and no money was received as reimbursement for traveling expenses. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering air and railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone, and telegraph tolls. (4) None. The formulation and presentation of proposed legislative program designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

Meeks,[6] E. A., National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary only, $1,500 for quarter ending June 30, 1948. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation affecting postmasters.

Meeks,[7] E. A., National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary only, $1,500 for quarter ending September 30, 1948. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation affecting postmasters.

Meixell, Harry, National Aviation Trades Association, 1344 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as outlined in registration form B. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Letters to membership of National Aviation Trades Association, Inc., for which I am executive director. (5) Support constructive legislation in connection with Public Law 346, as amended, particularly regarding veterans' flight training courses.

Messer, James, Jr., Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla. (1) Total amount received and expended, $13.77. (2) Southeastern Telephone Co., Tallahassee, Fla. (3) Telephone and telegraph expense in connection with S. 110 (Reed-Bulwinkle bill), which was theretofore pending in the Congress. (4) None. (5) Any legislation in which I might be directed to support or oppose by Florida Railroad Association, generally legislation affecting railroads.

Messer, Ross A., National Association of Post Office Maintenance Employees, formerly

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

National Association of Post Office Mechanics and Custodial Employees, name changed at national convention, Cincinnati, Ohio, August 23, 24, 25, 26, 1948, Post Office box 1611 (room 527 Victor Building), Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,333.32; expenses, $632.55; expenses include postage, office supplies, box rent, taxi, postage for mailing monthly publication and bulletins and other necessary expenses for handling legislation and grievances; $161.77 of the above expenses were for expenses to, from, and while attending our recent national convention at Cincinnati, Ohio. (2) [Blank.] (3) In support of all beneficial legislation for postal employees, and in handling grievances between the membership and the Post Office Department. (4) The Post Office Custodial News and Special News Bulletin advising the membership of legislation activities or other beneficial information for the membership. (5) All beneficial legislation for postal employees and custodial employees in particular.

Middleton, P. Harvey, Railway Business Association, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) The only money received by me during the period from July 1 to September 30, 1948, was $5,666.66 in salary gross. No part of this salary was spent in legislative activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Miles, Clarence R., Chamber of Commerce of the USA, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: Salary, $4,125. Expenses, $34.32. Expended: Transportation, $11.25; telephone, $23.07. (2) Taxi companies, railroad, and telephone company. (3) Transportation to and communication with the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Miles, Harold M., Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None for Federal legislation. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Miller, Charles C., 715 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) I have received from my employers, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., for the quarter ended September 30, 1948, prorated on the basis of total expenditures at 10 percent to cover time spent on legislative work in the period, a total of $497.08. (2) $14.96 to hotels for guest meals; $6.07 for taxis; $5.95 for tips and miscellaneous expenses; $30 for telephone and telegraph; $1.59 for postage; $10.05 for office supplies and equipment; $64.50 for rent; $314.80 for salaries of registrant and secretary; $29.33 air travel; $19.38 for hotel, meals, and travel expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) Press coverage consisted of general news reports on tire and tube production and rubber consumption. (5) Revision of excise tax on tires; measures pertaining to regulation of transportation of coated fabrics; investigation of the effects of recent basing point decisions on industry.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana & Texas, Houston, Tex.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Company, Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y. (1) Received: $1,500 plus $750 expenses, from Dallas Chamber of Commerce; $1,500 plus $296.27 expenses, from Intracoastal Canal Association; $1,500 plus $1,069.53 expenses, from Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. Expended: $2,115.80. This sum includes all business expenses in Washington, only a small portion of which would apply to activities within the purview of the act. (2) Carlyn Apartments, Mayflower Hotel, United States Post Office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, stationers, food and beverage establishments. (3) Apartment rent, $481.50; office rent, $780; taxi fares, etc., $108; telephone and telegraph companies, $158.30; stamps, stationery, other usual office expenses, $150; entertainment and miscellaneous, $438. (4) Monthly article in Dallas magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, appropriations, and taxes.

Milton, Charles J., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3237 and S. 249.

Mollin, F. E., American National Live Stock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Have had no special contributions for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. My compensation as executive secretary of the American National Live Stock Association is $1,000 a month. In addition I received in January of this year a bonus of $1,000 for last year. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities. Only part of the expense of myself as executive secretary of the association on trip to Washington in past quarter could be chargeable to such. Total expense for this purpose was: $305.28; telephone and telegraph, $10.51; Washington stenographer, $14.35. (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own official magazine, the American Cattle Producer. (5) Attended congressional hearings on price control and inflation.

Montgomery, Donald E., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks at $100, $1,300; subsistence, 13 weeks, $819; expenses, 13 weeks, $650.32; total, $2,769.32. This amount covers nonlegislative work as described under (4) in Form B, as well as legislative work. Legislative work accounts for less than half of total duties. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker, Washington Report, and Ammunition (UAW-CIO publications), Economic Outlook (CIO publication), Antioch Review, Labor and Nation. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Mooney, William W., 406 Bernice Building, Tacoma, Wash.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Total amount received after deductions of $152.10 for withholding tax, hospital, etc., was $1,146.64. From that amount $423.93 was paid out for travel expenses for travel in auto, bus, train, and hotel and incidental expenses, leaving $722.66 for personal use. (2) William W. Mooney, traveling field representative. (3) Traveling over the State of Washington promoting Townsend Plan activities and creating interest and organizing new clubs or helping to build stronger clubs with side trips to other States to give talks, by arrangement. (4) Send notices and articles to the Townsend National Weekly, printed in Cleveland, Ohio, also mail to clubs over the State, bulletins and letters of a promotional nature, and give talks to clubs and groups by arrangement. (5) Supporting the Townsend plan bills in United States Congress for a national security plan for the aged and permanently disabled.

Moore, Chester B., Western Growers Association, 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Regular salary as managing director of Western Growers Association, plus traveling expenses. (2) To all regular accounts of my personal and business life. (3) [Blank.] (4) Western Grower and Shipper. (5) Am paid regular salary. Not directly employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. I do oppose or support any legislation of interest to our members.

Moore, Clayton, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Fourth and Main Streets, Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) Actual expenses incurred, $215.69. (Salary for full-time services as associate counsel same as amount in last quarterly report and for the purposes more fully set out in registration form.) (2) Airline fares, $69.69; hotel, meals, phones, and taxicabs, $146. (3) Travel, hotel, meals, phones, and taxi fares. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation affecting R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Moran, Raymond H., 46 Burnside Avenue, Cranford, N. J.; International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, none; expenses, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Morgan, George W., Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made, no money has been received or expended by the registrant for activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601. (2) Inapplicable. (3) Inapplicable. (4) Copies of the only two issues of any publication in which the registrant caused any article or editorial to be published during the quarter for which this report is filed are annexed hereto[1] and made a part hereof. (5) The registrant is employed as president of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the quarter for which this report is filed the registrant did not support or oppose any proposed legislation.

Morgan, Gerald D., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Alaska Transportation Co., Pier 57, Seattle, Wash. (1) Engaged in legislative activity on behalf of Alaska Transportation Co. for approximately 10½ days, for which firm of Morgan & Calhoun received $1,050. Expended during this period $132.69 for telephone and teletype messages, for which the firm received reimbursement from Alaska Transportation Co. Thus sum includes expenses in connection with nonlegislative matters, but an allocation is impossible. (2) $132.69 paid to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., for telephone and teletype service. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Legislative activity consisted of conferences with various persons in the Maritime Commission and the Department of the Interior, as well as various Members of Congress respecting legislation to take the place of Public Law 12, Eightieth Congress, relating to Alaska shipping, when that law expired on June 30, 1948.

Morris Plan Corp. of America, the, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received, none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The corporation in its interests and in the interests of its stockholders opposes the adoption of bank holding company legislation in the form represented by S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Morrow,[6] Giles, Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary at the rate reported on Form B filed on January 24, 1947, as amended January 14, 1948, and in addition received $105.90 as reimbursement for expenses incurred. Reimbursement covered expenses incurred in Washington in connection with business of the institute, including taxicab fares, meals, and tips. (2) Washington taxicabs and restaurants. (3) Local transportation on office business, and business luncheons. (4) I. C. C. Practitioners' Journal (editor in chief). (5) Any legislation directly affecting the freight forwarding industry. Testified on national transportation inquiry before House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Morrow,[7] Giles, the Freight Forwarders Institute, 225 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary at the rate reported on Form B filed on January 24, 1947,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

and as subsequently amended, and in addition received $183.37 as reimbursement for expenses incurred in conducting institute business in Washington and New York City. (2) Taxicabs and restaurants in Washington, D. C.; the American Airlines; the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Pullman Co.; texicabs and restaurants and the Commodore and McAlpin Hotels in New York City. (3) Local and interstate transportation, meals, and other traveling expenses, all incurred in connection with meetings and other business of the Freight Forwarders Institute. (4) I. C. C. Practitioners Journal (editor and contributor of legal and technical articles). (5) Any legislation directly affecting the freight forwarding industry.

Morse, Henry Hoyt, 99 Pearl Street, Gardner, Mass.: Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove builder. (5) None.

Mosier, Harold G., Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.; the Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) In addition to the regular annual salary previously reported on form B, the registrant has been or will be reimbursed for certain expenditures for travel, subsistence, communications, etc. Payment of these amounts so expended has been made directly to the hotels, railroads, restaurants, etc., which rendered the services to which reference is made. Expended $311.29. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Mote, Lynn E., Association of American Ship Owners, suite 301, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made registrant received only his salary and expenses. The total salary received by the registrant during the quarter was $2,000, and the total expenses received by the registrant amounted to $341.06. Only a small portion of such salary and expenses is applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration. (2) No expenditures except taxicabs, meals, railroads, and similar out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See item (2) (4) None. (5) The registrant is employed as manager of the Washington office of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the quarter for which this report is filed the registrant did support bills to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Mougey, William J., 200 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.; General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file report. (4) None. (5) None.

Murph, Daniel S., the National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $25 may be allocable to attempt to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Chiropractic Association, Inc., Webster City, Iowa. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) None specified.

Murphy, Ray, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the third quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, its realtors Washington committee, and its public relations department, Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) Schedule attached.[1] (2) Schedule attached.[1] (3) Schedule attached.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Stevedores, 140 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $800 received, $704.24 expended; see statement A[1] attached. (2) See statement A[1] attached. (3) See statement A[1] attached. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4387, S. 2386.

National Postal Committee for Books, room 305, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (see registration for statement of membership of committee). (1) No receipts during said period; expenditures, $9,186.42. (2) $64.84 to American Book Publishers Council; $8,905.55 to Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens; $210.42 to Grosset and Dunlap, Inc.; $5.61 to Paul Printing Co. (3) For telegrams; professional services and disbursements; other telegrams and letterheads, respectively. (4) Publishers Weekly, New York, N. Y. (5) The committee opposes unfair increases in postal rates and discrimination in postal rates, such as contained in H. R. 2408 and H. R. 3519.

National Reclamation Association,[4] Don McBride, secretary-manager, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for period April 1 to October 1, 1948, $24,467 (see schedule VI[5]); total expenditures for period April 1 to October 1, 1948, $24,467 (see schedule VI[5]); total exattached schedules V and VI.[5] (4) National Reclamation Association Bulletin (see enclosed).[5] (5) Amendment to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and any other legislation affecting resources of the 17 Western States (see sec. 3, Purposes, first page, our Constitution enclosed in first quarterly report.[5])

Nau, Carlton L., American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW. (1) No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) None.

Neal, William S., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,685.10 during period engaged in activities probably covered by act, which is for July and 10 days of August 1948; $1,504 represents salary and $181.10 expenses. (2) Expenses paid for lunches, taxi fares, telephone, miscellaneous. (3) Advocating NAM program including opposition to regimentation, such as price control, rationing, and allocations, for lowered Government expenditures. (4) Regular contributions NAM News. (5) Opposition to regimentation, such as price control, rationing, and allocations, for lowered governmental expenditures.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

Neel, Samuel E., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) money received (July 1–September 30, 1948): (a) Retainer, $2,750.06; (b) traveling expenses, $370.60; (c) office expenses, $1,168.19. (2) The travel expenses were paid to various railroads, hotels, etc., and the office expenses were paid for postage, office supplies, etc. (3) See (2). (4) Washington News Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; Letter to Members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; the Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage banking industry.

Nelson, G. W., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $390.70, salary and expenses; $24.48, pullman and taxies; total, $415.18. (2) Hotels, restaurants, and Pullman Co. (3) Pullman berth, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley law, amendments to minimum-wage law, housing and anti-inflation.

Nelson,[1] George R., grand lodge representative, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Nelson,[1] George R., grand lodge representative, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Nelson, Herbert U., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Reimbursement by employer for travel expenses and per diem, $600; salary, 20 percent of time devoted to legislative activities, $1,250.01; total, $1,850.01. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Newton, R. Wayne, National Association of Cooperatives, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) July 14, $51.19 expense account; July 15, $367.87 salary; July 30, $367.87, salary. (2) R. Wayne Newton, August 13, $367.86, salary; August 31, $367.87, salary. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Employed to counteract the anti-farmer co-op lobbying activities of (1) the National Tax Equality Association; (2) Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, whether lobbying individually, as officers and employees of the National Tax Equality Association or as a firm of organization and industry counsellors claiming the National Tax Equality Association as a client; (3) all State and local tax-equality associations and all national, State, and local small business or other associations however known which are subsidized from or contributors to the lobbying funds of the National Tax Equality Association.

Nixon, Russ, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $45; expenses, $97.69. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel; these expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative activity. (4) UE News. (5) Support

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare, oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Noble, William R., National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $54.67. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, luncheons, and hotel. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer. (5) Have taken position on wage and hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Council of Technical Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Federation of Private School Associations, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Home Study Council, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Nortman, Walter, Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

O'Brien, John, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Riegel Textile Corp., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received; long-distance telephone calls, $10.06. (2) New York Telephone Co., $10.06. (3) Same as (1), (4) None. (5) Proposals for relief of work glove manufacturers on account of payments made in settlement of controversy with Office of Price Administration.

O'Connell, Jerry J., National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $125 per week (on loan from Progressive Party of Washington); expenses, $374.27. (2) Hotels, railroads, air-line companies, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Living expenses while away from home, travel, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Defeat of the Mundt bill.

O'Connor,[9] Edward H., Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received during quarter, $2,499.96; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $420.20. (2) Paid out $420.20 in traveling expenses to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous items of personal expense. (3) For personal traveling expenses of the undersigned incurred in carrying out my work for the Insurance Economics Society of America. No moneys expended during this quarter for lobbying activities. (4) None. (5) The Howell bill, H. R. 3150, and its companion Senate bill 670, by Hawkes; S. 1320 and its companion H. R. 3548; H. R. 6355, Senate Resolution 249.

[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 396 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

O'Gara, Herrick J., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1020 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $23.20 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing, welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

O'Hara, Bart W., secretary-treasurer, Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 450 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation that may be designed to bring about tax equality concerning corporations.

Oliver, Fred N., 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; senior partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Estimated $262.50 from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and an indeterminate part of $1,800 from Railroad Security Owners' Association, Inc. (see appendix).[1] (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation but is to appear before congressional committees on legislation in which the mutual savings banks and railroad security owners have a legitimate interest.

Oliver, John P., Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) July 1948, $583.33 plus $46.70; August 1948, $583.33 plus $7.30; September 1948, $583.33 plus $3.75. (2) The grocer, the baker, the landlord, the taxi driver, etc. (3) Living expenses for self and family, transportation, taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

Ottinger,[8] Mrs. Julia M., Tennessee Women's Christian Temperance Union, 1939 Cowden Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (1) Balance forwarded from last quarter, $12.98. (2) The Letter Shop, 215 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (3) Mimeographing letters (June 1), $4.75; mimeographing petitions (June 8), $2.75. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation bearing on the manufacturing, sale, and advertising of intoxicating liquors.

Owens,[6] Thomas R., United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $960; expenses, $943.64. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, and other travel expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) United Rubber Workers. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

Owens,[7] Thomas R., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Rubber Workers, Akron, Ohio. (1) Salary, $960; expenses, $892. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, and other incidental expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) United Rubber Workers. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Membership contributions, $37. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Federal legislation specifically affecting children and child welfare.

Parel, James Donald, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $3.25 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: International wheat agreement, authorization with respect to the construction of headquarters for the United Nations, monetary and fiscal policies.

Patton,[8] James G., National Farmers Union, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Paul,[6] Randolph (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton & Garrison), 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) Receipts, none; expenditures, $21.75 for miscellaneous disbursements. (2) Taxies, $4.05; telephone company, $15; Leet Bros. (photostats), $2.70. (3) Taxi fare, telephone toll on two long-distance calls, and photostats. (4) None relating to the subject below. (5) An amendment to eliminate section 131 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended, $74.57. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Perry,[6] Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $43.21. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) NAACP Bulletin. (5) FEPC, antipoll tax, antilynch, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft Housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security and similar social welfare legislation.

Perry,[7] Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $23.03. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) NAACP Bulletin. (5) FEPC, antipoll tax, antilynch, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft Housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security and similar social welfare legislation.

Petersen, William J., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my regular salary as executive secretary for the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, for which I performed my regular duties as chief administrative officer of the chamber, which said duties were related only incidentally to Federal legislation. Aside from my regular salary nothing was received nor spent for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

and as subsequently amended, and in addition received $183.37 as reimbursement for expenses incurred in conducting institute business in Washington and New York City. (2) Taxicabs and restaurants in Washington, D. C.; the American Airlines; the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Pullman Co.; texicabs and restaurants and the Commodore and McAlpin Hotels in New York City. (3) Local and interstate transportation, meals, and other traveling expenses, all incurred in connection with meetings and other business of the Freight Forwarders Institute. (4) I. C. C. Practitioners Journal (editor and contributor of legal and technical articles). (5) Any legislation directly affecting the freight forwarding industry.

Morse, Henry Hoyt, 99 Pearl Street, Gardner, Mass.: Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove builder. (5) None.

Mosier, Harold G., Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.; the Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) In addition to the regular annual salary previously reported on form B, the registrant has been or will be reimbursed for certain expenditures for travel, subsistence, communications, etc. Payment of these amounts so expended has been made directly to the hotels, railroads, restaurants, etc., which rendered the services to which reference is made. Expended $311.29. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Mote, Lynn E., Association of American Ship Owners, suite 301, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made registrant received only his salary and expenses. The total salary received by the registrant during the quarter was $2,000, and the total expenses received by the registrant amounted to $341.06. Only a small portion of such salary and expenses is applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration. (2) No expenditures except taxicabs, meals, railroads, and similar out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See item (2) (4) None. (5) The registrant is employed as manager of the Washington office of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. During the quarter for which this report is filed the registrant did support bills to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Mougey, William J., 200 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.; General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file report. (4) None. (5) None.

Murph, Daniel S., the National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $25 may be allocable to attempt to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Chiropractic Association, Inc., Webster City, Iowa. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) None specified.

Murphy, Ray, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the third quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, its realtors Washington committee, and its public relations department, Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) Schedule attached.[1] (2) Schedule attached.[1] (3) Schedule attached.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Stevedores, 140 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $800 received, $704.24 expended; see statement A[1] attached. (2) See statement A[1] attached. (3) See statement A[1] attached. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4387, S. 2386.

National Postal Committee for Books, room 305, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (see registration for statement of membership of committee). (1) No receipts during said period; expenditures, $9,186.42. (2) $64.84 to American Book Publishers Council; $8,905.55 to Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens; $210.42 to Grosset and Dunlap, Inc.; $5.61 to Paul Printing Co. (3) For telegrams; professional services and disbursements; other telegrams and letterheads, respectively. (4) Publishers Weekly, New York, N. Y. (5) The committee opposes unfair increases in postal rates and discrimination in postal rates, such as contained in H. R. 2408 and H. R. 3519.

National Reclamation Association,[4] Don McBride, secretary-manager, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for period April 1 to October 1, 1948, $24,467 (see schedule VI[5]); total expenditures for period April 1 to October 1, 1948, $24,467 (see schedule VI[5]); total exattached schedules V and VI.[5] (4) National Reclamation Association Bulletin (see enclosed).[5] (5) Amendment to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and any other legislation affecting resources of the 17 Western States (see sec. 3, Purposes, first page, our Constitution enclosed in first quarterly report.[5])

Nau, Carlton L., American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW. (1) No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) None.

Neal, William S., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,685.10 during period engaged in activities probably covered by act, which is for July and 10 days of August 1948; $1,504 represents salary and $181.10 expenses. (2) Expenses paid for lunches, taxi fares, telephone, miscellaneous. (3) Advocating NAM program including opposition to regimentation, such as price control, rationing, and allocations, for lowered Government expenditures. (4) Regular contributions NAM News. (5) Opposition to regimentation, such as price control, rationing, and allocations, for lowered governmental expenditures.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

Neel, Samuel E., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) money received (July 1–September 30, 1948): (a) Retainer, $2,750.03; (b) traveling expenses, $370.60; (c) office expenses, $1,168.19. (2) The travel expenses were paid to various railroads, hotels, etc., and the office expenses were paid for postage, office supplies, etc. (3) See (2). (4) Washington News Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; Letter to Members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; the Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage banking industry.

Nelson, G. W., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $390.70, salary and expenses; $24.48, pullman and taxies; total, $415.18. (2) Hotels, restaurants, and Pullman Co. (3) Pullman berth, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley law, amendments to minimum-wage law, housing and anti-inflation.

Nelson,[1] George R., grand lodge representative, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Nelson,[1] George R., grand lodge representative, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C.; International Association of Machinists. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Nelson, Herbert U., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Reimbursement by employer for travel expenses and per diem, $600; salary, 20 percent of time devoted to legislative activities, $1,250.01; total, $1,850.01. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Newton, R. Wayne, National Association of Cooperatives, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) July 14, $51.19 expense account; July 15, $367.87 salary; July 30, $367.87, salary. (2) R. Wayne Newton, August 13, $367.86, salary; August 31, $367.87, salary. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Employed to counteract the anti-farmer co-op lobbying activities of (1) the National Tax Equality Association; (2) Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, whether lobbying individually, as officers and employees of the National Tax Equality Association or as a firm of organization and industry counsellors claiming the National Tax Equality Association as a client; (3) all State and local tax-equality associations and all national, State, and local small business or other associations however known which are subsidized from or contributors to the lobbying funds of the National Tax Equality Association.

Nixon, Russ, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $45; expenses, $97.69. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel; these expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative activity. (4) UE News. (5) Support

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare, oppose all legislation deterimental to these objectives.

Noble, William R., National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $54.67. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, luncheons, and hotel. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer. (5) Have taken position on wage and hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Council of Technical Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Federation of Private School Associations, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., National Home Study Council, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Nortman, Walter, Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

O'Brien, John, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Riegel Textile Corp., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received; long-distance telephone calls, $10.06. (2) New York Telephone Co., $10.06. (3) Same as (1), (4) None. (5) Proposals for relief of work glove manufacturers on account of payments made in settlement of controversy with Office of Price Administration.

O'Connell, Jerry J., National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $125 per week (on loan from Progressive Party of Washington); expenses, $374.27. (2) Hotels, railroads, air-line companies, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Living expenses while away from home, travel, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Defeat of the Mundt bill.

O'Connor,[5] Edward H., Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received during quarter, $2,499.96; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $420.20. (2) Paid out $420.20 in traveling expenses to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous items of personal expense. (3) For personal traveling expenses of the undersigned incurred in carrying out my work for the Insurance Economics Society of America. No moneys expended during this quarter for lobbying activities. (4) None. (5) The Howell bill, H. R. 3150, and its companion Senate bill 670, by Hawkes; S. 1320 and its companion H. R. 3548; H. R. 6355, Senate Resolution 249.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 396 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

O'Gara, Herrick J., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 102C Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $23.20 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing, welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

O'Hara, Bart W., secretary-treasurer, Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 450 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation that may be designed to bring about tax equality concerning corporations.

Oliver, Fred N., 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; senior partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Estimated $262.50 from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and an indeterminate part of $1,800 from Railroad Security Owners' Association, Inc. (see appendix).[1] (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation but is to appear before congressional committees on legislation in which the mutual savings banks and railroad security owners have a legitimate interest.

Oliver, John P., Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) July 1948, $583.33 plus $46.70; August 1948, $583.33 plus $7.30; September 1948, $583.33 plus $3.75. (2) The grocer, the baker, the landlord, the taxi driver, etc. (3) Living expenses for self and family, transportation, taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

Ottinger,[2] Mrs. Julia M., Tennessee Women's Christian Temperance Union, 1939 Cowden Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (1) Balance forwarded from last quarter, $12.98. (2) The Letter Shop, 215 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (3) Mimeographing letters (June 1), $4.75; mimeographing petitions (June 8), $2.75. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation bearing on the manufacturing, sale, and advertising of intoxicating liquors.

Owens,[6] Thomas R., United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $960; expenses, $943.64. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, and other travel expenses. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) United Rubber Workers. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

Owens,[7] Thomas R., 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Rubber Workers, Akron, Ohio. (1) Salary, $960; expenses, $892. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, and other incidental expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) United Rubber Workers. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Membership contributions, $37. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Federal legislation specifically affecting children and child welfare.

Parel, James Donald, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $3.25 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: International wheat agreement, authorization with respect to the construction of headquarters for the United Nations, monetary and fiscal policies.

Patton,[3] James G., National Farmers Union, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Paul,[3] Randolph (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton & Garrison), 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) Receipts, none; expenditures, $21.75 for miscellaneous disbursements. (2) Taxies, $4.05; telephone company, $15; Leet Bros. (photostats), $2.70. (3) Taxi fare, telephone toll on two long-distance calls, and photostats. (4) None relating to the subject below. (5) An amendment to eliminate section 131 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended, $74.57. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Perry,[4] Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $43.21. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) NAACP Bulletin. (5) FEPC, antipoll tax, antilynch, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft Housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security and similar social welfare legislation.

Perry,[7] Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $23.03. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) NAACP Bulletin. (5) FEPC, antipoll tax, antilynch, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft Housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security and similar social welfare legislation.

Petersen, William J., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my regular salary as executive secretary for the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, for which I performed my regular duties as chief administrative officer of the chamber, which said duties were related only incidentally to Federal legislation. Aside from my regular salary nothing was received nor spent for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such

[4] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[3] Filed with the Clerk only.

legislation affecting business and industry generally, as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $1,222. Received $178.90 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $90.24 of this amount was for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder of amount for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, air lines. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) CIO News and The Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Petty, Don, National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 received for services as attorney for the National Association of Broadcasters for quarter ending September 30, 1948; $2,843.55 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, communications companies, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) The amount set forth in (1) above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as general counsel handling all of the legal affairs of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involved Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None. (5) None. I am interested in any legislation—Federal or State—which may affect the radio-broadcasting industry.

Pierce,[5] James L., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) For special session of Congress, July 26 to August 7, 1948, for salary and expense, or per diem, salary, $350; per diem, $177. (2) To myself. (3) For services as deputy president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (4) None. (5) Repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, national housing legislation, Wages and Hours Act, Social Security Act, extension of coverage and benefits, national health legislation, Federal aid to education, steam plant, T. V. A., United Nations loan.

Pierson, A. T., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $1,815, and no expenses. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Pirnie,[6] Col. Warren Bruce, president, Pirnie, Lee & Co., Federal, Inc., U. S. A., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; R. Allman, provincial governments of Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Hopeh, and Hunan, China. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank]. (4) Before Appropriations Committee of the Senate, China-aid program, June 10, 1948, and Appropriations Committee of the House, May 18, 1948. (5) China-aid program.

Pirnie,[7] W. Bruce, president, Pirnie, Lee & Co., Federal, Inc., U. S. A., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., and Fedder Building, Hongkong; Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Hunan Province, as negotiating agents for reconstruction of China. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) China Monthly for October, (5) China aid.

Place, Henry C., care of Townsend, Elliott & Munson, National Association of Electric Companies, 1100 Provident Trust Building, Seventeenth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) The firm received from the National Association of Electric Companies $6,225 for legal services for the quarter and reimbursement of $641.96 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all legal services to the association, only a part of which fee and expenses was for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $289.97; subsistence expenses away from Philadelphia, $308.49; telephone and telegraph, $40.50; miscellaneous, $3. (4) [Blank.] (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which our firm is counsel, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members, directly or indirectly, as going business concerns.

Plumley, Fletcher D. P., Rialto Building, State Street, Montpelier, Vt.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $975 gross salary received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Pogue, L. Welch, Committee for World Travel, 905 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,250 fee received during quarter plus disbursements as follows: Taxicabs, $1; postage, $1.75. Total received during quarter, $2,252.75. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B on file in your office.

Pollitzer,[8] Anita, national chairman, National Woman's Party, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Woman's Party: Quarter ended September 30, 1948, $330; 6 months ended June 30, 1948, $100; total, $430. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support equal rights amendment. Chief sponsor in Senate, Senator Arthur Capper; chief sponsor in House, Hon. Katharine St. George.

Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $8,366.32; disbursements, $148.10. (2) See attached statement.[1] (3) See attached statement.[1] (4) None. (5) S. 2173; H. R. 5583; S. 2202; H. R. 6556; H. R. 6248; S. 2318.

Posner, Stanley I., the Linen Supply Association of America, Institute of Industrial Launderers, National Council of Technical Schools, National Council of Business Schools, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Poulton, J. E., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Powell, E. Henry, partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,800 is the entire amount received by registrant from Oliver & Donnally for all his legal services rendered during the quarter. A small proportion of this amount (not more than 5 percent) was for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

Powell, W. Royce, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee of Americans, Inc., 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, and Magothy River Association, Annapolis, Md. (1) $1,200, Committee of Americans; $1,000, Magothy River Association. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Washington Post, Washington Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington News, Baltimore Sun. (5) Opposed legislation to authorize and appropriate for Sandy Point Naval Academy Airport at Annapolis.

Pratt, Foster J., International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, A. F. L., room 908, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As acting president he receives a monthly salary of $600 minus withholding tax and social-security tax, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Foster J. Pratt. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as administrative and executive head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Union, (Lobbying is minor and incidental.) (4) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, A. F. L. weekly Federal news letters and monthly outlook for the dissemination of organization news including legislation. (5) Beneficial to the employees in the engineering and architectural professions.

Pray, Kenneth L., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $5,000; expenses, allowance, $1,260. (2) University Club, National Press Club, Statler Hotel, taxicabs, Pennsylvania Railroad, etc. (3) Dues, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) My services insofar as legislative matters are concerned consist primarily of factually reporting the status and content of proposals affecting Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies.

Prentice, Howard A., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.03 as miscellaneous expenses (see below). (2) Notary public, $2; postage, 3 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report; postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Press, William H., Washington Board of Trade, 204 Star Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,000; expenses, $73.20. (2) Miscellaneous taxi and transportation, $28.75; miscellaneous luncheons and dinners, $44.45. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) Releases sent to Washington newspapers—Washington Post, Times-Herald, Evening Star, and Washington Daily News. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia.

Pritchard, E. Anthony, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and traveling expenses in connection with his usual duties as assistant to the manager of the National Lead Co., Washington office, and no part of it whatsoever was expended during this quarter in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Proctor, Harry E., attorney at law, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally; no expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) The registrant contributed articles for the July and September issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied and analyzed a number of bills pertaining to banks, savings and loan associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing.

Purves, Edmund R., director of public and professional relations, the American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None, except salary for this period, which amounted to $3,125. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None.

---

[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.
[8] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.

(5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Putt, C. J., the Atchison, Topeko & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) None preceding calendar quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None preceding calendar quarter.

Pyke, John S.,1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None for second quarter of 1948. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) S. 265, S. 2352, S. 2365, H. R. 6556.

Pyle,[6] Schuyler Shelby, Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. Am registered, but have not engaged in any legislative activity whatever since registering. (4) None. (5) None.

Pyle,[7] Schuyler Shelby, Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Quigley, Frank, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,071.19. (2) Transportation: Pennsylvania Railroad, Washington, D. C., to Absecon, N. J., and return, $18.36; Washington, D. C., to Charleston, W. Va., Indianapolis, Ind., Milwaukee, Wis., Minneapolis, Minn., Cleveland, Ohio, and intermediate points and return; automobile mileage, 3,091 miles, at 6 cents per mile, $185.46; car ferry, one way, Detroit to Cleveland, one car and person, $14.56; Washington, D. C., to Jamestown, N. Y., Buffalo, N. Y., Detroit, Mich., and intermediate points and return, automobile mileage, 1,134 miles, at 6 cents per mile, $68.04; car ferry, Detroit to Buffalo, one way, car and person, $18.64; Hotel Statler, Detroit, $18.50; all other items individually amounting to less than $10 cover meals, board, lodging, garage, and incidental traveling expense. (3) Conferring with associated and connecting Bell Telephone companies at various points hereinbefore mentioned and other intermediate points in connection with general matters of information and public relations. Also general conference on public relations matters at points above referred to, to wit, Absecon, N. J. (4) None. (5) None.

Radner & Zito (the firm members and associates are William Radner, Frank J. Zito, J. Franklin Fort, Odell Kominers, and Mary L. Schleifer), Room 528, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (see letter of September 1, 1948, to clerk, amending Form B), 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting maritime industry, particularly in relation to wage-and-hour law.

Raebeck, Helen, National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $425. On leave until September 1. Pro rata salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Spotlight, a house organ of the National Council of Jewish Women, a small part of which is devoted to asking membership support of certain legislative measures. (5) None. My job is to keep the membership informed on legislative developments and indicate action they can take in support of certain bills.

Raesly, Leon, Thornton & Taylor, 1218 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) None.

Ragland, Edward F., Associated Tobacco Manufacturers, 109–110 Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None, but am interested in any legislation affecting tobacco industry.

Railroad Pension Conference,[4 16] Post Office box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) $1,203. This was $1 contributions for membership into the Railroad Pension Conference. Expended, $802.67. (2) Railroad Pension Conference. (3) Membership fees. (4) Railroad Pension Conference Bulletin. (5) H. R. 4695 and S. 2055.

Railroad Pension Conference,[4 6] Post Office box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) $1,307. This was contributions of $1 each for membership into the Railroad Pension Conference. Expended, $567.69. (2) Railroad Pension Conference. (3) Membership fees. (4) Railroad Pension Conference Bulletin. (5) Passage of H. R. 4695 and S. 2055.

Ramsey, Donald J., Silver Users Association, 1730 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (before tax withholdings), $3,000; reimbursement for expenses, $1,960.76; total, $4,960.76. (2) Various. (3) Transportation, hotels, etc. (4) Silver News Letter. (5) Legislation affecting the silver using industry.

Ramspeck, Robert, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Eighty cents. (2) Taxi fare. (3) Taxi fare. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the air-line industry in the public interest. For specific legislation supported during this quarter.

Rankin, J. Lee (Beghtol & Rankin, a partnership), Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

Ray, L. S., 2015 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $450 salary. (2) Myself. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting disabled emergency officers.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association Legislative Bulletin, which is issued by registrant in his capacity as Washington representative. (5) H. R. 3825; registrant is paid an annual retainer as counsel of the National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association; no determinable amount of compensation is paid or received on account of legislative activities of registrant; normally the total time used by registrant in activities covered by this law is infinitesimal.

Reckord, M. A., executive vice president, National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Rector, Stanley, 506 Washington Hotel, Fifteenth and Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.; Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. (1) Received $5,000 as salary for second quarter for duties as legislative director of Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. (2) No money paid except for expenses, for which I am reimbursed; expenses reported by employing corporation. (3) [Blank.] (4) The Advisor. (5) Social security and related legislation.

Reinhold, James P., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.; 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary for calendar quarter as reported in January 10, 1948, quarterly report Form C; also reimbursed in the amount of $335.80 expended during calendar quarter, none of which was expended for purposes covered in the act. (2) Paid for meals in hotels and various restaurants, expended for taxicabs and automobile, telephone calls, postage, and telegrams. (3) In furtherance of duties described in Registration Form B, of which personal legislative activity is not my principal purpose but is occasional and incidental. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Rhodes, Hubert M., 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1342 East Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association, Inc., and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work. The amount received and expended by him was $1. (2) Notary public, $1. (3) Notarizing reports required to be filed under the Lobbying Act for the quarter ended June 30, 1948. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

Rice, Richard M., Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality as between similar businesses.

Richards,[9] D. D., 1238 National Press Building; Mail Order Association of America, 1061 West Thirty-fifth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specifically.

Riggle,[6] John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $2,000; less than 10 percent of this amount would be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Legislative Digest, a mimeographed résumé of legislation introduced which is of interest to agriculture; distributed to members of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Riggle,[7] John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September 1948, $2,000; less than 10 percent of this amount would be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Legislative Digest, a mimeographed résumé of legislation introduced which is of interest to agriculture; Foreign Trade Memo, a mimeographed résumé of developments in foreign trade in agricultural products and supplies; both are distributed to members of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Riggs, Frank E., Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Received and paid out for expenses, $550 for commuting to and from Washington, D. C., and expenses while there lobbying for Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association from July 1 to October 1, 1948, and for National Conference on Public Employee Retirement Systems. (2) Frank E. Riggs, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) For train fares commuting to and from Washington, D. C., for meals on trains and in Washington and for taxis, lunches, refreshments, entertainment, etc., in Washington. (4) None. (5) Trying to have Federal and municipal employee pensions exempt up to $1,440 from income tax as are railroad pensions. Also, trying to keep members of existing pension funds out of social security.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.
[16] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

legislation affecting business and industry generally, as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $1,222. Received $178.90 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $90.24 of this amount was for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder of amount for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, air lines. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) CIO News and The Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Petty, Don, National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 received for services as attorney for the National Association of Broadcasters for quarter ending September 30, 1948; $2,843.55 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, communications companies, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) The amount set forth in (1) above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as general counsel handling all of the legal affairs of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involved Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None. (5) None. I am interested in any legislation—Federal or State—which may affect the radio-broadcasting industry.

Pierce,[5] James L., 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) For special session of Congress, July 26 to August 7, 1948, for salary and expense, or per diem, salary, $350; per diem, $177. (2) To myself. (3) For services as deputy president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. (4) None. (5) Repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, national housing legislation, Wages and Hours Act, Social Security Act, extension of coverage and benefits, national health legislation, Federal aid to education, steam plant, T. V. A., United Nations loan.

Pierson, A. T., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $1,815, and no expenses. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Pirnie,[6] Col. Warren Bruce, president, Pirnie, Lee & Co., Federal, Inc., U. S. A., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; R. Allman, provincial governments of Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Hopeh, and Hunan, China. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank]. (4) Before Appropriations Committee of the Senate, China-aid program, June 10, 1948, and Appropriations Committee of the House, May 18, 1948. (5) China-aid program.

Pirnie,[7] W. Bruce, president, Pirnie, Lee & Co., Federal, Inc., U. S. A., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., and Pedder Building, Hongkong; Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Hunan Province, as negotiating agents for reconstruction of China. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) China Monthly for October, (5) China aid.

Place, Henry C., care of Townsend, Elliott & Munson, National Association of Electric Companies, 1100 Provident Trust Building, Seventeenth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) The firm received from the National Association of Electric Companies $6,225 for legal services for the quarter and reimbursement of $641.96 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all legal services to the association, only a part of which fee and expenses was for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $289.97; subsistence expenses away from Philadelphia, $308.49; telephone and telegraph, $40.50; miscellaneous, $3. (4) [Blank.] (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which our firm is counsel, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members, directly or indirectly, as going business concerns.

Plumley, Fletcher D. P., Rialto Building, State Street, Montpelier, Vt.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $975 gross salary received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Pogue, L. Welch, Committee for World Travel, 905 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,250 fee received during quarter plus disbursements as follows: Taxicabs, $1; postage, $1.75. Total received during quarter, $2,252.75. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B on file in your office.

Pollitzer,[5] Anita, national chairman, National Woman's Party, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Woman's Party: Quarter ended September 30, 1948, $330; 6 months ended June 30, 1948, $100; total, $430. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support equal rights amendment. Chief sponsor in Senate, Senator Arthur Capper; chief sponsor in House, Hon. Katharine St. George.

Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $8,366.32; disbursements, $148.10. (2) See attached statement.[1] (3) See attached statement.[1] (4) None. (5) S. 2173; H. R. 5583; S. 2202; H. R. 6556; H. R. 6248; S. 2318.

Posner, Stanley I., the Linen Supply Association of America, Institute of Industrial Launderers, National Council of Technical Schools, National Council of Business Schools, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Poulton, J. E., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Powell, E. Henry, partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,800 is the entire amount received by registrant from Oliver & Donnally for all his legal services rendered during the quarter. A small proportion of this amount (not more than 5 percent) was for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

Powell, W. Royce, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Committee of Americans, Inc., 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, and Magothy River Association, Annapolis, Md. (1) $1,200, Committee of Americans; $1,000, Magothy River Association. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Washington Post, Washington Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington News, Baltimore Sun. (5) Opposed legislation to authorize and appropriate for Sandy Point Naval Academy Airport at Annapolis.

Pratt, Foster J., International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, A. F. L., room 908, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As acting president he receives a monthly salary of $600 minus withholding tax and social-security tax, expended for personal living expenses. (2) Foster J. Pratt. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as administrative and executive head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Union, (Lobbying is minor and incidental.) (4) International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions, A. F. L. weekly Federal news letters and monthly outlook for the dissemination of organization news including legislation. (5) Beneficial to the employees in the engineering and architectural professions.

Pray, Kenneth L., 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $5,000; expenses, allowance, $1,260. (2) University Club, National Press Club, Statler Hotel, taxicabs, Pennsylvania Railroad, etc. (3) Dues, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) My services insofar as legislative matters are concerned consist primarily of factually reporting the status and content of proposals affecting Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies.

Prentice, Howard A., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.03 as miscellaneous expenses (see below). (2) Notary public, $2; postage, 3 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report; postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Press, William H., Washington Board of Trade, 204 Star Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $3,000; expenses, $73.20. (2) Miscellaneous taxi and transportation, $28.75; miscellaneous luncheons and dinners, $44.45. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) Releases sent to Washington newspapers—Washington Post, Times-Herald, Evening Star, and Washington Daily News. (5) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia.

Pritchard, E. Anthony, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and traveling expenses in connection with his usual duties as assistant to the manager of the National Lead Co., Washington office, and no part of it whatsoever was expended during this quarter in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Proctor, Harry E., attorney at law, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally; no expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) The registrant contributed articles for the July and September issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied and analyzed a number of bills pertaining to banks, savings and loan associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing.

Purves, Edmund R., director of public and professional relations, the American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None, except salary for this period, which amounted to $3,125. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

(5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Putt, C. J., the Atchison, Topeko & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) None preceding calendar quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None preceding calendar quarter.

Pyke, John S.,1759 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None for second quarter of 1948. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) None. (5) S. 265, S. 2352, S. 2365, H. R. 6556.

Pyle,[6] Schuyler Shelby, Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. Am registered, but have not engaged in any legislative activity whatever since registering. (4) None. (5) None.

Pyle,[7] Schuyler Shelby, Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Quigley, Frank, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,071.19. (2) Transportation: Pennsylvania Railroad, Washington, D. C., to Absecon, N. J., and return, $18.36; Washington, D. C., to Charleston, W. Va., Indianapolis, Ind., Milwaukee, Wis., Minneapolis, Minn., Cleveland, Ohio, and intermediate points and return; automobile mileage, 3,091 miles, at 6 cents per mile, $185.46; car ferry, one way, Detroit to Cleveland, one car and person, $14.56; Washington, D. C., to Jamestown, N. Y., Buffalo, N. Y., Detroit, Mich., and intermediate points and return, automobile mileage, 1,134 miles, at 6 cents per mile, $68.04; car ferry, Detroit to Buffalo, one way, car and person, $18.64; Hotel Statler, Detroit, $18.50; all other items individually amounting to less than $10 cover meals, board, lodging, garage, and incidental traveling expense. (3) Conferring with associated and connecting Bell Telephone companies at various points hereinbefore mentioned and other intermediate points in connection with general matters of information and public relations. Also general conference on public relations matters at points above referred to, to wit, Absecon, N. J. (4) None. (5) None.

Radner & Zito (the firm members and associates are William Radner, Frank J. Zito, J. Franklin Fort, Odell Kominers, and Mary L. Schleifer), Room 528, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (see letter of September 1, 1948, to clerk, amending Form B), 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting maritime industry, particularly in relation to wage-and-hour law.

Raebeck, Helen, National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $425. On leave until September 1. Pro rata salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Spotlight, a house organ of the National Council of Jewish Women, a small part of which is devoted to asking membership support of certain legislative measures. (5) None. My job is to keep the membership informed on legislative developments and indicate action they can take in support of certain bills.

Raesly, Leon, Thornton & Taylor, 1218 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) None.

Ragland, Edward F., Associated Tobacco Manufacturers, 109–110 Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None, but am interested in any legislation affecting tobacco industry.

Railroad Pension Conference,[4] [10] Post Office box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) $1,203. This was $1 contributions for membership into the Railroad Pension Conference. Expended, $802.67. (2) Railroad Pension Conference. (3) Membership fees. (4) Railroad Pension Conference Bulletin. (5) H. R. 4695 and S. 2055.

Railroad Pension Conference,[4] [6] Post Office box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) $1,307. This was contributions of $1 each for membership into the Railroad Pension Conference. Expended, $567.69. (2) Railroad Pension Conference. (3) Membership fees. (4) Railroad Pension Conference Bulletin. (5) Passage of H. R. 4695 and S. 2055.

Ramsey, Donald J., Silver Users Association, 1730 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (before tax withholdings), $3,000; reimbursement for expenses, $1,960.76; total, $4,960.76. (2) Various. (3) Transportation, hotels, etc. (4) Silver News Letter. (5) Legislation affecting the silver using industry.

Ramspeck, Robert, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Eighty cents. (2) Taxi fare. (3) Taxi fare. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the air-line industry in the public interest. For specific legislation supported during this quarter.

Rankin, J. Lee (Beghtol & Rankin, a partnership), Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

Ray, L. S., 2015 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md.; Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $450 salary. (2) Myself. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting disabled emergency officers.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association Legislative Bulletin, which is issued by registrant in his capacity as Washington representative. (5) H. R. 3825; registrant is paid an annual retainer as counsel of the National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association; no determinable amount of compensation is paid or received on account of legislative activities of registrant; normally the total time used by registrant in activities covered by this law is infinitesimal.

Reckord, M. A., executive vice president, National Rifle Association of America, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Rector, Stanley, 506 Washington Hotel, Fifteenth and Pennsylvania, Washington, D. C.; Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. (1) Received $5,000 as salary for second quarter for duties as legislative director of Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc. (2) No money paid except for expenses, for which I am reimbursed; expenses reported by employing corporation. (3) [Blank.] (4) The Advisor. (5) Social security and related legislation.

Reinhold, James P., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.; 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary for calendar quarter as reported in January 10, 1948, quarterly report Form C; also reimbursed in the amount of $335.80 expended during calendar quarter, none of which was expended for purposes covered in the act. (2) Paid for meals in hotels and various restaurants, expended for taxicabs and automobile, telephone calls, postage, and telegrams. (3) In furtherance of duties described in Registration Form B, of which personal legislative activity is not my principal purpose but is occasional and incidental. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Rhodes, Hubert M., 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1342 East Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association, Inc., and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work. The amount received and expended by him was $1. (2) Notary public, $1. (3) Notarizing reports required to be filed under the Lobbying Act for the quarter ended June 30, 1948. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

Rice, Richard M., Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to effect tax equality as between similar businesses.

Richards,[9] D. D., 1238 National Press Building; Mail Order Association of America, 1061 West Thirty-fifth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specifically.

Riggle,[6] John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June 1948, $2,000; less than 10 percent of this amount would be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Legislative Digest, a mimeographed résumé of legislation introduced which is of interest to agriculture; distributed to members of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Riggle,[7] John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for July, August, and September 1948, $2,000; less than 10 percent of this amount would be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Legislative Digest, a mimeographed résumé of legislation introduced which is of interest to agriculture; Foreign Trade Memo, a mimeographed résumé of developments in foreign trade in agricultural products and supplies; both are distributed to members of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Riggs, Frank E., Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Received and paid out for expenses, $550 for commuting to and from Washington, D. C., and expenses while there lobbying for Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association from July 1 to October 1, 1948, and for National Conference on Public Employee Retirement Systems. (2) Frank E. Riggs, Philadelphia Police Pension Fund Association, 419 City Hall Annex, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) For train fares commuting to and from Washington, D. C., for meals on trains and in Washington and for taxis, lunches, refreshments, entertainment, etc., in Washington. (4) None. (5) Trying to have Federal and municipal employee pensions exempt up to $1,440 from income tax as are railroad pensions. Also, trying to keep members of existing pension funds out of social security.

---

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.
[10] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

Rising, E. W., Western Beet Growers' Association, National Water Conservation Conference, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A. Western Beet Growers' Association, Great Falls, Mont., $250. B. National Water Conservation Conference, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., $464.97. (2) A. To E. W. Rising for office expenses, postage, stationery in connection with information service furnished members of Western Beet Growers' Association. B. To E. W. Rising for office expenses as follows: Postage, $10.53; Western Union, $1.35; stenographer, $345; miscellaneous stationery, $10.09; telephone, $15.50; flowers, $7.50. (3) [Blank.] (4) None during third quarter, 1948. (5) A. Legislation of interest to sugar-beet growers. B. Legislation in connection with development and conservation of land and water resources and in preservation of States' rights and control of natural resources; tidelands legislation; regional and valley authority legislation.

Roark,[s] L. E., National Founders Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000; expenses, nominal travel, hotel, and meals. (2) Common carriers for travel; hotels for room and meals. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Roark,[t] L. E., National Founders Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000; expenses, nominal travel, hotel and meals, but none this quarter. (2) No expenses this quarter. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Robb, George Mackay, 121 Warner Avenue, Syracuse, N. Y.; Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) There was no activity during July, August, and September; No money received; no money expended. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Senate Joint Resolution 150 and House Joint Resolution 239.

Robbins, Paul H., National Society of Professional Engineers, 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $500, and expenses, $50, for July, August, September, 1948 for attention to legislative matters. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer, Legislative Bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

Rogers, Watson, National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received or expended by the undersigned for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation except: $27 (9 hours estimated, at $3.00 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,780 received by the undersigned as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocres' Association, Inc., allocable to the preparation of the following documents in which Federal legislation was advocated, opposed or mentioned: News releases, answer to questionnaire of the House Small Business Committee, letters to wholesale grocers seeking witnesses from among them to appear at hearings held by that committee in various parts of the country and report of the undersigned on legislation submitted at the fall meeting of said association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Washington News Letter of United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. He was later specifically authorized by the executive committee of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., to support or oppose general labor legislation and fair-employment-practice legislation.

Rudy, John Forney, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $100 received as salary from National Federation of American Shipping during the third quarter of 1948, and approximately $50 for lunches and entertainment, allocable to legislative activities. (2) The $50 was paid to restaurants and dining rooms. (3) For lunches and entertainment. (4) None. (5) As Director of Public Relations am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. During the closing days of the Eightieth Congress issued several news releases and assisted in preparation of statements to our membership outlining legislation before Congress.

Rule, Gordon W., Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,875 fee received during quarter plus disbursements as follows: taxicabs, $13.90; telephone calls, $41; travel, $53; mimeographing, mailing, etc., $36.16; for a total received during quarter of $2,019.06. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B on file in your office.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, room 427, Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) None received; approximately $50 expended for taxicabs, long distance phone calls, etc., during quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code relating to the foreign tax credit.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, room 427, Washington, D. C.; Harbor Boat Building Co. and Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) None expended; $1,739 fee and $36.68 disbursements received during quarter; no more moneys will be received and this case is now closed; no further reports will be filed. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 4379, a private bill for the relief of the companies listed above, which bill was signed by the President on June 3, 1948, and became Private Law No. 329.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I receive my salary, commissions, and expenses, as reported on earlier Form B; the corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A. (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue news releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then I distribute educational material on the question.

Rush, Charles J., Washington Real Estate Board, 1417 K Street NW. (1) Received $666.66 per month as executive secretary. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate.

Russell, Francis M., National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $245 expended for matters relating to legislation. (2) See (3) below. (3) Telephone and telegraph, taxi fares, entertainment. (4) [Blank.] (5) As an incidental part of registrant's duties as vice president in charge of Washington office of National Broadcasting Co Inc., including operation of the company's radio stations in Washington, registrant may engage in activities relating to legislation affecting radio communications companies.

Russell, Horace, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received retainer at rate of $11,000 per annum a nominal fraction of which is for legislative work and incurred no lobbying expense. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) Contents of the Legal Bulletin of the United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill. (5) Legislation affecting the savings and loan business.

Russo, Paul M., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks, $1,170; subsistence, 13 weeks, $952; expenses, 13 weeks, $713.74; total, $2,835.74. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Rutherford, F. S., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative work did not exceed $1,250. Amount expended, $99; this covers hearings and securing miscellaneous information pertaining to industry in general and the steel industry in particular. (2) See item (3) below. (3) Approximately 30 trips to Capitol by taxicab at 80 cents a trip; approximately $75 for phone calls, both local and long distance; the above for the purpose of securing legislative information on matters pertaining to industry; and transmittal to principals. (4) None. (5) See original registration.

Ryan, M. O., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,300; July 1, 1948, to September 30, 1948, inclusive, total personal expenses for taxes, lunches, and dinners, phones, etc., in Washington, D. C., were $498.02, of which an insignificant amount was for activities related to lobbying. (2) Taxies, restaurants, and hotels for lunches and other meals. (3) For transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Any legislation affecting the hotel industry. (5) [Blank.]

St. Clair, Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $1,250; no expenditures. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of general interest to retail automobile dealers.

St. Clair, Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Stran Steel Division, Great Lakes Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) Received, $1,500; no expenditures. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of general interest to client.

Sanders,[s] J. T., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I received $1,500 as salary for the quarter as legislative counsel of the National Grange; in addition I received $50.44 for expenses, as follows: Transportation, $24.70; meals and incidentals, $25.74. (2) Transportation agencies and restaurants. (3) Transportation, food, etc. (4) The National Grange Monthly. (5) Hawaiian Statehood; Commodity Credit Corporation, H. R. 6214; Selective service; Federal Standard Time, S. 2041 and S. 2246; meat inspection bills, H. R. 5675, H. R. 6259, and S. 2256; cattle-grub eradication; agricultural appropriations bill; soil conservation, H. R. 6054; international wheat agreement; mortgage insurance, H. R. 6114; Interior appropriations; Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; ECA appropriations.

[s] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[t] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[s] Filed with the Clerk only.

Sands, Chas. E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, AFL, 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Just salary at rate of $7,200 per year. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Social and labor legislation.

Sasuly, Elizabeth, 158 North Twentieth Street, Philadelphia, Pa., former address, 930 F Street NW., Washington D. C.; Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers of America, CIO. (1) $1,125, salary; $475.79, expenses. (2) Funds received to cover expenses paid to railroad, taxicabs, air lines, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) To cover expenses incurred. (4) FTA News. (5) Support legislation in the interest of the working people of the United States and oppose legislation directed against the interests of the people.

Saylor, Richard D., National Lead Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and expenses in connection with his usual duties as manager of the National Lead Co., Washington office, and no part of it whatsoever was expended in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) Office lessor, telephone company, stationers, etc. (3) Rent, telephone service, supplies needed in carrying out duties as manager of the Washington office. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Schaeffer, Alexander L., Ancram, N. Y. (1) $167.63 advanced by myself. (2) postage, books, and miscellaneous stationery, etc., to post office and local merchants, newspapers, etc. (3) General distribution of letters and gathering information. (4) None. (5) No royalty taxes on any commodity or service; the right to work and the right to strike legislation, and total abolition of the closed shop.

Schell, S. D., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Approximately $300 of regular salary is allocable to services performed on matters relating to legislation. Activities consisted mainly of answering questions of various persons, Government department officials, and consultations regarding general legislation pending in Congress, with no particular activity on any pending bills. (2) No expenditures. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) No particular activities or appearances before Congress or committees, nor conferences with Members or employees of Congress during this period on any legislation. Discussions as referred to in (1) above related to general matters in connection with maritime activities.

Schmidt, Henry P., care of Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, etc., 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Salary, $635.52; expenses, $562.67. (2) Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C., cabs, streetcars, and train fares, telephone, laundry, cleaning, postage, and various eating places. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor, particularly to oppose all bills detrimentally affecting the existing railroad retirement and unemployment system.

Schoen,[5] Paul W., Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Schoene, Freehill & Kramer, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, and Milton Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad retirement, unemployment insurance, and employers' liability matters.

Schoenhals,[5] E. L., Tax Equity League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Received from Tax Equality League of Utah for use of my law office, stenographic services, traveling, $100. (2) To my secretary, Jean Powers, for office rent. (3) To maintain my office, receive phone calls from members, and carry on correspondence with members of the organization. (4) Deseret News, Salt Lake Tribune, and Salt Lake Telegram have carried news items only, but no paid advertising. (5) To obtain tax equality.

Scott, Jack Garrett, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Motor Operators. (1) No receipts except annual retainer for general legal services as shown in registration statement; no expenditures for legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Generally all legislation affecting the intercity motorbus industry. During the second session I made presentations before congressional committees on S. 110, H. R. 221, excise-tax legislation, H. R. 584 and S. 1126, House investigation of Fair Labor Standards Act, S. 1812, national transportation inquiry, standard and daylight time, S. 2062, S. 2386, and H. R. 6136.

Scott, John W., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Harvey B. Jacobson, Randolph & Beavers. (1) None other than salary received at the total monthly rate of $400 from Harvey B. Jacobson, John N. Randolph, and Patrick D. Beavers; no expenditures made. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) None. (5) As previously stated in my registration statement. (Note: The firms of McMorrow, Berman & Davidson and Victor J. Evans & Co. are attempting to concel contracts of employment with me, and they are not currently paying me any sum of money.)

Scott, Vernon, and Schuler, Loring A., constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, organizers and counselors, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; see attached statement; [1] see attached statement.[1] (1) No money was received or expended for purposes within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress; see attached statement.[1] (2) No one; see answer to paragraph (1). (3) See answer to paragraph (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to have various types of business corporations taxed on the same basis.

Scott, William C., report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received during said period; receipts of the firm of which I am a member are reported in the quarterly report of Mr. Ethelbert Warfield; no expenditures during said period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Sears,[4] W. J., vice president, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No time devoted to legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills pertaining to long-term legislation on national rubber policy, on the transportation of flammable materials, and on proposed revisions of the excise taxes.

Shandros,[6] Geraldine, American Communications Association, CIO, 5 Beekman Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $280 (this constitutes one-half of salary received and is so reported since time spent in activities covered by the act constitute about one-half of working time); travel expense, $11.50; miscellaneous, $25. (2) Travel, Pennsylvania Railroad, miscellaneous taxies, telephone calls, newspapers, etc. (3) Explained above. (4) ACA News. (5) Legislation affecting workers in the communication industry and American working men and women generally.

Shandros,[7] Geraldine, American Communications Association, CIO, 5 Beekman Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Salary, $140 (this constitutes one-fourth of salary received and is so reported since time spent in activities covered by the act constitutes about one-fourth of working time); travel expense, $15; miscellaneous, $15. (2) Travel: Pennsylvania Railroad; miscellaneous taxies, telephone calls, newspapers, etc. (3) Explained above. (4) ACA News. (5) Legislation affecting workers in the communication industry and American working men and women generally.

Shaw, Mark R., 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.; National Council for Prevention of War, New England secretary, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; traveling expenses, $26.55; total, $226.55. (2) Gas stations, restaurants, etc. (3) Traveling to speaking dates, conferences, meetings. (4) Bulletins of the NCPW. (5) Universal military training, oppose; repeal of peacetime selective service, favor; admission of displaced persons, favor; other measures related to issues of war and peace.

Shields, Robert H., United States Beet Sugar Association as president and general counsel, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Sifton, Paul, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW-CIO, 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks at $100, $1,300; subsistence, 13 weeks, $819; expenses, 13 weeks, $432.30. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker, Washington Report, and Ammunition (UAW-CIO publications). (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Skinner, W. E., 325 Park Drive, Pueblo, Colo.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) I received $670.76; this includes salary, per diem, travel expenses, living expenses, transportation, and incidentals. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxies, etc. (3) For transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, amendments to minimum wage laws, housing, and anti-inflation. Note: This is final report as employment was only temporary.

Smart, Elizabeth A., 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; National WCTU, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill. (1) Received $665.07 salary; received and paid out $73.40. (2) Washington Times-Herald, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., post office, Western Union Telegraph Co., New York Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission, A. C. Gilbert Co., A. B. Dick Co. (3) Subscription, telephone, postage, telegrams, copy New York liquor-control law, electric fan, covers for mimeograph and addressograph machines;

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

Rising, E. W., Western Beet Growers' Association, National Water Conservation Conference, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A. Western Beet Growers' Association, Great Falls, Mont., $250. B. National Water Conservation Conference, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., $464.97. (2) A. To E. W. Rising for office expenses, postage, stationery in connection with information service furnished members of Western Beet Growers' Association. B. To E. W. Rising for office expenses as follows: Postage, $10.53; Western Union, $1.35; stenographer, $345; miscellaneous stationery, $10.09; telephone, $15.50; flowers, $7.50. (3) [Blank.] (4) None during third quarter, 1948. (5) A. Legislation of interest to sugar-beet growers. B. Legislation in connection with development and conservation of land and water resources and in preservation of States' rights and control of natural resources; tidelands legislation; regional and valley authority legislation.

Roark,[6] L. E., National Founders Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000; expenses, nominal travel, hotel, and meals. (2) Common carriers for travel; hotels for room and meals. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Roark,[7] L. E., National Founders Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Annual salary, National Founders Association, $15,000; expenses, nominal travel, hotel and meals, but none this quarter. (2) No expenses this quarter. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Labor legislation, tax legislation, and legislation affecting the foundry industry.

Robb, George Mackay, 121 Warner Avenue, Syracuse, N. Y.; Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) There was no activity during July, August, and September; No money received; no money expended. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Senate Joint Resolution 150 and House Joint Resolution 239.

Robbins, Paul H., National Society of Professional Engineers, 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $500, and expenses, $50, for July, August, September, 1948 for attention to legislative matters. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer, Legislative Bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

Rogers, Watson, National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received or expended by the undersigned for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation except: $27 (9 hours estimated, at $3.00 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,780 received by the undersigned as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocres' Association, Inc., allocable to the preparation of the following documents in which Federal legislation was advocated, opposed or mentioned: News releases, answer to questionnaire of the House Small Business Committee, letters to wholesale grocers seeking witnesses from among them to appear at hearings held by that committee in various parts of the country and report of the undersigned on legislation submitted at the fall meeting of said association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Washington News Letter of United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. He was later specifically authorized by the executive committee of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., to support or oppose general labor legislation and fair-employment-practice legislation.

Rudy, John Forney, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $100 received as salary from National Federation of American Shipping during the third quarter of 1948, and approximately $50 for lunches and entertainment, allocable to legislative activities. (2) The $50 was paid to restaurants and dining rooms. (3) For lunches and entertainment. (4) None. (5) As Director of Public Relations am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. During the closing days of the Eightieth Congress issued several news releases and assisted in preparation of statements to our membership outlining legislation before Congress.

Rule, Gordon W., Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,875 fee received during quarter plus disbursements as follows: taxicabs, $13.90; telephone calls, $41; travel, $53; mimeographing, mailing, etc., $36.16; for a total received during quarter of $2,019.06. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B on file in your office.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, room 427, Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) None received; approximately $50 expended for taxicabs, long distance phone calls, etc., during quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code relating to the foreign tax credit.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, room 427, Washington, D. C.; Harbor Boat Building Co. and Wilmington Welding & Boiler Works, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) None expended; $1,739 fee and $36.68 disbursements received during quarter; no more moneys will be received and this case is now closed; no further reports will be filed. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 4379, a private bill for the relief of the companies listed above, which bill was signed by the President on June 3, 1948, and became Private Law No. 329.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I receive my salary, commissions, and expenses, as reported on earlier Form B; the corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A. (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed but issue news releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then I distribute educational material on the question.

Rush, Charles J., Washington Real Estate Board, 1417 K Street NW. (1) Received $666.66 per month as executive secretary. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate.

Russell, Francis M., National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $245 expended for matters relating to legislation. (2) See (3) below. (3) Telephone and telegraph, taxi fares, entertainment. (4) [Blank.] (5) As an incidental part of registrant's duties as vice president in charge of Washington office of National Broadcasting Co Inc., including operation of the company's radio stations in Washington, registrant may engage in activities relating to legislation affecting radio communications companies.

Russell, Horace, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received retainer at rate of $11,000 per annum a nominal fraction of which is for legislative work and incurred no lobbying expense. (2) See above. (2) See above. (4) Contents of the Legal Bulletin of the United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill. (5) Legislation affecting the savings and loan business.

Russo, Paul M., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks, $1,170; subsistence, 13 weeks, $952; expenses, 13 weeks, $713.74; total, $2,835.74. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Rutherford, F. S., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative work did not exceed $1,250. Amount expended, $99; this covers hearings and securing miscellaneous information pertaining to industry in general and the steel industry in particular. (2) See item (3) below. (3) Approximately 30 trips to Capitol by taxicab at 80 cents a trip; approximately $75 for phone calls, both local and long distance; the above for the purpose of securing legislative information on matters pertaining to industry; and transmittal to principals. (4) None. (5) See original registration.

Ryan, M. O., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,300; July 1, 1948, to September 30, 1948, inclusive, total personal expenses for taxes, lunches, and dinners, phones, etc., in Washington, D. C., were $498.02, of which an insignificant amount was for activities related to lobbying. (2) Taxies, restaurants, and hotels for lunches and other meals. (3) For transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Any legislation affecting the hotel industry. (5) [Blank.]

St. Clair, Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, $1,250; no expenditures. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of general interest to retail automobile dealers.

St. Clair, Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Stran Steel Division, Great Lakes Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) Received, $1,500; no expenditures. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of general interest to client.

Sanders,[8] J. T., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I received $1,500 as salary for the quarter as legislative counsel of the National Grange; in addition I received $50.44 for expenses, as follows: Transportation, $24.70; meals and incidentals, $25.74. (2) Transportation agencies and restaurants. (3) Transportation, food, etc. (4) The National Grange Monthly. (5) Hawaiian Statehood; Commodity Credit Corporation, H. R. 6214; Selective service; Federal Standard Time, S. 2041 and S. 2246; meat inspection bills, H. R. 5675, H. R. 6259, and S. 2256; cattle-grub eradication; agricultural appropriations bill; soil conservation, H. R. 6054; international wheat agreement; mortgage insurance, H. R. 6114; Interior appropriations; Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; ECA appropriations.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[8] Filed with the Clerk only.

Sands, Chas. E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, AFL, 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Just salary at rate of $7,200 per year. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Social and labor legislation.

Sasuly, Elizabeth, 158 North Twentieth Street, Philadelphia, Pa., former address, 930 F Street NW., Washington D. C.; Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers of America, CIO. (1) $1,125, salary; $475.79, expenses. (2) Funds received to cover expenses paid to railroad, taxicabs, air lines, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) To cover expenses incurred. (4) FTA News. (5) Support legislation in the interest of the working people of the United States and oppose legislation directed against the interests of the people.

Saylor, Richard D., National Lead Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and expenses in connection with his usual duties as manager of the National Lead Co., Washington office, and no part of it whatsoever was expended in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) Office lessor, telephone company, stationers, etc. (3) Rent, telephone service, supplies needed in carrying out duties as manager of the Washington office. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Schaeffer, Alexander L., Ancram, N. Y. (1) $167.63 advanced by myself. (2) postage, books, and miscellaneous stationery, etc., to post office and local merchants, newspapers, etc. (3) General distribution of letters and gathering information. (4) None. (5) No royalty taxes on any commodity or service; the right to work and the right to strike legislation, and total abolition of the closed shop.

Schell, S. D., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Approximately $300 of regular salary is allocable to services performed on matters relating to legislation. Activities consisted mainly of answering questions of various persons, Government department officials, and consultations regarding general legislation pending in Congress, with no particular activity on any pending bills. (2) No expenditures. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) No particular activities or appearances before Congress or committees, nor conferences with Members or employees of Congress during this period on any legislation. Discussions as referred to in (1) above related to general matters in connection with maritime activities.

Schmidt, Henry P., care of Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, etc., 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Salary, $635.52; expenses, $562.67. (2) Hamilton Hotel, Washington, D. C., cabs, streetcars, and train fares, telephone, laundry, cleaning, postage, and various eating places. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting railway labor, particularly to oppose all bills detrimentally affecting the existing railroad retirement and unemployment system.

Schoen,[5] Paul W., Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Schoene, Freehill & Kramer, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, and Milton Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad retirement, unemployment insurance, and employers' liability matters.

Schoenhals,[5] E. L., Tax Equity League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Received from Tax Equality League of Utah for use of my law office, stenographic services, traveling, $100. (2) To my secretary, Jean Powers, for office rent. (3) To maintain my office, receive phone calls from members, and carry on correspondence with members of the organization. (4) Deseret News, Salt Lake Tribune, and Salt Lake Telegram have carried news items only, but no paid advertising. (5) To obtain tax equality.

Scott, Jack Garrett, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Motor Operators. (1) No receipts except annual retainer for general legal services as shown in registration statement; no expenditures for legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Generally all legislation affecting the intercity motorbus industry. During the second session I made presentations before congressional committees on S. 110, H. R. 221, excise-tax legislation, H. R. 584 and S. 1126, House investigation of Fair Labor Standards Act, S. 1812, national transportation inquiry, standard and daylight time, S. 2062, S. 2386, and H. R. 6136.

Scott, John W., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Harvey B. Jacobson, Randolph & Beavers. (1) None other than salary received at the total monthly rate of $400 from Harvey B. Jacobson, John N. Randolph, and Patrick D. Beavers; no expenditures made. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) None. (5) As previously stated in my registration statement. (Note: The firms of McMorrow, Berman & Davidson and Victor J. Evans & Co. are attempting to cancel contracts of employment with me, and they are not currently paying me any sum of money.)

Scott, Vernon, and Schuler, Loring A., constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, organizers and counselors, 231 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; see attached statement; [1] see attached statement.[1] (1) No money was received or expended for purposes within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress; see attached statement.[1] (2) No one; see answer to paragraph (1). (3) See answer to paragraph (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to have various types of business corporations taxed on the same basis.

Scott, William C., report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received during said period; receipts of the firm of which I am a member are reported in the quarterly report of Mr. Ethelbert Warfield; no expenditures during said period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Sears,[4] W. J., vice president, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No time devoted to legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills pertaining to long-term legislation on national rubber policy, on the transportation of flammable materials, and on proposed revisions of the excise taxes.

Shandros,[6] Geraldine, American Communications Association, CIO, 5 Beekman Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $280 (this constitutes one-half of salary received and is so reported since time spent in activities covered by the act constitute about one-half of working time); travel expense, $11.50; miscellaneous, $25. (2) Travel, Pennsylvania Railroad, miscellaneous taxies, telephone calls, newspapers, etc. (3) Explained above. (4) ACA News. (5) Legislation affecting workers in the communication industry and American working men and women generally.

Shandros,[7] Geraldine, American Communications Association, CIO, 5 Beekman Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Salary, $140 (this constitutes one-fourth of salary received and is so reported since time spent in activities covered by the act constitutes about one-fourth of working time); travel expense, $15; miscellaneous, $15. (2) Travel: Pennsylvania Railroad; miscellaneous taxies, telephone calls, newspapers, etc. (3) Explained above. (4) ACA News. (5) Legislation affecting workers in the communication industry and American working men and women generally.

Shaw, Mark R., 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.; National Council for Prevention of War, New England secretary, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; traveling expenses, $26.55; total, $226.55. (2) Gas stations, restaurants, etc. (3) Traveling to speaking dates, conferences, meetings. (4) Bulletins of the NCPW. (5) Universal military training, oppose; repeal of peacetime selective service, favor; admission of displaced persons, favor; other measures related to issues of war and peace.

Shields, Robert H., United States Beet Sugar Association as president and general counsel, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Sifton, Paul, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, UAW-CIO, 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks at $100, $1,300; subsistence, 13 weeks, $819; expenses, 13 weeks, $432.30. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker, Washington Report, and Ammunition (UAW-CIO publications). (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Skinner, W. E., 325 Park Drive, Pueblo, Colo.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) I received $670.76; this includes salary, per diem, travel expenses, living expenses, transportation, and incidentals. (2) Hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxies, etc. (3) For transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, amendments to minimum wage laws, housing, and anti-inflation. Note: This is final report as employment was only temporary.

Smart, Elizabeth A., 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; National WCTU, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill. (1) Received $665.07 salary; received and paid out $73.40. (2) Washington Times-Herald, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., post office, Western Union Telegraph Co., New York Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission, A. C. Gilbert Co., A. B. Dick Co. (3) Subscription, telephone, postage, telegrams, copy New York liquor-control law, electric fan, covers for mimeograph and addressograph machines;

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

stencil sheets, mimeo ink, and correction fluid. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relations.

Smith, Allen L., Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., P. O. box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support any legislation to amended the Internal Revenue Code so as to improve basic taxation principles providing for removal of tax disparities between business competitors.

Smith, Anthony W., Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative employment, $75; this is computed as stated in registration statement A $300 a year; no expenditures. (2) None. (3) Compensation as above received for legislative work. (4) CIO-News, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Forestry legislation, River Valley developments, resource conservation.

Smith, Donald W. (report as attorney for American Nurses' Association), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American Nurses's Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: $12,706.23 for legal fees and disbursements, paid to Satterlee Warfield & Stephens for services by firm as counsel in all capacities; expenditures: No expenditures during said period. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None during the period covered by this report. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing or health, on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand, including the extension of social security coverage and Federal aid to nursing education.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,250 monthly from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for the principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for the purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Harold O., Jr., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) During the past quarter I did not have occasion to engage in any activities which I believe would be construed as lobbying; serving full time as executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., my activities are those of a trade association executive and any contacts with members of Congress are purely incidental to my many other activities in connection with trade association work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) In our bulletins and weekly news letter to members, we occasionally report on legislative matters affecting the trade. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers; in behalf of our members we opposed the rulings of the Department of Internal Revenue which exempted cooperatives from taxation; also the Department's rulings which placed an unreasonable burden on wholesale grocers in reporting sales of oleo margarine.

Smith, Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) July, salary, $1,603.15; August, salary, $750; September, salary (unpaid), travel expense, $160.99. (2) Howard J. Smith, executive secretary, Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Salary, travel expense, board and room when engaged in travel, in interest of work of the association. (4) The Case for Water in Central Arizona, Work for Water, California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River, What the Central Arizona Project Means to You. (5) Employed to support Senate bill 1175.

Smith, Lloyd W., room 425, Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW, Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received regular salary for the period July 1 to September 30, 1948, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. in the same amount as for the quarter ending June 30 and reported previously; no money was received or expended by me during this last quarter in connection with any lobbying activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Other duties for said company comprise the major part of this work.

Smith, Purcell L., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $523.65 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, clubs, railroads, airlines, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $70.45; hotels, clubs, restaurants, $376.54; gratuities and miscellaneous, $41.26; telephone and telegraph, $35.40. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters; the association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Robert E., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York. (1) Received $300; expenditures, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) To support legislation which directly or indirectly is believed to be beneficial to holders of life insurance and their beneficiaries; and to oppose such legislation as is believed to be unfavorable to same.

Smith, Russell, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Snyder, Calvin K., Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $813.24. (2) Various. (3) Travel expenses, taxicabs, telephone calls, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Snyder, James D., Illinois Legislative Committee, room 1236, LaSalle Street Station, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Illinois railroads.

Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 received for services covering the period commencing in 1947 and continuing to June 1, 1948; $67.99 for disbursements for expenses on two trips; $2,567.99, total. (2) Transcontinental & Western Airlines, $42.09; Pennsylvania Railroad, $13; taxies, busses, etc., $12.90; total, $67.99. (3) To cover expenses of trips. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Spencer, Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Stack, Thomas George, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. (1) None, as I have not been in Washington since June 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., Newspaper Rail Pension News, cost $900 for quarterly edition, June, July, and August 1948; circulation, 90,000 rail employees. (5) Supported H. R. 6766 last session of Congress, and to get before the House and Senate bills to give railroad employees more adequate benefit under the Railroad Retirement Act.

Starling, Howard M., 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York City. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act; registrant has estimated, however, that $150 received by registrant during the third quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock, casualty and surety insurance companies.

Steele, Raymond E., general counsel, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Stein, Margaret I., 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $1,000.02; received expenses, $157.99; total, $1,158.01. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Stengle, Charles I., American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW. (1) $13.20. (2) Taxicab drivers. (3) Trips to and from Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Government employees.

Stewart, Annalee (Mrs. Alexander Stewart), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No report for the third quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary (50 percent of time devoted to legislative activities), $3,000; reimbursement by employer for travel expenses, incidental expenses and per diem, $229.14; total, $3,229.14. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street NW, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Money received July 1, 1948–September 30, 1948—$1,800 salary (only 50 percent of time, however, is devoted to legislative activities). Expenses incurred by Edwin L. Stoll in connection with legislative activities for which reimbursement was received for the period from July 1 to September 30, 1948, were $24.43. (2) Various. (3) Dues, lunches, taxicabs, etc. (4) Attached list shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stone, Mrs. Margaret F., National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $80.78 salary; no money expended for legislative activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own National Women's Trade Union League publications, monthly, Life and Labor Bulletin. (5) See regular legislative program of league already on file with your office.

Stoudenmire, Sterling F., Jr., 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries, Mobile, Ala. (1) Salary, $2,100; expense reimbursements, $106.24. (2) Various. (3) Taxicab transportation, meals, entertainment, etc. (4) None. (5) I am not engaged specifically "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by Congress"; my employment is as attorney in the general counsel's office of the Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries, who are interested in any legislation affecting the merchant marine, the operation of aircraft, and transportation generally. Such employment of necessity requires presentation of information and facts to members of committees handling such legislation. This work is not the principal part of my employment, but is one of the incidental duties in connection therewith. During quarter for which this report is filed, supported House Joint Resolution 412, House Joint Resolution 413, and S. 2647, S. 2696 relating to the merchant marine.

Strachan, Paul A., American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1376 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Sponsoring legislation on behalf of our 28,000,000 physically handicapped citizens. Supporting S. 2896; S. 2319; H. R. 6525; H. R. 6653.

Strackbein, O. R., America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 601 Carpenters' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, July–September, $3,990; expenses, July–September, $3,024.31 (consisting of $2,600 in salary and $424.31 expenses). (2) No payments were made to individuals. Expense money was paid out for the purposes listed below. (3) Rent, telephone, taxicab fares, clerical work, traveling expense, a few lunches, and office supplies. (4) Editorial in the Photo-Engraver, a monthly publication of the International Photo-Engravers' Union. Article in the Glass Cutter, published by the Window Glass Cutters' League. (5) Tariff legislation and related matters, such as ratification or nonratification of the charter of the International Trade Organization.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200 salary, $4.30 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers and streetcar drivers. (3) Transportation. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Sturrock, J. E., Texas Water Conservation Association, 605–609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Salary for July, August, and September 1948, $1,500, less income tax. Traveling expenses for July, August, and September 1948, $212.85. (2) $212.85 traveling expenses paid to various railroad, air-line, and taxi companies, hotels and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals, lodging, and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association Bulletins and pamphlets and various analyses of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support legislation, both State and National, concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan, Charles H., 75 State Street, Albany, N. Y.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $125 salary, $93.32 expense. (2) Charles H. Sullivan. (3) Hotel bills, meals, railroad and pullman fare. (4) None. (5) All legislation at the special session of interest to the brotherhood, particularly housing, price controls, wage controls.

Sullivan, Francis M., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, September, 1948 (after taxes and social security), $1,746.60; bonus, 10 percent of annual salary (after taxes and social security), $634.11; expenses to Philadelphia, Pa., June 1948, $118.81; incidental expenses, June 1948, $27.80; total, $2,527.32. (2) Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) See No. (1) above. (4) DAV Semimonthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the survivors of deceased service men and women.

Sutlive, Carey R., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,013.87. Expenditures: $1,013.87. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations, and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Swanson, Walter S. J., National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. During the quarterly period just ended, he has expended no money and has made no payments to anyone in connection with any activities coming within the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Prepared articles for Highway Highlights and certain bulletins released by the National Highway Users Conference (5) Within the general responsibility of my office, I have carried out the work outlined above. During the past quarter, this has been solely confined to reportorial coverage of congressional activities dealing with Federal highway aid and highway taxation, the only legislation in which I am interested. I have conducted no activity during the quarterly period coming within the purview of the Lobbying Act.

Swomley,[4] John M., Jr., 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Travel expenses between Washington and New York plus out-of-pocket expenses in Washington, $22.68. (2) John M. Swomley, Jr., for personal expenses indicated above. (3) Indicated above. (4) Conscription News Weekly. (5) I serve as acting director of the National Council Against Conscription on a volunteer basis to promote the achieving of the international abolition of conscription, worldwide disarmament, and the defeat of conscription.

Swope,[4] Harold W., 1006A La Salle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Fees, $2,940; expenses, $2,104.60. (2) La Salle Apartment Hotel, Inc. (3) Office rental, $400; hotel rent, $315; transportation, $187.65; balance, $1,201.95. Other expenses, none of which totaled more than $10. (4) None. (5) Incentive payment plan for strategic and critical minerals.

Taylor,[5] Hugh W., 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky. (1) Amount received from Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association: For salary, less social security and tax, $2,250; for expenses incurred, $120.45. (2) Various. (3) Hotels, meals, taxicabs, etc. (4) Tobacco and the Marshall Plan, July 1948 issue of the Kentucky Marketing Bulletin, published by Division of Markets, Department of Agriculture, Frankfort, Ky. (5) Legislation which affects tobacco production and foreign trade in leaf tobacco.

Taylor, John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $500 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $504.48 reimbursement for traveling expenses during July, August, and September 1948; $1.60 incidental expenses for July, August, and September 1948 (taxies) (2) John Thomas Taylor. (3) $504.48 reimbursement for traveling expenses: Round trip to Aberdeen, S. Dak., two round trips to Philadelphia, Pa., one trip and return, Minneapolis, Minn., and Indianapolis, Ind; $1.60 incidental expenses for July, August, and September 1948 (taxies). (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, re-education, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which are opposition to all subversive activities, and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $13.30; (2) Various. (3) Taxicabs and telephones. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Taylor, Russell J., United Shoe Workers of America, CIO, room 608, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $80 per week; expenses, $21 per week; hotel, $12 per week. (2) Russell J. Taylor. (3) Legislative representative, United Shoe Workers of America, CIO. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Taylor, Tyre, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $2,500 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by National Association of Retail Grocers. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expense amounting to $838.03; (b)

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

stencil sheets, mimeo ink, and correction fluid. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relations.

Smith, Allen L., Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., P. O. box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support any legislation to amended the Internal Revenue Code so as to improve basic taxation principles providing for removal of tax disparities between business competitors.

Smith, Anthony W., Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative employment, $75; this is computed as stated in registration statement A $300 a year; no expenditures. (2) None. (3) Compensation as above received for legislative work. (4) CIO-News, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Forestry legislation, River Valley developments, resource conservation.

Smith, Donald W. (report as attorney for American Nurses' Association), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American Nurses's Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: $12,706.23 for legal fees and disbursements, paid to Satterlee Warfield & Stephens for services by firm as counsel in all capacities; expenditures: No expenditures during said period. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None during the period covered by this report. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing or health, on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand, including the extension of social security coverage and Federal aid to nursing education.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,250 monthly from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for the principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for the purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Harold O., Jr., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) During the past quarter I did not have occasion to engage in any activities which I believe would be construed as lobbying; serving full time as executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., my activities are those of a trade association executive and any contacts with members of Congress are purely incidental to my many other activities in connection with trade association work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) In our bulletins and weekly news letter to members, we occasionally report on legislative matters affecting the trade. (5) No legislation in particular, any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers; in behalf of our members we opposed the rulings of the Department of Internal Revenue which exempted cooperatives from taxation; also the Department's rulings which placed an unreasonable burden on wholesale grocers in reporting sales of oleo margarine.

Smith, Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) July, salary, $1,603.15; August, salary, $750; September, salary (unpaid), travel expense, $160.99. (2) Howard J. Smith, executive secretary, Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (3) Salary, travel expense, board and room when engaged in travel, in interest of work of the association. (4) The Case for Water in Central Arizona, Work for Water, California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River, What the Central Arizona Project Means to You. (5) Employed to support Senate bill 1175.

Smith, Lloyd W., room 425, Shoreham Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW, Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received regular salary for the period July 1 to September 30, 1948, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. in the same amount as for the quarter ending June 30 and reported previously; no money was received or expended by me during this last quarter in connection with any lobbying activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. Other duties for said company comprise the major part of this work.

Smith, Purcell L., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $523.65 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, clubs, railroads, airlines, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $70.45; hotels, clubs, restaurants, $376.54; gratuities and miscellaneous, $41.26; telephone and telegraph, $35.40. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters; the association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Robert E., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York. (1) Received $300; expenditures, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) To support legislation which directly or indirectly is believed to be beneficial to holders of life insurance and their beneficiaries; and to oppose such legislation as is believed to be unfavorable to same.

Smith, Russell, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Snyder, Calvin K., Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $813.24. (2) Various. (3) Travel expenses, taxicabs, telephone calls, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Snyder, James D., Illinois Legislative Committee, room 1236, LaSalle Street Station, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Illinois railroads.

Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $2,500 received for services covering the period commencing in 1947 and continuing to June 1, 1948; $67.99 for disbursements for expenses on two trips; $2,567.99, total. (2) Transcontinental & Western Airlines, $42.09; Pennsylvania Railroad, $13; taxies, busses, etc., $12.90; total, $67.99. (3) To cover expenses of trips. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Spencer, Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Stack, Thomas George, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. (1) None, as I have not been in Washington since June 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., Newspaper Rail Pension News, cost $900 for quarterly edition, June, July, and August 1948; circulation, 90,000 rail employees. (5) Supported H. R. 6766 last session of Congress, and to get before the House and Senate bills to give railroad employees more adequate benefit under the Railroad Retirement Act.

Starling, Howard M., 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York City. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act; registrant has estimated, however, that $150 received by registrant during the third quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock, casualty and surety insurance companies.

Steele, Raymond E., general counsel, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Stein, Margaret I., 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $1,000.02; received expenses, $157.99; total, $1,158.01. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Stengle, Charles I., American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW. (1) $13.20. (2) Taxicab drivers. (3) Trips to and from Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Government employees.

Stewart, Annalee (Mrs. Alexander Stewart), Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No report for the third quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary (50 percent of time devoted to legislative activities), $3,000; reimbursement by employer for travel expenses, incidental expenses and per diem, $229.14; total, $3,229.14. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street NW, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Money received July 1, 1948–September 30, 1948—$1,800 salary (only 50 percent of time, however, is devoted to legislative activities). Expenses incurred by Edwin L. Stoll in connection with legislative activities for which reimbursement was received for the period from July 1 to September 30, 1948, were $24.43. (2) Various. (3) Dues, lunches, taxicabs, etc. (4) Attached list shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stone, Mrs. Margaret F., National Women's Trade Union League of America, 317 Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $80.78 salary; no money expended for legislative activity. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own National Women's Trade Union League publications, monthly, Life and Labor Bulletin. (5) See regular legislative program of league already on file with your office.

Stoudenmire, Sterling F., Jr., 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries, Mobile, Ala. (1) Salary, $2,100; expense reimbursements, $106.24. (2) Various. (3) Taxicab transportation, meals, entertainment, etc. (4) None. (5) I am not engaged specifically "for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by Congress"; my employment is as attorney in the general counsel's office of the Waterman Steamship Corp. and subsidiaries, who are interested in any legislation affecting the merchant marine, the operation of aircraft, and transportation generally. Such employment of necessity requires presentation of information and facts to members of committees handling such legislation. This work is not the principal part of my employment, but is one of the incidental duties in connection therewith. During quarter for which this report is filed, supported House Joint Resolution 412, House Joint Resolution 413, and S. 2647, S. 2696 relating to the merchant marine.

Strachan, Paul A., American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1376 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Sponsoring legislation on behalf of our 28,000,000 physically handicapped citizens. Supporting S. 2896; S. 2319; H. R. 6525; H. R. 6653.

Strackbein, O. R., America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 601 Carpenters' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, July-September, $3,990; expenses, July-September, $3,024.31 (consisting of $2,600 in salary and $424.31 expenses). (2) No payments were made to individuals. Expense money was paid out for the purposes listed below. (3) Rent, telephone, taxicab fares, clerical work, traveling expense, a few lunches, and office supplies. (4) Editorial in the Photo-Engraver, a monthly publication of the International Photo-Engravers' Union. Article in the Glass Cutter, published by the Window Glass Cutters' League. (5) Tariff legislation and related matters, such as ratification or nonratification of the charter of the International Trade Organization.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $200 salary, $4.30 expenses. (2) Taxi drivers and streetcar drivers. (3) Transportation. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor law revision, social-security law revision, inflammable fabric legislation.

Sturrock, J. E., Texas Water Conservation Association, 605-609 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex. (1) Salary for July, August, and September 1948, $1,500, less income tax. Traveling expenses for July, August, and September 1948, $212.85. (2) $212.85 traveling expenses paid to various railroad, air-line, and taxi companies, hotels and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals, lodging, and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association Bulletins and pamphlets and various analyses of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support legislation, both State and National, concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation which seeks to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan, Charles H., 75 State Street, Albany, N. Y.; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $125 salary, $93.32 expense. (2) Charles H. Sullivan. (3) Hotel bills, meals, railroad and pullman fare. (4) None. (5) All legislation at the special session of interest to the brotherhood, particularly housing, price controls, wage controls.

Sullivan, Francis M., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, July, August, September, 1948 (after taxes and social security), $1,746.60; bonus, 10 percent of annual salary (after taxes and social security), $634.11; expenses to Philadelphia, Pa., June 1948, $118.81; incidental expenses, June 1948, $27.80; total, $2,527.32. (2) Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) See No. (1) above. (4) DAV Semimonthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the survivors of deceased service men and women.

Sutlive, Carey R., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,013.87. Expenditures: $1,013.87. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations, and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Swanson, Walter S. J., National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. During the quarterly period just ended, he has expended no money and has made no payments to anyone in connection with any activities coming within the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Prepared articles for Highway Highlights and certain bulletins released by the National Highway Users Conference. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office, I have carried out the work outlined above. During the past quarter, this has been solely confined to reportorial coverage of congressional activities dealing with Federal highway aid and highway taxation, the only legislation in which I am interested. I have conducted no activity during the quarterly period coming within the purview of the Lobbying Act.

Swomley,[4] John M., Jr., 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Travel expenses between Washington and New York plus out-of-pocket expenses in Washington, $22.68. (2) John M. Swomley, Jr., for personal expenses indicated above. (3) Indicated above. (4) Conscription News Weekly. (5) I serve as acting director of the National Council Against Conscription on a volunteer basis to promote the achieving of the international abolition of conscription, worldwide disarmament, and the defeat of conscription.

Swope,[4] Harold W., 1006A La Salle Building, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Fees, $2,940; expenses, $2,104.60. (2) La Salle Apartment Hotel, Inc. (3) Office rental, $400; hotel rent, $315; transportation, $187.65; balance, $1,201.95. Other expenses, none of which totaled more than $10. (4) None. (5) Incentive payment plan for strategic and critical minerals.

Taylor,[5] Hugh W., 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky. (1) Amount received from Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association: For salary, less social security and tax, $2,250; for expenses incurred, $120.45. (2) Various. (3) Hotels, meals, taxicabs, etc. (4) Tobacco and the Marshall Plan, July 1948 issue of the Kentucky Marketing Bulletin, published by Division of Markets, Department of Agriculture, Frankfort, Ky. (5) Legislation which affects tobacco production and foreign trade in leaf tobacco.

Taylor, John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $500 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $504.48 reimbursement for traveling expenses during July, August, and September 1948; $1.60 incidental expenses for July, August, and September 1948 (taxies) (2) John Thomas Taylor. (3) $504.48 reimbursement for traveling expenses: Round trip to Aberdeen, S. Dak., two round trips to Philadelphia, Pa., one trip and return, Minneapolis, Minn., and Indianapolis, Ind; $1.60 incidental expenses for July, August, and September 1948 (taxies). (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; the National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, re-education, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which are opposition to all subversive activities, and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended, $13.30; (2) Various. (3) Taxicabs and telephones. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Taylor, Russell J., United Shoe Workers of America, CIO, room 608, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $80 per week; expenses, $21 per week; hotel, $12 per week. (2) Russell J. Taylor. (3) Legislative representative, United Shoe Workers of America, CIO. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Taylor, Tyre, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $2,500 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by National Association of Retail Grocers. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expense amounting to $838.03; (b)

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

traveling expenses, $76.30. (2) (a) Landlord, secretary, postage, telephone, etc.; (b) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above. (4) National Grocers' Bulletin (published monthly). (5) Repeal of margarine license taxes and other legislation of interest to independent retail food distributors.

Taylor, Tyre, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.; Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) Received $4,237.50 and one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expense amounting to $488.03; (b) Research and technical assistance, $1,581.27; (c) travel expense, $76.30. (2) (a) Landlord, postage, telephone, etc.; (b) Henry Bison, Jr.; (c) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above for purposes. (4) Semimonthly News Bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council. (5) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Teel, Donald, Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., formerly Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Temple, Marjorie L., American Association of University Women, 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received only salary which is $4,100 per year, approximately one-half of which is for legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women (quarterly) General Director's Letter (3 or 4 times a year as program guide to State and branch officers and chairmen. (5) See attached sheet (legislative notes from summer journal, 1948). Printed sheet (original copy only).

Terrell,[4] John U., Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Colorado River Association, $2,750. (2) Ordinary business expenses, including transportation, hotel, meals, taxies, telephone, etc. (3) Ordinary business expenses, including transportation, hotel, meals, taxies, telephone, etc. (4) Newspapers, wire services, especially southern California newspapers, including Los Angeles Daily News, Los Angeles Times, Hearst papers, Copley papers, and general distribution. (5) S. J. Res. 145 and H. R. 226.

Thompson, Chester C., the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary from the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., $5,000, covering July, August, September, 1948. (2) Miscellaneous expenses, $11.25. (3) Local transportation and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Concerned about all legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States. Duringing third calendar quarter (July, August, September) of 1948; less than 2 percent of registrant's time occupied in legislative matters.

Thomson, Mrs. Dorothy W., American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act; National Science Foundation bill; appropriations for United States Children's Bureau; Federal aid for education bill.

Thompson, Louis E., president, Small Business Association of New Jersey, Inc., Box 188, Glen Ridge, N. J. (1) Dues received by the Small Business Association of New Jersey, Inc., in the third quarter of 1948, $340; of that amount, $13.35 was spent for, see (3).

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

(2) Conference of American Small Busines Organizations. (3) Promote legislation to return to the gold standard. (4) None. (5) See (3).

Tinney, William H., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending September 30, 1948; consequently, no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act and, likewise, no expenses were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) My salary is $1,250 per month, or $3,750 for quarter year. I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (2) Fred A. Tobin. (3) I am an attorney representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers Union and its affiliated locals before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Labor Relations Board. Am the liaison representative between various Government agencies and international union and the affiliated locals. The above includes general services of a nonlegislative nature pertaining to business and operation of International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals; also for part-time services in connection with legislation, both Federal and State, for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals. (4) I do not have any connection with any newspaper. (5) Legislation, Federal and State, which may affect the interests of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals, particularly in the field of labor law.

Tobler, H. Willis, 261 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $5.36 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: International wheat agreement, authorization with respect to the construction of headquarters for the United Nations, monetary and fiscal policies

Todd,[5] John H., 1037 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) None for the purposes covered by the act. This filing is made in the conviction that it is not required by Public Low 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. It is made solely to avoid even any unwarranted suggestion of a question of good faith or of compliance with the law. (2) None for purposes covered by the act. (3) None for purposes covered by the act. (4) None relating to the purposes covered by the act. (5) No specific legislation.

Tone, Joseph M., legislative representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,875; expenses, $5 per day, excluding Sundays and holidays. (2) Personal. (3) Personal. (4) None. (5) None.

Tool Owners Union, Inc., 1802 Massachusetts Avenue, Lexington, Mass. (1) Received $5,983.08; expended, $4,070.24. (2) See attached schedule.[1] (3) See attached schedule.[1] (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $41.25. (2) Various persons. (3) Miscellaneous expenses

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

such as taxies, carfare, luncheons, notaries' fees, etc. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., partner of law firm of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Louis Dreyfus, president of Chappell & Co., Inc., R. K. O. Building, New York City, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, a bill to facilitate naturalization of Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; John Frederick Firth-Hand, 1744 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 1742, Eightieth Congress, first session, a bill for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C.: Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia; the Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania, 308 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the just payment of French spoliation claims.

Turner, Harold J., 325 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., et al. (1) None on Federal legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular proposed Federal legislation. See statement A to my registration, Form B.

Vance, C. W., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) None. No services performed in third quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Van Osdol,[6] Paul, Jr., Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. (NOTE.—I am secretary-treasurer of the Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association. As secretary of this association I may, in the future, write letters to businessmen, civic organizations, and to the public, which may encourage them to write letters to members of Congress with regard to pending or proposed Federal legislation, including legislation relating to taxes. Although I am of the opinion that my activity does not come within the requirements of the Federal regulations of Lobbying Act, since a part of my activities may include the writing of letters to Members of Congress, or to encourage the members of our association to do so, I will keep the records required by the act and submit the required reports.)

Van Osdol,[7] Paul, Jr., Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. (NOTE.—I am secretary-treasurer of the Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association. As secretary of this association I may, in the future, write letters to businessmen, civic organizations, and to the public, which may encourage them to write letters to Members of Congress with regard to pending or proposed Federal legislation, including legislation relating to taxes. Although I am of the opinion that my activity does not come within the requirements of the Federal regulations of Lobbying Act, since a part of my activities may include the writing of letters to Members of Congress, or to encourage the members of our association to do so, I will keep the records required by the act and submit the required reports.)

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1945.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

(1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the city of New York.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Versen,[5] Albert F., Missouri Valley Chapter, Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Received, $156.25; expended, $900.28. (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None.

Versen,[5] Albert F., St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) See statement attached.[1] (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None.

Viles,[4] A. L., president, the Rubbe Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No time devoted to legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills pertaining to long-term legislation on national rubber policy, on the transportation of flammable materials, and on proposed revisions of the excise taxes.

Virkus,[5] Frederick A., Conference of American Small Business Organizations, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Compensation, $3,000; expense, $181.03. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Mayflower Hotel, taxi drivers, telephone company, telegraph company. (3) Expenses: Primarily travel, some miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business.

Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Walker,[6] Jimmie, (voluntary) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., P. O. box 1329, 305–306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax equality among all business.

Walker,[7] Jimmie, (voluntary) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., post office box 1329, 305–306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) None. (1) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax equality among all business.

Waller, Theodore, United World Federalists of Washington, D. C., 1710 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United World Federalists, Inc., 7 East Twelfth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary received from United World Federalists, Inc., $375. Received from United World Federalists, Inc., for traveling expenses, $217.39. Received from William Cochran as a gift for the purpose of carrying out the work and program of United World Federalists, $1,500. (2) Salary paid to my secretary, Mrs. Anita Kiefer, April 23, 1948, $25; May 21, 1948, $25; June 25, 1948, $25; $75 total salary paid by me to my secretary during the quarter April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948. (3) Salary for secretarial services. (4) World Government News. (5) Any legislation designed to strengthen the United Nations.

Walter, Stephen M., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $6,625.02 as an employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursement of $675 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, book stores and stationers. (3) Transportation $196.65; meals and incidental expenses on account of association members in Washington, $375.35; telephones and telegraph, $25.55; newspapers and publications, $32.75; miscellaneous, $44.70. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies of which I am an employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Warfield, Ethelbert, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; report as attorney for American General Corporation, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) No receipts or expenditures during said period. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) To oppose S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Warfield, Ethelbert, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: $8,905.55 received by Satterlees, Warfield & Stephens for services by firm as counsel in all capacities. Expenditures: Professional services and disbursements, $2,343.75; transportation, $19.67; carfare, 20 cents; telephone calls, $85.74; telegrams, $2.39; stenography, $39.47; hotel rooms, $13.28; meals, $3.40; postage, $1.90. (2) William J. Bulow, Jr., Washington, D. C.: Pennsylvania Railroad and American Airlines, Inc.; various surface transportation companies; various telephone companies; Western Union; various stenographers; Hotel Carlton, Washington, D. C., various restaurants; and United States Post Office, respectively. (3) For the respective purposes above specified. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Warner, Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) Received from the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J., for professional services; conferences with various Members of Congress in regard to legislation for the period April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, $3,250. Expenses for transportation and traveling to and from Washington, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, entertainment, and expenses in Washington, $532.19. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Services were rendered in connection with housing, credit, labor, railroad reorganization, and general welfare legislation and protective of the interests of the policy holders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[10] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $543. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $310.48; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $300, proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $77.47; total, $687.95. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $31.04 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[11] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $736.97. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $465.72; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $95.69; total, $1,011.41. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $46.57 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Times-Herald, Washington Daily News, Washington Evening Star, Washington Post. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[12] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received; contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $1,396. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $400.02, reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $166.23; total, $1,016.25. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted, not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities; therefore the sum of $40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[13] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $1,359.50. Moneys expended: management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $400.02; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $143.87; total, $993.89. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted, not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities; therefore the sum of $40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk, in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[9] Filed with the Clerk only.
[10] Filed for third quarter, 1946.
[11] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[12] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[13] Filed for second quarter, 1947.

traveling expenses, $76.30. (2) (a) Landlord, secretary, postage, telephone, etc.; (b) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above. (4) National Grocers' Bulletin (published monthly). (5) Repeal of margarine license taxes and other legislation of interest to independent retail food distributors.

Taylor, Tyre, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.; Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) Received $4,237.50 and one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: (a) Adjusted regular office expense amounting to $488.03; (b) Research and technical assistance, $1,581.27; (c) travel expense, $76.30. (2) (a) Landlord, postage, telephone, etc.; (b) Henry Bison, Jr.; (c) Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1) above for purposes. (4) Semimonthly News Bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council. (5) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Teel, Donald, Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., formerly Michigan Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Temple, Marjorie L., American Association of University Women, 1634 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received only salary which is $4,100 per year, approximately one-half of which is for legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women (quarterly) General Director's Letter (3 or 4 times a year as program guide to State and branch officers and chairmen. (5) See attached sheet (legislative notes from summer journal, 1948). Printed sheet (original copy only).

Terrell,[4] John U., Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Colorado River Association, $2,750. (2) Ordinary business expenses, including transportation, hotel, meals, taxies, telephone, etc. (3) Ordinary business expenses, including transportation, hotel, meals, taxies, telephone, etc. (4) Newspapers, wire services, especially southern California newspapers, including Los Angeles Daily News, Los Angeles Times, Hearst papers, Copley papers, and general distribution. (5) S. J. Res. 145 and H. R. 226.

Thompson, Chester C., the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary from the American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., $5,000, covering July, August, September, 1948. (2) Miscellaneous expenses, $11.25. (3) Local transportation and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Concerned about all legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States. Duringing third calendar quarter (July, August, September) of 1948; less than 2 percent of registrant's time occupied in legislative matters.

Thomson, Mrs. Dorothy W., American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) The Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act; National Science Foundation bill; appropriations for United States Children's Bureau; Federal aid for education bill.

Thompson, Louis E., president, Small Business Association of New Jersey, Inc., Box 188, Glen Ridge, N. J. (1) Dues received by the Small Business Association of New Jersey, Inc., in the third quarter of 1948, $340; of that amount, $13.35 was spent for, see (3).

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

(2) Conference of American Small Busines Organizations. (3) Promote legislation to return to the gold standard. (4) None. (5) See (3).

Tinney, William H., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending September 30, 1948; consequently, no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act and, likewise, no expenses were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) My salary is $1,250 per month, or $3,750 for quarter year. I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (2) Fred A. Tobin. (3) I am an attorney representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers Union and its affiliated locals before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Labor Relations Board. Am the liaison representative between various Government agencies and international union and the affiliated locals. The above includes general services of a nonlegislative nature pertaining to business and operation of International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals; also for part-time services in connection with legislation, both Federal and State, for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals. (4) I do not have any connection with any newspaper. (5) Legislation, Federal and State, which may affect the interests of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals, particularly in the field of labor law.

Tobler, H. Willis, 261 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $5.36 expended. (See item (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxis. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) In accordance with the annual meeting resolutions adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, proposed legislation on the following matters has been supported or opposed: International wheat agreement, authorization with respect to the construction of headquarters for the United Nations, monetary and fiscal policies

Todd,[5] John H., 1037 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) None for the purposes covered by the act. This filing is made in the conviction that it is not required by Public Low 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. It is made solely to avoid even any unwarranted suggestion of a question of good faith or of compliance with the law. (2) None for purposes covered by the act. (3) None for purposes covered by the act. (4) None relating to the purposes covered by the act. (5) No specific legislation.

Tone, Joseph M., legislative representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,875; expenses, $5 per day, excluding Sundays and holidays. (2) Personal. (3) Personal. (4) None. (5) None.

Tool Owners Union, Inc., 1802 Massachusetts Avenue, Lexington, Mass. (1) Received $5,983.08; expended, $4,070.24. (2) See attached schedule.[1] (3) See attached schedule.[1] (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $41.25. (2) Various persons. (3) Miscellaneous expenses

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[5] Filed with the Clerk only.

such as taxies, carfare, luncheons, notaries' fees, etc. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., partner of law firm of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Louis Dreyfus, president of Chappell & Co., Inc., R. K. O. Building, New York City, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, a bill to facilitate naturalization of Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; John Frederick Firth-Hand, 1744 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 1742, Eightieth Congress, first session, a bill for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C.: Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia; the Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania, 308 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the just payment of French spoliation claims.

Turner, Harold J., 325 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., et al. (1) None on Federal legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular proposed Federal legislation. See statement A to my registration, Form B.

Vance, C. W., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) None. No services performed in third quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Van Osdol,[6] Paul, Jr., Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. (NOTE.—I am secretary-treasurer of the Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association. As secretary of this association I may, in the future, write letters to businessmen, civic organizations, and to the public, which may encourage them to write letters to members of Congress with regard to pending or proposed Federal legislation, including legislation relating to taxes. Although I am of the opinion that my activity does not come within the requirements of the Federal regulations of Lobbying Act, since a part of my activities may include the writing of letters to Members of Congress, or to encourage the members of our association to do so, I will keep the records required by the act and submit the required reports.)

Van Osdol,[7] Paul, Jr., Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None. (NOTE.—I am secretary-treasurer of the Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association. As secretary of this association I may, in the future, write letters to businessmen, civic organizations, and to the public, which may encourage them to write letters to Members of Congress with regard to pending or proposed Federal legislation, including legislation relating to taxes. Although I am of the opinion that my activity does not come within the requirements of the Federal regulations of Lobbying Act, since a part of my activities may include the writing of letters to Members of Congress, or to encourage the members of our association to do so, I will keep the records required by the act and submit the required reports.)

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1945.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

(1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the city of New York.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Versen,[5] Albert F., Missouri Valley Chapter, Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Received, $156.25; expended, $900.28. (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None.

Versen,[5] Albert F., St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) See statement attached.[1] (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None.

Viles,[4] A. L., president, the Rubbe Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No time devoted to legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills pertaining to long-term legislation on national rubber policy, on the transportation of flammable materials, and on proposed revisions of the excise taxes.

Virkus,[5] Frederick A., Conference of American Small Business Organizations, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Compensation, $3,000; expense, $181.03. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Mayflower Hotel, taxi drivers, telephone company, telegraph company. (3) Expenses: Primarily travel, some miscellaneous. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation or proposed legislation affecting small business.

Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Walker,[6] Jimmie, (voluntary) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., P. O. box 1329, 305–306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax equality among all business.

Walker,[7] Jimmie, (voluntary) Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., post office box 1329, 305–306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) None. (1) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax equality among all business.

Waller, Theodore, United World Federalists of Washington, D. C., 1710 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United World Federalists, Inc., 7 East Twelfth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary received from United World Federalists, Inc., $375. Received from United World Federalists, Inc., for traveling expenses, $217.39. Received from William Cochran as a gift for the purpose of carrying out the work and program of United World Federalists, $1,500. (2) Salary paid to my secretary, Mrs. Anita Kiefer, April 23, 1948, $25; May 21, 1948, $25; June 25, 1948, $25; $75 total salary paid by me to my secretary during the quarter April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948. (3) Salary for secretarial services. (4) World Government News. (5) Any legislation designed to strengthen the United Nations.

Walter, Stephen M., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $6,625.02 as an employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursement of $675 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various restaurants, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, book stores and stationers. (3) Transportation $196.65; meals and incidental expenses on account of association members in Washington, $375.35; telephones and telegraph, $25.55; newspapers and publications, $32.75; miscellaneous, $44.70. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies of which I am an employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Warfield, Ethelbert, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; report as attorney for American General Corporation, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) No receipts or expenditures during said period. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) To oppose S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Warfield, Ethelbert, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: $8,905.55 received by Satterlees, Warfield & Stephens for services by firm as counsel in all capacities. Expenditures: Professional services and disbursements, $2,343.75; transportation, $19.67; carfare, 20 cents; telephone calls, $65.74; telegrams, $2.39; stenography, $39.47; hotel rooms, $13.28; meals, $3.40; postage, $1.90. (2) William J. Bulow, Jr., Washington, D. C.: Pennsylvania Railroad and American Airlines, Inc.; various surface transportation companies; various telephone companies; Western Union; various stenographers; Hotel Carlton, Washington, D. C., various restaurants; and United States Post Office, respectively. (3) For the respective purposes above specified. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Warner, Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) Received from the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J., for professional services; conferences with various Members of Congress in regard to legislation for the period April 1, 1948, to June 30, 1948, inclusive, $3,250. Expenses for transportation and traveling to and from Washington, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, entertainment, and expenses in Washington, $532.19. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Services were rendered in connection with housing, credit, labor, railroad reorganization, and general welfare legislation and protective of the interests of the policy holders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[10] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $543. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $310.48; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $300, proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $77.47; total, $687.95. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $31.04 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[11] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $736.97. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $465.72; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $95.69; total, $1,011.41. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $46.57 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Times-Herald, Washington Evening Star, Washington Post. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[12] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received; contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $1,396. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $400.02, reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $166.23; total, $1,016.25. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted, not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities; therefore the sum of $40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[13] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $1,359.50. Moneys expended: management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $400.02; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $143.87; total, $993.89. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted, not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities; therefore the sum of $40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk, in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.
[10] Filed for third quarter, 1946.
[11] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[12] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[13] Filed for second quarter, 1947.

association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation appropriations and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[14] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $418. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $400.02; reimbursement of Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $106.66; total, $956.68. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities; therefore the sum of $40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[15] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received, contributions fror members of the association (none over $500), $98?.47. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $400.02; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $135.42; total, $985.44. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted, not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities; therefore the sum of $40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[16] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $741.83. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $329.94; reimbursement Rufus S. Luck for the following: clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $78.11; total, $858.05. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $32.99 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[6] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $837. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $329.95; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $100.50; total, $880.45. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $32.99 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[7] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $1,193. Moneys expended, none. (2) Registrant has received no moneys for management fees or reimbursement for expenses incurred during this quarter. Any such moneys will be subsequently shown in the proper quarterly statement. (3) See (1). (4) The following are names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Watson, J. R., Mississippi Railroad Association, room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss. (1) No reportable receipts and expenditures. (No segregation of salary as between principal employment and possible incidental concern with matters of Federal legislation. The registrant is of the opinion that his activities for the period covered by this report do not fall within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Annual employment, primarily for services not related to Federal legislation. Matters of Federal legislation are other and different from and only incidental to principal employment and purpose, but as an incident thereto, legislation pertaining to railroads in Mississippi None within the period covered by this report.

Waybur, Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative activity. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,000; $10 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying; i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 6 percent of time spent on this work. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and occasionally organized labor in general.

Webb, William H., National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,298.45. Reimbursement for expenses, $416.50; expended, $536.15. (2) Various individuals, corporations, and organizations. (3) For miscellaneous office, personal and traveling expenses. (4) Collier's Yearbook, 1948; Waterways magazine; and the Workboat. (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Weingarten, J. W., 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me during the quarter ending September 30, 1948, on account of lobbying activities. I received my regular monthly compensation described in last report for the duties of my office but neither received nor expended any money in connection with any lobbying activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroad business.

Weitzer,[8] Bernard, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Money expended: Railroad fares, $41.38; plane fares, $81.31; hotel bills (including room and meals), $82.75; taxi fares, $80.60; miscellaneous office expenses, $3.70; postage, $7.78; telephone calls from booths, $9.24; salaries $2,000 received by Bernard Weitzer. (2) American Airlines, Pennsylvania Railroad, Netherland Plaza Hotel, Cincinnati; Biltmore Hotel, New York; Park Central Hotel, New York; Hildebrecht Hotel, Philadelphia; various restaurants, various taxi drivers, various telephone booths, office expenses. (3) (As indicated by the nature of expenses in (1).) (4) None. (5) He is to support such legislation as will carry out the purposes of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution which follows and to oppose any legislation which would tend to frustrate the purposes therein expressed: "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America: to foster and perpetuate true Americanism; to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions; to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men; to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of ex-servicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies

[14] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[15] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[16] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[8] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

Weitzer, Bernard, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money expended: Railroad fares, $52.84; hotel bills (including room and meals), $41.50; taxi fares, $63; miscellaneous office expenses, $7.95; postage, $13.75; telephone calls from booths, $9.50; salaries, $999.99 received by Bernard Weitzer. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Park Central Hotel, New York, Concord Hotel, Kiamesha Lake, N. Y., various restaurants, various taxi drivers, various telephone booths, office expenses. (3) As indicated by the nature in (1). (4) The Jewish War Veterans. (5) He is to support such legislation as will carry out the purposes of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution which follows and to oppose any legislation which would tend to frustrate the purposes therein expressed: "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America, to foster and perpetuate true Americanism, to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions, to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed, to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men, to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of ex-servicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

Welliver, Edward M., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $18.60. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Wenchel, Tannenbaum & Nunan, 1625 K Street, Washington, D. C.; David Rosenthal, Scarsdale, N. Y., and Henry Kalman, New Rochelle, N. Y., through their counsel, Brozan & Holman, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,000. (2) No funds expended. (3) See answer to (2). (4) None. (5) To support changes in the Internal Revenue Code with respect to family partnerships.

West, Oscar H., 1001–1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (4) American Agency Bulletin, monthly publication of National Association of Insurance Agents. (Tear sheets attached.) (On original only.) (5) [Blank.]

White,[6] John C., care of Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Shippers Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) $65.10. (2) Ever Ready Stenographic Service, 1745 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Mimeographing statements of witnesses before Senate Agriculture Committee on minimum-margin legislation. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support S. 2202, European Recovery Act; S. 2376, revolving fund for occupied areas; reciprocal trade agreements extension. Oppose: Minimum margin legislation on futures exchanges; tax exemption of cooperatives.

White,[7] John C., care of Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Shippers Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) No expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support S. 2202, European Recovery Act; S. 2376, revolving fund for occupied areas; reciprocal trade agreements extension. Oppose: Minimum margin legislation on future exchanges; tax exemption of cooperatives.

White, Richard P., American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 636 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts of salary, $2,500; expenses reimbursed by employers, $514.49; (2) expenses paid to various air lines, railroads, hotels, clubs, restaurants, taxis, associations, etc. (3) Attending meetings of association committees, local associations, and payment for miscellaneous publications. (4) Blank. (5) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry.

Whitehall, Albert V., 1834 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $2,187.48; reimbursement of travel expenses, $82.02. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitlock, Douglas, partner of law firm Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock & Howrey, Room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Building Products Institute. (1) From the Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C., total fee, $4,500, allocated $1,500 to legislative and $3,000 to legal and administrative. Total expenses, $402.06, allocated $24.06 to legislative and $378 to legal and administrative. (2) Various. (3) Taxicabs, etc., and legal and administrative. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Whitney, Byrl A., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 1528 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $871.51 paid to me by Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and expended by me for transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (2) To hotel, restaurants, railroads, taxies, etc. (3) For transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, amendments to minimum-wage law, housing, and anti-inflation. NOTE.—This is final report, as above employment was only temporary.

Whyte, Louis E., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, allocated, $725. (2) No legislation pending; no expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) No legislation pending.

Wickenden, Elizabeth, 522 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None (on leave of absence entire period). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Wieting,[8] C. Maurice, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June, 1948, $1,650. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Wieting,[7] C. Maurice, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary from July 1 to July 23, 1948, $421.59. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. Left employ of above organization as of July 23, 1948. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Wilken,[11] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) October 1, to December 31, 1946, none received. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilken,[12] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) January 1 to March 31, 1947, none received. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilken,[14] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) April 1 to June 30, 1947, none received. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilken,[14] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,000 from Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill., and $750 from Earl W. Shinn, attorney, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., quarter July 1 to September 30, 1947, as a donation to publish research material under the title "Prosperity Unlimited—The American Way." (2) Kistler Stationery Co., Denver, Colo. (3) Costs of printing book. (4) Prosperity Unlimited—The American Way. (5) None.

Wilken,[15] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) None received quarter October 1 to December 31, 1947. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilken,[16] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) None received January 1 to March 30, 1948. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received no money for activities in any way connected with influencing legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Supporting S. 2743.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., and Wilkinson, Glen A., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Radio Service Corp. of Utah, 10 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No money received; expenses totaled $2.20: $1.70 for taxicabs and 50 cents for notary fees. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Opposing S. 2231, Senate Resolution 240 and Senate Resolution 246.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Goodwin, Francis M., and Wilkinson, Glen A., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath Tribe of Indians of Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) Received no payments; expended $651.75 as follows: Taxicabs, $7.50; telephone, $44.41; telegraph, $15.25; postage, $3.86; notary fees, $1; United Air Lines, $451.33; other travel, $128.40 (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2502 and H. R. 2775; opposing S. 1222, S. 1210, H. R. 1113, and H. R. 4725.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Goodwin, Francis M., and Wilkinson, Glen A., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Keshena, Wis. (1) Received $650 for legal services; only a portion of that amount is properly allocable to legislative work; expended $24.52 for taxicabs,

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[8] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[11] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.
[12] Filed for first quarter, 1947.
[13] Filed for second quarter, 1947.
[14] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[15] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[16] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation appropriations and the efficient and econcmical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[14] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $418. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $400.02; reimbursement of Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $106.66; total, $956.68. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities; therefore the sum of $40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[15] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received, contributions fror members of the association (none over $500), $98?.47. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $400.02; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: Clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $135.42; total, $985.44. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted, not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities; therefore the sum of $40 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[16] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $741.83. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $329.94; reimbursement Rufus S. Luck for the following: clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $78.11; total, $858.05. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $32.99 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[6] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $837. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $329.95; reimbursement Rufus S. Lusk for the following: clerical services, $450; proportionate share of office rent, telephone expense, printing, lights, postage, and miscellaneous, $100.50; total, $880.45. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $32.99 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The attached list shows names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Washington Taxpayers Association,[7] 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received: Contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $1,193. Moneys expended, none. (2) Registrant has received no moneys for management fees or reimbursement for expenses incurred during this quarter. Any such moneys will be subsequently shown in the proper quarterly statement. (3) See (1). (4) The following are names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent. Registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material: Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Watson, J. R., Mississippi Railroad Association, room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss. (1) No reportable receipts and expenditures. (No segregation of salary as between principal employment and possible incidental concern with matters of Federal legislation. The registrant is of the opinion that his activities for the period covered by this report do not fall within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Annual employment, primarily for services not related to Federal legislation. Matters of Federal legislation are other and different from and only incidental to principal employment and purpose, but as an incident thereto, legislation pertaining to railroads in Mississippi. None within the period covered by this report.

Waybur, Bruce, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,060; expenses, $130. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, etc. (3) Personal expenses in Washington and travel. These expenses cover both legislative and nonlegislative activity. (4) UE News. (5) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and the general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,000; $10 legislative expenses during quarter. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Lobbying; i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more than 6 percent of time spent on this work. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and occasionally organized labor in general.

Webb, William H., National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $1,298.45. Reimbursement for expenses, $416.50; expended, $536.15. (2) Various individuals, corporations, and organizations. (3) For miscellaneous office, personal and traveling expenses. (4) Collier's Yearbook, 1948; Waterways magazine; and the Workboat. (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Weingarten, J. W., 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me during the quarter ending September 30, 1948, on account of lobbying activities. I received my regular monthly compensation described in last report for the duties of my office but neither received nor expended any money in connection with any lobbying activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroad business.

Weitzer,[8] Bernard, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Money expended: Railroad fares, $41.38; plane fares, $81.31; hotel bills (including room and meals), $82.75; taxi fares, $80.60; miscellaneous office expenses, $3.70; postage, $7.78; telephone calls from booths, $9.24; salaries $2,000 received by Bernard Weitzer. (2) American Airlines, Pennsylvania Railroad, Netherland Plaza Hotel, Cincinnati; Biltmore Hotel, New York; Park Central Hotel, New York; Hildebrecht Hotel, Philadelphia; various restaurants, various taxi drivers, various telephone booths, office expenses. (3) (As indicated by the nature of expenses in (1).) (4) None. (5) He is to support such legislation as will carry out the purposes of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution which follows and to oppose any legislation which would tend to frustrate the purposes therein expressed: "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America: to foster and perpetuate true Americanism; to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions; to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men; to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of ex-servicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies

[14] Filed for third quarter, 1947.
[15] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.
[16] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[8] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

Weitzer, Bernard, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money expended: Railroad fares, $52.84; hotel bills (including room and meals), $41.50; taxi fares, $63; miscellaneous office expenses, $7.95; postage, $13.75; telephone calls from booths, $9.50; salaries, $999.99 received by Bernard Weitzer. (2) Pennsylvania Railroad, Park Central Hotel, New York, Concord Hotel, Kiamesha Lake, N. Y., various restaurants, various taxi drivers, various telephone booths, office expenses. (3) As indicated by the nature in (1). (4) The Jewish War Veterans. (5) He is to support such legislation as will carry out the purposes of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution which follows and to oppose any legislation which would tend to frustrate the purposes therein expressed: "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America, to foster and perpetuate true Americanism, to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions, to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed, to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men, to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of ex-servicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

Welliver, Edward M., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $18.60. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Wenchel, Tannenbaum & Nunan, 1625 K Street, Washington, D. C.; David Rosenthal, Scarsdale, N. Y., and Henry Kalman, New Rochelle, N. Y., through their counsel, Brozan & Holman, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $1,000. (2) No funds expended. (3) See answer to (2). (4) None. (5) To support changes in the Internal Revenue Code with respect to family partnerships.

West, Oscar H., 1001–1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (4) American Agency Bulletin, monthly publication of National Association of Insurance Agents. (Tear sheets attached.) (On original only.) (5) [Blank.]

White,[6] John C., care of Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Shippers Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) $65.10. (2) Ever Ready Stenographic Service, 1745 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) Mimeographing statements of witnesses before Senate Agriculture Committee on minimum-margin legislation. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support S. 2202, European Recovery Act; S. 2376, revolving fund for occupied areas; reciprocal trade agreements extension. Oppose: Minimum margin legislation on futures exchanges; tax exemption of cooperatives.

White,[7] John C., care of Fulbright, Crooker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Shippers Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) No expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support S. 2202, European Recovery Act; S. 2376, revolving fund for occupied areas; reciprocal trade agreements extension. Oppose: Minimum margin legislation on future exchanges; tax exemption of cooperatives.

White, Richard P., American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 636 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts of salary, $2,500; expenses reimbursed by employers, $514.49; (2) expenses paid to various air lines, railroads, hotels, clubs, restaurants, taxis, associations, etc. (3) Attending meetings of association committees, local associations, and payment for miscellaneous publications. (4) Blank. (5) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry.

Whitehall, Albert V., 1834 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $2,187.48; reimbursement of travel expenses, $82.02. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitlock, Douglas, partner of law firm Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock & Howrey, Room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Building Products Institute. (1) From the Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C., total fee, $4,500, allocated $1,500 to legislative and $3,000 to legal and administrative. Total expenses, $402.06, allocated $24.06 to legislative and $378 to legal and administrative. (2) Various. (3) Taxicabs, etc., and legal and administrative. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Whitney, Byrl A., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 1528 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $871.51 paid to me by Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and expended by me for transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (2) To hotel, restaurants, railroads, taxies, etc. (3) For transportation, living expenses, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, amendments to minimum-wage law, housing, and anti-inflation. NOTE.—This is final report, as above employment was only temporary.

Whyte, Louis E., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, allocated, $725. (2) No legislation pending; no expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) Natural Gas News Letter. (5) No legislation pending.

Wickenden, Elizabeth, 522 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None (on leave of absence entire period). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Wieting,[8] C. Maurice, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for April, May, and June, 1948, $1,650. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Wieting,[9] C. Maurice, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary from July 1 to July 23, 1948, $421.59. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. Left employ of above organization as of July 23, 1948. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Wilken,[11] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) October 1, to December 31, 1946, none received. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilken,[12] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) January 1 to March 31, 1947, none received. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilken,[13] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) April 1 to June 30, 1947, none received. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilken,[14] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,000 from Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill., and $750 from Earl W. Shinn, attorney, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., quarter July 1 to September 30, 1947, as a donation to publish research material under the title "Prosperity Unlimited—The American Way." (2) Kistler Stationery Co., Denver, Colo. (3) Costs of printing book. (4) Prosperity Unlimited—The American Way. (5) None.

Wilken,[15] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) None received quarter October 1 to December 31, 1947. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilken,[16] Carl H., 1316 Euclid Street, Washington, D. C. (1) None received January 1 to March 30, 1948. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received no money for activities in any way connected with influencing legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Supporting S. 2743.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., and Wilkinson, Glen A., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Radio Service Corp. of Utah, 10 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No money received; expenses totaled $2.20: $1.70 for taxicabs and 50 cents for notary fees. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Opposing S. 2231, Senate Resolution 240 and Senate Resolution 246.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Goodwin, Francis M., and Wilkinson, Glen A., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath Tribe of Indians of Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) Received no payments; expended $651.75 as follows: Taxicabs, $7.50; telephone, $44.41; telegraph, $15.25; postage, $3.86; notary fees, $1; United Air Lines, $451.33; other travel, $128.40. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 2502 and H. R. 2775; opposing S. 1222, S. 1210, H. R. 1113, and H. R. 4725.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Goodwin, Francis M., and Wilkinson, Glen A., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Keshena, Wis. (1) Received $650 for legal services; only a portion of that amount is properly allocable to legislative work; expended $24.52 for taxicabs,

[6] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[8] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[9] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[11] Filed for fourth quarter, 1946.

[12] Filed for first quarter, 1947.

[13] Filed for second quarter, 1947.

[14] Filed for third quarter, 1947.

[15] Filed for fourth quarter, 1947.

[16] Filed for first quarter, 1948.

postage, telegrams, and notary fees. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 5300; opposing H. R. 1113, H. R. 4725, and S. 1210.

Willard, A. D., Jr., National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $6,249.09 received for services as executive vice president of the National Association of Broadcasters for the quarter ending September 30, 1948; $1,070.61 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, communication companies, hotels and restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as executive vice president, acting as administrative officer at the headquarters of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involve Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None; miscellaneous information is furnished to members through weekly bulletin. (5) None; I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radio-broadcastnig industry.

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,500; no part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Williams, Myers & Quiggle, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Paul F. Myers, James Craig Peacock, Martin W. Meyer, John E. Skilling, and Robert H. Myers, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Food Brokers Association, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington Food Brokers Association, care of R. J. Dannemiller, president, 2653 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $47.03 from the National Food Brokers Association as reimbursement to us for taxi fares, telephone calls, telegrams, and transcript; and received $1,100 from the Washington Food Brokers Association as partial payment of our fee for legal services rendered in this matter; no expenditures. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) S. 2409 which became Public Law 509 on May 3, 1948.

Wilson, E. Raymond, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, July, August, September, $1,500; travel expense, $977.71. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Wilson, Eugene E., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a National Air Policy.

Wilson, Everett B., Jr., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, J. B., Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (1) No money received for legislative work; Wyoming Wool Growers Association paid my salary amounting to $1,500 for the third quarter and paid me $817.15 for traveling expenses, none of which was expended in Washington or on legislative work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) J. B. Wilson is editor of the Wyoming Wool Grower, a semimonthly publication sent to members of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association. (5) J. B. Wilson is not employed to support or oppose legislation, but as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association, is interested in all legislation concerning wool, lamb, mutton, public lands, and taxes.

Wingert, E. L., 1 West Main Street, Madison, Wis.; Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my share of retainer fee paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving mainly services unrelated to Federal legislation. Aside from that, received nothing for use in influencing Federal legislation; and expended nothing for that purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Woodrum, Clifton A., president, American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The registrant, Clifton A. Woodrum, nor his employer, the American Plant Food Council, Inc., neither received nor expended during last quarter any funds for the purpose of influencing directly or indirectly any legislation. (2) Please see letter filed with original registration. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Woodson, George W., 424 North Washington Avenue, Lansing, Mich.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) I have received as a commission $992.06, and I have also received $572.40 to be used for a petition drive in the State of Michigan to initiate legislation and all have been spent as follows: Attorney fee, supplies, printing, postage, and other expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Spent for supplies, postage, hotel, meals, transportation, clerical work, telephone, and telegraph. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16 (Townsend plan).

Woodul, Walter F., Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.; Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex.; Burlington-Rock Island Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Forth Worth, Tex.; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex.; the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; International-Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex.; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co., Houston, Tex.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Paris & Mount Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex.; Quanah, Acme & Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co., of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Texas Electric Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Texas South-Eastern Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex.; the Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; the Texas Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex.; the Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex.; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.; the Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Compensation as previously reported, and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses for months of June, July, and August 1948, in the sum of $630. (2) Braniff Airways, $21.98; Indian Lodge, $124.50; Hotel, Austin, $12.13; Hotel Baker, $17.25; and to various hotels, eating places, and others, in amounts less than $10. (3) Transportation, $36.02; hotels, $181.21; meals, $74.15; entertaining, $6.40; taxis, telephone, tips, and incidentals, $54.50. (4) None. (5) All legislation effecting Texas railroads.

Wootton, Edward W., Wine Institute, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 quarterly salary as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute, principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco. (2) Received by the undersigned for all personal services rendered as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above; no expenditures were made by undersigned to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) No legislative activity this quarter.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) $2,000 fees for services; $525.32 reimbursement for traveling, telephone and telegraph (including that paid to firm of Case & Wozencraft). (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved, Western Union and telephone company. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Wright, Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For July, August, and September 1948, postage and miscellaneous, $18.23. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for pay; a volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs; the General Federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Yonkers, Andrew J., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary, $875. This represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $99.31. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,333.34; expended, $6.90; meals, $2.10; transportation, $4.80; phone calls, none. (2) Restaurants and taxi companies. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Young, Robert R., 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Railway Progress, volume II, No. 5, July 1948; volume II, No. 6, August 1948; volume II, No. 7, September 1948. (5) None.

Zook, John D., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

postage, telegrams, and notary fees. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Supporting H. R. 5300; opposing H. R. 1113, H. R. 4725, and S. 1210.

Willard, A. D., Jr., National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $6,249.09 received for services as executive vice president of the National Association of Broadcasters for the quarter ending September 30, 1948; $1,070.61 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, communication companies, hotels and restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as executive vice president, acting as administrative officer at the headquarters of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involve Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None; miscelloneous information is furnished to members through weekly bulletin. (5) None; I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radio-broadcastnig industry.

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,500; no part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Williams, Myers & Quiggle, a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Paul F. Myers, James Craig Peacock, Martin W. Meyer, John E. Skilling, and Robert H. Myers, 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Food Brokers Association, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington Food Brokers Association, care of R. J. Dannemiller, president, 2653 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $47.03 from the National Food Brokers Association as reimbursement to us for taxi fares, telephone calls, telegrams, and transcript; and received $1,100 from the Washington Food Brokers Association as partial payment of our fee for legal services rendered in this matter; no expenditures. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) S. 2409 which became Public Law 509 on May 3, 1948.

Wilson, E. Raymond, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary, July, August, September, $1,500; travel expense, $977.71. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Wilson, Eugene E., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a National Air Policy.

Wilson, Everett B., Jr., 728 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, J. B., Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (1) No money received for legislative work; Wyoming Wool Growers Association paid my salary amounting to $1,500 for the third quarter and paid me $217.15 for traveling expenses, none of which was expended in Washington or on legislative work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) J. B. Wilson is editor of the Wyoming Wool Grower, a semimonthly publication sent to members of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association. (5) J. B. Wilson is not employed to support or oppose legislation, but as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association, is interested in all legislation concerning wool, lamb, mutton, public lands, and taxes.

Wingert, E. L., 1 West Main Street, Madison, Wis.; Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my share of retainer fee paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving mainly services unrelated to Federal legislation. Aside from that, received nothing for use in influencing Federal legislation; and expended nothing for that purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Woodrum, Clifton A., president, American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The registrant, Clifton A. Woodrum, nor his employer, the American Plant Food Council, Inc., neither received nor expended during last quarter any funds for the purpose of influencing directly or indirectly any legislation. (2) Please see letter filed with original registration. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Woodson, George W., 424 North Washington Avenue, Lansing, Mich.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) I have received as a commission $992.06, and I have also received $572.40 to be used for a petition drive in the State of Michigan to initiate legislation and all have been spent as follows: Attorney fee, supplies, printing, postage, and other expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Spent for supplies, postage, hotel, meals, transportation, clerical work, telephone, and telegraph. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16 (Townsend plan).

Woodul, Walter F., Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.; Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex.; Burlington-Rock Island Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Forth Worth, Tex.; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex.; the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; International-Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex.; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co., Houston, Tex.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Paris & Mount Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex.; Quanah, Acme & Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co., of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Texas Electric Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Texas South-Eastern Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex.; the Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; the Texas Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex.; the Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex.; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.; the Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex. (1) Compensation as previously reported, and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses for months of June, July, and August 1948, in the sum of $630. (2) Braniff Airways, $21.98; Indian Lodge, $124.50; Hotel, Austin, $12.13; Hotel Baker, $17.25; and to various hotels, eating places, and others, in amounts less than $10. (3) Transportation, $36.02; hotels, $181.21; meals, $74.15; entertaining, $6.40; taxis, telephone, tips, and incidentals, $54.50. (4) None. (5) All legislation effecting Texas railroads.

Wootton, Edward W., Wine Institute, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 quarterly salary as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute, principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco. (2) Received by the undersigned for all personal services rendered as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above; no expenditures were made by undersigned to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) No legislative activity this quarter.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) $2,000 fees for services; $525.32 reimbursement for traveling, telephone and telegraph (including that paid to firm of Case & Wozencraft). (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved, Western Union and telephone company. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Wright, Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For July, August, and September 1948, postage and miscellaneous, $18.23. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for pay; a volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs; the General Federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Yonkers, Andrew J., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary, $875. This represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $99.31. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,333.34; expended, $6.90; meals, $2.10; transportation, $4.80; phone calls, none. (2) Restaurants and taxi companies. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Young, Robert R., 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Railway Progress, volume II, No. 5, July 1948; volume II, No. 6, August 1948; volume II, No. 7, September 1948. (5) None.

Zook, John D., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.